INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI

**RISK FACTORS FOR VIOLENCE: A COMPARISON OF DOMESTIC
BATTERERS AND OTHER VIOLENT AND NON-VIOLENT OFFENDERS**

by

VICTORIA MOWAT-LÉGER

**A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Psychology**

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

November, 2001

© Victoria Mowat-Léger, 2001

**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-67053-8

Canada

The undersigned recommend to the
Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
Acceptance of the thesis:

"Risk Factors for Violence: A comparison of domestic
batterers and other violent and non-violent offenders"

submitted by

Vicki Mowat-Léger

in Partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Chair
External Examiner
Thesis Supervisor

Carleton University
November, 2001

Abstract

The current research explored the differences in risk and need factors associated with different types of batterers in comparison to other offenders. Historically there have been problems in this literature with male batterers being sampled without the use of any typologies, despite the wide acceptance that they are a heterogeneous group of individuals, differing in areas such as severity of abuse, generality of aggression, and psychopathology. In response, a number of researchers have developed typologies of risk and need. The current research employed a modified version of the typology proposed by Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994). One hundred and fifty-four male offenders, incarcerated at a provincial institution, participated in the study. Subjects were coded as to whether they were: violent only with an intimate partner (FOV); violent both in and outside of the home (GV); violent only with strangers (no intimate partner) (SOV); or not violent (NV). Numerous paper and pencil measures were administered, as well as interview-based measures, including the Psychopathy Checklist-Short Version (PCL:SV) and the Spousal Assault Risk Assessment Guide (SARA). Results indicated that the offender groups were homogeneous in terms of childhood background and parental dysfunction. This was thought to be due to the sample being comprised of all incarcerates, with such dysfunction being more typical of male offenders, generally. The two Batterer groups (FOV, GV) were more abusive within their relationships, held attitudes that were more supportive of domestic violence and sympathetic to male batterers as compared to the other violent (SOV) and non-violent offenders. In contrast, FOV batterers were more

similar to non-violent offenders in their general criminal attitudes than they were the other violent groups (GV, SOV). Psychopathy and impulsivity differentiated the violent from the non-violent offenders, while there were no differences among the groups on the measure of personality (NEO-PI-R). Lastly, the SARA proved to be a useful risk assessment instrument and was able to better differentiate the four groups than were the PCL:SV or the Level of Service Inventory-Ontario Revision (LSI-OR). This has important implications for both treatment and court policies and procedures that determine how different types of domestic batterers are dealt with.

Acknowledgements

A number of people have contributed in a number of different ways to the completion of this thesis. First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Bob Hoge, whose wealth of experience in Correctional Psychology and guidance was critical to the completion of this work.

Along the way, there have been several individuals who have lent an enormous amount of support and direction. Special thanks to Dr. Dave Simourd for his continuous encouragement with this research and his guidance with the HIQ, and to Dr. Adelle Forth, who not only has been incredibly supportive with both this and past research, but has also served as an inspiring role model for women in Corrections.

To my clinical supervisor and friend, Dr. Elizabeth Yates; words cannot express my gratitude for all your support with this project. This would never have been possible without you. To the men from RCTC who agreed to participate in this research and share their stories with me; I appreciate your candidness even though you didn't always like the questions. Thanks, guys.

Personally, I would like to express my appreciation to my friend Brenda Smith, who always listened patiently when nothing made sense and always seemed to know just what to say to keep me from throwing in the towel, all the while experiencing those same emotions with her own dissertation.

Finally, this work is dedicated to my son Alexandre and husband Claude. You both have patiently endured these last few months of craziness with smiles on your faces (most of the time). You have been my constant source of love, support and encouragement and I thank you for always believing in me.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	v
Table of Contents.....	vi
List of Tables.....	ix
List of Appendices.....	xi
Introduction: Literature Review.....	1
Prevalence.....	1
Theories of Domestic Violence.....	7
Feminist.....	8
Biological.....	9
Systemic.....	10
Social Learning.....	11
Psychology of Criminal Conduct.....	13
Batterer Typologies.....	14
Risk Factor Associated with Domestic Violence.....	20
Criminal History.....	23
History of Childhood Abuse.....	24
Personality Disorder.....	26
Personality Disorder: Five Factor Model.....	27
Personality Disorder: Psychopathy.....	29
Anger.....	31
Impulsivity.....	33

Substance Abuse.....	33
Minimization and Denial.....	35
Negative Attitudes About Women..... and Attitudes Supportive of Abuse	36
Jealousy.....	37
Risk Prediciton.....	38
Summary and Present Study.....	40
Objectives and Hypotheses.....	41
Method.....	44
Participants.....	44
Measures.....	49
Self-Report Measures.....	49
Interview and File-Based..... Measures	56
Procedure.....	60
Results.....	63
Data Management.....	64
Group Differences on Background Variables.....	66
Child Abuse and Family..... Dysfunction	66
Offender Substance Abuse History.....	68
Criminal History.....	69
Violence in Intimate Relationships.....	71
Denial and Minimization.....	72
Correlations Between BIDR and Predictor Variables.....	74

Analysis of Covariance.....	76
Group Comparisons on Predictor Variables.....	79
Comparisons Among Violent Groups.....	88
Comparisons Between Batterer Groups.....	90
Discriminant Function Analysis.....	91
Group Classification.....	95
Psychometric Analysis of the SARA.....	97
Reliability and Validity of the SARA.....	97
Principle Components Analysis.....	97
Construct Validity.....	98
Concurrent Validity.....	98
Four Group Comparisons.....	101
Comparisons Among Violent Groups.....	103
Comparisons Between Batterer Groups.....	104
Discussion.....	105
References.....	128
Appendices.....	145

List of Tables

Table 1:	Proportions of Different Types of Relationship Violence..... (GSS)	3
Table 2:	Risk Variables Associated With Domestic Violence.....	23
Table 3:	Type of Violence by Different Subject Group.....	41
Table 4:	Inter-rater Reliability Correlations.....	48
Table 5:	Prevalence of Offenders Experiencing Familial Abuse..... and Dysfunction	67
Table 6:	Prevalence of Offender Substance Abuse.....	69
Table 7:	Prevalence of Official Prior Offences.....	70
Table 8:	Prevalence of Past Relationship Violence.....	72
Table 9:	Proportions of Levels of Denial by Group.....	73
Table 10:	Correlations of Dependent Variable and BIDR Score.....	75
Table 11:	Means and Standard Deviations for Neuroticism and..... Conscientiousness	77
Table 12:	Adjusted and Unadjusted Means for MANCOVA.....	78
Table 13:	Means and Standard Deviations for MANOVA (NEO..... Variables and Attribution of Hostility)	80
Table 14:	Means and Standard Deviations for MANOVA..... (PCL:SV Total; Overgeneralization; Personal Responsibility; External Blame)	81
Table 15:	Means and Standard Deviations for MANOVA..... (Impulsivity, HIQ Total, LCP, ICO, TLV)	83
Table 16:	Means and Standard Deviations for MANOVA..... (ABI, ATWS, IBWB)	85
Table 17:	Means and Standard Deviations for MANOVA..... (IBWB subscales)	88
Table 18:	Structure Matrix for Discriminant Function.....	94

Table 19:	Group Classification Results.....	96
Table 20:	Factor Loadings for SARA..... Principle Components Analysis	98
Table 21:	Correlations of Variables and SARA Scores.....	100
Table 22:	Means and Standard Deviations for MANOVA..... (SARA factors and Total)	102
Table Q1:	Inter-Correlations of Variables.....	194
Table S1:	Means and Standard Deviations for MANOVA..... (SARA subscales)	206

List of Appendices

Appendix A: NEO-PI-R.....	145
Appendix B: Hostile Interpretations Questionnaire.....	151
Appendix C: Criminal Sentiments Scale.....	158
Appendix D: Interpersonal Jealousy Scale.....	162
Appendix E: Abusive Behaviour Inventory.....	164
Appendix F: Attitudes Towards Women Scale.....	167
Appendix G: Inventory of Beliefs About Wife Beating.....	169
Appendix H: Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding.....	171
Appendix I: Semi-Structured Interview.....	174
Appendix J: Level of Service Inventory-Ontario Revision.....	186
Appendix K: Spousal Assault Risk Assessment Guide.....	188
Appendix L: Psychopathy Checklist: Short Version.....	190
Appendix M: Informed Consent Form.....	191
Appendix N: Consent to Audio-tape Interview.....	192
Appendix O: Information Slip for Participants.....	193
Appendix P: Verbal Debriefing for Subjects.....	194
Appendix Q: Intercorrelations Among Variables.....	195
Appendix R: Results from 3-Group MANOVA and Special Contrasts.....	200
Appendix S: SARA subscale MANOVA Results.....	207

Risk Factors for Violence: A Comparison of Domestic Batterers and Other Violent and Non-Violent Offenders

Literature Review

The abuse of women within the context of intimate relationships has been defined as the "misuse of power by a husband, intimate partner (male or female), ex-husband or ex-partner against a woman, resulting in loss of dignity, control and safety as well as a feeling of powerlessness and entrapment experienced by the woman, who is the victim of on-going or repeated physical, psychological, economic, sexual, verbal, and/or spiritual abuse" (DeKeserdy & MacLeod, 1997, p. 5). The definition also includes threats or forced observation of violence against children, possessions, friends, pets, etc.

Prevalence

Abuse and aggression within intimate relationships has a long history and is unfortunately still a common phenomenon. Past surveys in the area of domestic violence include the Violence Against Women Survey (VAWS) by Statistics Canada in 1993. Of 12,300 women surveyed in Canada in 1993, 51% reported at least one incident of physical or sexual violence since the age of 16. It is unclear if "sexual violence" includes only contact violence or such "lesser violent" acts as being exposed to. Only 14% of these had ever disclosed or reported the incident to police (DeKeserdy & MacLeod, 1997). La Taillade and Jacobson (1997) reported that domestic violence is the single most common source of intentional injury among women. One third to one half of married

couples are violent towards each other at least once in their marriage, although the authors did not specify what constituted "violent". Among college and university students the numbers seem to be higher. Of 3,142 students surveyed across Canada, 35% of women reported experiencing some form of physical violence and 86% reported psychological abuse within a relationship since leaving high school. Among male respondents, 17% reported being physically abusive and 80% reported being psychologically abusive within a relationship since leaving high school (DeKeserdy & Kelly, 1993). These surveys have been criticized for mis-representing the picture of serious domestic violence in Canada, particularly in the way that all levels of abuse were included together, thereby, almost trivializing the very serious form of battering. High percentages of physical violence in these surveys included mostly "low level" violence such as pushing or grabbing. A much smaller proportion of these numbers engage in more severe violence such as choking or punching.

Most recently, the General Social Survey (GSS) was administered by Statistics Canada in 1999. This was the first attempt to measure spousal assault in a comprehensive way. Men and women were asked questions about violence they had experienced in any relationship occurring 12 months and five years preceding the survey. There were 10 questions regarding physical violence, ranging in seriousness from threats to sexual assault. Individuals were also questioned separately about psychological abuse. Results were compared to the VAWS from 1993. Results showed that one year rates of wife physical assault

remained constant at about 3%, while five year rates fell from 12% in 1993 to 8% in 1999 (Johnson & Hotton, 2001).

Again, the majority of violence involved less severe abuse. The table below outlines the proportions of individuals reporting the various types of violence within their relationship. Of those reporting abuse over the last five years, 26% were injured physically, 10% received medical attention and 20% reported fearing for their lives.

Table 1

Proportions of Different Types of Relationship Violence (GSS)

Violence By Current Spouse	Percentage (%)
Threatened to hit	56
Threw something	35
Pushed/Grabbed	72
Slapped	30
Kicked, Bit, Hit	19
Hit with an object	11
Beat	13
Choked	10
Used/Threatened to use gun/knife	Too small to report
Sexual Assault	8

With regard to emotional abuse within relationships, questions regarding insults, jealousy and attempts to control and limit activities and social relationships were posed. Results indicated that 18% of both men and women reported some emotional abuse within their relationships over the last year. Of these, 37% also reported being physically abused (Johnson & Hotton, 2001). The authors concluded that male to female victimization is multi-dimensional and women are victims of a wide range of assaultive behaviours in a variety of contexts.

In addition to the risk to the woman in a domestically violent situation, there is also evidence of an increased risk to the children. It has been found that men who are violent with their partners also tend to be violent towards the children in the relationship (McClosky, Figueredo, Aurelio, & Koss, 1995; Ross, 1996). Saunders (1996) reported that 50% of wife batterers also batter their children. Johnson and Hotton (2001) found that of the 1,245,946 reported cases of spousal violence in Canada in the last five years preceding the GSS, children were witness to the incidences in 37% of the cases. In 14% of those, children were also harmed or threatened. Wolfe and Jaffe (1991) noted that children who witness wife assault exhibit adjustment problems ranging from chronic developmental impairments to stress related disorders such as weight, eating and sleeping problems, anxiety and lowered responsiveness to adults, in general. Johnson and Hotton (2001) found that children who witness domestic violence are three times more likely to act physically aggressive with others and twice as likely to commit delinquent acts against property than are children who

do not witness such violence. In their adult years, children from these abusive situations also have a higher level of risk for violence within their own intimate relationships (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986).

Wife abuse, then, is a serious social problem with far-reaching negative consequences for the whole family. Although a serious problem, Dutton (1995) reported that only about 14.5% of batterers come into contact with police. Of these, 21.1% result in arrest and only 0.5% result in a conviction. Of all incarcerated men in Canada, at least 25% have a history of physical and/or sexual assault against a family member (Kropp & Hart, 1998). Arrest tends to vary in effectiveness. Schmidt and Sherman (1996) reported that arrest only acted as a deterrent to abuse for about 30 days. After that, abuse victims actually reported escalations in violence by their partners. Also, arrest tended to be a deterrent only for those who were employed or married, or "had something to lose". For those who had a history of arrest, were unemployed and had less than high school education, arrest actually escalated violence. In general, Schmidt and Sherman (1996) concluded that arrest increases the incidence of domestic violence over the long term rather than achieve its goal of reducing the violence.

Despite a plethora of literature in the area of domestic violence, there is still a great deal of variation on the characteristics, risk factors and motivation of domestic batterers. A comprehensive understanding of male batterers, their characteristics and risk factors is imperative for a number of reasons. First, a clearer understanding would help to prevent future violence on at least two levels. The first would be to prevent future violence from the batterer, himself.

Secondly, given the link between children witnessing violence between their parents and becoming violent within their own relationships as adults, understanding the risk factors might also prevent future violence within this population (Andrews & Bonta, 1998). Identifying the risk factors associated with domestic violence would also shed some light on classifying batterers who are prone to more severe violence within their relationship. This would potentially aid judges and other criminal justice personnel in making determinations related to sentencing, mandated treatment and community supervision for probation and parole purposes. According to Andrews and Bonta's (1994) risk principle, higher levels of service should be reserved for higher risk cases. Lastly, in identifying the particular criminogenic needs (dynamic risk factors) among batterers, future treatment providers can better target these needs and match the intervention to these factors. This is in line with Andrews and Bonta's (1994) need principle, which states that for correctional treatment to be effective, one should target the specific criminogenic needs of the offender. Traditionally, many treatment programs for male batterers have focused on anger management to the relative exclusion of other risk factors, such as substance use, or attitudes towards women. With the identification of the factors that are specific to batterers' needs, treatment intervention could be better tailored to meet their needs.

Despite the prevalence of wife assault and a huge literature on the topic, there have been surprisingly few efforts to identify the risk factors for spousal abuse. Andrews and Bonta (1998) explained that it was not until recently that spousal assault has even been considered a serious criminal act. Familial

violence historically has been viewed as a private matter - victims did not come forward, police did not respond to domestic calls and physicians did not report cases of abuse they treated. However, the feminist movement served to change the traditional perceptions of domestic violence. For example, shelters were opened for abused women and their children and the public was educated that this was not simply a "family" problem.

The following review will serve to summarize what has been addressed in the literature to date on male violence against their intimate partners. The research in this area has focused broadly on the types of violent acts engaged in by batterers, theories of male battering, as well as some risk characteristics of those who are violent with their intimates. Results of studies have generally varied widely. One problem is that men who batter are not a homogenous group of individuals: they vary in terms of psychopathology, motivation, and attitudes, as well as risk level. As such, the following review will begin with a review of the predominant theories of wife abuse and an overview of the risk factors that have been found to be particularly important in identifying male batterers.

Theories of Domestic Violence

A number of theories have been proposed to account for male violence against their intimate partners. Early theories of spousal assault were dominated by psychiatric explanations, where violence on a partner was attributed to psychological dependency, brain lesions or sadistic characteristics (La Taillade & Jacobson, 1997). Women also were labeled as being masochistic, and fulfilling some need by "choosing" violent men. Today, violence among intimates is

considered to be far more common than originally thought, and a phenomenon that is not confined only to psychologically disturbed individuals.

Feminist theory. Violence against women is regarded as simply one of the unfortunate outcomes of a long-standing tradition of male domination and patriarchy in the political and economic affairs of many societies (Ellis, 1993). In this sense, the act of violence upholds the system of male dominance by maintaining the exploitation of women and maintaining their position in a subservient role (Ellis, 1993; Stock, 1991). The class in power will, and is encouraged to use whatever means available to maintain their level of advantage (Stock, 1991). Violence is motivated by a desire for power and control (Barbaree & Marshall, 1991; Ellis, 1993; Stock, 1991). Research in this area has focused on the relation between more traditional attitudes towards men and women's roles. Tokar and Fischer (1996) surveyed 106 male university students. They found that negative attitudes towards feminism were the strongest predictor of whether subjects also held attitudes supportive of violence in dating situations. Those more supportive of the use of force in dating situations also held more traditional gender role attitudes. The weakness with the feminist theory is that it does not explain why only some men are violent while the rest are not.

As Dutton (1994) noted, one of the problems with the feminist approach is the assumption that patriarchy causes violence. He reported that with the high incidence of psychopathology among domestic batterers, a more likely explanation is that patriarchy provides the values and attitudes that personality disordered men will use to justify their abuse. Otherwise, as Dutton (1994)

concluded, if patriarchy was a causal factor, all men would batter their partners. Andrews and Bonta (1998) also criticized the feminist perspective for its "anti-individualism" thinking. They noted that this is one of the reasons for the scarcity of research on risk assessment. Andrews and Bonta (1998) reported that in adopting the perspective that aggression among men is "normal" in our society and that differentiating batterers along other dimensions was of little value, feminist researchers have discouraged the investigation of individual risk factors.

Biological theory. Evolutionary and biological theory propose that there is a physiological link to aggression, criminal behaviour, impulse control and risk seeking behaviour. Testosterone levels have long been suspected of being linked with incidences of aggression (Archer, 1994). Testosterone and aggression has been investigated with community males (Soler, Vinayak, & Quadagno, 2000), adult male offenders (Aromacki, Lindman, & Eriksson, 1999; Dabbs, Carr, Frady, & Riad, 1995), young offenders (Brooks & Reddon, 1996), male batterers (McKenry, Julian, & Garazzi, 1995) and female offenders (Dabbs, & Hargrove, 1997). Some studies have found significant correlations between testosterone levels and the type of offender (violent offenders having higher levels than non-violent offenders) (Brooks & Reddon, 1996; Dabbs, et al., 1995) while others have found mixed results (Aromacki, et al., 1999; Dabbs & Hargrove, 1997), or no connection (McKenry et al., 1995). Among male batterers, Soler et al. (2000) found higher levels of testosterone were associated with self-reported verbal and physical aggression, while McKenzie et al. (1995) found no such association. Generally, it has been concluded that testosterone based

theories have little concrete support (Albert, Walsh, & Jonik, 1993), particularly between aggressive and non-aggressive individuals. Also, aggression levels do not tend to change at puberty – a time of highest testosterone levels.

More recently, Gottman, Jacobson, Rushe and Shortt (1995) have begun a line of research in which heart rate responses were measured and found to differ among different types of aggressive men. Gottman et al. (1995) actually proposed a typology of batterers based on their findings. In looking at 60 couples during conflict enactment's in a laboratory setting, they noted that Type I batterers experienced decelerations in their heart rates while Type II batterers displayed increases in their heart rates. Type I batterers were described as more "cold-hearted" in their abuse, displayed more severe physical violence, were generally more criminal, and were violent both inside and outside the home. This type of batterer also had witnessed more parental violence than the others. Jacobson and Gortner (1996) described this type as having a number of similarities to psychopathic offenders. Type II batterers, by contrast, were more emotional, more "hot-blooded", more verbally abusive and limited their violence to the home. Although interesting, this perspective is new and requires more research to be completed before it can be evaluated.

Systemic theory. This theory holds that the family's emphasis on intimacy, privacy and their own ascribed sex roles contribute to the maintenance and transmission from generation to generation of violence within the family. The actions of one spouse are seen as functions or consequences of the actions of the other spouse. In this regard, the responsibility of the batterer's actions is

dispersed among the other family members (La Taillade & Jacobson, 1997). For obvious reasons, this theory is generally not well supported, as it ignores issues of sexism, negative attitudes towards women and other societal pressures as factors in family violence. It also smacks of victim blaming in holding the other family members as at least partially responsible for the abusive behaviour.

Social learning theory. In response to the problems associated with the feminist perspective, researchers have attempted to identify what differentiates batterers from non-batterers. The social learning theory of domestic violence is similar to the feminist theory in that both agree that cultural beliefs and traditions condone and even encourage both physical and sexual aggression against women (Ellis, 1993). However, social learning focuses more on the fact that aggressive behaviour of any kind is learned (Ellis, 1993).

Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) found support for this theory in their landmark study on male batterers. They discovered that one of best predictors for becoming abusive within a relationship is the witnessing of violence in the home as a child. The use of violence is proposed to be maintained by internal (reduction of tension for the batterer) and external (fear and obedience by the woman) reinforcers and justified with cognitive strategies such as denial and minimization. Among children in the family, boys learn that the use of violence is an acceptable way of solving problems in their relationships. This would explain the high percentage of batterers who come from families in which they observed or experienced abuse. Again, though, the theory does not fully explain how men

who also come from such environments break free of the cycle within their own relationships.

More recently, and in response to the criticisms presented regarding the feminist, social learning, and biological perspectives, more researchers have adopted a more integrated theory, which combines the above-noted perspectives to propose a more comprehensive theory of male aggression against women. Dutton (1988) noted a more complex psychosocial model was required. As such, he proposed the Interactionist Model, which incorporates as many different risk factors as possible in explaining male aggression against their partners, including sociocultural, individual, psychological, physiological and familial factors. In this model, Dutton describes that batterers suffer from Borderline Personality Organization (BPO), which includes symptoms very typical of Borderline Personality Disorder, including extreme levels of anger and impulsivity, an unstable sense of self and an inability to form meaningful, stable relationships. Instead, batterers tend to have many intense but unstable intimate relationships.

Dutton (1995) described that as children, these men experience paternal rejection, shame and trauma (childhood abuse) resulting in an insecure attachment pattern and anger that carries on into adulthood. This insecure attachment translates into the inability to form quality adult relationships. These batterers respond to strong inner cues of tension and negative ruminations about their partner as being the source of their misery (Dutton, 1998). The tension they experience is a reaction to intermittently rewarding/punishing attachment patterns developed in childhood and is relieved through their violent outburst (Dutton,

1998). In this sense, the violence is initiated by their internal state rather than external occurrences. Although this theory has received some empirical support, Pan, Neidig and O'Leary (1994) criticized the theory for being far too complex and with too many factors to be reasonably used for hypothesis testing.

Psychology of Criminal Conduct. Andrews and Bonta (1994) proposed a more comprehensive theory of general criminal behaviour. This theory is more a general personality and social psychology of criminal conduct and in this sense, looks at biological, personal and interpersonal, familial, structural/cultural factors and, of course, individual differences. As such, it can be applied to various different types of criminal behaviours, including sexual offending and domestic violence (Scott, 1995). This theory holds that criminal activity results from the interaction between the individual's immediate situation and personal factors. As such, there is a sensitivity to changes in the environment and behaviour to which other theories may not be as receptive. The primary focus of the psychology of criminal conduct is in explaining individual differences within criminal behaviour. Andrews and Bonta (1994) identified four variables they considered to be central to the prediction of criminal activity. Based on past meta-analysis research, such as that by Gendreau, Andrews, Coggin, and Chanteloupe (1992), those variables identified by Andrews and Bonta (1994;1998) as the "Big Four" include past criminal history, antisocial attitudes, antisocial associates and antisocial personality. These are considered to be the best established risk factors for criminal conduct within any sample. Within the area of domestic violence specifically, these four would translate into a history of spousal assault, attitudes

condoning such behaviour, personality-disorder traits and peers that also condone spousal abuse.

It would appear, then, that there is not one all-encompassing theory to explain why men engage in abusive behaviour towards their female partners. The consensus does seem to be, though, that domestic violence is multi-faceted with many different factors contributing to such behaviour. According to Andrews and Bonta (1994), one of the biggest issues in both general criminal behaviour and domestic violence is that of individual differences - "people differ in the frequency of criminal activity, and in the number, type and variety of criminal acts in which they engage" (Andrews & Bonta, 1994, p. 36). Given that batterers are a heterogeneous group, the issue then becomes identifying which factors are more predominant for which types of batterers and what differentiates them from men who do not batter.

Batterer Typologies

Batterers have been recognized as a fairly diverse and heterogeneous group of individuals (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; La Taillade & Jacobson, 1997). They vary in frequency and severity of attacks, attitudes towards women, personality characteristics, impairment of psychological functioning and the function of their violent behaviour. Given the widely accepted idea that batterers are a heterogeneous group of individuals, it is interesting that they continue to be treated as a homogenous group within the literature. Child molesters have long been recognized as heterogeneous, and are treated as such in the literature. Studies break down their samples into incest offenders versus

extra-familial child molesters. Some go further to break down the distinction between offenders targeting boys versus girls versus those who target both boys and girls. Similarly, the rapist literature has also recently begun to advocate for the use of typologies (Marshall, 1993; Marshall & Pithers, 1994). It would make sense, then, that male batterers should also be differentiated, at least among those who are violent only within their families versus those who are generally violent both inside and outside the home. Resulting from this recognized variation, there have been several theorists who have proposed different typologies of batterers.

Early attempts to subtype male batterers were based mostly on clinical observation and a priori speculation. Three dimensions were identified as differentiating these individuals: severity of violence, generality of violence and psychopathology. More recently, empirical studies have employed factor and cluster analysis to identify different types. Interestingly, most typologies derived empirically have resulted in differentiating batterers along roughly the same three dimensions as the rational/deductive approach (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994).

Hamberger and Hastings (1986) used the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory (MCMI; Millon, 1983) to identify three key personality types among 105 men seeking treatment for domestic violence. The first type, the "Passive-dependent/compulsive" tended to be tense, rigid and highly dependent on their partners. Their hostility came when their wives did not meet their needs.

Their second group, the "Schizoid/borderline", was withdrawn and asocial, hypersensitive to interpersonal slights and therefore emotionally volatile and prone to over-reacting in situations. Hamberger and Hastings (1986) described this group as a "Jeekyll and Hyde" personality - being calm one moment and flying into a rage the next.

The third subgroup was labeled "Narcissistic/antisocial". These men were highly self centered and rigid in their beliefs. They tended to use others to meet their needs. Any hesitation by a woman to meet their demands resulted in threats and aggression.

Rather than focusing on psychopathology, Saunders (1992) focused more on the actual difference in violent behaviour among his 165 men entering a treatment program for domestic violence. Through cluster analysis, Saunders also discovered three subgroups. The first, accounting for 52% of the sample was labeled "Family Only". These men displayed very little violence outside of the home, and were least psychologically abusive with their partners.

The second group accounted for 29% of the sample, and Saunders (1992) termed them as "Generally violent". This group exhibited the most extrafamilial violence and was most severe in their marital violence.

The last group, accounting for 19% of the sample was labeled "Emotionally Volatile", and most closely resemble the psychopathological explanation for abusive behaviour. These men were most psychologically abusive with their partners, however, their physical violence was not as severe as among the "Generally violent" group.

Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) proposed a three-fold typology that combined the typologies of Hamberger and Hastings (1986) and Saunders (1992). Types were differentiated on factors such as childhood/family experiences, attachment to others, impulsivity, attitudes towards women and violence, peer experiences and social skills. Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) proposed a "Family only" group, who exhibited the least severe violence, the least sexual and psychological violence, and had almost no violence outside of the home. This group resembles the "Family only" and "Passive-dependent" groups from Saunders (1992) and Hamberger and Hastings (1986), respectively.

The "Generally violent" group, corresponding with Hamberger and Hastings' (1986) "Narcissistic/antisocial" and Saunders' (1992) "Generally violent" groups, displayed moderate to severe abuse and exhibited high levels of extra-familial violence.

Finally, the "Dysphoric-Borderline" group exhibited moderate to severe abuse mostly within the family, however, they also showed some extra-familial violence and criminal behaviour. This group corresponds with the "Emotionally volatile" and "Schizoid/Borderline" groups from Saunders (1992) and Hamberger and Hastings (1986).

The above studies all investigated numerous risk factors associated with the different types. Their results will be discussed in the following section on Risk Factors Associated with Domestic Violence.

There have been other typologies put forth. For example, Gondolf (1988) proposed a sociopathic, antisocial and typical batterer. However, there has been

little empirical research to support this typology, and there was actually little to differentiate the sociopathic and antisocial batterer.

One point that tends to emerge from an analysis of research on typologies is that there appears to be a great deal of overlap between types. Rather than the different profiles possessing one trait or not (for example, depression or anger), traits seem to fall more on a continuum. For example, "Family only" batterers seem to have *lower* levels of depression, anger and jealousy than "Generally violent" batterers, and the "Dysphoric-borderline" fall somewhere in between. In fact, in the Saunders (1992) study, there was actually very little to differentiate the "Emotionally volatile" and "Generally violent" groups of men, other than the severity of their violence. Unfortunately, the author did not define the levels of severity of violence and what constituted "severe enough" violence to be deemed "Generally violent". Similarly, although Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) attempted to bring both earlier studies together in an all-encompassing typology, there still seemed to be some overlap between categories. For example, their "Family only" batterers had "almost no violence outside the home". There was no description of what level of violence outside the home was acceptable before one was categorized as "Generally violent".

Two recent studies have separately investigated the validity and utility of Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart's (1994) typology (Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Huss, & Ramsey, 2000). First, Waltz et al. (2000) attempted to validate this typology with 75 domestically violent couples recruited from the community and 32 maritally distressed, but non-violent

comparison couples. Couples were administered a number of psychological measures and abuse questionnaires. They were also videotaped and physiological readings taken when discussing a topic of dissent. Although overall some validity was found for the typology based on the degree of violence within the relationship and degree of general violence, Dysphoric-Borderline and Generally violent offenders were difficult to distinguish based on personality characteristics. In fact, the authors noted that the one component of this classification system that continues to lack clarity is the personality disorder factor.

In support of these findings, Tweed and Dutton (1998) also found no significant differences on the MCMI-II Antisocial and Aggressive-Sadistic scales between their Generally violent and Pathological groups of batterers. Waltz et al. (2000) suggested that confusion of group differences in psychopathology may be due to limitations of the MCMI/MCMI-II.

Langhinrichsen-Rohlin et al. (2000) also found that Generally violent batterers were most differentiated from Dysphoric-Borderline and Family-only batterers. In contrast, Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart (2000) were able to confirm their three-fold typology and found that Generally violent men were most like Dysphoric-Borderline with respect to impulsivity, attitudes towards women and violence and lack of social skills. Family-only batterers most resembled the non-violent comparison group. Given the current difficulties with a full 3-fold typology, the current research investigated only two of those categories; Generally violent and Family-only.

Further difficulties include the fact that all of the above studies have based their typologies on men seeking treatment within the community for domestic violence. This potentially leaves out two populations. First, there has been little research compiled with men who are actually incarcerated for both domestic and other violent offences. Also, in studying men who are seeking treatment for domestic violence, there is the potential to miss men who tend to be abusive in their relationships but have never been charged with domestic violence. Given that the percentage of batterers actually coming into contact with the police is only about 14.5% (Dutton, 1994), the number of men who engage in this behaviour but are never caught is tremendous. It would seem beneficial for the purposes of furthering our knowledge of the various risk factors for domestic violence to extend the samples to include men who are violent only within their families; those who are only violent with strangers; those who are violent with both strangers and their families and those with no history of violence.

Risk Factors Associated with Domestic Violence

Risk factors have often been studied to determine which are important in predicting future re-offending. Historically, risk prediction and predictions of future criminal activity have been based on clinical judgement, or what Andrews and Bonta (1994) termed as first generation risk assessments. These were typically characterized by informal and non-observable criteria based on a clinical interview and occasionally some psychological testing. As such, assessments were very subjective, often intuitive and most importantly, not particularly

accurate (Andrews & Bonta, 1998). Clinicians have fairly consistently been found to be "poor prognosticians" (Andrews & Bonta, 1998, p. 220).

More recently, there has been more movement towards the use of actuarial based risk assessments, or those that provide a more set criteria for decision making. These criteria are validated with empirical research. Meta-analyses that have been completed have shown that actuarial measures are superior to clinical judgements in the assessment of dangerousness (Bonta, Law, & Hanson, 1998) and in the prediction of sex offenders (Hanson & Bussiere, 1998). Some of the problems associated with actuarial measures include a lack of training provided in the completion of the assessment as well as the fact that many of the measures assess only static items. Static risk factors are those that are unchangeable in the individual (eg. criminal history). However, it has become more apparent that it is also vitally important to assess what are called the dynamic risk factors, or criminogenic need variables; those variables that can be altered through intervention or treatment, and if changed, reduce the chances of future criminal or antisocial activity (Andrews & Bonta, 1994). These dynamic variables provide the predictive information for risk assessments and represent the variables that guide the administration of services and treatment intervention. However, the preferred actuarial measures of risk now tend to incorporate both static and dynamic factors, for example, the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R; Andrews & Bonta, 1995).

The following section summarizes the risk factors that have been found to be most strongly related to domestic violence. Extensive research has been

The following section summarizes the risk factors that have been found to be most strongly related to domestic violence. Extensive research has been published regarding both static and dynamic risk factors found to be associated with violence against women. Some have been found to be stronger predictors than others. For example, variables such as past history of childhood abuse, cognitive distortions and negative attitudes towards women have received stronger empirical support. Other variables, such as anger and substance abuse have generated more debate as to their role in domestic violence. Below is a table that summarizes these risk variables that are included in this section. Many of the variables are also related to general criminal behaviour, while others have been found to be quite specific to male batterers.

Table 2

Risk Variables Associated with Domestic Violence

Variable	Dynamic (D) or Static (S)
Criminal History	S
History of Childhood Abuse	S
Personality Disorders – Five Factor Model	S
- Psychopathy	S
Anger/Hostility	D
Impulsivity	D
Substance Abuse	D
Minimization/Denial	D
Negative Attitudes Towards Women	D
Jealousy	D
Attitudes Supportive of Abuse	D

Criminal History. One of the most consistent and reliable predictors of violent offending is a history of prior violent and non-violent offending (Hanson & Bussiere, 1996). Boer, Wilson, Gauthier, and Hart (1997) concluded that past violent and non-violent convictions were indicative of a predisposition towards general anti-social behaviour, and therefore, predictive of future violence. In looking at the recidivism rate over two years, Klein (1996) found that 56.4% of 663 batterers were re-arrested for a new crime and 34% were re-arrested for a new incidence of spousal abuse. Age and prior criminal history were the only

variables found to predict more spousal abuse. Klein (1996) concluded that male batterers "look like criminals, act like criminals and re-abuse like criminals" (p.207). However, given that the sample was taken from those proceeding through the court process, this statement is somewhat deceptive - these individuals were criminals. Eighty percent had prior records and 23% had committed other violent offences against other males. To suggest that all batterers are typical of this sample is somewhat misleading. Another limitation of this study is there was no breakdown provided as to recidivism rates of men who were violent only within their family versus those who were also violent outside the family.

It is believed that different types of domestic batterers have varying levels of contact with the criminal justice system, for example, Family-only batterers have little other criminal involvement compared to Generally violent batterers (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). In addition to this, failures to abide by probation or other conditions seem to indicate a poor prognosis in terms of re-offending (Kropp & Hart, 1998).

History of Childhood Abuse. Dysfunctional and abusive family backgrounds has long been considered as a strong predictor of criminal offending (Boer, et al., 1997; Groth & Burgess, 1977; McCoy, 1997) and domestic violence (Saunders, 1995). Some studies have reported that witnessing violence is an even stronger predictor than actually experiencing violence as a child (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986; Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989) while others have noted that both are equally strong in their predictive ability. If both

experiencing and witnessing violence are present, the risk for domestic violence is even higher (Saunders, 1995). In support of the social learning theory of violence, the authors explained that witnessing violence teaches a child that violent behaviour reestablishes control over another individual. This is a fairly consistent finding among researchers (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1991; Limandri & Sheridan, 1996).

In an attempt to predict woman abuse among married couples, O'Leary, Malone and Tyree (1994) conducted a 30-month longitudinal study of 393 married couples. They found that witnessing violence as a child was one of the three main predictors of physical violence towards a spouse. The other two variables were marital discord and an aggressive personality. In comparing 177 Family-only batterers versus 346 offenders who were only violent with strangers and had no evidence of domestic violence (Stranger-Violent), Dutton and Hart (1992) found that Family-only (54.6%) batterers had witnessed significantly more childhood violence than Stranger-violent men (38.7%). In contrast to this, Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) and Saunders (1992) all found that "Generally violent" men seemed to report higher levels of experiencing and witnessing of childhood abuse, while "Family only" men reported the least. La Taillade and Jacobson (1997) reported that 78% of "Generally violent" men observed bi-directional and father-to-mother violence growing up, as compared to 22% of "Family only" batterers. Shields, McCall and Hanneke (1988) found, though that "Family only" batterers were more likely to have experienced victimization at the hands of their fathers as children than were "Stranger only"

and "Generally violent" batterers. They proposed that "Family only" batterers use violence as a coping strategy for stress and conflict within a relationship whereas "Generally violent" batterers use violence simply as a way of interacting with people (Generally violent and Stranger only violent men were almost indistinguishable in their profiles). Boer et al. (1997) concluded that victimization is a general risk factor for criminal and violent behaviour.

Personality Disorder. Although many of the theorists in the area of domestic violence are reluctant to "pathologize" the behaviour of male batterers by chalking it up to a personality disorder, many researchers have put forth evidence that these individuals do show higher frequencies of diagnosed personality disorders (Dutton & Hart, 1992; Dutton Starzomski, & Ryan, 1996; Gondolf, 1998; Limandri & Sheridan, 1996; Meloy, 1998; Meloy & Gothard, 1995). The most common of these have been those personality disorders characterized by anger or impulsivity - borderline personality disorder (Dutton et al., 1996), narcissism, obsessive-compulsive, histrionic, dependent, and of course, antisocial personality disorders (Kropp, Hart, Webster, & Eaves, 1995; Meloy & Gothard, 1995; Zona, Sharma, & Lane, 1994). In a sample of 840 court-referred batterers in treatment, Gondolf (1988) found that almost 50% had an Axis II personality disorder. Of these, 25% evidenced Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD; American Psychological Association, 1994), 25% Passive-Aggressive Personality Disorder (PAPD; American Psychological Association, 1994), 20% Anti-social Personality Disorder (APD; American Psychological Association, 1994) and 20% Dependent Personality Disorder (DPD; American

Psychological Association, 1994). Often, it is these personality disorders that have been associated with a higher risk of violence and violent recidivism (Saunders, 1992).

Dutton and Hart (1992) found within their sample of 597 offenders, 34% were diagnosed with a personality disorder. "Family only" batterers (43.5%) had significantly more diagnoses than "Stranger only violent" (34.1%) or non-violent offenders (13.6%). The most common personality disorder with domestic batterers were NPD and Borderline Personality Disorder (BPD; American Psychological Association, 1994). "Family only" batterers were as likely as "Stranger-only" batterers to be diagnosed with APD. In contrast to these findings, Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) found that their "Family only" batterers had very little evidence of any psychopathology while their "Generally violent" group had high levels of psychopathy and APD. The "Dysphoric/Borderline" group had other personality disorders such as BPD and Schizoid Personality Disorder (SZDPD; American Psychological Association, 1994).

Personality Disorders: The Five-Factor Model. Despite the widespread use of the DSM multi-axial system of diagnosing psychopathology and personality disorders, this categorical and often medicalized model of diagnosing personality disorders has often been criticized (Costa & McCrae, 1992). In contrast, the dimensional model of personality disorders, which emphasizes the continuity within normal variations in personality traits has been far more supported. The dimensional model is typically less arbitrary, more informative and more consistent with the actual nature of personality disorders (Costa &

McCrae, 1992). Historically, the major impediment to adopting a dimensional approach has been a lack of consensus on a model of "normal personality" among the different schools of thought on personality theory. More recently, however, there has been more consensus on the five basic factors of personality structure. These factors have been found to occur and re-occur across numerous different studies and seem to account for a large proportion of variance on measures across a variety of personality theories (Costa & McCrae, 1992). The five-factor model of personality includes neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness. These have been the basis for the development of the NEO-PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Evidence of this same five-factor structure has been replicated in other cultures and among different populations (children, adults, men, women, non-Caucasian) (Costa & McCrae, 1992). At this point, the five-factor model provides the most comprehensive description of personality.

In using the five-factor model for the diagnosis of personality disorders, the NEO-PI-R is the only five-factor personality inventory to be used extensively in clinical practice. As such, each of the DSM personality disorders can be translated as "maladaptively extreme variants to the five basic factors of personality" (Widiger, Trull, Clarkin, Sanderson & Costa, 1994, p. 41). Extreme or excessive personality characteristics are tantamount to a personality disorder and place an individual at risk for certain personality disorders, although an extreme score does not in and of itself mean an individual has a personality disorder (Widiger, et al., 1994). Given the wide acceptance now of the use of the

five-factor model of personality, the model will serve as the basis of examination of personality structure for the current research.

Personality Disorders: Psychopathy. Given the apparent prevalence of personality disorders among male batterers, the issue of psychopathy has also recently been gaining more popularity in an effort to understand the motives of aggressive men. Psychopathy is a personality disorder that represents a "constellation of affective, interpersonal and behavioural characteristics, including egocentricity, impulsivity, irresponsibility, shallow emotions, lack of empathy guilt or remorse, strong ability to manipulate, pathological lying and the persistent violation of societal norms and expectations" (Hare, 1996, p.25). Given the implications with regards to risk of violence and recidivism, psychopathy is certainly at least one of the most important constructs with a criminal population, although perhaps with a male batterer population, other personality disorders may be of more importance. Psychopathy differs from APD in that the latter does not capture the affective aspects of the disorder (Haapasalo, 1994; Hare, Forth, & Strachan, 1992). APD is more concerned with general criminality and the behaviours representing that criminality whereas, at the core of psychopathy is the lack of emotion, superficial charm and lack of empathy in addition to the behavioural markers (Hare et al., 1992). A diagnosis, then of APD will identify the antisocial and under-socialized individuals, but the diagnosis is relatively insensitive to the personality elements inherent in the diagnosis of psychopathy (Harpur, Hare, & Hakistan, 1989). It is estimated that 50-75% of prison populations are APD whereas only 15-25% are psychopathic

(Hare et al., 1992; Hare, 1996). It has also been suggested that psychopathy is a narrower concept than APD, as only 30% of those diagnosed with APD also meet the criteria for psychopathy, whereas, of those diagnosed with psychopathy, 90% also meet the criteria for APD, suggesting that APD encompasses more than psychopathy (Hare, 1996).

One of the most widely used measures to assess psychopathy is the Psychopathy Checklist (PCL; PCL-R; Hare, 1991) first described by Hare in 1980 and revised in 1985 (Hare, 1996). The revised version was cut down to 20 items from 22, with each item being scored on a three point scale according to specific criteria. It remains a clinical rating scale completed using file information and a semi-structured clinical interview (Hare, Harpur, Hakistan, Forth, Hart, and Newman, 1990). The total score can range from 0 to 40, with the generally accepted cut-off being a score of 30 for those deemed psychopathic (Hare, 1996). Factor analyses of both the PCL and the PCL-R have consistently revealed a stable two-factor structure (Hare et al., 1990; Hare, 1996; Harpur et al., 1989). The first factor consists of the constellation of affective and interpersonal traits that are considered the core of psychopathy, including lack of remorse, callousness, manipulateness. The second factor describes more of the behavioural aspects typically indicative of a chronically unstable and antisocial lifestyle (Hare, 1996; Harpur et al., 1989).

The psychometric properties of the PCL-R have consistently shown to be more than adequate, with high levels of internal consistency and inter-rater reliability (Brown & Forth, 1996; Hare et al., 1990; Hare, 1996). More recently,

Hart, Cox and Hare (1995) have devised a shorter version of the PCL-R meant to be a brief screening version of psychopathy (PCL:SV). Although significantly shorter in length (12 items) and time to administer, the screening version has maintained the same psychometric properties of the original. The psychometrics of this scale will be discussed further in the methodology section. Given that certain batterers types display at least some psychopathic features (Holzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994), and given the implications of psychopathic personalities within the criminal justice system, it is important to include and assess this construct within a batterer population.

Despite an abundance of research on personality disorders and offenders, one question that has not been addressed is which type of batterer is more likely to present with either higher levels of psychopathy or with deviations on the five-factors of personality. Being careful not to use personality disorders as an excuse for battering, Kropp and Hart (1998) indicated that mental disorders are often associated with poor coping skills as well as an increase in interpersonal stress. In these stressful situations, these individuals tend to act impulsively on poor decisions.

Anger. Negative emotions such as anger are clearly integral in domestic violence, although it has not consistently been directly related to violence (Saunders, 1992). When speaking of anger in a battering situation, one mainly thinks of the actual escalation from everyday life pressures and stresses to the actual battering incident or crisis period. This period is characterized by extreme and overt anger that is externalized by the batterer, and presents itself in the

form of hitting, slapping, yelling, etc. This pattern has been well documented as the Cycle of Violence (Walker, 2000). In other situations, for example, stalking situations, anger seems to be more internalized. Many researchers have talked of "abandonment rage" (Meloy & Gothard, 1995). In the case of domestic stalking, anger is harbored or internalized, but when threatened with the loss of the relationship, the loss of control results in a sense of anxiety and panic, and subsequent feelings of intense anger and fury. The research on batterer types has indicated that there are some differences in levels of anger experienced by the different types. Hamberger and Hastings (1986) found that their "Passive-Dependent" group and "Narcissistic/Antisocial" group had the lowest levels of anger while the "Schizoid/Borderline" group had the highest levels. In support of these findings, Saunders (1992) found similar results with his corresponding types. His "Family only" and "Generally violent" had the lowest levels of anger while the "Emotionally Volatile" group had the highest. Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) also noted that the "Dysphoric/Borderline" group of batterers were characterized by high levels of anger and anxiety, as compared to the "Family only" or "Generally violent" men. It would be interesting to see if different types of batterers present with different types of anger as compared to other types of offenders. One reason for the possible inconsistencies may be the type of measures being used (Saunders, 1992). For example, some measures focus on anger in general while others look at target (eg. wife) specific anger (Scott, 1995). It is important to identify whether anger is, indeed, an important risk factor or criminogenic need to target among batterers.

Impulsivity. Lifestyle impulsivity has also been implicated as a factor in abusive and aggressive behaviour. As outlined above, Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) assessed a number of different psychosocial factors in their integrated model of spousal abuse, and found that impulsivity was important in differentiating the different types of male batterers. They found that “Generally violent” men, not surprisingly, showed the highest levels of impulsivity and criminal involvement, a finding that has been supported by others (Shields, et al., 1988). It appears to be a factor that is also amenable to treatment. Wolfus and Bierman (1997) concluded that those male batterers who received treatment programs improved on post-test assessments of their levels of impulsivity. Dutton (1988) has argued that impulsivity is characteristic of most domestic batterers as part of the etiology of Borderline personality so common in this population.

Substance Abuse. Alcohol and drug use has been found to be a key factor in both physically and sexually aggressive behaviour, although it is unclear as to how many of these individuals would meet criteria for addictive problems (Limandri & Sheridan, 1995; Marshall, 1993; 1996). Seto and Barbaree (1995) proposed that alcohol acts as a disinhibitor in men, at least in a lab setting, allowing them to adapt more liberal norms, and impairing their ability to process “inhibition” cues from women. Sugarman and Hotaling (1989) investigated 608 male respondents in an national family violence study. There appeared to be increased substance abuse with couples reporting higher levels of marital conflict. Oriel and Fleming (1998) found that of 237 men questioned, those with higher levels of alcohol consumption reported more violence with their partners

within the last year. If an individual presented with three factors of substance abuse, depression and a history of child abuse, there was a 41% probability of spousal violence. Limandri and Sheridan (1995) found 70.5% of batterers in their sample had been under the influence of alcohol at the time of the incident; 32% had used illicit drugs and 22% had used a combination of drugs and alcohol. When using both drugs and alcohol, these men tended to engage in more severe violence against their partners'. Similar findings with an offender population (White, 2000) indicated that although there were high levels of substance abuse among the inmates, in general, those who reported being violent with a partner also evidenced particularly high levels of both substance abuse and APD. There also appears to be some evidence that the type of drug affects the abuse. Again, Limandri and Sheridan (1995) found that cocaine and marijuana usage was associated with more impulsivity and aggression than alcohol, hallucinogen or tranquilizer use.

Among the typological research, Hamberger and Hastings (1986) found that their "Narcissistic/Antisocial" group evidenced the most drug and alcohol abuse of the three groups. Saunders (1992) also found heavy substance use by both the "Family only" groups (occurring in about 50% of the violent incidences) and the "Generally violent" groups (evidence of their overall criminal lifestyle). Alcohol and drug use was rare in the "Emotionally Volatile" group. Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) also found that the highest drug and alcohol use was among the "Generally violent" group. Interestingly, they noted that the "Family - only" group had little substance use which is in contrast to those findings by

Saunders. Despite the variation in results, however, the consensus appears to be that alcohol and drug use are important factors in the cycle of violence (Dunnegan, 1997; Oriel & Fleming, 1998).

Although an important factor, Maiden (1997) cautioned that treatment of substance abuse may reduce the incidence of domestic violence, however, it will not eliminate it. He found that men may learn to better control their physically aggressive behaviour when not under the influence of alcohol, however, they still have difficulties mediating conflict with their partners. This supports the notion that alcohol and drugs serve more as disinhibitors, but that something else is still at work in abuse situations, whether that be cognitions or negative attitudes about women, etc.

Minimization and Denial. Minimization and denial of offences present both as potentially serious barriers to accurate self-report information and as significant problem in treatment (Nugent & Kroner, 1996). Both Young and Gerson (1992) and Wetzel and Ross (1983) found that a prominent feature of domestic batterers is a significant level of denial. In fact, Wetzel and Ross (1983) actually made denial and projection of blame parts of their 11-trait profile of men who batter their spouses. Gondolf (1998) reported that one of the greatest obstacles in working with male batterers in treatment is the huge amount of denial, minimization and justification of their abuse. He found that among a group of arrested batterers, only 36% of the men agreed with their partners' reports of the assault. Among batterers in a substance abuse program, 40% of the men admitted to physically assaulting their partners while 80% of the women reported

being abused. Dutton and Hart (1992) also found such discrepancies. They found that offenders reported approximately 3.6 violent incidences per year while their female partners reported about 15.5 incidences per year. Of particular interest in this study was that 35.7% of the female partners of inmates labeled as "Stranger-violent" reported abuse by these men. This implies that there could very well be abuse occurring within a relationship even in the absence of an official record of domestic assault.

Among different types of batterers, Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) found that "Generally violent" men exhibited little remorse for their partner, and actually tended to victim blame more than the other groups. "Family only" men, on the other hand, showed high levels of remorse (typical of the honeymoon phase of the cycle of violence).

Denial and minimization are not only traits found in male batterers. Scully and Marolla (1984) found that 59% of their sample of 114 rapists denied their offences. Minimization and denial are also thought to be important risk factors in terms of the increased likelihood of recidivating among those who deny or minimize their offense.

Negative Attitudes About Women and Attitudes Supportive of Domestic Violence. Both Marshall (1993) and Pithers (1993) proposed that treatment should also address a number of attitudinal factors that seem to be more specific to violence against women. Many batterers possess inappropriate attitudes such as the acceptance of domestic violence, negative attitudes towards women and relations between men and women that serve to both dehumanize women and

justify their violence (Saunders, Lynch, Grayson, & Linz, 1987). Malamuth, Heavey and Linz (1996) investigated dynamic predictors of sexual aggression, including dominance, hostility to women, and attitudes supporting violence. They found that of their sample of 95 men, those scoring high on all six predictors were significantly more likely to have reported engaging in sexually aggressive behaviour (89% reported engaging in this type behaviour). Among different batterer types, negative attitudes have also been found to be important in differentiating them. Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) and Saunders (1992) all found that "Generally violent" men held the most rigid attitudes towards women and were most supportive of violence; "Family only" were most liberal in their attitudes towards women and were least supportive of violence and the "Dysphoric" or "Emotionally Volatile" group fell somewhere in between.

Treatment programs that focus only on anger are potentially missing important areas, as addressing anger is no guarantee that the hostility toward women, self-confidence issues, power and control will also be addressed.

Jealousy. The emotion of jealousy has often been associated with domestic violence and stalking situations. Dutton, van Ginkel and Landolt (1996) viewed jealousy as important enough to include it as a third aspect of their "abusive personality". Certainly in stalking situations, feelings of jealousy have been noted as very common particularly among stalkers of former intimates (Dutton et al., 1996; Meloy, 1998). Although the Dutton et al. study concluded that those with an abusive type personality tended to exhibit extreme jealousy, although it is not clear whether it is a factor that differentiates between higher

and lower risk batterers. Only Saunders (1992) investigated jealousy among different types of batterers. He found that "Family only" batterers exhibited the lowest levels of jealousy. While the "Emotionally Volatile" group exhibited the highest levels. This is in conjunction with their extreme levels of anger, also. It is likely that jealousy fuels the anger, which fuels the subsequent violence.

The current research will focus more on the stronger predictors of male violence against intimate partners, i.e., those associated with a more integrated theory of domestic violence, as well as those that have been identified as primarily found among batterers. These variables were investigated with respect to two of the different batterer types identified by Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994); Generally violent and Family-only violent.

Risk Prediction

Risk prediction is a central issues for the criminal justice system because it impacts on the safety of the community, prevention of future crime and treatment considerations for the individual (Andrews & Bonta, 1994). Historically, risk factors have come from surveys and research on relationship conflict (Andrews and Bonta, 1998). Survey information tends to give the prevalence, incidence and only some risk information. It seems apparent, then, that there is a need to differentiate higher risk men from lower risk men with a sound actuarial measure.

Risk assessment in the field of domestic violence has traditionally lacked a systematic, standardized, clinically useful and empirically-based framework with which to collect information about batterers (Kropp & Hart, 1998). In fact,

until recently, there have been no guidelines as to how to even conduct a spousal assault risk assessment. For example, professionals were left to decide what facts to consider as important in the assessment, what information is most useful and where to get that information. Other risk/need assessment instruments have been utilized with a batterer population. For example, Rooney (1998) found that Level of Service Inventory (LSI-R) scores differentiated batterers from non-batterers ($r=.35$) and was able to predict treatment drop-out from a male batterer program. However, Andrews and Bonta (1998) and others (Dutton & Hart, 1992) have noted that no validated actuarial risk/needs assessment measure has been put forth specifically for the area of domestic violence. As Andrews and Bonta (1998) concluded, effective rehabilitation programming can begin only with a reliable assessment of risk and criminogenic needs.

Kropp, Hart, Webster and Eaves (1995) have developed the comprehensive Spousal Assault Risk Assessment Guide (SARA). In doing so, the authors focused on the theoretical and methodological issues from the literature. The SARA is divided into five sections with a total of 20 items. The items include both static and dynamic risk factors that the authors discovered through a comprehensive literature review. As the SARA is a fairly new instrument, there have been few studies investigating its effectiveness with male batterers. One recent study by Kropp and Hart (2000) investigated 2681 men on probationers and incarcerated offenders, all with an actual or suspected history of spousal assault. Results indicated that the SARA was able to discriminate

between spousal abusers and non-spousal abusers and recidivists and non-recidivists. The SARA, then, seems to be a promising instrument for assessing risk for domestic violence.

Summary and Present Study

Research on male batterers continues to give variable results. Part of the variability may be due to the ways in which male batterers have been defined and sampled in the literature. For example, the range of samples has varied from subjects who are proceeding through the criminal justice system (Dutton et al., 1996; Klein, 1996) to male students (DeKeserdy & Kelly, 1993) and community samples (O'Leary et al., 1993). Another source of variability may be that the heterogeneous population of batterers continues to be treated as a homogeneous one.

It would appear, then, that a more comprehensive analysis of risk factors is needed to further our knowledge of domestic violence. As such, the present study will look at a number of different risk factors within a sample of provincial offenders. Subjects were classified into one of four offender groups: "Family only violent (FOV)"; "Generally violent with both spouse and strangers (GV)"; "Stranger only violent (SOV)", and "Non-violent (NV)" offenders. Two of the groups (FOV and GV) were considered the "Batterer" groups; I) those who batter their partner but evidence no other violence outside of the home (Family only) and II) those who batter their spouse, but are also violent with others outside the

home (Generally violent). Table 3 is meant to clarify the breakdown of the four offender groups.

Table 3

Type of Violence by Different Subject Groups

Type of Violence	Offender Groups			
	Batterers		Non-Batterers	
	FOV	GV	SOV	NV
Within Home	X	X		
Outside Home		X	X	
None				X

A number of different measures were employed to assess a variety of risk factors associated with both general criminality and in particular, domestic violence which will be discussed further in the Method section.

Objectives and Hypotheses

The current study has two main goals:

1. The first goal is to examine the risk factors associated with domestic violence.

This will involve exploring the factors that differentiate aggressive from non-aggressive men, domestically violent from non-domestically violent men and which differentiate Family-Only violent from Generally Violent Batterers. To some extent, this study is exploratory in its attempt to form a multivariate

model that explains the differences among the four groups of offenders.

Nevertheless, there are some specific hypotheses derived from past research:

- Violent offenders (FOV, GV, SOV) will evidence significantly more childhood abuse, psychopathy, anger/hostility, impulsivity, and pro-criminal sentiments, than non-violent offenders (NV). FOV and GV offenders will also show more jealousy and negative attitudes towards women than NV offenders.
- Domestically violent offenders (FOV; GV) will evidence significantly more childhood abuse, jealousy and more negative attitudes towards women and attitudes supportive of abuse than non-domestically violent offenders (SOV). However, GV and SOV offenders will evidence similar patterns of general criminal sentiments more so than FOV offenders.
- Within the group of domestic batterers, Generally violent offenders (GV) will evidence significantly more criminal attitudes, psychopathy, impulsivity, substance abuse, minimize their offenses more and have greater use of abusive behaviour within their relationship than FOV offenders.
- On the personality measure, Generally violent (GV) and SOV offenders will have significantly higher Neuroticism and Extroversion scores and significantly lower Conscientiousness and Agreeableness

scores than FOV and NV offenders. This indicates a more typical APD profile.

2. The second goal of this research is to assess the concurrent and construct validity of the Kropp et al. (1995) Spousal Assault Risk Assessment Guide (SARA). The present study will serve as one of the first studies to assess the validity and reliability of the SARA.

- The predictions are that I) violent offenders (FOV, GV, SOV) will score higher than non-violent offenders (NV), and II) domestically violent offenders (FOV, GV) will score higher than non-domestically violent offenders (SOV) on the SARA.
- It is predicted that Generally violent (GV) and Stranger-only violent (SOV) offenders will have higher scores on Factor 1 of the SARA (Criminal History and Psychosocial Adjustment) than Family-only violent (FOV) and Non-violent (NV) offenders.
- Among the domestically violent subjects, GV offenders will score higher on Factor 2 of the SARA (Spousal Assault History, Current Offense, Other Considerations) than FOV offenders.
- Construct validity was assessed by correlating SARA scores with domestic abuse measure scores.

Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 155 subjects incarcerated at Rideau Correctional and Treatment Centre (RCTC), a provincial correctional and treatment centre outside the Ottawa area. Thirty-seven (37) were classified as Family-only violent (FOV); 35 as Stranger-only violent (SOV); 42 as Generally violent (GV) and 41 as Non-violent (NV). Towards the middle of the study, one subject was removed from both the institution and his treatment program for problematic institutional behaviour. As a result, he withdrew his permission for any of his information to be used for any research, including this study. As a result, the final subject total was 154 subjects (37 FOV; 35 SOV; 41 GV and 41 NV). Subjects were coded as to whether they were:

- violent only with an intimate partner (FOV)
- violent both in and outside of the home (GV)
- violent only with strangers (a man or woman other than an intimate partner) (SOV)
- not violent (no official/unofficial evidence of violent behaviour) (NV)

Subjects were classified to one of these groups based on two indices. The first involved the offender's official criminal record. If there were assault offenses or other offenses of a violent nature (eg., robbery) on record within the last five years, the offender was considered to fall into one of the three violent categories. Through the file information and the semi-structured interview,

details regarding these offenses determined whether the individual committed the violence against strangers (other men or women other than an intimate partner) and/or against his past or present intimate partner. The second indicator to group classification was based on interview information. If the offender revealed information that suggested he had been violent with either strangers or intimate partners within the last five years, even though there was no evidence of an official charge or conviction of such, he was also classified to the appropriate group according to this information. For individuals where there was some violence, but it occurred many (more than 5) years back, they were not coded as violent.

Family-only Violent Offenders

The average age of this group was 35.97 years of age, $SD = 9.11$ and the average grade level achieved was 10.73, $SD = 1.43$. Twenty-Seven percent (27%) were single at the time of offense, 32% were living common-law, 14% were married, and 27% separated or divorced. Most (27%) reported being employed full-time prior to the current offense, 14% were employed on a part-time/seasonal basis, 19% were receiving social assistance, 11% were receiving a pension and 3% were students. Twenty-seven percent (27%) reported their employment status as "other", which meant support through criminal activity.

Stranger-only Violent Offenders

The average age of this group was 29.54 years of age, $SD = 9.14$ and the average grade level achieved was 10.09, $SD = 1.60$. Sixty-six percent (66%) were single at the time of offense, 23% were living common-law, 6% were married,

and 6% separated or divorced. Twenty percent (20%) reported being employed full-time prior to the current offense, 20% were employed on a part-time/seasonal basis, 26% were receiving social assistance, none were receiving a pension and 3% were students. Thirty-one percent (31%) reported their employment status as "other" (support through criminal activity).

Generally Violent Offenders

The average age of this group was 35.15 years of age, $SD = 7.13$ and the average grade level achieved was 10.37, $SD = 1.93$. Thirty-four percent (34%) were single at the time of offense, 39% were living common-law, 7% were married, and 20% separated or divorced. Twenty-four percent (24%) reported being employed full-time prior to the current offense, 27% were employed on a part-time/seasonal basis, 17% were receiving social assistance or unemployment insurance, 17% were receiving a pension and none were students. Fifteen percent (15%) reported their employment status as "other" (support through criminal activity).

Non-Violent Offenders

The average age of this group was 33.15 years of age, $SD = 10.22$ and the average grade level achieved was 10.83, $SD = 1.76$. Thirty-nine percent (39%) were single at the time of offense, 32% were living common-law, 12% were married, and 17% separated or divorced. Twenty-seven percent (27%) reported being employed full-time prior to the current offense, 32% were employed on a part-time/seasonal basis, 12% were receiving social assistance, 12% were

receiving a pension and none were students. Seventeen percent (17%) reported their employment status as "other" (support through criminal activity).

Comparisons Among Groups

Various analyses were performed to detect any group differences. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Tukey HSD post-hoc follow-up tests revealed that the Stranger-only Violent group was significantly younger than the both the Family-only violent and Generally violent groups, $F(3,153)=3.70$, $p<.01$. Non-violent offenders were not different in age from any other groups. There were no differences in levels of education that was achieved by any of the groups, with all groups attaining essentially a grade 10 level of education (see above group means and standard deviations). Chi square analyses did not reveal any group differences for employment status, however, regarding marital status, follow-up log-linear analyses indicated that the SOV group was more likely to report being single than the other groups, possibly due to their younger age.

Inter-scorer Reliability

Sixteen subjects agreed to have their semi-structured interviews audio-taped by the primary researcher for a second rater to score the following variables: group classification, impulsivity, level of denial, PCL:SV factor 1 score, PCL:SV factor 2 score, PCL:SV Total score, SARA subscales of criminal history, psychosocial adjustment, spousal assault history, current offense, other considerations, factor 1, factor 2 and total scores. Intra-class correlation's were

completed to assess inter-scorer reliability on the 14 variables. All intra-class correlation's were high, indicating strong inter-scorer reliability. Results are found in Table 4.

Table 4

Inter-scorer Reliability Correlations

Variable	Intra-class Correlation
Group classification	1.00
Impulsivity	.939
Level of Denial	.926
PCL:SV factor 1	.925
PCL:SV factor 2	.939
PCL:SV total score	.941
SARA – criminal history	.991
SARA – psychosocial adjustment	.953
SARA – spousal assault history	.987
SARA – current offense	.995
SARA – other considerations	1.00
SARA – factor 1	.977
SARA – factor 2	.933
SARA – total score	.992

Measures

A number of measures were administered to assess the risk variables.

Upon arrival of offenders to the Assessment Unit of RCTC, each receives a psychological risk/needs assessment prior to entering treatment. The battery of measures for the current research was simply incorporated into the regular risk/need assessment process. Subjects were made aware that some of the questionnaires were part of a study and their written consent to participate was obtained.

Self-Report Measures

NEO-PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1990). This is a self-report measure consisting of 240 statements. Subjects rate the extent to which they agree with the statement on a 5-point Likert-type scale, from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" (Appendix A). The inventory provides overall scores on five domains including neuroticism (negative affect), extroversion, openness (to experience, intellect and culture), agreeableness (friendly compliance) and conscientiousness (will to achieve). Within each of the domains, there are six subscales. These subscales are summed to give a domain score. Domain scores are adequate to form a global impression of personality. Scores are translated into T-scores. Scores falling within a T-score range of 45-55 are considered "average" while those falling outside of that range are considered deviations from normal. Costa and McCrae (1988) have found that test-retest scores over a seven year period on the five domains to be as follows: .74, .79, .79, .70, .75 for Neuroticism, Extroversion, Openness, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness,

respectively. Costa and McCrae (1990) also found evidence of the construct validity of the NEO-PI-R from its correlation's with other measures of personality (eg. MCMI). Although not recommended as a diagnostic tool, the five factors of the NEO-PI-R can be used to analyze personality disorder and profile traits from the personality disorders as outlined in the DSM-IV (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Although there is very little research looking at the NEO-PI-R with an offender population, Harpur, Hart and Hare (1994) investigated 28 offender NEO profiles and PCL-R profiles. Twelve were scored as psychopathic and 16 were not. The non-psychopathic sample did not show any deviation from a previous non-offender sample, however the psychopathic group showed a distinct profile of elevated neuroticism, lower than normal scores on conscientiousness, quite low scores on agreeableness and average extroversion and openness scores. Factor 2 scores on the PCL-R were found to be positively related to neuroticism and extroversion while negatively related to agreeableness and conscientiousness. Despite the findings, the authors found that typically, one facet of a domain would relate to psychopathy, however, another facet in the same domain manifested in the opposite direction, thereby canceling each other out. Harpur et al. (1994) concluded that the broad level description of the five-factors was probably not the most appropriate level at which to describe the traits of a psychopathic sample. Instead, they suggested that the best discriminator between psychopaths and non-psychopaths was achieved using more specific facets rather than the general domains.

Hostile Interpretations Questionnaire (HIQ; Mamuza & Simourd, 1997).

The HIQ (Appendix B) is a self-report measure consisting of seven vignettes. The vignettes represent neutral social situations, including authority interactions, intimate/family relationships, acquaintance, work and anonymous (stranger) relationships. Vignettes are coded on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from "extremely unlikely/different/not at all responsible" to "extremely likely, similar/totally responsible". Higher scores reflect more hostile interpretations and attitudes. Scores are calculated for a hostile interpretation for each situation (authority interactions, intimate/family relationships, acquaintance, work and anonymous relationships). Summing these provides a measure of Hostile Interpretation Total. Scores are also calculated for different components of hostility, including overgeneralization, attribution of hostility, personal responsibility, hostile reaction, and external blame, producing a total of 10 subscales. Internal consistency has been shown to be strong with Cronbach alpha ranging from $\alpha = .44$ - $.87$. Also, construct validity has been shown through strong correlations with other measures of anger and hostility (Simourd & Mamuza, in progress).

Criminal Sentiments Scale (CSS; Andrews & Wormith, 1984). This is a 41-item self-report measure that assesses three separate criminal attitudes; attitudes towards the law, courts and police (LCP; "You can't get justice in court"); tolerance for law violations (TLV; "Most people would commit crime if they knew they could get away with it") and identification with other criminals (ICO; "I don't have much in common with people who never break the law"). The

LCP scale is made up of 25 items; the TLV scale of 10 items and the ICO of 6 items. Higher scores on LCP scale indicate more prosocial attitudes while higher scores on the TLV and ICO scales indicate more pro-criminal attitudes. The CSS (Appendix C) is scored on a 5-point Likert-type scale, 1 indicating "strongly disagree" and 5 indicating "strongly agree". Subjects rate the degree to which they agree with each statement. Roy and Wormith (1985) reported strong internal consistencies for the three scales, ranging from $\alpha=.80-.91$. Among 458 federal inmates, convergent and post-dictive validity was demonstrated by significant correlations between CSS scores and total number of incarcerations, number of past crimes and staff ratings of institutional behaviour (Roy & Wormith, 1985). More recently, Mills and Kroner (1997) found that the CSS was post-dictive of the number of prior incarcerations and predictive of recidivism among 130 federal offenders. Similarly, Simourd (1997) found that the total CSS scores, LCP scores and ICO scores were significantly correlated with the total number of institutional misconducts as well as with other measures of risk. Simourd (1997) assessed a modified version of the CSS in that study, however, the original version was utilized in the current research.

Interpersonal Jealousy Scale (IJS; Mathes & Severa, 1981). This is a 28-item self-report measure, scored on a 9-point Likert-type scale (Appendix D) ranging from "absolutely true/totally agree" to "absolutely false/disagree completely". Items include statements about possessiveness towards a partner ("If another man were to complement my partner, I would feel like he was trying to take her away from me"), and jealousy and irritation about her contact with

members of the opposite sex ("If my partner were to help another man at work, I would feel suspicious"). High scores on the IJS indicate a greater propensity to experience feelings of jealousy in an intimate relationship. Mathes and Severa (1981) found very high internal consistency with Cronbach's $\alpha=.92$. They also concluded this scale had good concurrent validity when compared to other measures of dependency and construct validity with other scales of jealousy. The IJS has been used in a number of studies on interpersonal relationships and domestic violence. Both Holtzworth-Munroe, Stuart and Hutchinson (1997) and Dutton, van Ginkel and Landolt (1996) found the IJS to differentiate between violent and non-violent husbands, with violent men scoring higher than the IJS than non-violent men. Dutton et al. (1996) further differentiated couples still living together versus those who were separated. Jealousy from the IJS was significantly correlated with abusiveness among "together couples" and with intrusiveness (stalking type behaviour) among "separated couples".

Abusive Behaviour Inventory (ABI; Shepard & Campbell, 1992). This 29-item self-report measure is scored on a 5- point Likert-type scale, ranging from "never" to "very frequently" (Appendix E). It assesses two types of violence towards women – psychological (put her on an allowance; called her names) and physical abuse (pushed, grabbed, kicked her). Higher scores indicate greater use of violence within a relationship. The ABI assess both physical and psychological violence unlike other measures that focus only on psychological abuse (e.g., Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (PMWI); Tolman, 1989) or physical abuse (Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS); Straus, 1979). Shepard

and Campbell (1992) found high internal consistency with the ABI, ranging from $\alpha=.70$ -.92 with four groups of men and women. The authors also found that the ABI correlated with other assessments of abusive behaviour, such as the CTS and PMWI, indicating good construct validity.

Attitudes Towards Women Scale (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973).

The Attitudes Towards Women Scale (Appendix F) is a 25-item self report measure. Subjects are asked to rate on a 4-point Likert -type scale, ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree", and the degree to which they agree with various statements about women's role in society. Items include statement such as "Telling dirty jokes is a male prerogative" and "In general, a father should have greater authority than the mother in raising children". High scores on the scale indicate more egalitarian or pro-feminist attitudes. It has been found to have strong reliability, with internal consistency of $\alpha =.90$ for men and $\alpha=.89$ for women among a sample of university students (Smith & Bradley, 1980). Spence et al. (1973) found that self-reported feminist women scored higher than women who did not identify themselves as feminist.

Inventory of Beliefs About Wife Beating (Saunders, Lynch, Grayson, & Linz, 1987). The IBWB (Appendix G) consists five scales, including Wife Beating is Justified (12 items; "A woman who constantly refuses to have sex with her husband is asking to be beaten"); Women Gain from Beatings (7 items; "Most wives secretly desire to be beaten by their husbands"); Help Should be Given in Beating Situation (5 items; If I heard a woman being beaten, it would be best that I do nothing"), Offenders are Responsibility for Their Behaviour (4 items;

"Husbands who batter are responsible for their behaviour because they intend to do it") and Offenders Should be Punished (5 items; "The best way to deal with a wife beater is to arrest the husband"). Items are scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". Lower scores reflect attitudes that are more supportive of abuse. Saunders et al. (1987) found that batterers held more traditional views of women, held more hostile views of women, and endorsed more attitudes such as battering was justified, women gained from the experience and women should not be helped. Those subjects holding more liberal attitudes towards women and who were less sex-role stereotyped held more attitudes such as the offender was responsible for the behaviour and he should be punished.

Paulhus Deception Scales (BIDR; Paulhus, 1999). Because of the number of self-report measures used in this study, the BIDR will also be administered. This 40-item self-report measure is based on a 5-point Likert-type scale (from "not true" to "very true") that assess self-deception enhancement ($\alpha=.81$) and impression management ($\alpha=.85$) (Appendix H). High self-deception scores ("I am fully in control of my own fate") reflect a general lack of insight into one's behaviour while high scores on impression management ("I don't gossip about other people's business") reflect attempts to project an overly positive image of one's self. In a sample of 539 male offenders, Kroner and Weekes (1996) found the original scale (Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding; BIDR; Paulhus, 1984) correlated with other response style measures of denial, and social desirability. They also found differences between offenders who admitted to their

offense as compared to those who did not admit to their offense. BIDR scores were correlated with scores of hostility, negative/criminal attitudes, jealousy, and abuse to assess the degrees to which responses are associated with tendencies to present a positive image or engage in self-deception (Alksnis & Robinson, 1996).

Interview and File Review Based Measures

Semi-Structured Interview. The interview was based on the PCL-R semi-structured interview (Appendix I). Areas covered in the interview included past and current offences, school/work history, current health, family background, past relationships, substance abuse history and usage prior to committing the offense, and general questions regarding attitudes towards their criminal behaviour and current offense, experiences of guilty feelings and life goals. This information, along with file review information was used to complete the SARA, PCL:SV, assessment of minimization/denial (as per Nugent and Kroner (1996)) and assessment of general lifestyle impulsivity. The information was recorded on the Background Checklist.

Level of Service Inventory – Ontario Revision (LSI-OR; Andrews & Bonta, 1995). The LSI-OR (Appendix J) is based on the original Level of Service Inventory – Revised (LSI-R; Andrews & Bonta, 1995). It is a comprehensive risk/needs actuarial assessment tool that includes 43 items within eight subcomponents (criminal history, family/marital, leisure/recreation, antisocial associates, antisocial attitudes, substance abuse, antisocial pattern). The items are those that the research literature has found to be associated with criminal

conduct, including the “Big Four” as well as family, substance abuse and social achievement factors. The LSI-OR is completed with information collected through file review and interview with the offender. High scores on the LSI-OR reflect a higher risk of general criminal recidivism. The original LSI-R has been found to correlate significantly with general and violent recidivism (Rowe, 1996) and is predictive of institutional behaviour (Bonta & Motiuk, 1992). The LSI-OR is widely used in Ontario provincial institutions, such as RCTC, and has also been found to be as psychometrically sound as the original. For the purposes of this research, file LSI-OR's were used. Trained Classification counselors and Social Workers typically completed these assessments within the detention centers where offenders resided prior to being transferred to RCTC.

Spousal Assault Risk Assessment (SARA; Kropp et al., 1995). The SARA (Appendix K) is a 20-item risk assessment guide completed using file information and a semi-structured clinical interview. There are five sections in the SARA, including criminal history, psychosocial adjustment, spousal assault history, current offense, and other considerations with the offender. The authors divided the SARA into two parts. Factor 1 consists of criminal history and psychosocial adjustment while Factor 2 refers to risk factors specific to spousal assault (spousal assault history, current offense, other considerations). Items on the SARA are coded on a 3-point scale; 0 meaning the item is absent, 1 meaning the item is partially/possibly present, and 2 meaning the item is definitely present. Higher scores indicate a greater risk for domestic violence. There are four separate ways to determine level of risk and they have produced varying levels

of inter-evaluator reliability. Simply summing the item scores produces the best inter-rater reliability, ranging from .45 - .86 (Kropp & Hart, 2000), indicating that the SARA can produce reliable judgments as to an individual's risk. Initial projects to determine the SARA's criterion related and concurrent validity have been completed. Kropp and Hart (2000) reported that the SARA correlated significantly with three other risk measures; the PCL:SV, the Violence Risk Appraisal Guide (VRAG; Harris, Rice, & Quinsey, 1993) and General Statistical Information Recidivism Scale (GSIR; Nuffield, 1982). Among 1,010 male offenders, those with a history of spousal assault had significantly higher SARA scores than those with no history of spousal assault. Similarly, among 102 probationers with a history of spousal abuse, recidivists had higher SARA Total scores (not significant) and significantly higher Factor 2 scores (risk factors specific to spousal abuse) than non-recidivists, indicating that the SARA appears to be a promising instrument for assessing the risk for domestic violence.

Psychopathy Checklist: Screening Version (PCL:SV; Hart, Cox & Hare, 1995). The PCL:SV (Appendix L) is a 12- item clinical rating scale completed using file information and a semi-structured clinical interview, with each item being scored on a three point scale according to specific criteria. The total score can range from 0 to 24, with the generally accepted cut-off being a score of 18 for those deemed psychopathic (Hart, Hare, & Forth, 1994). Factor analyses of the PCL:SV has revealed the same stable two-factor structure as the PCL-R (Hart, et al., 1994). As well, the psychometric properties of the PCL:SV have consistently been shown to be more than adequate, with high levels of internal

consistency ($\alpha=.72 - .91$) (Hart et al., 1994). In addition, Hart et al. (1994) found in a sample of 520 forensic and civil psychiatric and non-psychiatric individuals, the correlation between PCL:SV and PCL-R scores was $r=.80$ while the PCL:SV also correlated significantly ($r=.65$) with the number of APD symptoms each subject presented. Hill, Rogers, and Bickford (1996) reported that among a sample of 55 male offenders in a psychiatric hospital, the PCL:SV was a strong predictor of aggression within the institution and of treatment non-compliance. Forth, Brown, Hart and Hare (1996) found that the PCL:SV was significantly correlated with the number of APD symptoms, substance use, self-reported criminal activity and observer behaviour ratings among a sample of 150 university students. The authors concluded that as with the PCL-R, the PCL:SV is a robust predictor of recidivism and of violence in criminal populations. This was devised to be a parallel version of the original Hare Revised Psychopathy Checklist (PCL-R; Hare, 1991). Hare (1998) reported that the PCL:SV can be used as a screening instrument or a stand-alone assessment of psychopathy. Dutton and Kropp (2000) included the PCL in their discussions of different domestic violence risk instruments, as it is a proven robust predictor of general violence. They noted that throughout the many validation studies of the PCL, samples have often included male batterers. While there has been some evidence of the PCL:SV's ability to differentiate between male batterers who remained violence free compared with those who re-offended (Dunford, 2000), Kropp, Hart, Whittmore, Webster and Eaves (1998) found it did not discriminate between the two groups. In this study, the PCL:SV was used as a dimensional

measure, and Total scores, only, were employed, rather than categorizing subjects into low, medium, high psychopathy.

Lifestyle Impulsivity. General lifestyle impulsivity was measured using the five-items adapted by Brown (1994) from the work of Prentky and Knight (1991) (see Background Checklist). The five items are coded on a 3-point scale, with 0 indicating the item is not present and 2 indicating the item is present in the individual. Higher scores indicate more overall lifestyle impulsivity. Brown (1994) found this to be a valid measure of impulsivity given its strong correlation with PCL-R Total scores ($r=.45$), Factor 1 scores ($r=.30$) and Factor 2 scores ($r=.42$). This measure of lifestyle impulsivity was also able to differentiate her sample, with psychopaths scoring significantly higher in impulsivity than non-psychopaths.

Procedure

After ethics approval was received from both Carleton University and the Ministry of Correctional Services, permission was granted by the superintendent of RCTC to proceed with this research.

It was decided by Psychology staff to simply make the present battery part of the Assessment unit psychological risk/needs assessment. This assessment is completed for all residents prior to entering treatment. Subjects signed a separate informed consent form to allow the researcher to use the information as part of this study. Subjects were made aware that their participation in no way impacted on their participation in treatment, their stay at the institution or access

to temporary absence passes (Appendix M). The battery took approximately 90 minutes to complete.

The researcher (or in some cases, her supervisor at RCTC, Dr. Elizabeth Yates, Ph.D., C. Psych.) conducted a semi-structured interview based on the PCL-R. This, along with information recorded from the file review, was used to complete the PCL: SV, SARA, Lifestyle Impulsivity, minimization and denial assessment and the Background Checklist. It was often difficult for the researcher to remain blind to group classification while completing the PCL: SV, SARA, Lifestyle Impulsivity and minimization and denial assessment; however, the individual providing the second rating on these measures was blind to those groupings. Inter-scorer reliability was assessed in the following way. Several subjects were approached to give permission for the researcher to audio-tape their clinical interview (Appendix N). In total, 16 subjects agreed to have their interviews audio-taped for this purpose. A second rater used the audio-taped semi-structured interviews to confirm group classification and to score the SARA, PCL: SV, Lifestyle Impulsivity and minimization/denial. Audio-tapes were destroyed after transcription.

Upon completion of testing and the semi-structured interview, subjects were debriefed, which included a verbal description of the purposes of this research (Appendix P) as well as providing them with numbers to call in case of questions or ethical concerns (Appendix O). Originally, it was planned to provide each subject a written description of the study. Because of the dormitory setting at RCTC, it was later decided that the potential for unassessed subjects having

prior access to the study description would potentially cause bias in the research design. It was therefore approved by the Ethics Committee Chair as well as dissertation committee members to simply provide a verbal debriefing and written telephone numbers if subjects had any concerns.

Results

The following section will begin with a review of the steps followed to clean the data and assess the effects of the BIDR. Following that, results of the analyses of variance will be presented, beginning with comparisons among all four groups together (FOV, SOV, GV, NV), followed by comparisons of the three violent groups (FOV, SOV, GV) and lastly, comparisons of the two Batterer groups (FOV, GV) on all predictor variables.

This research is relatively exploratory in nature, with a large number of variables being investigated, relative to the sample size. As such, several steps were taken to ensure that power was maintained for the analyses. First Multivariate Analyses of Variance (MANOVA) was selected as the main choice of analysis as it is one of the most powerful and robust statistical procedures available. Multivariate analysis is also superior to multiple univariate analyses of variance as it guards against spurious results due to inflated alpha levels and it allows for examination of any inter-relationships between various dependent variables (Stevens, 1996).

Second, to ensure adequate power, it is recommended to have a numbers of subjects per groups : number of predictor variables ratio of about 5:1 (Stevens, 1996). As such, rather than including all 24 variables together in one analysis, the maximum number of variables included in each MANOVA was 5, as group sizes ranged from 35-41 subjects. In addition, only variables that were not strongly correlated with each other were included in each MANOVA in order to reduce the effects of multicollinearity, which might attenuate power.

Lastly, when determining which variables made significant unique contributions to the multivariate significance, Bonferroni inequality corrections were applied, once again, in order to guard against spurious significant results due to inflated alpha levels. Although it is acknowledged that multiple MANOVA may have had some implications on the power of this design, every effort was made to reduce that impact. Given the exploratory nature of this research, it was thought that this was the most appropriate statistical method available.

Following the analyses of variance, results of a discriminant function analysis are presented to assess which variables are strong in predicting the accuracy of classification into groups. Lastly validity and reliability results of the SARA are presented.

Data Management

Data was inspected and "cleaned" in order to ensure there were no violations of statistical assumptions of normality, homogeneity of variance, or univariate and multivariate outliers. Univariate outliers were identified by examining standardized scores of more than ± 3.0 . Outliers of more than $1/3$ or $1/4$ SD units are considered extreme and can influence statistical equations, and assumptions of normality. Stevens (1996) suggested that with large sample sizes, $1/4$ SD units may be a better guideline of outlier scores. Following this, there were only 6 variables that had outliers $1/4$ SD beyond the mean. Following Tabachnik and Fidell (2000), the following cases had their values changed to within $1/3$ SD units:

Antisocial Pattern (LSI-OR) – 1 case changed to within 3 SD

Conscientiousness scale of NEO-PI-R – 1 case changed to within 3 SD

Physical Abuse scale of ABI - 2 cases changed to within 3 SD

Emotional Abuse scale of ABI - 2 cases changed to within 3 SD

Other Considerations scale of SARA - 1 case changed to within 3 SD

Sum of Past Number of Offenses - 4 cases changed to within 3 SD

By using Mahalanobis distance with $p < .001$, 3 cases were identified as multivariate outliers in their own groups. However, in analyzing the Cook's distances (for any amounts > 1), it was concluded that none of the outliers were influential (none with Cook's distance > 1). Therefore, none of the outliers were removed (Stevens, 1996). Linearity, multicollinearity, singularity and homogeneity of variance and covariance matrices were all acceptable.

Transformations were completed on several variables in order to attempt to correct the non-normal distributions (as evidenced by significant skewness or kurtosis). In these cases, both logarithmic and square root (or reflections for seriously negatively skewed data) transformations were attempted (Tabachnik & Fidel, 2000). A logarithmic transformation improved the skewness and/or kurtosis and therefore was kept for the following variables: Antisocial Pattern (LSI-OR), Openness (NEO-PI-R), Anonymous scale (HIQ), Abuse Total (ABI), Physical and Emotional abuse (ABI).

A square root transformation improved the skewness and/or kurtosis and therefore was kept for the following variables: Total Number Offenses, Authority

scale (HIQ), Tolerance for Law Violations (CSS), Antisocial Attitudes (LSI-OR), SARA Factor 2, and SARA Total Score.

A reflect and logarithmic transformation was completed for Criminal History (LSI-OR), Wife Beating is Justified, Wives Gain from Beating and the Help Should be Given scales of the IBWB. Finally, a reflect square root transformation was completed for Substance Abuse (LSI-OR). All other variables were acceptably normally distributed.

Group Differences on Background Variables

Childhood Abuse and Family Dysfunction. Non-parametric tests were performed to investigate differences among groups on a number of variables. Chi square analyses revealed that the four groups did not differ significantly from each other in self-reported histories of childhood abuse or parental dysfunction (See Table 5). Perhaps with an offender population, childhood abuse and dysfunctional backgrounds are so prevalent that they simply do not discriminate between different types of offenders. It is interesting to note that, although not significant, the incidence of childhood physical, emotional and sexual abuse was consistently higher among the violent offenders than the non-violent subjects. The percentages of the domestically violent groups (FOV, GV) who reported witnessing parental violence was also higher than the other two non-batterer groups (SOV, NV), although the difference only approached statistical significance ($p=.06$). The results are listed in Table 5 below.

Table 5

Prevalence (%) of Offenders Experiencing Familial Abuse and Dysfunction

Category	Type of Violence				X ² (6)	p
	Family Only	Stranger Only	Generally	Non		
	<u>n</u>	37	35	41	41	
Past Physical Abuse	37.8	51.4	56.1	34.1	7.22	ns
Past Emotional Abuse	62.2	62.9	73.2	48.8	5.20	ns
Past Sexual Abuse	18.9	17.1	22.0	7.3	5.53	ns
Witnessed parental violence	59.5	45.7	53.7	29.3	11.97	ns
Parental Substance abuse	67.6	71.4	82.9	58.5	6.95	ns
Parental Psychiatric Problem	8.1	11.4	9.8	9.8	3.19	ns
Parental criminal record	13.5	34.3	19.5	17.1	7.12	ns

Of those experiencing physical violence as a child, 58% reported the perpetrator being their father. Forty-one percent of fathers and 22% of mothers were reported as being the perpetrators of emotional abuse, and 80% of the perpetrators of childhood sexual abuse were reportedly males (28% acquaintances). Of those subjects reporting witnessing violence between their parents, the overwhelming majority (89%) reported the violence was inflicted by their fathers towards their mothers. Only 6% reported bi-directional violence between parents. Regarding parental dysfunction, 57% of fathers were reported as being the sole substance abusers within the family, while 32% of subjects reported both parents abused substances. Of those reporting a criminal family, more subjects (78%) reported it was their father who was also involved in a criminal lifestyle. Interestingly, of those reporting parental psychiatric illness, 87% reported that it was their mother who suffered from such. It should be noted that there were no official data to support any subject reports of maternal mental illness.

Offender Substance Abuse History. Regarding the substance abuse history of the offenders themselves, Chi square results did not reveal significant differences among the groups (see Table 6). This is not surprising, given the prevalence of substance use among incarcerated offenders. To confirm these findings, a 4-group one-way analysis of variance on the substance abuse section of the LSI-OR failed to reveal any significant differences among the groups ($F(3,$

153)= .34, ns). Means of the substance abuse section of the LSI-OR were as follows: FOV ($M= 4.57$); SOV ($M= 4.94$); GV ($M= 5.02$) and NV ($M= 4.88$).

Table 6

Prevalence (%) of Offender Substance Abuse

Category	Type of Violence				$X^2(6)$	p
	Family Only	Stranger Only	Generally	Non		
	n					
	37	35	41	41		
History of Alcohol abuse	83.8	80.0	90.2	80.5	5.73	ns
History of Drug abuse	67.6	91.4	87.8	82.9	11.62	ns
Alcohol intoxication at time of offense	73.0	48.6	65.9	53.7	7.72	ns
Drug intoxication at time of offense	32.4	28.6	22.0	22.0	4.29	ns

Criminal History. Prior convictions were analyzed from official CPIC information. For the purposes of this analysis, all violent offenses were grouped together as Level I offenses (assault, sexual assault, attempt murder, manslaughter, robbery). Results of a Chi square analysis revealed some significant differences among the groups and the proportions of criminal offenses of which they had been convicted. Follow-up log-linear analyses revealed that Generally Violent offenders engaged in more Level I (violence) and Fail to

Comply and Breach offenses. For all other offenses, the groups did not differ in the extent of their involvement. Results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Prevalence (%) of Official Prior Offenses

Category	Type of Violence				χ^2	df	p
	FOV	SOV	GV	NV			
<u>n</u>	37	35	41	41			
DWI (>1)	35.1	20.0	36.6	34.1	2.97	3	ns
Narcotics (>1)	24.3	14.3	19.5	17.1	1.30	3	ns
FTC/Breach (>1)	54.1	54.1	73.2	34.1	12.60	3	.01
Uttering Threats (>1)	5.4	2.9	4.9	2.4	.66	3	ns
UAL (>1)	5.4	8.6	9.8	4.9	1.02	3	ns
Property (>1)	64.9	77.1	75.6	61.0	3.47	3	ns
Level I (>1)	89.2	85.7	92.7	22.0	67.48	3	.001
(>2)	48.6	45.7	80.5	4.9	84.22	6	.001

Note: FOV= Family-only violent; SOV= Stranger-only violent; GV=Generally violent; NV= Non-violent; DWI=Drive While Prohibited; FTC/Breach=Fail to comply/Breach probation/parole; UAL=Unauthorized leave (escape); Property=property offenses; Level I=any violent offenses

Violence in Intimate Relationships. All subjects were questioned regarding any violence or abusive behaviour within their past intimate relationships (excluding the current relationship). Results of Chi square analyses revealed significant differences in the self-reported history of physical abuse and emotional abuse within past relationships (see Table 8). Follow-up log-linear analyses revealed that Generally Violent subjects reported engaging in physical violence within past relationships more so than did the other groups. Follow-up results for emotional abuse indicated that the sample as a whole were more likely than not to have endorsed having been emotional abusive in past relationships. Chi square results (see Table 8) also indicated significant group differences for escalation of violence in the relationship leading up to the current offense. Follow-up log-linear analyses revealed that both SOV and NV denied any escalation in physical violence within their current relationship more often than did FOV and GV offenders. Given the nature of their group classification, these results are not surprising. As these two groups are supposedly not violent within their relationships, it would not be expected that there would have been any escalation of such over the past year.

Table 8

Prevalence (%) of Past Relationship Violence

Category	Type of Violence				X ² (6)	p
	Family Only	Stranger Only	Generally	Non		
	n	37	35	41	41	
Past Physical Abuse	59.5	11.4	90.2	0	92.91	.001
Past Emotional Abuse	89.2	80.0	95.1	70.7	13.42	.05
Escalation of Violence	64.9	2.9	46.3	0	61.40	.001

Denial and Minimization. Levels of denial revealed some interesting significant differences among the groups. Recall that this variable was measured as per Nugent and Kroner (1996). Through the course of the semi-structured interview and discussions of the offenses, offender's accounts of the offense were compared to official reports of the abuse. Offenders were coded as complete deniers (completely deny the offense), partial deniers (admitted an altercation but denied the offense; "I didn't punch her, I just pushed her"), partial admitters (admitted offense, but minimized/justified behaviour; "Ya, I punched, her but she hit me first"), or admitters (complete admitting to the behaviour). Results are presented in Table 9. There were no offenders in either the FOV or the GV groups who were coded as fully admitting to their offenses without the

use of minimization or justification. Most of the FOV offenders (70.3%) and GV offenders (51.2%) tended to deny in part, or entirely deny their role in their criminal behaviour. In contrast, most of the SOV (80.0%) and NV (80.6%) offenders tended to either partially or fully admit to their offenses. The differences were significant, $\chi^2(9)=35.85$, $p<.01$.

Table 9

Proportions (%) of Levels of Denial by Group

Group	n	Admitter	Partial Admitter	Partial Denier	Denier
Family-only violent	37	0	29.7	51.4	18.9
Stranger-only violent	35	5.7	74.3	20.0	0
Generally violent	41	0	48.8	34.1	17.1
Non-violent	41	9.8	70.7	17.1	2.4

Correlations of BIDR and Predictor Variables

Pearson Product Moment correlations were completed between BIDR Total scores and all other self-report based variables in order to determine if BIDR results should be used as a covariate in any analyses. Results (using a cut-off of $r = .35$) indicated that BIDR scores correlated significantly with Neuroticism, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Hostile Reaction, self-reported jealousy, and self-reported abuse. For these variables, a MANCOVA was performed using BIDR Total as the covariate. Results of the correlations are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Correlations of Predictor Variables and BIDR Score

Variable	Correlation with BIDR Score (Pearson r)
Neuroticism-NEO	-.53**
Extroversion-NEO	.27*
Agreeableness-NEO	.50**
Conscientiousness-NEO	.66**
Openness-NEO	.19*
Overgeneralization-HIQ	-.07
Attribution of Hostility-HIQ	-.07
Personal Responsibility-HIQ	-.03
Hostile Reaction-HIQ	-.37**
External Blame-HIQ	-.19*
HIQ Total-HIQ	-.21*
Law, Courts, Police-CSS	.28*
Identification with Criminal Others-CSS	-.30*
Tolerance for Law Violations-CSS	-.30*
Jealousy-IJS	-.36**
Attitudes Towards Women-ATWS	.22*
Abuse Total-ABI	-.38**
Inventory of Beliefs About Wife Beating Total-IBWB	.18*
Offender Should be Punished-IBWB	.11
Offender is Responsible-IBWB	.10
Wife Beating is Justified-IBWB	-.14
Women Gain-IBWB	-.18*
Help Should be Given-IBWB	-.20*

Note: * $p < .01$

** $p < .001$

Analysis of Covariance. In order to assess the impact of the BIDR Total score as covariate on the six variables noted in the previous section, a 4-group (FOV, SOV, GV, NV) between subjects multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was performed on Neuroticism (NEO), Agreeableness (NEO), Conscientiousness (NEO), Hostile Reaction (HIQ), Jealousy Total (IJS), and Abuse Total (ABI). With the use of Wilks' criterion to assess multivariate significance, the combined variables differentiated the four groups, $F(18, 390.81)=2.57, p<.001$. The results reflected a modest association between groups and the combined Variables (partial $\eta^2=.10$). Two Variables—Agreeableness, $F(3, 151)=3.05, p<.05, \eta^2=.06$, and the Abuse Total scores, $F(3, 151)=6.64, p<.001, \eta^2=.21$ made unique contributions in distinguishing the four groups.

For comparison sake, a 4-group (FOV, SOV, GV, NV) between subjects multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on the same six variables noted above. With the use of Wilks' criterion, the combined variables differentiated the four groups, $F(18, 402.12)=4.37, p<.001$. The results reflected a modest association between groups and the combined Variables (partial $\eta^2=.16$). This time, however, four variables – Agreeableness, $F(3, 151)=3.61, p<.05, \eta^2=.07$, the Abuse Total score, $F(3, 151)=18.12, p<.001, \eta^2=.27$, IJS scores, $F(3, 151)=4.27, p<.01, \eta^2=.08$ and Hostile Reaction scores, $F(3, 151)=5.10, p<.01, \eta^2=.09$ all made unique contributions in distinguishing the four groups.

Because Agreeableness and Abuse were significant both with and without

the use of the BIDR Total as a covariate, it was decided to simply use them in the subsequent regular analyses of variance (MANOVA). Because neither Neuroticism nor Conscientiousness made any significant contribution with or without the covariate (BIDR Total), they were not included in any further analyses. Their means are presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Means and Standard Deviations for Neuroticism and Conscientiousness

Variable		FOV	SOV	GV	NV	Posthoc
	<u>N</u>	36	34	41	41	
Neuroticism	<u>M</u>	97.11	97.47	102.61	93.61	ns
	<u>SD</u>	23.26	21.95	22.07	22.85	
Conscientiousness	<u>M</u>	112.06	112.06	106.56	111.41	ns
	<u>SD</u>	19.58	21.68	19.14	21.09	

As the presence of the covariate did make a difference for the Hostile Reaction and IJS variables, the BIDR Total was maintained as a covariate for further analyses with these two variables. As such, a 4-group (FOV, SOV, GV, NV) between subjects analyses of covariance (MANCOVA) was performed on two predictor variables: Hostile Reaction (HIQ) and IJS. The covariate was BIDR Total scores. After adjustment by the covariate, only Hostile Reaction scores varied significantly by group, $F(3, 153)=3.25$, $p=.02$. The strength of the

relationship, however, was weak, with, $\eta^2=.06$. Pairwise comparisons revealed that Non-violent offenders had significantly lower Hostile Reaction scores than did the other three violent groups, indicating that non-violent offenders are less likely to respond in a hostile way based on their interpretation of situation than are the other three violent groups. This is not surprising given the association between hostility and the histories of aggression that characterized the three violent groups. The adjusted marginal means are displayed in Table 12.

Table 12

Adjusted and Unadjusted Means for MANCOVA

Variable		FOV	SOV	GV	NV
<u>n</u>		36	35	41	41
Hostile Reaction	Unadjusted	15.25	17.20	16.73	13.00
	Adjusted	15.31	16.82	16.51	13.30
Jealousy	Unadjusted	126.03	121.94	144.02	123.20
	Adjusted	126.86	121.21	142.72	126.44

To investigate possible differences between the violent groups, a 3-group (FOV, SOV, GV) between subjects analyses of covariance (MANCOVA) was performed on two predictor variables: IJS and Hostile Reaction (HIQ). The covariate was the Total BIDR score. After adjustment by the BIDR covariate, the

variables differed significantly by group, $F(4, 210)=2.51$, $p<.05$, however, neither Hostile Reaction, $F(2, 112)=2.05$, ns, nor IJS, $F(2, 112)=1.67$, ns, made significant unique contributions to group differences. No further analyses were performed.

Group Comparisons on Predictor Variables

In order to begin the process of hypothesis testing for differences among the four subject groups, several 4-group multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were completed. According to Stevens (1996), in order to capitalize on the power of MANOVA, it is recommended that included variables contribute unique variance to avoid the issue of multicollinearity. To this end, variables that highly correlated with each other (using a cut-off of $r = .80$) and that did not contribute uniquely were not included together for further analyses of variance (Stevens, 1996). Variable inter-correlations are presented in Appendix Q.

In order to test the hypotheses of differences among the three violent groups, and between the two domestic violent groups, 3-group MANOVA with special contrasts were also completed, using the same combinations of predictor variables as in the 4-group analyses. Results presented below will begin with differences among all four groups (FOV, SOV, GV and NV), followed by a section on differences among the three violent groups (FOV, SOV, GV) and finally, differences between the two Batterer groups (FOV, GV).

NEO Variables, Attribution of Hostility. A 4-group (FOV, SOV, GV, NV) between subjects multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on four predictor variables: Extroversion (NEO), Agreeableness (NEO), Openness

(NEO) and Attribution of Hostility (HIQ). With the use of Wilks' criterion for multivariate significance, the combined variables failed to differentiate the four groups, $F(12, 381.28)=1.10$, ns ($p=.36$). The results reflected a weak association between groups and the combined variables (partial $\eta^2=.03$). No further analyses were completed. Means are presented in Table 13.

Table 13

Means (Standard Deviations) for MANOVA (NEO Variables and Attribution of Hostility)

Variable	FOV (1) n=35		SOV (2) n=34		GV (3) n=41		NV (4) n=41		Posthoc
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
Extroversion	110.92	21.20	107.41	24.19	106.24	16.56	109.85	18.95	ns
Agreeableness	122.56	16.13	111.65	19.05	113.56	16.93	121.76	19.50	ns
Openness (log)	2.04	.07	2.04	.07	2.03	.05	2.04	.06	ns
Attribution of Hostility	17.09	5.13	18.53	4.11	18.61	4.10	16.98	4.26	ns

PCL:SV, Overgeneralization, Personal Responsibility, External Blame. A 4-group (FOV, SOV, GV, NV) between subjects multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on four predictor variables: PCL:SV Total, Overgeneralization (HIQ), Personal Responsibility (HIQ), External Blame (HIQ). With the use of Wilks' criterion for multivariate significance, the combined variables differentiated the four groups, $F(12, 386.57)=4.19$, $p<.001$. The results

reflected a modest association between groups and the combined variables (partial $\eta^2=.28$). Only one variable – PCL:SV Total made a unique contribution in distinguishing the four groups, $F(3,153)=11.42$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.19$. Follow-up post hoc Tukey HSD analyses revealed that the three violent groups had significantly higher PCL:SV Total scores than did the non-violent group of offenders, indicating the violent groups had a tendency to demonstrate more psychopathic characteristics than did the non-violent group. Other indicators of hostility, however, did not contribute to differentiating the groups. Means are shown in Table 14.

Table 14

Means and Standard Deviations for MANOVA (PCL:SV Total;
Overgeneralization; Personal Responsibility; External Blame)

Variable	FOV (1) $n=36$		SOV (2) $n=35$		GV (3) $n=41$		NV (4) $n=41$		Posthoc
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
PCL:SV Total	12.81	3.13	12.94	3.69	13.59	3.49	12.12	3.93	4<1,2,3
Overgeneralization	17.86	3.66	19.14	3.60	19.34	3.20	18.93	3.36	ns
Personal Responsibility	22.56	2.61	21.86	3.39	21.27	2.92	21.27	3.62	ns
External Blame	17.22	5.54	19.66	3.90	17.76	4.91	16.12	5.37	ns

Impulsivity, HIQ Total, CSS Subscales. A 4-group (FOV, SOV, GV, NV) between subjects multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on five predictor variables: Impulsivity, Hostile Interpretation Total (HIQ), Law, Courts, & Police (CSS), Identification with Other Criminals (CSS) and Tolerance for Law Violations (square root) (CSS). With the use of Wilks' criterion for multivariate significance, the combined variables differentiated the four groups, $F(15, 400.68)=3.61, p<.001$. The results reflected a strong association between groups and the combined variables (partial $\eta^2=.30$). Three of the variables made unique contributions in distinguishing the four groups. Means are shown in Table 15.

The greatest contribution was made by Impulsivity, $F(3,153)=10.47, p<.001, \eta^2=.17$. Follow-up post hoc Tukey HSD analyses revealed that the NV group had significantly lower Impulsivity scores than the three violent groups, indicating non-violent offenders tended to exhibit a less impulsive lifestyle and disposition than did the violent offenders. Identification with Other Criminals (CSS) also made a significant unique contribution, $F(3,153)=6.57, p<.001, \eta^2=.12$. Follow-up post hoc Tukey HSD analyses revealed that the NV and FOV groups scored significantly lower than did the SOV and GV groups, indicating the FOV offenders were more like non-violent offenders in their lack of self-identification with other offenders.

Finally, Tolerance for Law Violations (CSS) also made a significant unique contribution, $F(3,153)=4.74, p=.003, \eta^2=.09$. Follow-up post hoc Tukey HSD analyses revealed that the FOV offenders scored significantly lower than the

SOV and GV offenders, while NV scored significantly lower than did GV offenders. This would indicate that FOV offenders have less tolerance for breaking the law than do the other two violent groups. Non-violent offenders appear to somewhat more tolerant, however, GV offenders, are the most accepting of breaking the rules of society.

In summary, the results of this MANOVA would seem to indicate that while FOV offenders do not differ from other violent offenders in terms of impulsivity, this group of men are more like non-violent offenders in the area of criminal attitudes, and are somewhat less antisocial than SOV and GV offenders.

Table 15

Means and Standard Deviations for MANOVA (Impulsivity, HIQ Total, LCP, ICO, TLV)

Variable	FOV (1)		SOV (2)		GV (3)		NV (4)		Posthoc
	<u>n</u> =36		<u>n</u> =35		<u>n</u> =41		<u>n</u> =41		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
Impulsivity	5.08	2.03	5.54	2.31	5.22	2.26	3.17	1.73	4<1,3,2
HIQ Total	63.82	12.32	68.70	10.88	66.28	10.05	60.99	9.40	ns
LCP	93.56	11.49	84.77	20.51	84.34	15.38	89.20	14.13	ns
ICO	13.92	3.04	16.17	3.36	16.39	3.04	14.10	3.29	1,4<2,3
TLV (square root)	4.49	.52	4.95	.73	4.88	.60	4.59	.59	1<3,2 4<3

Note: HIQ Total= Hostile Interpretations Total; LCP= Law, courts & Police (CSS); ICO= Identification with Criminal Others (CSS); TLV= Tolerance for Law Violations (CSS)

Abuse, Negative Attitudes Towards Women and Attitudes Supportive of Abuse. A 4-group (FOV, SOV, GV, NV) between subjects multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on three predictor variables: Abuse Total (log), Attitudes Towards Women Total, Inventory of Beliefs About Wife Beating Total. With the use of Wilks' criterion for multivariate significance, the combined variables differentiated the four groups, $F(9, 357.91)=8.61$, $p<.001$. The results reflected a strong association between groups and the combined variables (partial $\eta^2=.38$). Two of the three variables made unique contributions in distinguishing the four groups. Means are presented in Table 16.

The greatest contribution was made by Abuse, $F(3,153)=17.70$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.26$. Follow-up post hoc Tukey HSD analyses revealed that the NV and SOV groups had significantly lower Abuse scores than FOV and GV offenders, clearly indicating that the two groups of batterers engaged more in the use of abusive behaviour with their partners. FOV offenders also had lower scores than did GV offenders, indicating that between the batterers, men who are also violent outside the home tend to be more severe in their domestic violence than are those men who are only violent with their spouse.

IBWB Total also made a significant unique contribution, $F(3,153)=13.05$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.21$. Follow-up post hoc Tukey HSD analyses revealed that the GV group had significantly lower scores than did all three other groups, indicating a tendency for this group of offenders to hold beliefs that are more supportive of spousal assault.

Together, these results indicate that Generally Violent offenders appear to be the more brutal in terms of their violent behaviour with their partner's, even more so than Family-Only violent offenders. Although it appears from the IBWB Total results that Family-Only violent offenders were more similar to non-batterers in their attitudes about violence against women, the next section further clarifies this.

Table 16

Means and Standard Deviations for MANOVA (ABI, ATWS, IBWB)

Variable	FOV (1)		SOV (2)		GV (3)		NV (4)		Posthoc
	<u>n</u> =37		<u>n</u> =35		<u>n</u> =41		<u>n</u> =40		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
ABI Total	1.64	.08	1.58	.06	1.69	.10	1.58	.07	2,4<1,3
(log)									1<3
ATWS	82.41	8.28	80.40	8.46	77.59	9.12	81.90	8.12	ns
IBWB Total	195.46	20.13	204.63	20.28	175.61	24.35	199.65	22.89	3<1,4,2

Note: ABI= Abusive Behaviour Inventory; ATWS=Attitudes Towards Women Scale; IBWB= Inventory of Beliefs of Wife Beating Scale

To further break down the IBWB into its five subscales, a 4-group (FOV, SOV, GV, NV) between subjects multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on the five subscales scores: Offender Should Be Punished, Offender is Responsible, Wife Beating is Justified (log), Wives Gain from Beatings (log), Help Should be Given (log). With the use of Wilks' criterion for

multivariate significance, the combined variables differentiated the four groups, $F(15, 403.44)=4.51$, $p<.001$. The results reflected a strong association between groups and the combined variables (partial $\eta^2=.35$). All of the variables made unique contributions in distinguishing the four groups. Means are presented in Table 17 below.

The greatest contribution was made by Offender Should be Punished, $F(3,154)=13.01$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.21$. Follow-up post hoc Tukey HSD analyses revealed that the NV and SOV groups had significantly higher scores than FOV and GV offenders, indicating that Batterers were less likely to think that spousal abusers should be punished for their behaviour. Offender is Responsible also made a significant unique contribution, $F(3,154)=5.25$, $p=.002$, $\eta^2=.10$. Follow-up post hoc Tukey HSD analyses revealed that the GV offenders were less likely than were NV and SOV offenders to believe that batterers are responsible for their behaviour. FOV offenders were also less likely than SOV offenders to think that batterers are responsible for their violence.

Wife Beating is Justified made a significant unique contribution, $F(3,154)=5.90$, $p=.001$, $\eta^2=.11$. Follow-up post hoc Tukey HSD analyses revealed that GV offenders were more likely than the other three groups to believe that assaulting an intimate partner could be justified. Wives Gain also made a significant unique contribution, $F(3,154)=4.84$, $p=.003$, $\eta^2=.09$. Follow-up post hoc Tukey HSD analyses revealed that GV offenders were more likely than SOV offenders to believe that women actually gain from spousal violence. The other comparisons were not significant.

Lastly, Help Should Be Given made a significant unique contribution, $F(3,154)=6.92$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.12$. Follow-up post hoc Tukey HSD analyses revealed that GV offenders were less likely than the other three groups to support intervening in a battering situation.

In summary, these MANOVA results further clarify the actual break down of attitudes that support violence against women. It seems that both Batterer groups (FOV and GV) are far more supportive and sympathetic to perpetrators of domestic violence, in that they do not hold that perpetrators should be held responsible or should be punished for their violent behaviour. Interestingly, the results regarding attitudes towards the victims of domestic violence show that although FOV are male batterers, they tend to hold attitudes that are more supportive of victims than do the Generally Violent Batterers.

Table 17

Means and Standard Deviations for MANOVA (IBWB subscales)

Variable	FOV (1)		SOV (2)		GV (3)		NV (4)		Posthoc
	<u>n</u> =37		<u>n</u> =35		<u>n</u> =41		<u>n</u> =41		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
Offender Should be Punished	22.51	5.09	27.89	5.70	20.90	5.16	26.05	5.88	1,3<2,4
Offender is Responsible	20.68	4.62	23.51	3.87	19.98	4.51	22.46	4.35	3<2,4 1<2
Wife Beating Justified (log)	.50	.58	.52	.58	.96	.54	.55	.59	1,2,4<3
Wives Gain (log)	.61	.49	.39	.46	.82	.49	.60	.52	2<3
Help Should be Given (log)	.54	.37	.61	.38	.86	.41	.49	.43	1,2,4<3

Comparisons Among Violent Groups (FOV, GV, SOV)

Another objective of this research was to analyze differences among the three violent groups without the effects of the non-violent group's scores, in order to see if there were factors that were able to differentiate Batterers from violent offenders who did not engage in spousal assault. To this end, several 3-group MANOVA on the same variables as in the previous section were completed. Results revealed identical results as with the above 4-group contrasts, and will

not be re-presented. The full MANOVA analysis write-up for this and the comparisons between the two Batterer groups is found in Appendix R.

In addition to this, MANOVA with special contrasts, grouping Batterers (FOV and GV) together compared to SOV offenders were completed. Results again were almost identical, with three exceptions:

- When combining the two Batterer groups (FOV, GV) in comparison with the Stranger-only violent group on Impulsivity, HIQ Total and CSS subscales, with the use of Wilks' criterion, the combined variables failed to differentiate the groups, $F(5, 145)=1.04$, ns.
- When combining the two Batterer groups (FOV, GV) in comparison with the Stranger-only violent group on the IBWB subscales, Wife Beating is Justified, $F(1, 150)=3.23$, ns, and Help Should be Given, $F(1,150)=1.22$, ns, did not make any unique contributions in differentiating the groups.

In all these cases, because FOV and GV groups were significantly different from each other on these variables, when combined together, FOV and GV offenders essentially "cancelled" each other out. Together, then, they did not differ from SOV offender scores.

To summarize the section comparing the three violent groups, it appears that Family-Only violent offenders (FOV) were more prosocial in their criminal attitudes than were the other two violent groups, although FOV offenders did not differ from other violent offenders in terms of personality, hostility, psychopathy and impulsivity. As expected, the two Batterer groups (FOV, GV) exhibited more

abusive behaviour within their relationship and held attitudes supportive of male batterers more so than the Stranger-Only violent (SOV) group. However, FOV Batterers were more like SOV offenders in their support for victims of domestic violence, while Generally violent offenders maintained their negative, unsympathetic attitudes that seemed to characterize this group.

Comparisons Between Batterer Groups (FOV versus GV)

Lastly, this research sought to reveal differences between the two groups of male batterers without the effects of the other subject groups. This was to potentially understand the risks and needs associated with individuals who only express their violence and aggression towards an intimate partner versus those who are violent outside of the home as well. Again, several MANOVA were completed. Results, again, were almost identical to the 4-group analyses, with three exceptions:

- When comparing the two Batterer groups (FOV, GV) on Abuse total, Attitudes Towards Women and IBWB total, ATWS now made a significant unique contribution, $F(1,149)=6.23$, $p<.01$ with GV offenders ($M=77.58$, $SD=9.12$) self-reporting more conservative and traditional attitudes towards women than did FOV offenders ($M=82.41$, $SD= 8.28$).
- When comparing the two Batterer groups (FOV, GV) on CSS subscales, Law, Courts and Police now made a significant unique contribution, $F(1,149)=6.67$, $p<.01$ with GV offenders ($M=84.34$, $SD= 15.38$) self-reporting more negative attitudes towards the criminal justice system than did FOV offenders ($M=93.56$, $SD= 11.49$).

- When comparing the two Batterer groups (FOV, GV) on IBWB subscales, only Help Should be Given, $F(1,150)=12.50$, $p<.01$, and Wife Beating is Justified, $F(1,150)=12.70$, $p<.01$ made significant unique contributions to differentiating the groups. GV offenders were more apt to endorse that spousal assault can be justified ($M= .96$, $SD= .54$) and that help should not be given in a battering situation ($M= .86$, $SD= .41$) than were FOV Batterers ($M= .50$, $SD= .58$; $M= .54$, $SD=.37$, respectively).

To summarize the section comparing the two groups of male Batterers, Generally violent offenders again presented with more generally antisocial attitudes than did the Family-Only violent offenders, as well as with attitudes that were less sympathetic towards victims of domestic violence, including an overall reluctance to step in to help in a battering situation. Generally violent offenders also held more traditional and conservative attitudes towards women and reported greater use of violence within their relationships. This, despite there still being no difference between the two groups on measures of personality, psychopathy, hostility and impulsivity.

Discriminant Functions Analysis

In an effort to determine if a set of variables was able to predict violent offender group membership, a discriminant function analysis was completed with all four groups on several measures, including paper and pencil questionnaire scores and other variables thought to be important in the prediction of domestic

violence. These variables included incidence of physical abuse in past relationships, escalation of violence, NEO-PI-R factor scores, Hostile Interpretations Total, the remaining five HIQ subscale scores, CSS subscale scores, Abuse Total score, Attitudes Towards Women, Interpersonal Jealousy, IBWB subscale scores, Impulsivity score, PCL:SV Total scores. Three discriminant functions were calculated with a combined $\chi^2(78)=214.29, p<.001$. After removal of the first function, there was still a strong association between groups and predictors, $\chi^2(50)=108.99, p<.001$. After removal of the first and second functions, the association between groups and predictors failed to reach significance. The two significant discriminate functions accounted for 54% and 30%, respectively, of the between group variability.

As shown in the loading matrix of the correlation between discriminate functions and predictors in Table 18, the first discriminate function maximally separates the two Batterer groups (FOV, GV) and non-Batterer groups (SOV, NV) groups. The group centroids were: FOV=.74, SOV= -1.15, GV=1.30, NV= -1.00. Analysis of the loading matrix (loadings of .30 or greater were considered important; Stevens, 1996) revealed that the best predictor for distinguishing on this first factor were the Abuse scores, Offender related attitudes (Offender not Responsible and Offender Should not be Punished) of the IBWB, indicating that Batterers were more abusive within their relationships and held attitudes that were more supportive of the perpetrators of domestic violence.

The second discriminant function appeared to maximally separate the Family-only batterers and Non-violent offenders from Generally and Stranger-

only violent offenders. Group centroids were : FOV= -.65, SOV= 1.12, GV=.48, NV= -.87. Factors that differentiated the groups included Identification with Other Criminals (CSS), Impulsivity scores, PCL:SV scores, Tolerance for Law Violations (CSS), Hostile Reaction (HIQ), Agreeableness (NEO), Hostile Interpretation Total (HIQ), and Help Should be Given (IBWB). In terms of classifying the groups, these results indicate that Stranger-Only and Generally Violent offenders seem to hold more criminally-oriented attitudes (including less likely to offer to intervene in a battering situation, are more likely to react with hostility and more likely to perceive situations with hostility, and are less Agreeable (less compliant, trusting).

Table 18

Structure Matrix for Discriminant Function

Variable	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
Abuse-ABI	.542	.088	.153
Offender Should be Punished-IBWB	-.479	.075	-.040
Offender is Responsible-IBWB	-.301	.035	-.040
Past physical violence in relationships	-.268	-.148	.013
Wives Gain-IBWB	.241	-.091	.229
Interpersonal Jealousy Total	.224	.099	.220
Neuroticism-NEO	.102	.096	.040
Openness-NEO	-.051	-.014	-.042
Identification with Other Criminals-CSS	.082	.416	.168
Impulsivity Score	.186	.413	-.371
PCL:SV total	.287	.391	-.268
Tolerance for Law Violations-CSS	.013	.352	.110
Hostile Reaction-HIQ	.122	.337	-.112
Agreeableness-NEO	-.030	-.319	-.088
Hostile Interpretation -HIQ	.048	.302	-.102
Help Should be Given-IBWB	.234	.300	.226
External Blame-HIQ	-.020	.298	-.165
Law Courts and Police-CSS	-.009	-.229	-.228
Attribution of Hostility-HIQ	.046	.221	.051
Extroversion-NEO	-.030	-.084	-.044

Escalation of Violence	-.262	.127	.398
Wife Beating is Justified-IBWB	.229	.160	.321
Personal Responsibility-HIQ	.025	-.036	-.272
Overgeneralization-HIQ	-.010	.110	.229
Attitude Towards Women –ATWS	-.118	-.166	-.192
Conscientiousness-NEO	-.070	-.023	-.130

Group Classification. For classification, sample sizes were used to estimate prior probabilities of group membership, chance classifications were calculated at 23.3% FOV, 22.7% SOV, 27.3% GV and 26.7% NV. On the basis of the 26 risk factors, 74% of Family-Only violent, 74% of the Stranger-Only violent, 71% of the Generally violent and 75% of the Non-violent were correctly classified. Most of the errors in classification were due to Generally violent offenders being misclassified as Family-Only (20%); Non-violent being misclassified as Stranger-Only violent (10%); Family-Only violent being misclassified as Generally violent (11%) and Stranger-Only violent being misclassified as Non-Violent (18%). Overall, 73.3% of the sample was correctly classified. Results are found below in Table 19.

Table 19

Group Classification Results: Proportions (%)

Actual Group	Predicted Group			
	Family-Only Violent	Stranger- Only Violent	Generally Violent	Non-violent
Family-only Violent	74.3	2.9	11.4	11.4
Stranger- only Violent	5.9	73.5	2.9	17.6
Generally violent	19.5	2.4	70.7	7.3
Non-violent	5.0	10.0	10.0	75.0

Psychometric Analyses of the SARA

Reliability and Validity of the SARA. One of the objectives of the current research was to assess the reliability and validity of the SARA. Referring back to Table 4, inter-scorer reliability on 16 subjects was strong, with intra-class correlation coefficients ranging from .93 – 1.0.

Principle Components Analysis of the SARA. Through principle components analysis a two-factor structure as described by the authors of the SARA was confirmed. A PCA with Varimax rotation confirmed the factor structure of the SARA (5 subscales), and resulted in 2 significant factors (presented in Table 20). The first factor accounted for 38% of the variance. This factor, named Spousal Assault, included loadings >0.45 for Spousal Assault History, Current Offense, Other Considerations. The second factor, named Criminal Pattern included loadings >0.45 for Criminal History and Psychosocial Adjustment. This factor accounted for 28% of variance. Although this analysis confirmed the 2-factor structure of the SARA, it should be noted that the Factor 1 (Spousal Assault) described here is actually Factor 2 as described by Kropp and Hart (2000). Similarly, the second factor here is equivalent to Kropp and Hart's first factor (criminality/general violence). For clarity sake, all further analyses with the SARA will refer to the factors as identified by Kropp and Hart (2000); Factor 1 (general criminality/violence) and Factor 2 (spousal assault).

Table 20

Factor Loadings for SARA Principle Components Analysis

SARA Subscale	Factor 1	Factor 2
Criminal History	-4.258E-02	.89
Psychosocial Adjustment	.36	.70
Spousal Assault History	.78	.33
Current Offense	.83	7.864E-02
Other Considerations	.69	2.238E-02

Construct Validity of SARA. In order to assess the construct validity of the SARA, Pearson Product Moment bi-variate and partial correlations (controlling for BIDR Total results) were completed between the two SARA factors and Total score and scores on the ABI (physical and emotional abuse subscales). Results (presented in Table 21) indicated that the Spousal Abuse factor and SARA Total scores were strongly correlated with both physical and emotional abuse scores. The Criminal Pattern factor of the SARA was strongly correlated with Physical abuse scores, but not Emotional abuse scores. Interestingly, Total scores on the IBWB were strongly negatively correlated with the Spousal Abuse factor, indicating that those individuals who held attitudes that were more sympathetic of male perpetrators of domestic violence and more supportive of domestic violence tended to score higher on that SARA factor dealing specifically with domestic abuse behaviour.

Concurrent Validity of SARA. To assess concurrent validity of the SARA,

its correlation to other risk instruments was examined. The correlations are presented in Table 21. Both factors and the Total score of the SARA were highly correlated with PCL:SV Total scores, particularly, Factor 1 (Criminal Pattern). In addition, the Factor 1 of the SARA was also highly correlated with LSI-OR total scores. This would indicate that the SARA is correlated with other risk instruments for both violence and criminal behaviour. The Spousal Assault factor of the SARA was not correlated with the LSI-OR, which is not unexpected, given that the LSI-OR is a far more general risk instrument than focusing only on spousal assault.

Table 21

Correlations of Variables and SARA Scores

Variable	SARA Factor 1 (Criminal History)		SARA Factor 2 (Spousal Assault History)		SARA Total Score	
	Corr	Partial	Corr	Partial	Corr	Partial
SARA Total	.75**	.74**	.89**	.89**	1.00	1.00
ABI Total	.29**	.23*	.48**	.49**	.46**	.44**
ABI: Physical Abuse	.37**	.32**	.60**	.61**	.59**	.57**
ABI: Emotional Abuse	.24*	.16	.37**	.37**	.36**	.33**
IBWB Total	-.21*	-.18	-.34**	-.34**	-.30**	-.28**
PCL:SV Total	.59**	.59**	.37**	.36**	.57**	.56**
LSI-OR Total	.55**	.53**	.02	.00	.28**	.26**

Note: ** $p < .001$; * $p < .01$

SARA= Spousal Assault Risk Assessment; ABI= Abusive Behaviour Inventory; IBWB=Inventory of Beliefs About Wife Beating; PCL:SV= Psychopathy Checklist (Short); LSI-OR= Level of Service Inventory-Ontario Revision

One of the main objectives of this research was to investigate any differences among the groups on SARA scores. To this end, the following analyses involve only Factor 1, Factor 2 and SARA Total scores. Means and standard deviations for each of the five subscale scores (Criminal History, Psychosocial Adjustment, Spousal Assault History, Current Offense, Other Considerations) are found in Appendix S.

Four Group Comparison (FOV, SOV, GV, NV). To test the hypothesis of group differences on the SARA, a 4-group (FOV, SOV, GV, NV) between subjects multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on three predictor variables: Factor 1 (Criminal Pattern), Factor 2 (Spousal Assault History) (square root) and Total scores of the SARA (square root). With the use of Wilks' criterion for multivariate significance, the combined variables differentiated the four groups, $F(9, 360.34)=48.52$, $p<.001$. The results reflected a strong association between groups and the combined variables (partial $\eta^2=.53$). All variables made unique contributions in distinguishing the four groups. Means are presented in Table 22. For comparison sake, untransformed scores are also provided for SARA Factor 2 and Total.

The greatest contribution was made by Factor 2, $F(3, 154)=150.74$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.75$. Follow-up post hoc Tukey HSD analyses revealed that the NV group had lowest scores on this factor followed by the SOV group followed by the FOV and GV groups. Generally violent and Family-only violent offenders did not differ significantly from each other in their scores for Spousal Assault History.

Factor 1 also made a unique contribution, $F(3, 154)=26.75$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.35$. Follow-up post hoc Tukey HSD analyses revealed that the NV group had the lowest scores, followed by the FOV group and SOV group (who did not differ from each other) and finally, the GV offenders. Together, these results indicated that the Batterer groups, as expected, generated significantly higher scores than the non-batterer groups on the section of the SARA that dealt with spousal assault behaviour. Also as expected, Generally violent offenders showed the

highest levels of criminally oriented lifestyle and risk factors associated with such a lifestyle, followed by the other violent groups and non-violent offenders.

SARA Total scores also differentiated the four groups, $F(3, 154)=106.74$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.68$. Follow-up post hoc Tukey HSD analyses revealed, as expected, FOV and GV offenders had the highest total scores, followed by SOV and lastly, NV offenders.

Table 22

Means and Standard Deviations for MANOVA (SARA factors and Total)

Variable	FOV (1)		SOV (2)		GV (3)		NV (4)		Posthoc
	<u>n</u> =37		<u>n</u> =35		<u>n</u> =41		<u>n</u> =41		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
SARA Factor 1	8.76	2.77	10.09	3.15	11.56	2.36	6.27	2.80	4<1,2<3
SARA Factor 2 (square root)	3.44	.70	1.66	.49	3.24	.45	1.37	.49	4<2<3,1
SARA Factor 2 (untransformed)	11.30	4.43	2.00	1.77	9.68	2.93	1.12	2.00	
SARA Total (square root)	4.58	.65	3.57	.56	4.70	.44	2.80	.54	4<2<1,3
SARA Total (untransformed)	20.41	5.69	12.09	3.92	21.24	4.20	7.15	3.14	

Note: Factor 1=Criminal Pattern; Factor 2=Spousal Assault History

Comparison Among Violent Groups (FOV, SOV, GV). Another objective of this research was to analyze differences among the three violent groups without the effects of the non-violent group's scores, in order to see if the SARA was able to differentiate Batterers from violent offenders who did not engage in spousal assault. To this end, a 3-group MANOVA on the three SARA factors as above was completed. Results revealed identical results as with the above 4-group contrasts, and will not be re-presented. The full MANOVA write-up for this and comparisons between Batterers is found in Appendix S.

In addition to this, MANOVA, grouping Batterers (FOV and GV) together compared to SOV offenders were completed. Results again were almost identical, with one exception:

- When combining the two Batterer groups (FOV, GV) in comparison with the Stranger-only violent group on the three SARA factors, Factor 1 (Criminal History) failed to make a unique contribution in differentiating the groups, $F(1, 150) = .02$, ns. In this case, because FOV and GV groups were significantly different from each other on this variable, when combined together, FOV and GV offenders essentially "cancelled" each other out, and together, were not significantly different from SOV offenders.

To summarize this section, not surprisingly, the two Batter groups (FOV, GV) presented as higher risk individuals for future domestic violence than were SOV offenders as assessed by the SARA. Generally violent offenders also seemed to

evidence more risk factors on the criminal history/pattern section than the other two violent groups, indicating more of an overall criminal lifestyle and pattern.

Comparison Between Batterer Groups (FOV, GV). When comparing the two Batterer groups (FOV, GV) on the three SARA factors, results were the same as the 4-group analyses, in that both groups were similar in their scores on Factor 2 (Spousal Assault History) and SARA Total score, however, GV offenders scored higher on Factor 1 (Criminal History) in risk factors associated with overall criminality than did FOV offenders, $F(1, 150) = 19.95, p < .001$. When comparing these SARA findings to those found by Kropp and Hart (2000), the scores here are similar to, albeit, somewhat higher than what Kropp and Hart found in their investigation. Kropp and Hart (2000) found that recidivistic spousal assaulter scored 17.7 (Total), 8.4 (Factor 1) and 9.3 (Factor 2). This sample, however, was comprised of men on probation, and therefore, perhaps a less serious group of offenders than the current sample. Similarly, the incarcerate sample of those with a history of spousal assault from Kropp and Hart's (2000) study had scores of 163.4 (total), 10.0 (Factor 1) and 6.4 (Factor 2), again, similar to the current findings. One explanation for the differences might be that Kropp and Hart (2000) included men who had ever had a history of domestic violence, while the current sample included men who only demonstrated that behaviour within the last 5 years.

Discussion

Historically the literature in the area of male batterers and domestic violence has suffered from inconsistencies and methodological problems, not the least of which has been the failure to employ a typological approach to assess this population. The need for further research using a break down of batterer subtypes seemed apparent to better understand the needs, risk, and violence associated with each type. This, in turn, should lead to more efficient and effective supervision and treatment. The current research attempted to address some of these issues by investigating the risk factors and potential treatment targets associated with subtypes of batterers using a common typology employed by researchers in the area (Dutton & Hart, 1992; Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994) and to compare them with two other groups of offenders. This included assessing how male offenders who are violent with their intimate partners differ from other violent offenders and non-violent offenders, as well as identifying differences between two types of male batterers. In sub-typing offenders, we potentially gain a much clearer understanding of specific static and dynamic risk factors.

Demographic Information

From the demographic information, it was apparent that the four different offender groups did not differ a great deal from each other, indicating a fairly homogeneous sample. One difference was that offenders who were violent only with strangers (Stranger-Only Violent) were significantly younger than the two batterer groups (Family-Only and Generally Violent) and were more likely to be

single than the other groups. Perhaps because of their younger age, they have had less intimate relationship experience, and therefore less opportunity to have been violent within a relationship. The fact that this group tended to report being single also lends some support to the lack of "opportunity" to be violent with a partner. It would be interesting to follow this particular group further down the road to investigate whether they generalize their current violent behaviour with strangers to any future intimate partners.

Family of Origin Dysfunction

Other group comparisons indicated that the sample as a whole was relatively homogeneous with respect to familial background and incidences of abuse in their upbringing. Following the social learning perspective on domestic violence, past research (Shields, et al., 1998) has indicated that male batterers tend to have higher incidences of childhood abuse. Although the hypothesis that batterers would differ significantly from non-batterers in self reported childhood abuse was not supported, there was a trend in the expected direction. That is, all three violent groups reported higher proportions of childhood abuse than non-violent offenders and Batterers reported higher proportions than non-Batterers (being mostly pronounced among Generally Violent Men).

Witnessing parental violence is considered to be one of the strongest predictors of future male violence against a partner (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986; Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989), however, once again, results in this study only revealed a trend in support of that finding, with Batterers being most likely to report having witnessed violence between their own caregivers.

The lack of significant differences among groups regarding dysfunctional childhood experiences is thought to be due mainly to the fact that the sample is comprised of a very homogeneous group of incarcerated offenders. Although trends developed in the expected directions for many of these particular risk variables, it is suspected that incarcerated offenders have similarly dysfunctional backgrounds overall, despite whether they become violent or not in their own adult lives. Taken together, the findings support Boer et al's (1997) conclusions that victimization (witnessing and experiencing abuse) is a general risk factor for both criminal and violent behaviour. Perhaps if a comparison community sample was used, the differences would have been more prominent. Clearly, it would seem that other factors may be more important in precipitating violence against an intimate partner.

Prior Intimate Relationship Violence

Physical Abuse. In looking at the subject's own histories of relationship violence, more Generally Violent Offenders admitted to engaging in physically violent behaviour in past relationships than did the other groups. For Family-Only Violent offenders, they often reported the current victim to be their first serious or long-standing relationship, therefore, it could very well be that this group did not have much prior relationship experience.

Another explanation is simply that men who are only violent with a partner, as opposed to with others, engage in a great deal of minimization and denial. Gondolf (1998) reported that only a minority of his sample of batterers agreed with their partners' account of the assault. In support of this, the findings in the

present study also indicated that the majority of Batterers were coded as expressing either partial or full denial about their offense, while a small percentage of Stranger-Only Violent and Non-Violent offenders were coded as such. Among Batterers, it was hypothesized that Generally Violent offenders would engage in more minimization or denial than would Family-Only Violent offenders. In fact, the opposite occurred. The majority of Family-Only Violent batterers compared to half of Generally Violent offenders were coded as partly denying (thereby providing some justifications) or denying their offenses. This would indicate that among men who are violent with an intimate partner, minimization and denial continue to present as significant concerns, particularly for issues surrounding treatment and rehabilitation, as noted by previous researchers (Young & Gerson, 1992; Wetzel & Ross, 1983). This may also be an issue that needs to be considered further by justice personnel when sentencing and mandating treatment.

As Generally Violent offenders appear to be more criminal in their attitudes and orientation, and show far less sympathy than Family-Only Violent batterers for victims of abuse, perhaps they simply do not try as much as Family-Only batterers to make excuses for their behaviour. Or, Generally-Violent offenders simply do not care as much about how they are perceived and therefore are more forthright and almost "comfortable" with their abusive behaviour. Family-Only Violent batterers, on the other hand, seem to be quite unlike other violent offenders, and are possibly "uncomfortable" with their violent behaviour, and therefore, try to minimize and justify their behaviour in an effort to

be perceived as really a “nice guy, who’s had some bad luck”.

Emotional Abuse. One interesting finding was that self-reported emotional abuse in past relationships was virtually a constant among all offender groups. This is in contrast to past surveys of emotional abuse within relationships (Johnson & Hotton, 2001) where a much smaller proportion of individuals report such abuse. Again, this could go back to the fact that this was a particularly homogeneous sample of provincial incarcerated offenders, with very similar childhood and background experiences. Recalling that all four groups reported fairly dysfunctional backgrounds, including physical, emotional and sexual abuse within their own childhoods, it is not surprising, then, that emotional violence seems to have carried on into many of their adult relationships. This may also be a function of fairly broad criteria for emotional abuse being employed in this research (any repeated incidences of swearing, name calling, controlling behaviour used in an intimate relationship). As the sample of subjects had fairly similar backgrounds, and almost all reported having been emotionally abusive in past relationships, it appears that other factors are involved that have lead some of these offenders (Family-Only Violent, Generally Violent) to actually physically assault their partners while others (Stranger-Only Violent, Non-Violent) have apparently refrained from such behaviour.

Risk Factors: Violent versus Non-Violent Offenders

In order to test the hypotheses regarding other risk factors differentiating violent offenders (Family-Only Violent, Stranger-Only Violent, Generally Violent) from Non-Violent offenders, a number of multivariate analyses of variance were

completed. Hare (1998) and Hill et al. (1996), among others, have found that impulsivity and higher psychopathy continue to present as risk factors for violence, whether that violence is directed inside or outside of the family. As hypothesized, violent offenders in this study were more impulsive and had higher PCL:SV scores than did Non-Violent offenders. Interestingly, there was little variation among the three violent groups, indicating that these variables are potentially related to overall aggressive behaviour, no matter who the victim is.

The hypothesis that violent offenders would differ from Non-Violent offenders in terms of procriminal sentiments was partially supported. As expected, Generally Violent and Stranger-Only Violent offenders did identify more with other criminals and show greater tolerance for breaking the law than did Family-Only Violent or Non-Violent offenders. Not surprisingly, given an all-offender sample, all four groups were similar in their negative sentiments regarding the criminal justice system. Results revealed that Family-only Violent batterers were more like Non-Violent offenders in their criminal sentiments than they were the other two violent groups. From past research (Andrews & Bonta, 1994; Simourd, 1997; Mills & Kroner, 1997) antisocial attitudes in general are regarded as strong risk factors. However, Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, and Stuart (2000) found their sample of Family-Only batterers resembled the Non-Violent sample more closely than they did the other Batterer groups. It may be that the criminal repertoire of Family-Only batterers consists of domestic assaults and other low-level, non-violent offenses, and that otherwise, they are relatively prosocial in their attitudes and lifestyle, or at least, less

antisocial than other violent offenders.

Past research on male batterers has shown that both interpersonal jealousy and the tendency to hold more conservative/traditional attitudes towards women are risk factors for abuse (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1997; Spence et al., 1973). This finding was not supported in the current research as the four groups of offenders did not differ from each other on these measures. With respect to interpersonal jealousy, recall that the majority of the sample reported engaging in emotional abuse in past relationships. Presumably if jealousy is considered to be emotionally abusive or if jealous emotion precipitates emotionally abusive/controlling behaviour, this would explain the lack of differentiation among groups.

Holding more traditional attitudes about women also failed to differentiate the groups. The exception was when comparing the two Batterer groups without the influence of the other two groups. In that case, Generally Violent offenders did hold more traditional and conservative attitudes about women than did Family-Only Violent offenders. This is contrary to past findings of male batterer research (Dutton, et al., 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; Saunders, 1992). Results here seem to indicate that jealousy and more conservative attitudes about women are not necessarily risk factors unique to male batterers, but to offenders in general. Perhaps offenders tend to hold more stereotypically conservative attitudes about women in general, and this is a factor more associated with emotional abuse within relationships than physical violence. When female partners do not conform to the stereotypical view that is held by

these men, they respond with jealousy, control and emotional abuse.

Another issue may be that, although every effort was made to keep groups as "pure" as possible, the fact that so many of the supposed non-batterers (Stranger-Only Violent, Non-Violent offenders) engaged in emotional abuse somehow contaminated these groups as truly representative of offenders who are not abusive with a partner.

It was hypothesized that violent offenders would evidence more anger/hostility than non-violent offenders. The results indicated that only one (Hostile Reaction) of the six subscales of the measure of hostility (Hostile Reaction, Hostile Interpretations Total, Overgeneralization, Attribution of Hostility, Personal Responsibility, External Blame) failed to differentiate the groups, indicating that Non-Violent offenders were less likely to respond in a hostile way than were the three violent groups. This supports past research showing a distinct lack of relationship between this construct and criminal conduct. Loza and Loza-Fanous (1999) have suggested that it is unnecessary to strongly emphasize anger/hostility as meaningful when explaining criminal activity.

Perhaps the lack of variability was again due to the fact that the sample was of incarcerates, and more definitive distinctions would have been noted with the addition of a community sample of men. Another issue for anger measures is that they are not typically administered when subjects are in the same emotionally aroused state as when they committed their crimes. Perhaps the attitudes and cognitions measured are very different when these individuals are

calm, compared with when experiencing anger arousal.

With regard to the Hostile Interpretations Questionnaire, its utility was demonstrated more from a clinical perspective, in that, although subscale totals did not differentiate groups, it was very useful to note individual subscale totals within the context of a risk/needs assessment. This was also a point noted by Simourd and Mamouza (in progress), in that, a client may have a low overall HIQ score, but be elevated on individual subscales (e.g., intimate/family or external blame). This would indicate that, although the client probably does not require intensive programming to address overt hostility/anger, (s)he might benefit from attention focusing on familial issues or accepting responsibility. Although beyond the scope of this research, further studies may be designed to investigate individual subscale score differences among the different types of offenders.

Risk Factors: Domestically Violent versus Non-domestically Violent Offenders

The second set of hypotheses dealt with identifying risk factors more specifically for domestic violence as compared to more general violence, and the proposed differences between the two groups of batterers (Family-Only Violent, Generally Violent) as compared to the Stranger-Only Violent offenders. To re-iterate, although the incidence of reported childhood abuse did not significantly differentiate the batterer groups from either of the non-batterer groups, as was hypothesized, a lower percentage of Stranger-only Violent offenders reported experiencing physical or sexual abuse as a child than either of the two batterer groups.

In terms of abusive behaviour within relationships, as expected, the

Stranger-only Violent offenders self-reported less domestically abusive behaviour than did both of the batterer groups. This is not surprising, given the lack of history with relationship violence for the Stranger-only Violent group.

Following Andrew and Bonta's (1994;1998) theory of the psychology of criminal conduct and the "Big 4", it was hypothesized that attitudes specifically condoning abuse against women would be an important risk factor for male batterers. This idea was supported in the current research. As hypothesized, Stranger-Only Violent offenders did not hold the same attitudes supportive of domestic violence as did the two batterer groups. Both Generally Violent and Family-Only Violent men were more likely to endorse attitudes that justified male batterer behaviour, such as "offenders should not be punished for domestic violence", and "male batterers were not responsible for the behaviour". These findings are not surprising, given that these particular variables represent the types of minimizations and justifications commonly used and unique to male batterers to excuse their abusive behaviour. Very often within an institution setting, domestic batterers are perceived negatively by other inmates (only sex offenders and child abusers fall lower in the scale) and "should be punished". As such, the fact that Stranger-Only Violent offenders did not endorse such condoning attitudes reflects this "inmate code". This may be why the findings are attitudes specific to male batterers.

Interestingly, in terms of attitudes towards victims of domestic violence (wife beating is justified, help should be given), Generally Violent offenders held attitudes that were significantly less sympathetic towards victims of domestic

assault than the other groups, including Family-Only batterers. Although the average of the Generally Violent group did not reach diagnosable limits (cut-off of 18), the higher scores on the PCL:SV for this group might explain the more callous and antisocial attitudes found within this group as compared to the others. This could be due to a general attitude of apathy and lack of empathy as evidenced by other attitudes supportive of domestic violence as well as general criminal sentiments. (A noteworthy point is that 15% of the Generally Violent offenders scored 18 or greater on the PCL:SV compared to 8% of the Family-Only Violent, 9% of the Stranger-Only Violent and 5% of the Non-Violent offenders.)

Another explanation for the apparent support of victims by Family-Only Violent batterers could be that these batterers engage in such high levels of either partial or full denial and justification of their own behaviour (making excuses, such as "she's just as violent as I am"; "I was drunk and didn't know what I was doing" (therefore, cannot be held responsible) that they actually do feel more sympathy for *other* victims of domestic violence (more in line with Non-Violent or Stranger-only Violent offenders). However, their *own* partners (victims) deserved the assault. The IBWB asked about attitudes towards victims, in general, rather than specifically about the man's own partner. Perhaps if a measure was administered that queried attitudes about their own specific victim, less sympathetic attitudes among Family-only batterers (and more in line with Generally Violent Batterers) would have emerged.

Risk Factors: Family-only Batterers versus Generally Violent Offenders

The next set of hypotheses compared the two batterer groups together in order to distinguish what risk factors are associated with engaging only in domestic violence versus more general violence. As hypothesized, Generally Violent offenders, once again, held more antisocial attitudes as measured by the CSS than did Family-Only Violent offenders. This has been a consistent finding, throughout; Family-Only batterers seem to not be as antisocial as other violent offenders in their general orientation despite their violent behaviour with their partners. This finding, in particular, has implications for addressing responsivity issues within treatment programs. Often times, treatment programs either within institutions or in the community take all participants together, and rarely are responsivity issues such as a strong criminal orientation taken into account. Presumably, if Family-only Violent offenders are less criminally oriented, placing them with the more criminally oriented Generally Violent offenders could potentially be detrimental to the former group.

Oddly enough, Family-Only Violent offenders did not differ significantly from Generally Violent offenders in psychopathy or impulsivity, as hypothesized. This supports prior research in the area of psychopathy that scores on the PCL are associated with violent behaviour, whether that violence be within or outside of the family (Hare, 1998). Although past researchers (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994) found that Generally Violent offenders tended to score higher in measures of impulsivity, their sample also consisted of community men. Given that the more serious batterers tend to receive periods of incarceration rather

than simply community sentences, perhaps the lack of significant differences for psychopathy or impulsivity are due to the nature of the current sample as "more serious" offenders.

Generally Violent offenders had significantly higher scores on the measure of abusive behaviour, and poorer attitudes towards women, as hypothesized. This supports the findings of a number of past researchers, indicating that again, as both Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) and Saunders (1992) found, Family-Only Violent batterers have slightly more liberal attitudes towards women than Generally Violent men. This latter group also maintained more negative and unsympathetic attitudes towards victims of domestic violence, and were more likely to believe that women deserved the assaults they received and that help should not be offered in a domestic situation. Together, these findings fit with the general, all-around "bad boy" image that seems to have been revealed about Generally Violent offenders with this current research.

The hypothesis that Generally Violent offenders would also have more substance abuse activity or history was not confirmed, although findings were consistent with that of Limandri and Sheridan (1995) and others that intoxication is a factor in a large percentage of violent crimes and that a high proportion of batterers have been under the influence of alcohol prior to their offense. Again, however, the general lack of differentiation among groups is perhaps due to the fact that within an incarcerated offender sample, a significant proportion of offenders have substance abuse problems (Andrews & Bonta, 1994;1998; White,

2000). The findings here lend support for the idea that substance abuse seems to be an important risk factor for criminality in general than one that is specific to domestic violence. As Andrews and Bonta (1998) noted, "It is indisputable that substance abuse is a correlate of criminal behaviour that is more important than class and race" (p. 337).

Personality: Five-Factor Structure

The last hypothesis referred to differences among the groups on NEO-PI-R factors. It was predicted that Generally and Stranger-Only Violent offenders would have higher neuroticism and extroversion scores and lower conscientiousness and agreeableness scores than Family-Only or Non-Violent offenders. This hypothesis was not confirmed and there were no significant difference among the groups on the individual factors. The original thinking for the hypothesis was that higher neuroticism and extroversion, and lower conscientiousness and agreeableness indicated a typical APD profile, which was hypothesized to be more typical of Generally and Stranger-only Violent offenders. However, the lack of differentiation could again be due to the fact that the whole sample consists of incarcerated offenders, who are typically the more serious offenders. The fact that they all seem to be displaying this profile should not be too surprising, reflecting the fact that upwards of 80% of incarcerates are APD, while only about 25% are psychopathic (Hare, 1996). Recall that Harpur et al. (1994) also found that the 5-factors were not the most appropriate levels at which to describe the traits of their psychopathic sample. They suggested, instead, the use of the individual facets making up each domain scale score. To

this end, it would be interesting and probably more fruitful for future research in this area to look at each individual component score of the NEO-PI-R. There are possibly more specific differences among component scores that become "absorbed" within the whole factor score.

Reliability and Validity of the SARA

As predicted, the SARA was successful in differentiating the four groups of offenders as well as the two batterer groups from the Stranger-Only Violent subjects in the predicted direction. All violent offenders scored higher than the Non-Violent offenders, and those offenders who had no histories of spousal assault scored significantly lower on the SARA than the two Batterer groups.

It was hypothesized that Generally Violent and Stranger-Only Violent offenders would score higher on Factor 1 (Criminal Pattern) than Family-Only and Non-Violent offenders. In fact, Generally Violent scored higher on that factor than did the Stranger-Only Violent, Family-Only Violent or the Non-Violent offenders, reflecting their all-encompassing criminal and violent lifestyle.

The hypothesis that Generally Violent offenders would score higher in the Spousal Assault section than Family-Only Violent offenders was not supported, despite the fact that they were reportedly more seriously abusive in their relationships. One possible explanation for this is that Family-Only batterers typically scored more points in the "Current Offense" section, simply because they were most likely incarcerated on a domestic violence charge, whereas, Generally Violent offenders did not necessarily have a current conviction of spousal assault. With some of these individuals, their current conviction was not

of a violent nature at all. Secondly, Family-Only Violent individuals were most likely to have points scored in the "Other Considerations" section, specifically, prior stalking behaviour, more so than Generally Violent offenders. This is in line with past research on domestic stalking behaviour that shows that men who are violent only within their families tend to be more dependent on their partners, and more prone to stalking behaviour in the event of a break down in the relationship (Meloy, 1998).

As with past research (Kropp & Hart, 2000), the construct validity of the SARA was supported as evidenced by correlations with measures of abuse. As expected, physical and emotional abuse scores of the ABI were highly correlated with Spousal Assault factor scores. Criminal Pattern scores also correlated with abuse scores, but not as strongly. Recall that emotional abuse was almost a constant with this sample, hence the lack of relationship with that SARA factor. Interestingly, attitudes that were supportive of domestic violence were also highly correlated with the Spousal Assault factor. This is not surprising, given the theoretical importance of crime-specific attitudes on violent behaviour (Andrews & Bonta, 1994).

Kropp and Hart (2000) found in their validation research with the SARA that the measure was significantly related to other risk measures, including the PCL:SV, GSIR and VRAG. The present research confirmed Kropp and Hart's (2000) findings of concurrent validity in that PCL:SV total scores were significantly related to SARA Criminal Pattern scores, SARA Spousal Assault History scores and SARA Total scores. This research extended those findings to

show that SARA Criminal Pattern and Total scores were also significantly correlated with LSI-OR total scores, but almost not at all with Spousal Assault History factor scores. This makes some sense in that the LSI-OR is a far more general risk instrument and does not focus as much on risk for violence or risk for spousal assault. It seems, then, that the SARA is a valid and useful risk assessment instrument for domestic violence in its ability to more finely discriminate between groups than the PCL:SV and the LSI-OR.

Limitations of the Present Study

Although every effort was made to ensure a methodologically sound and rigorous research design, there remain some limitations to the present study. Probably first and foremost is the fact that with a sample made up exclusively of incarcerated men, differentiation among the four groups could have been obscured. Perhaps with other comparison groups of community offenders and non-offenders, more distinct differences might have been found. This is particularly true with respect to variables such as incidence of childhood abuse, where there was only a trend in the expected direction. Another problem with an exclusively incarcerated sample is the fact that, in general, the most serious offenders receive incarceration sentences. Again, with a comparison sample of theoretically "less serious" offenders from the community, more differences might have been apparent. This sample was also made up of men who were about to enter treatment programs. As such, the results are not as generalizable to every offender sample. Those entering treatment might be different from other offenders in their levels of motivation and other attitudes, that might, in turn,

impact on how they respond in a study such as this. The fact that this sample was relatively more mature in age (early-mid 30's) also indicates that this is a group of men who have probably been through the system a number of times and are finally at a point in their lives to recognize they need some help. In this respect, they are different from many of the younger (early 20's) offenders who might still view incarceration as "fun" or "a joke".

A second issue within this research is the fact that some errors were likely made in classifying offenders to particular groups. For example, men who actually should have been classified as "Batterer" were missed and classified as "Non-Batterer" and vice versa. Again, although every effort was made to keep the groups as pure as possible, errors in classification are inevitable, which might have had an impact on the results. If feasible, it would be interesting for future research to corroborate offender's accounts of their offenses and relationship with their victims/partners as another check of whether they have engaged in any aggressive behaviour. Although not done in the present research, Kropp et al. (1995) suggested contacting victims when completing the SARA.

Other potential problems with this research include the large number of self-report questionnaires, many of which were fairly transparent regarding the construct being measured. Again, although every effort was made to reduce the incidence of self-report bias, this is always a concern with such measures. Perhaps future research would benefit from utilizing measures that are somewhat more ambiguous in what they are measuring, particularly with a topic such as

violence against women, which tends to generate defensive responses at the best of times. Ideally, behavioural observation measures would be employed in assessing variables such as interpersonal jealousy and attitudes towards women.

Along these same lines, the present research utilized LSI-OR scores from offender files. These LSI-OR's had been completed by a number of different people within the Ministry prior to the offender arriving at RCTC (usually classification officers in the offender's local detention center or jail). As such, the validity of these LSI-OR's might be questionable, given the wide variety of people involved. Future research might benefit from the researcher re-administering the LSI-OR's him/herself in order to maintain some sense of consistency.

General Implications for Treatment, Victims and Current Legislation

Present findings support the idea that there is no one all-encompassing theory of domestic violence. Instead, the results have demonstrated some support for feminist theories (batterers hold more traditional attitudes towards women), social learning theory (incidence of childhood abuse and witnessed violence in the home), but mainly for the general personality and social psychology of criminal conduct theory (batterers hold more attitudes supportive of abuse; history of relationship violence, etc.).

The results from this study will therefore aid future treatment providers and probation and parole officers in targeting treatment and supervision goals based on the particular needs identified among each type. According to Andrews

and Bonta's (1994) risk, need and responsivity principles, higher levels of service should be reserved for higher risk cases, intervention should be matched with the criminogenic needs (dynamic risk factors) of the offenders, and styles and models of intervention should be matched to the learning style of the offenders. In particular, results emerged that indicated that Generally Violent offenders present as all-round "bad boys", and as fairly high risk and high need individuals, with slightly more psychopathic characteristics, and attitudes that are supportive of both criminal activity in general as well as specifically for violence against women. At the same time, this group did not seem as interested in trying to portray themselves in a positive light. It almost seemed that they just did not care what others thought of them, and responded to the measures with what they truly think. In a sense, this is easier to work with in treatment, as one tends to know "where you stand" with these types of individuals. This group would probably benefit from more all-round, intensive programming that focuses on their generally criminal and violent behaviour, including domestic violence, and that accommodates their apparent lack of empathy and antisocial attitudes.

Family-Only Violent offenders seem to present as most like Non-Violent offenders, in terms of criminal attitudes and behaviour. The exception is that their attitudes were more supportive of domestic violence. This group, unlike the Generally Violent Batterer, seemed to be more interested in presenting themselves in a positive light and minimizing their behaviour. As such, they probably present as more challenging clinically. These individuals, therefore, would most likely benefit less from programming focusing on criminogenic

factors, and more from intensive programming targetting cognitions and attitudes surrounding their own domestic violence and attitudes towards their partners, victim awareness and empathy, as well as the cognitions that support the minimization and denial of their violence.

In addition to identifying the risk factors unique to each type of offender, this study also served as an opportunity to obtain some reliability and validity data on the SARA, the first risk instrument designed specifically for domestic batterers. Results were promising and the SARA was able to differentiate the groups where other measures of risk were not.

One implication of the SARA findings was that, although Generally Violent batterers are more criminally oriented and supposedly engage in more serious violence within relationships, it is the Family-Only batterers who are potentially at higher risk for future serious domestic violence as per the SARA, particularly with their propensity to engage in stalking behaviour. This has important implications for policy and legislation in the way different types of batterers might be supervised by probation and parole officers, what victim services are needed and how male batterers are treated by the courts. Often, Family-Only batterers receive either only probation or lighter sentences, while Generally Violent offenders are perceived as the more serious and dangerous criminals, and are treated as such by the courts. While this may be the case in terms of general criminal behaviour, it seems that Family-Only Violent offenders are of more concern as risks for continued domestic violence. This type of batterer tended to be more likely to engage in stalking type behaviour, which is consistent with the

research on domestic violence and stalking. Family-Only batterers seem to fit the profile of those most likely to engage in domestic stalking (Meloy, 1998). Given the link between domestic stalking and future violence, including intimate femicide (Burgess, Baker, Greening, Hartman, Burgess, Douglas, & Halloran, 1997), coupled with the high proportion of Family-Only Violent offenders reporting an escalation of violence over the past year, it would seem that Family-Only batterers are of most concern in terms of risk for future domestic violence and for their female victims, despite the fact that Generally Violent batterers are seemingly more criminally oriented.

Extending this argument, the findings of the current research suggest that perhaps victims of different types of batterers may require different levels of service. While victim services are of utmost importance for all victims of crime and violence, from the findings just noted, one might reason that the victims of Family-Only Violent men might benefit from more intensive attention and focus on developing a safety plan, especially given that their partners seem to be more likely to engage in stalking and, as Dutton et al. (1996) termed, "intrusive" behaviour with the same victim. Although not specifically addressed in this study, Generally Violent men may have more of a tendency to leave a relationship and move on to a new victim once they are charged with domestic assault. Further research might clarify this distinction.

Although certain offender groups are already "red-flagged" by the courts and Probation and Parole, current findings further the knowledge regarding different types of domestic batterers and clarify what areas to focus on with

which types. The current findings also seem to lend support to the on-going Canadian legislation agenda to strengthen domestic violence laws and policies.

References

- Albert, D.J., Walsh, M.L., & Jonik, R.H. (1993). Aggression in humans: What is its biological foundation? Neuroscience and Biobehavioural Reviews, 17(4), 405-425.
- Alksnis, C., & Robinson, D. (1996). Family violence demonstration project assessment battery: Potential for measuring treatment change. Ottawa: Correctional Service Canada.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. (4th Ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (1994). The psychology of criminal conduct. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing.
- Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (1995). The level of service inventory-revised. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (1998). The psychology of criminal conduct, 2nd edition. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing.
- Andrews, D.A., & Wormith, J.S. (1984). Criminal sentiments and criminal behaviour. Programs Branch User Report. Ottawa: Solicitor General of Canada.
- Archer, J. (1994). Testosterone and aggression. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 21, 3-39.
- Aromacki, A.S., Lindman, R.E., & Eriksson, C.J.P. (1999). Testosterone, aggressiveness and antisocial personality. Aggressive Behaviour, 25, 113-123.

Barbaree, H.E., & Marshall, W.L. (1991). The role of male sexual arousal in rape: Six models. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59, 621-630.

Boer, D.P., Wilson, R.J., Gauthier, C.M., & Hart, S.D. (1997). Assessing risk for sexual violence: Guidelines for clinical practice. In C.D. Webster, & M.A. Jackson (Eds.). Impulsivity: Theory, assessment and treatment (pp. 326-342). New York: Guilford Press.

Bonta, J., & Motiuk, L.L. (1992). Inmate classification. Journal of Criminal Justice, 20, 343-353.

Bonta, J., Law, M., & Hanson, R.K. (1998). The prediction of criminal and violent recidivism among mentally disordered offenders: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 123, 123-142.

Brooks, J.H., & Reddon, J.R. (1996). Serum testosterone in violent and non-violent young offenders. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 52, 475-483.

Brown, S.L. (1994). Sexual aggression and psychopathy among convicted rapists: Static, dynamic and motivational precursors. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.

Brown, S.L., and Forth, A.E. (1997). Psychopathy and sexual assault: Static risk factors, emotional precursors and rapists subtypes. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 65, 848-857.

Burgess, A.W., Baker, T., Greening, D., Hartman, C.R., Burgess, A.G., Douglas, J.E., & Halloran, R. (1997). Stalking behaviors within domestic violence. Journal of Family Violence, 12, 389-403.

Costa, P.T., & McCrae, R.R. (1988). Personality in adulthood: A six year longitudinal study of self reports and spouse ratings on the neo personality inventory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 853-863.

Costa, P.T., & McCrae, R.R. (1990). Personality disorder and the five-factor model of personality. Journal of Personality Disorders, 4, 362-371.

Costa, P.T., & McCrae, R.R. (1992). The five-factor model of personality and its relevance to personality disorders. Journal of Personality Disorders, 6, 343-359.

Costa, P.T., & Widiger, T.A. (1994). Personality disorders and the five-factor model of personality. Washington: American Psychological Association.

Dabbs, J.M., & Hargrove, M.F. (1997). Age, testosterone and behaviour among female prison inmates. Psychosomatic Medicine, 59, 477-480.

Dabbs, J.M., Carr, T.S., Frady, R.L., & Riad, J.K. (1995). Testosterone, crime and misbehaviour among 692 male prison inmates. Personality and Individual Differences, 18(5), 627-633.

DeKeserdy, W., & Kelly, K. (1993). The incidence and prevalence of woman abuse in canadian university and college dating relationships. Canadian Journal of Sociology, 18, 137-159.

DeKeserdy, W.S., & MacLeod, L. (1997). Woman abuse: A sociological story. Toronto: Harcourt Brace.

Dunford, F.W. (2000). The san diego navy experiment: An assessment of interventions for men who assault their wives. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68(3), 468-476.

Dunnegan, S.W. (1997). Violence, trauma and substance abuse. Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 29, 345-351.

Dutton, D.G. (1988). The domestic assault of women: Psychological and criminal justice perspectives. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Dutton, D.G. (1994). Patriarchy and wife assault: The ecological fallacy. Violence and Victims, 9, 167-182.

Dutton, D.G. (1995). The domestic assault of women: Psychological and criminal justice perspectives. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Dutton, D.G. (1998). A social psychological perspective on impulsivity/intimate violence. In C.D. Webster and M.A. Jackson (Eds.), Impulsivity: Theory, assessment and treatment, (pp. 32-41). New York: Guilford Press.

Dutton, D.G., & Hart, S.D. (1992). Risk markers for family violence in a federally incarcerated population. International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 15, 101-112.

Dutton, D.G., & Kropp, P.R. (2000). A review of domestic violence risk instruments. Trauma, Violence and Abuse, 1, 171-181.

Dutton, D.G., Starzomski, A., & Ryan, L. (1996). Antecedents of abusive personality and abusive behaviour in wife assaulters. Journal of Family Violence, 11, 113-132.

Dutton, D.G., van Ginkel, C., & Landolt, M.A. (1996). Jealousy, intimate abusiveness and intrusiveness. Journal of Family Violence, 11, 411-423.

- Ellis, L. (1993). Rape as a biosocial phenomenon. In G.C. Nagayama-Hall, R. Hirschman, J.R. Graham, & M.S. Zaragoza (Eds.), Sexual aggression: Issues in etiology, assessment and treatment, (pp 17-41). Washington: Taylor & Frances.
- Forth, A.E., Brown, S.L., Hart, S.D., & Hare, R.D. (1996). The assessment of psychopathy in male and female noncriminals.: Reliability and validity. Personality and Individual Differences, 20(5), 531-543.
- Gendreau, P., Andrews, D.A., Coggin, C., & Chanteloupe, F. (1992). The development of clinical and policy guidelines for the prediction of criminal behaviour in criminal justice settings. Unpublished manuscript from the Department of Psychology, University of New Brunswick, St. John, New Brunswick.
- Gondolf, E.W. (1988). Who are those guys? Toward a behavioral typology of batterers. Violence and Victims, 3, 187-202.
- Gondolf, E.W. (1998). Assessing woman battering in mental health services. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Gottman, J.M., Jacobson, N.S., Rushe, R.H., & Shortt J.W. (1995). The relationship between heart rate reactivity, emotions, aggressive behaviour and general violence in batterers. Journal of Family Psychology, 9, 227-248.
- Groth, A.N., & Burgess, A.W. (1977). Rape: A sexual deviation. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 47, 400-406.
- Haapasalo, J. (1994). Types of offences among the Cleckley psychopaths. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative

Criminology, 38, 59-67.

Hamberger, L.K., & Hastings, J.E. (1986). Personality correlates of men who abuse their partners: A cross validation study. Journal of Family Violence, 1, 323-341.

Hanson, R.K., and Bussiere, M.T. (1996). Predictors of sexual offender recidivism: A meta-analysis. User Report. Ministry Secretariat, Solicitor General of Canada: Ottawa.

Hare, R.D., (1991). The hare psychopathy checklist - revised. Toronto, Ontario: Multi-health Systems.

Hare, R.D., (1996). Psychopathy: A clinical construct whose time has come. Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 23(1), 25-54.

Hare, R.D. (1998). The hare pcl-r: Some issues concerning its use and misuse. Legal and Criminological Psychology, 3(1), 99-119.

Hare, R.D., Forth, A.E., & Strachan, K.E. (1992). Psychopathy and crime across the lifespan. In R. Dev. Peters, R.J. McMahon, & V.L. Quinsey (Eds.), Aggression and violence throughout the lifespan, (pp 285-300). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Hare, R.D., Harpur, T.J., Hakistan, A.R., Forth, A.E., Hart, S.D., & Newman, J.P. (1990). The revised psychopathy checklist: Reliability and factor structure. Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 2, 338-341.

Harpur, T.J., Hare, R.D., & Hakistan, A.R. (1989). Two-factor conceptualization of psychopathy: Construct validity and assessment

implications. Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1, 6-17.

Harpur, T.J., Hart, S.D., & Hare, R.D. (1994). Personality of the psychopath. In P.T. Costa, P.T., & T.A. Widiger, T.A. (Eds.), Personality disorders and the five-factor model of personality, (p. 149-173). Washington: American Psychological Association.

Harris, G.T., Rice, M.E., & Quinsey, V.L. (1993). Violent recidivism of mentally disordered offenders: The development of a statistical prediction instrument. Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 20, 315-335.

Hart, S.D., Cox, D.N., & Hare, R.D. (1995). The hare psychopathy checklist screening version (PCL:SV). Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.

Hart, S.D., Hare, R.D., & Forth, A.E. (1994) Psychopathy as a risk marker for violence: development and validation of a screening version of the revised psychopathy checklist. In J. Monohan, & H.J. Steadman (Eds.), Violence and mental disorder, (pp. 81-98). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hill, C.D., Rogers, R., & Bickford, M.E. (1996). Predicting aggressive and socially disruptive behaviour in a maximum security forensic psychiatric hospital. Journal of Forensic Sciences, 41, 56-59.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Stuart, G.L. (1994). Typologies of male batterers: 3 subtypes and the differences among them. Psychological Bulletin, 116, 476-497.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Meehan, J.C., Herron, K., Rehman, U., & Stuart, G.L. (2000). Testing the holtzworth-munroe (1994) batterer typology. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68(6), 1000-1019.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Stuart, G.L., & Hutchinson, G. (1997). Violent versus non-violent husbands: Differences in attachment patterns, dependence and jealousy. Journal of Family Violence, 11, 314-331.

Hotaling, G. T., & Sugarman, B. B. (1986) An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of knowledge. Violence and Victims, 1(2), 101-124.

Jacobson, N.S., & Gortner, E.T. (1996). Biosocial risk factors for domestic violence. In A. Raine, P.A. Brennan, D.P Farrington, & S.A. Mednic (Eds.), Biosocial bases of violence, (pp. 127-144). New York: Plenum Press.

Johnson, H. & Hotton, T. (2001). Spousal violence. In C. Trainor, & Mihorean, K. (Eds.), Family violence in canada: A statistical profile, 2001. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Klein, A.R. (1996). Reabuse in a population of court-restrained male batterers: Why restraining orders don't work. In E.S. Buzawa, & C.G. Buzawa (Eds.), Do arrests and restraining orders work?, (pp. 192-213). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Kroner, D.G., & Weekes, J.R. (1996). BIDR: Factor structure, reliability and validity with an offender sample. Personality and Individual Differences, 21(3), 323-333.

Kropp, P.R., & Hart, S.D. (1998). Assessing risk of violence in wife assaulters: The spousal assault risk assessment guide. In C.D. Webster and M.A. Jackson (Eds.), Impulsivity: Theory, assessment and treatment, (pp. 302-325). New York: Guilford Press.

Kropp, P.R., & Hart, S.D. (2000). The spousal assault risk assessment (SARA) guide: Reliability and validity in adult male offenders. Law and Human Behaviour, 24, 101-118.

Kropp, P.R., Hart, S.D., Webster, C.D., & Eaves, D. (1995). Manual for the spousal abuse risk assessment guide (2nd ed.). Vancouver: British Columbia Institute of Family Violence.

Kropp, P.R., Hart, S.D., Whittemore, K., Webster, C.W., & Eaves, D. (1998). The SARA guide: Validation and implementation research. Redondo Beach: American Psychology and Law Society.

La Taillade, J.J., & Jacobson, N.S. (1997). Domestic violence: Antisocial behaviour in the family. In D.M. Stoff, J. Breiling, & J.D. Maser (Eds.), Handbook of antisocial behaviour (pp. 534-549). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Huss, M.T., & Ramsey, S. (2000). The clinical utility of batterer typologies. Journal of Family Violence, 15(1), 37-53.

Limandri, B.L., & Sheridan, D.J. (1995). Prediction of intentional interpersonal violence: An introduction. In J.C. Campbell (Ed), Assessing dangerousness: Violence by sex Offenders, batterers, and child abusers, (pp. 1-19). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Loza, W., & Loza-Fanous, A. (1999). Anger and prediction of violent and non-violent offenders recidivism. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14, 1014-1029.

Maiden, R.P. (1997). Alcohol dependence and domestic violence: Incidence and treatment implications. Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly, 15, 31-50.

Malamuth, N.M., Heavey, C.L., & Linz, D. (1996). The confluence model of sexual aggression: Combining hostile masculinity and impersonal sex. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 23(3/4), 13-37.

Mamuza, J.M., & Simourd, D.J. (1997). The hostile interpretations questionnaire. Unpublished manual. Kingston, Canada.

Mamuza, J.M., & Simourd, D.J. (1998). The hostile interpretations questionnaire (HIQ): An alternative perspective on the measurement of hostility. A paper presented at the Canadian Psychological Association 1998 Annual Convention, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.

Marshall, W.L. (1993). A revised approach to the treatment of men who sexually assault adult females. In G.C. Nagayama-Hall, R. Hirschman, J.R. Graham, & M.S. Zaragoza (Eds.), Sexual aggression: Issues in etiology, assessment and treatment, (pp 143-165). Washington: Taylor & Frances.

Marshall, W.L. (1996). Assessment, treatment and theorizing about sex offenders. Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 23, 162-199.

Marshall, W.L., & Pithers, W.D. (1994). A reconsideration of treatment outcomes with sex offenders. Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 21, 10-27.

Mathes, E. W., & Severa, N. (1981). Jealousy, romantic love and liking: Theoretical considerations and preliminary scale development. Psychological Reports, 49, 23-31.

McClosky, L.A., Figueredo, A.J., Aurelio, J., & Koss, M.P. (1995). The effects of systemic family violence on childrens' mental health. Child Development, 66, 1239-1261.

McCoy, M.E. (1997). Predictors of recidivism in a population of canadian sex offenders: Psychological, physiological and offense factors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Ottawa.

McKenry, P.C., Julian, T.W., & Garazzi, S.M. (1995). Towards a biopsychosocial model of domestic violence. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57, 307-320.

Meloy, J. R., & Gothard, S. (1995). Demographic and clinical comparisons of obsessional followers and offenders with mental disorders. American Journal of Psychiatry, 152(2), 258-263.

Meloy, J.R. (1998). The psychology of Stalking. In J.R. Meloy (Ed.), The psychology of stalking, (pp. 1-23). San Diego: Academic Press.

Millon, T. (1983). Millon clinical multiaxial inventory manual (3rd ed.). Minneapolis: Interpretive Scoring Systems.

Mills, J.F., & Kroner, D.G. (1997). The criminal sentiments scale: Predictive validity in a sample of violent and sexual offenders. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 53(4), 399-404.

Nuffield, J. (1982). Parole decision making in Canada: Research towards decision guidelines. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.

Nugent, D.M., & Kroner, D.G. (1996). Denial, response styles and admittance of offences among child molesters and rapists. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 11, 475-486.

O'Leary, K.D., Malone, J., & Tyree, A. (1994). Physical aggression in early marriage: Pre-relationship and relationship effects. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62, 594-602.

Oriel, K.A., & Fleming, M.F. (1998). Screening men for partner violence in a primary care setting: A new strategy for detecting domestic violence. Journal of Family Practice, 46, 493-498.

Pan, H.S., Neidig, P.H., & O'Leary, K.D. (1994). Predicting mild and severe husband-to-wife physical aggression. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62, 975-981.

Paulhus, D.L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 598-609.

Paulhus, D.L. (1999). Paulhus deception scales. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.

Pithers, W.D. (1993). Treatment of rapists: Reinterpretation of early outcome data and exploratory constructs to enhance therapeutic efficacy. In G.C. Nagayama-Hall, R. Hirschman, J.R. Graham, & M.S. Zaragoza (Eds.), Sexual aggression: Issues in etiology, assessment and treatment (pp. 167-196). Washington: Taylor & Frances.

Prentky, R.A., & Knight, R.A. (1991). Identifying critical dimensions for discriminating among rapists. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59, 643-661.

Rooney, J. (1998). Predicting attrition from treatment programs for male batterers. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Department of Psychology, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.

Ross, S.M. (1996). Risk of physical abuse to children of spouse abusing parent. Child Abuse and Neglect, 20, 589-598.

Rowe, R.C. (1996). Parole decision making in Ontario. Report for the Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services, Toronto, Ontario.

Roy, R.E., & Wormith, J.S. (1985). The effects of incarceration: Measuring criminal sentiments. Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, 1985.

Saunders, D. G. (1992). A typology of men who batter: Three types derived from cluster analysis. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 62, 264-275.

Saunders, D.G. (1995). Prediction of wife assault. In J.C. Campbell (Ed.), Assessing dangerousness: Violence by sexual offenders, batterers and child abusers, (pp. 68-95). Thousand Oakes: Sage Publications.

Saunders, D.G. (1996). Feminist-cognitive-behavioural and process-psychodynamic treatment for men who batter: Interaction of abuser traits and treatment models. Violence and Victims, 11, 393-415.

Saunders, D.G., Lynch, P.B., Grayson, M., & Linz, D. (1987). The inventory of beliefs about wife beating: The construction and initial validation of a measure of beliefs and attitudes. Violence and Victims, 2, 45-54.

Schmidt, J.D., & Sherman, L.W. (1996). Does arrest deter domestic violence? In E.S. Buzawa, & C.G. Buzawa (Eds.), Do arrests and restraining orders work? (pp.43-53). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Scott, H.A. (1995). The determinants of sexual aggression: An examination of risk factors in self-reported and convicted sexual aggressors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Carleton University, Ottawa.

Scully, D., & Marolla, J. (1984). Convicted rapists' vocabulary of motive: Excuses and justifications. Social Problems, 31, 530-544.

Seto, M.C., & Barbaree, H.E. (1995). The role of alcohol in sexual aggression. Clinical Psychology Review, 15, 545-566.

Shepard, M.F., & Campbell, J.A. (1992). The abusive behaviour inventory: A measure of psychological and physical abuse. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7, 291-305.

Shields, N.M., McCall, G.J., & Hanneke, C.R. (1988). Patterns of family and non-family violence: Violent husbands and violent men. Violence and Victims, 3, 83-95.

Simourd, D.J. (1997). The criminal sentiments scale-modified and pride in delinquency scale: Psychometric properties and construct validity of two measures of criminal attitudes. Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 24, 52-70.

Simourd, D.J., & Mamouza, J.M. (in progress). The hostile interpretations questionnaire: Psychometric properties and construct validity. Unpublished manuscript. Kingston, Canada.

Smith, R.L., & Bradley, D.W. (1980). In defense of the attitude towards women scale: An affirmation of validity and reliability. Psychological Reports, 47, 511-522.

Soler, H., Vinayak, P., & Quadagno, D. (2000). Biosocial aspects of domestic violence. Psychoneuroendocrinology, 25(7), 721-739.

Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R.L., & Stapp, J. (1973). A short version of the attitudes towards women scale. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 2, 219-220.

Stevens, J. (1996). Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences, 3rd Edition. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Stock, W.E. (1991). Feminist explanations: Male power, hostility and sexual coercion. In E. Grauerholz & M.A. Koralewski, (Eds.), Sexual coercion: A sourcebook in its nature, causes and prevention, (pp. 61-74). Toronto: Lexington Books.

Straus, M. (1979). The conflict tactics scale. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 75-88.

Sugarman, D. B., & Hotaling, G. T. (1989). Violent men in intimate relationships: An analysis of risk markers. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 19, 1034-1048.

Tabachnik, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (2001). Using multivariate statistics (4th Edition). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Tokar, D.M. & Fischer, A.R. (1996). More on RIASEC and the five factor model of personality: Direct assessment of predigers and hogan's dimensions. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 52, 246-259.
- Tolman, R. M. (1989). The development of a measure of psychological maltreatment of women by their male partners. Violence and Victims, 4, 159-177.
- Tweed, R.G., & Dutton, D.G. (1998). A comparison of impulsive and instrumental subgroups of batterers. Violence and Victims, 13, 217-230.
- Walker, L.E. (2000). Battered woman syndrome. New York: Springer.
- 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.
- Wetzel, L., & Ross, M.A. (1983). Psychological and social ramifications of battering: Observations leading to a counselling methodology for victims of domestic violence. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 61, 423-428.
- White, R.J. (2000). Self-reported woman battering personality characteristics and substance abuse of low security federal prison inmates. Dissertation Abstracts International Section B, 61(4-B), 2230.
- Widiger, T.A. (1994). Conceptualizing a disorder of personality from the five-factor model. In P.T. Costa, & T.A. Widiger (Eds.), Personality disorders and the five-factor model of personality, (pp. 311-317). Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Widiger, T.A., Trull, T.J., Clarkin, J.F., Sanderson, C., & Costa, P.T. (1994). A description of the dsm-iii-r and dsm-iv personality disorders with the

five-factor model of personality. In P.T. Costa, & T.A. Widiger (Eds.), Personality disorders and the five-factor model of personality, (pp. 41-56). Washington: American Psychological Association.

Wolfe , D.A., & Jaffe, P. (1991). Child abuse and family violence as determinants of child psychopathology. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 23, 282-299.

Wolfus, B., & Bierman, R. (1997). An evaluation of a group treatment program for incarcerated male batterers. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 40, 318-333.

Young, G.H., & Gerson, S. (1992). New psychoanalytic perspectives on masochism and spousal abuse. Psychotherapy, 28, 30-38.

Zona, M. A., Sharma, K. K., & Lane, J. (1993). A comparative study of erotomanic and obsessional subjects in a forensic sample. Journal of Forensic Sciences, 38, 894-903.

1. I am not a worrier.
2. I really like most people I meet.
3. I have a very active imagination.
4. I tend to be cynical and skeptical of others' intentions.
5. I'm known for my prudence and common sense.
6. I often get angry at the way people treat me.
7. I shy away from crowds of people.
8. Aesthetic and artistic concerns aren't very important to me.
9. I'm not crafty or sly.
10. I would rather keep my options open than plan everything in advance.
11. I rarely feel lonely or blue.
12. I am dominant, forceful, and assertive.
13. Without strong emotions, life would be uninteresting to me.
14. Some people think I'm selfish and egotistical.
15. I try to perform all the tasks assigned to me conscientiously.
16. In dealing with other people, I always dread making a social blunder.
17. I have a leisurely style in work and play.
18. I'm pretty set in my ways.
19. I would rather cooperate with others than compete with them.
20. I am easy-going and lackadaisical.
21. I rarely overindulge in anything.
22. I often crave excitement.
23. I often enjoy playing with theories or abstract ideas.
24. I don't mind bragging about my talents and accomplishments.
25. I'm pretty good about pacing myself so as to get things done on time.
26. I often feel helpless and want someone else to solve my problems.
27. I have never literally jumped for joy.
28. I believe letting students hear controversial speakers can only confuse and mislead them.
29. Political leaders need to be more aware of the human side of their policies.
30. Over the years I've done some pretty stupid things.
31. I am easily frightened.
32. I don't get much pleasure from chatting with people.
33. I try to keep all my thoughts directed along realistic lines and avoid flights of fancy.
34. I believe that most people are basically well-intentioned.
35. I don't take civic duties like voting very seriously.
36. I'm an even-tempered person.
37. I like to have a lot of people around me.
38. I am sometimes completely absorbed in music I am listening to.
39. If necessary, I am willing to manipulate people to get what I want.
40. I keep my belongings neat and clean.
41. Sometimes I feel completely worthless.
42. I sometimes fail to assert myself as much as I should.
43. I rarely experience strong emotions.
44. I try to be courteous to everyone I meet.
45. Sometimes I'm not as dependable or reliable as I should be.

46. I seldom feel self-conscious when I'm around people.
47. When I do things, I do them vigorously.
48. I think it's interesting to learn and develop new hobbies.
49. I can be sarcastic and cutting when I need to be.
50. I have a clear set of goals and work toward them in an orderly fashion.
51. I have trouble resisting my cravings.
52. I wouldn't enjoy vacationing in Las Vegas.
53. I find philosophical arguments boring.
54. I'd rather not talk about myself and my achievements.
55. I waste a lot of time before settling down to work.
56. I feel I am capable of coping with most of my problems.
57. I have sometimes experienced intense joy or ecstasy.
58. I believe that laws and social policies should change to reflect the needs of a changing world.
59. I'm hard-headed and tough-minded in my attitudes.
60. I think things through before coming to a decision.
61. I rarely feel fearful or anxious.
62. I'm known as a warm and friendly person.
63. I have an active fantasy life.
64. I believe that most people will take advantage of you if you let them.
65. I keep myself informed and usually make intelligent decisions.
66. I am known as hot-blooded and quick-tempered.
67. I usually prefer to do things alone.
68. Watching ballet or modern dance bores me.
69. I couldn't deceive anyone even if I wanted to.
70. I am not a very methodical person.
71. I am seldom sad or depressed.
72. I have often been a leader of groups I have belonged to.
73. How I feel about things is important to me.
74. Some people think of me as cold and calculating.
75. I pay my debts promptly and in full.
76. At times I have been so ashamed I just wanted to hide.
77. My work is likely to be slow but steady.
78. Once I find the right way to do something, I stick to it.
79. I hesitate to express my anger even when it's justified.
80. When I start a self-improvement program, I usually let it slide after a few days.
81. I have little difficulty resisting temptation.
82. I have sometimes done things just for "kicks" or "thrills."
83. I enjoy solving problems or puzzles.
84. I'm better than most people, and I know it.
85. I am a productive person who always gets the job done.
86. When I'm under a great deal of stress, sometimes I feel like I'm going to pieces.
87. I am not a cheerful optimist.
88. I believe we should look to our religious authorities for decisions on moral issues.
89. We can never do too much for the poor and elderly.
90. Occasionally I act first and think later.

91. I often feel tense and jittery.
92. Many people think of me as somewhat cold and distant.
93. I don't like to waste my time daydreaming.
94. I think most of the people I deal with are honest and trustworthy.
95. I often come into situations without being fully prepared.
96. I am not considered a touchy or temperamental person.
97. I really feel the need for other people if I am by myself for long.
98. I am intrigued by the patterns I find in art and nature.
99. Being perfectly honest is a bad way to do business.
100. I like to keep everything in its place so I know just where it is.
101. I have sometimes experienced a deep sense of guilt or sinfulness.
102. In meetings, I usually let others do the talking.
103. I seldom pay much attention to my feelings of the moment.
104. I generally try to be thoughtful and considerate.
105. Sometimes I cheat when I play solitaire.
106. It doesn't embarrass me too much if people ridicule and tease me.
107. I often feel as if I'm bursting with energy.
108. I often try new and foreign foods.
109. If I don't like people, I let them know it.
110. I work hard to accomplish my goals.
111. When I am having my favorite foods, I tend to eat too much.
112. I tend to avoid movies that are shocking or scary.
113. I sometimes lose interest when people talk about very abstract, theoretical matters.
114. I try to be humble.
115. I have trouble making myself do what I should.
116. I keep a cool head in emergencies.
117. Sometimes I bubble with happiness.
118. I believe that the different ideas of right and wrong that people in other societies have may be valid for them.
119. I have no sympathy for panhandlers.
120. I always consider the consequences before I take action.
121. I'm seldom apprehensive about the future.
122. I really enjoy talking to people.
123. I enjoy concentrating on a fantasy or daydream and exploring all its possibilities, letting it grow and develop.
124. I'm suspicious when someone does something nice for me.
125. I pride myself on my sound judgment.
126. I often get disgusted with people I have to deal with.
127. I prefer jobs that let me work alone without being bothered by other people.
128. Poetry has little or no effect on me.
129. I would hate to be thought of as a hypocrite.
130. I never seem to be able to get organized.
131. I tend to blame myself when anything goes wrong.
132. Other people often look to me to make decisions.
133. I experience a wide range of emotions or feelings.
134. I'm not known for my generosity.
135. When I make a commitment, I can always be counted on to follow through.

136. I often feel inferior to others.
137. I'm not as quick and lively as other people.
138. I prefer to spend my time in familiar surroundings.
139. When I've been insulted, I just try to forgive and forget.
140. I don't feel like I'm driven to get ahead.
141. I seldom give in to my impulses.
142. I like to be where the action is.
143. I enjoy working on "mind-twister"-type puzzles.
144. I have a very high opinion of myself.
145. Once I start a project, I almost always finish it.
146. It's often hard for me to make up my mind.
147. I don't consider myself especially "light-hearted."
148. I believe that loyalty to one's ideals and principles is more important than "open-mindedness."
149. Human need should always take priority over economic considerations.
150. I often do things on the spur of the moment.
151. I often worry about things that might go wrong.
152. I find it easy to smile and be outgoing with strangers.
153. If I feel my mind starting to drift off into daydreams, I usually get busy and start concentrating on some work or activity instead.
154. My first reaction is to trust people.
155. I don't seem to be completely successful at anything.
156. It takes a lot to get me mad.
157. I'd rather vacation at a popular beach than an isolated cabin in the woods.
158. Certain kinds of music have an endless fascination for me.
159. Sometimes I trick people into doing what I want.
160. I tend to be somewhat fastidious or exacting.
161. I have a low opinion of myself.
162. I would rather go my own way than be a leader of others.
163. I seldom notice the moods or feelings that different environments produce.
164. Most people I know like me.
165. I adhere strictly to my ethical principles.
166. I feel comfortable in the presence of my bosses or other authorities.
167. I usually seem to be in a hurry.
168. Sometimes I make changes around the house just to try something different.
169. If someone starts a fight, I'm ready to fight back.
170. I strive to achieve all I can.
171. I sometimes eat myself sick.
172. I love the excitement of roller coasters.
173. I have little interest in speculating on the nature of the universe or the human condition.
174. I feel that I am no better than others, no matter what their condition.
175. When a project gets too difficult, I'm inclined to start a new one.
176. I can handle myself pretty well in a crisis.
177. I am a cheerful, high-spirited person.
178. I consider myself broad-minded and tolerant of other people's lifestyles.
179. I believe all human beings are worthy of respect.
180. I rarely make hasty decisions.

181. I have fewer fears than most people.
 182. I have strong emotional attachments to my friends.
 183. As a child I rarely enjoyed games of make believe.
 184. I tend to assume the best about people.
 185. I'm a very competent person.
 186. At times I have felt bitter and resentful.
 187. Social gatherings are usually boring to me.
 188. Sometimes when I am reading poetry or looking at a work of art, I feel a chill or wave of excitement.
 189. At times I bully or flatter people into doing what I want them to.
 190. I'm not compulsive about cleaning.
 191. Sometimes things look pretty bleak and hopeless to me.
 192. In conversations, I tend to do most of the talking.
 193. I find it easy to empathize—to feel myself what others are feeling.
 194. I think of myself as a charitable person.
 195. I try to do jobs carefully, so they won't have to be done again.
 196. If I have said or done the wrong thing to someone, I can hardly bear to face them again.
 197. My life is fast-paced.
 198. On a vacation, I prefer going back to a tried and true spot.
 199. I'm hard-headed and stubborn.
 200. I strive for excellence in everything I do.
 201. Sometimes I do things on impulse that I later regret.
 202. I'm attracted to bright colors and flashy styles.
 203. I have a lot of intellectual curiosity.
 204. I would rather praise others than be praised myself.
 205. There are so many little jobs that need to be done that I sometimes just ignore them all.
 206. When everything seems to be going wrong, I can still make good decisions.
 207. I rarely use words like "fantastic!" or "sensational!" to describe my experiences.
 208. I think that if people don't know what they believe in by the time they're 25, there's something wrong with them.
 209. I have sympathy for others less fortunate than me.
 210. I plan ahead carefully when I go on a trip.
 211. Frightening thoughts sometimes come into my head.
 212. I take a personal interest in the people I work with.
 213. I would have difficulty just letting my mind wander without control or guidance.
 214. I have a good deal of faith in human nature.
 215. I am efficient and effective at my work.
 216. Even minor annoyances can be frustrating to me.
 217. I enjoy parties with lots of people.
 218. I enjoy reading poetry that emphasizes feelings and images more than story lines.
 219. I pride myself on my shrewdness in handling people.
 220. I spend a lot of time looking for things I've misplaced.
 221. Too often, when things go wrong, I get discouraged and feel like giving up.
 222. I don't find it easy to take charge of a situation.
 223. Odd things—like certain scents or the names of distant places—can evoke strong moods in me.
 224. I go out of my way to help others if I can.
 225. I'd really have to be sick before I'd miss a day of work.
-

- 226. When people I know do foolish things, I get embarrassed for them.
- 227. I am a very active person.
- 228. I follow the same route when I go someplace.
- 229. I often get into arguments with my family and co-workers.
- 230. I'm something of a "workaholic."
- 231. I am always able to keep my feelings under control.
- 232. I like being part of the crowd at sporting events.
- 233. I have a wide range of intellectual interests.
- 234. I'm a superior person.
- 235. I have a lot of self-discipline.
- 236. I'm pretty stable emotionally.
- 237. I laugh easily.
- 238. I believe that the "new morality" of permissiveness is no morality at all.
- 239. I would rather be known as "merciful" than as "just."
- 240. I think twice before I answer a question.

Appendix B
HIQ

NAME: _____ DATE: _____

Described below are different social situations in which a person named Fred finds himself. Read each situation and answer each question.

A. Fred is on probation. He is walking down the street with a couple buddies when a police officer approaches and asks where they are going.

A1. Rate how likely you think it is that police officers approach people on probation like this.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
EXTREMELY UNLIKELY UNDECIDED LIKELY EXTREMELY
UNLIKELY LIKELY

A2. Rate how much you think the police officer wants to start something with Fred.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
VERY LITTLE UNDECIDED SOME VERY
LITTLE MUCH

A3. Rate how likely you think it is that Fred was doing anything to deserve this attention from the police officer.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
EXTREMELY UNLIKELY UNDECIDED LIKELY EXTREMELY
UNLIKELY LIKELY

A4. Fred refuses to cooperate because he figures that the police officer is trying to give him a hard time. If you found yourself in this same situation today, rate how differently or similarly you would respond.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
EXTREMELY DIFFERENTLY UNDECIDED SIMILARLY EXTREMELY
DIFFERENT SIMILAR

A5. If Fred refuses to cooperate, how responsible is the police officer for Fred's reaction.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
NOT AT ALL NOT VERY UNDECIDED SOMEWHAT TOTALLY
RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE

B. Fred invites a few friends to his house and when he walks in his common-law wife complains about how late he is.

B1. How likely do you think it is that his wife always nags Fred.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 EXTREMELY UNLIKELY UNLIKELY UNDECIDED LIKELY EXTREMELY
 UNLIKELY LIKELY

B2. Rate how much you think his wife wants to start something with Fred.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 VERY LITTLE LITTLE UNDECIDED SOME VERY
 LITTLE MUCH

B3. Rate how likely you think it is that Fred was doing anything to deserve what his wife is saying.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 EXTREMELY UNLIKELY UNLIKELY UNDECIDED LIKELY EXTREMELY
 UNLIKELY LIKELY

B4. Fred figures his wife has no business telling him what to do and when to do it so he puts her in her place. If you found yourself in this same situation today, rate how differently or similarly you would respond.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 EXTREMELY DIFFERENTLY UNDECIDED SIMILARLY EXTREMELY
 DIFFERENT SIMILAR

B5. If Fred puts his wife in her place, rate the amount of responsibility would you place on his wife for Fred's reaction.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 NOT AT ALL NOT VERY UNDECIDED SOMEWHAT TOTALLY
 RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE

C. Fred goes over to his mother's house for dinner one night and all his brothers and sisters are there. They ask Fred a lot of questions about what he has been up to lately.

C1. Rate how likely you think it is that his family is always on Fred's case.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 EXTREMELY UNLIKELY UNLIKELY UNDECIDED LIKELY EXTREMELY
 UNLIKELY LIKELY

C2. Rate how likely you think it is that his brothers and sisters are asking Fred all these questions because they are suspicious of him.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 VERY LITTLE UNDECIDED SOME VERY
 LITTLE MUCH

C3. Rate how likely you think it is that Fred deserves all these questions from his family.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 EXTREMELY UNLIKELY UNDECIDED LIKELY EXTREMELY
 UNLIKELY LIKELY

C4. Assume that Fred figures that his brothers and sisters are trying to give him a hard time and so he tells them to mind their own business and leaves the dinner table. If you found yourself in this same situation today, rate how differently or similarly you would respond.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 EXTREMELY DIFFERENTLY UNDECIDED SIMILARLY EXTREMELY
 DIFFERENT SIMILAR

C5. If Fred told his brothers and sisters to mind their own business and left the dinner table, rate the amount of responsibility would you place on his brothers and sisters for Fred's reaction.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 NOT AT ALL NOT VERY UNDECIDED SOMEWHAT TOTALLY
 RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE

D. Fred is out with some friends drinking. One of his buddies starts joking about the fact that Fred has had some trouble with the law.

D1. Rate how likely you think it is that his friends are always trying to get Fred pissed off.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 EXTREMELY UNLIKELY UNLIKELY UNDECIDED LIKELY EXTREMELY
 UNLIKELY LIKELY

D2. Rate how much you think his buddies are trying to start something with Fred.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 VERY LITTLE LITTLE UNDECIDED SOME VERY
 LITTLE MUCH

D3. Rate how likely you think it is that Fred deserves this joking from his buddies.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 EXTREMELY UNLIKELY UNDECIDED LIKELY EXTREMELY
 UNLIKELY LIKELY

D4. Fred finally gets tired of listening to his buddy and tells him to "shut up or else..." If you found yourself in this same situation today, rate how differently or similarly you would respond.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 EXTREMELY DIFFERENTLY UNDECIDED SIMILARLY EXTREMELY
 DIFFERENT SIMILAR

D5. If Fred ends up saying this to his buddy, rate the amount of responsibility would you place on his buddy for Fred's reaction.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 NOT AT ALL NOT VERY UNDECIDED SOMEWHAT TOTALLY
 RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE

E. Fred is at work hanging around with a couple of co-workers. The boss approaches Fred and asks him to go to his office because he needs to talk to Fred about something.

E1. Rate how much you think Fred's boss is always looking for something to bother Fred about.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 EXTREMELY UNLIKELY UNDECIDED LIKELY EXTREMELY
 UNLIKELY LIKELY

E2. Rate how likely you think it is that Fred's boss is trying to give Fred a hard time today.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 VERY LITTLE UNDECIDED SOME VERY
 LITTLE MUCH

E3. Rate how likely you think it is that Fred was doing anything to deserve the attention from his boss.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 EXTREMELY UNLIKELY UNDECIDED LIKELY EXTREMELY
 UNLIKELY LIKELY

E4. Assume that Fred figures that his boss is going to fire him so he tells him where he can stick his job. If you found yourself in this same situation today, rate how differently or similarly you would respond.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 EXTREMELY DIFFERENTLY UNDECIDED SIMILARLY EXTREMELY
 DIFFERENT SIMILAR

E5. If Fred tells his boss to stick the job, rate the amount of responsibility would you place on his boss for Fred's reaction.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 NOT AT ALL NOT VERY UNDECIDED SOMEWHAT TOTALLY
 RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE

F. Fred is walking down the street and notices two people walking toward him. They are talking to each other and as they get closer to Fred they glance at him. They continue talking all the while but as they pass Fred they start to laugh.

F1. Rate how likely you think it is that most people talk about Fred just because of the way he looks.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 EXTREMELY UNLIKELY UNLIKELY UNDECIDED LIKELY EXTREMELY
 UNLIKELY LIKELY

F2. Rate how likely you think it is that these strangers were talking and laughing about Fred.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 VERY LITTLE LITTLE UNDECIDED SOME VERY
 LITTLE MUCH

F3. Rate how likely you think it is that Fred was doing anything to deserve being glanced at.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 EXTREMELY UNLIKELY UNDECIDED LIKELY EXTREMELY
 UNLIKELY LIKELY

F4. Assume that Fred figures the strangers are making fun of him and stops them to give them a piece of his mind. If you found yourself in this same situation today, rate how differently or similarly you would respond.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 EXTREMELY DIFFERENTLY UNDECIDED SIMILARLY EXTREMELY
 DIFFERENT SIMILAR

F5. If Fred gives the strangers a piece of his mind, rate the amount of responsibility would you place on the strangers for Fred's reaction.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 NOT AT ALL NOT VERY UNDECIDED SOMEWHAT TOTALLY
 RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE

G. Fred goes to see his probation officer for the first time. The probation officer reads him all the conditions of his probation.

G1. Rate how likely you think it is that probation officers read the conditions of probation just to put guys in their place and show them who's boss.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 EXTREMELY UNLIKELY UNDECIDED LIKELY EXTREMELY
 UNLIKELY LIKELY

G2. Rate how much you think the probation officer ~~wants~~ to put Fred in his place.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 VERY LITTLE LITTLE UNDECIDED SOME VERY
 LITTLE MUCH

G3. Rate how likely you think it is that Fred was doing anything to deserve having his probation officer doing what he did.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 EXTREMELY UNLIKELY UNDECIDED LIKELY EXTREMELY
 UNLIKELY LIKELY

G4. Fred figures that the probation officer is power-tripping and lets him/her know it. If you found yourself in this same situation today, rate how differently or similarly you would respond.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 EXTREMELY DIFFERENTLY UNDECIDED SIMILARLY EXTREMELY
 DIFFERENT SIMILAR

G5. If Fred thinks the probation officer was power-tripping and decided to say something, rate the amount of responsibility would you place on the probation officer for Fred's reaction.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 NOT AT ALL NOT VERY UNDECIDED SOMEWHAT TOTALLY
 RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE RESPONSIBLE

Appendix C
CSS

Name _____

Date _____

Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with some opinions listed on the following pages. Please enter 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 next to each statement using this scale:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Give your own opinions about the statements: There are no right or wrong answers on this questionnaire.

Example:

_____ 1. Laws are made to be broken.

If you strongly disagree with this statement (you believe it to be completely wrong), you should enter "1". If you strongly agree with the statement, enter "5". If you tend to agree or disagree but don't feel quite so certain about your opinion, enter "2" for disagree or "4" for agree. If you are unable to make up your mind about the statement or if you have no opinion about the statement, enter "3".

CSS

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

___ 1. Laws are so often made for the benefit of small selfish groups that a person cannot respect the law.

___ 2. Nearly all laws deserve our respect.

___ 3. It is our duty to obey all laws.

___ 4. Laws are usually bad.

___ 5. The law is rotten to the core.

___ 6. Almost any jury can be fixed.

___ 7. You can't get justice in court.

___ 8. On the whole, lawyers are honest.

___ 9. Fake witnesses are often produced by the prosecution.

___ 10. On the whole, the police are honest.

___ 11. A cop is a friend to people in need.

___ 12. Life would be better with fewer police.

___ 13. The police should be paid more for their work.

___ 14. The police are just as crooked as the people they arrest.

___ 15. All laws should be strictly obeyed because they are laws.

___ 16. The law does not benefit the common person.

CSS

Strongly
Disagree
1

Disagree
2

Uncertain
3

Agree
4

Strongly
Agree
5

- ___ 17. The law as a whole is sound.
- ___ 18. In the long run, law and justice are the same.
- ___ 19. The law enslaves the majority of people for the benefit of a few.
- ___ 20. On the whole, judges are honest and kind-hearted.
- ___ 21. Court decisions are almost always just.
- ___ 22. Almost anything can be fixed in the courts if you have enough money.
- ___ 23. A judge is a good person.
- ___ 24. Our society would be better off if there were more police.
- ___ 25. Police rarely try to help people.
- ___ 26. Sometimes a person like me has to break the law in order to get ahead.
- ___ 27. Most successful people used illegal means to become successful.
- ___ 28. People who have been in trouble with the law have the same sort of ideas about life that I have.
- ___ 29. People should always obey the law no matter how much it interferes with their personal ambition.
- ___ 30. I would rather associate with people who obey the law than with those who don't.
- ___ 31. It's alright for a person to break the law if he or she doesn't get caught.

CSS

Strongly
Disagree
1

Disagree
2

Uncertain
3

Agree
4

Strongly
Agree
5

- ___ 32. I'm more like the people who can make a living outside the law than I am like those who only break the law occasionally.
- ___ 33. Most people would commit crimes if they knew they wouldn't get caught.
- ___ 34. People who have been in trouble with the law are more like me than people who don't have trouble with the law.
- ___ 35. There never is a good cause for breaking the law.
- ___ 36. I don't have much in common with people who never break the law.
- ___ 37. A hungry person has the right to steal.
- ___ 38. It's alright to evade the law if you don't actually violate it.
- ___ 39. No one can violate the law and be my friend.
- ___ 40. A person should obey only those laws which seem reasonable.
- ___ 41. A person is a fool to work for a living if he or she can get by some easier way, even if it means violating the law.

Appendix D

IJS

In responding to each item, think of the name of your partner when you see the X. You don't have to write her name. Then use the scale below to express your feelings concerning the truth of each item over the past 12 months. For example, if you feel that the item is "absolutely true" in how you have felt, place a 9 for the item. If it is only "slightly true", you would place a 6 for the item, etc.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
absolutely true; agree totally	definitely true	true	slightly true	neither true nor false	slightly false	false	definitely false	absolutely false; disagree completely

1	If X were to see an old male friend and respond with a great deal of happiness, I would be annoyed	
2	If X went out with same sex friends, I would want to know what she did	
3	If X admired another man, I would feel irritated	
4	If X were to help another man with his work, I would feel suspicious	
5*	When X likes one of my friends, I am pleased	
6*	If X were to go away for the weekend without me, my only concern would be whether she had a good time	
7	If X were helpful to another man, I would feel jealous	
8	When X talks of happy experiences of her past, I feel sad that I wasn't part of it	
9	If X were to become displeased about the time I spent with others, I would feel flattered	
10	If X and I went to a party and I lost sight of her, I would become uncomfortable	
11*	I want X to remain good friends with other people she used to date	
12	If X were to date others, I would feel unhappy	
13	When I notice that X and another man have something in common, I am envious	
14	If X were to become very close to another man, I would feel unhappy and/or angry	
15	I would like X to be faithful to me	
16*	I don't think it would bother me if X flirted with another man	
17	If another man were to compliment X, I would feel that this person was trying to take X away from me	
18*	I feel good when X makes a new friend	
19*	If X were to spend the night comforting a male friend who had just had a tragic experience, X's compassion would please me	
20	If another man were to pay attention to X, I would become possessive of her	
21*	If X was to become exuberant and hug another man, it would make me feel good that she was expressing her feelings openly	

22	The thought of X kissing someone else drives me up the wall	
23	If another man lit up at the sight of X, I would become uneasy	
24	I like to find fault with X's old boyfriends	
25	I feel possessive towards X	
26	If X had been married before, I would feel resentment towards her ex-husband	
27	If I saw a picture of X and an old boyfriend, I would feel unhappy	
28	If X were to accidentally call me by the wrong name, I would become furious	

*=reverse scored items

Appendix E
ABI

In relationships people interact in a variety of ways. Below is a list of things that you might have done in relationships with girlfriends. Circle the appropriate number for each item.

- 1 = NEVER
2 = RARELY
3 = OCCASIONALLY
4 = FREQUENTLY
5 = VERY FREQUENTLY

1. Called her a name and/or criticized her	1 2 3 4 5
2. Tried to keep her from doing something she wanted to do (example: going out with friends, going to meetings)	1 2 3 4 5
3. Gave her angry stares or looks	1 2 3 4 5
4. Prevented her from having money for her own use	1 2 3 4 5
5. Ended a discussion with her and made the decision yourself	1 2 3 4 5
6. Threatened to hit or throw something at her	1 2 3 4 5
7. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved her	1 2 3 4 5
8. Put down her family and friends	1 2 3 4 5
9. Accused her of paying too much attention to someone or something else	1 2 3 4 5
10. Put her on an allowance	1 2 3 4 5
11. Used her children to threaten her (example: told her that she would lose custody, said you would leave town with the children)	1 2 3 4 5

12. Became very upset with her because dinner, housework, or laundry was not ready when you wanted it or done the way you thought it should be	1	2	3	4	5
13. Said things to scare her (examples: told her something "bad" would happen, threatened to commit suicide)	1	2	3	4	5
14. Slapped, hit, or punched her	1	2	3	4	5
15. Made her do something humiliating or degrading (example: begging for forgiveness, having to ask your permission to use the car or do something)	1	2	3	4	5
16. Checked up on her (examples: listened to her phone calls, checked the mileage on her car, called you repeatedly at work)	1	2	3	4	5
17. Drove recklessly when she was in the car	1	2	3	4	5
18. Pressured her to have sex in a way that she didn't like or want	1	2	3	4	5
19. Refused to do housework or childcare	1	2	3	4	5
20. Threatened her with a knife, gun, or other weapon	1	2	3	4	5
21. Told her she was a bad parent	1	2	3	4	5
22. Stopped her or tried to stop her from going to work or school	1	2	3	4	5
23. Threw, hit, kicked, or smashed something	1	2	3	4	5
24. Kicked her	1	2	3	4	5
25. Physically forced her to have sex	1	2	3	4	5
26. Threw her around	1	2	3	4	5
27. Physically attacked the sexual parts of her body	1	2	3	4	5

28. Choked or strangled her

1 2 3 4 5

29. Used a knife, gun, or other weapon
against her

1 2 3 4 5

Appendix F ATWS

The statements listed below describe attitudes towards the role of women in society that different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your feelings about each statement by indicating whether you strongly agree, mildly agree, mildly disagree or strongly disagree.

		SD	MD	MA	SA
1 *	Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than a man	1	2	3	4
2	Women should take increasing responsibility for leadership in solving the intellectual and social problems of the day	1	2	3	4
3	Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce	1	2	3	4
4 *	Telling dirty jokes should be mostly a masculine prerogative	1	2	3	4
5 *	Intoxication among women is worse than intoxication among men	1	2	3	4
6	Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing laundry	1	2	3	4
7	It is insulting for women to have the "obey" clause remain in a marriage ceremony	1	2	3	4
8	There should be strict merit system in job appointment and promotion without regard to sex	1	2	3	4
9	A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage	1	2	3	4
10 *	Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers	1	2	3	4
11	Women earning as much as their dates should bear mutually the expense when they go out	1	2	3	4
12	Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men	1	2	3	4
13 *	A woman should not expect to go to the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man	1	2	3	4
14 *	Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters	1	2	3	4
15 *	It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for men to darn socks	1	2	3	4
16 *	In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the raising of children	1	2	3	4
17 *	Women should be encouraged not to become sexually intimate with anyone before marriage, even their fiancés	1	2	3	4
18	The husband should not be favoured by law over his wife in the disposal of family property or income	1	2	3	4
19 *	Women should be concerned with their duties of childbearing and house tending, rather than with the desires for professional and business careers	1	2	3	4
20 *	The intellectual leadership of a community should largely be in the hands of men	1	2	3	4
21	Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal femininity that has been set	1	2	3	4

	up by men				
22 *	On the average, women should be regarded as less capable of contributing to economic production than are men	1	2	3	4
23 *	There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted	1	2	3	4
24	Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades	1	2	3	4
25	The modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given the modern boy.	1	2	3	4

* Reverse scored

Appendix G

IBWB

The statements listed below describe attitudes women that different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your feelings about each statement by indicating whether you strongly agree, mildly agree, mildly disagree or strongly disagree.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree	agree	slightly agree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

	SUBSCALE WJ: WIFE BEATING IS JUSTIFIED	
1	A husband has no right to beat his wife even if she breaks an agreement with him	
2	Even when a wife's behaviour challenges her husband's manhood, he's not justified in beating her	
3	A wife doesn't deserve a beating even if she keeps reminding her husband of his weak points	
4	Even when women lie to their husbands, they don't deserve a beating	
5*	A sexually unfaithful wife deserves to be beaten	
6*	Sometimes it's OK for a man to beat his wife	
7*	It would do some wives good to be beaten by their husbands	
8*	Occasional violence by a husband toward his wife can help maintain the marriage	
9	There is no excuse for a man to beat his wife	
11*	A woman who constantly refuses to have sex with her husband is asking to be beaten	
18*	Episodes of a man beating his wife are the wife's fault	
19*	Wives could avoid being battered by their husbands if they knew when to stop talking	
	SUBSCALE WG: WIVES GAIN FROM BEATINGS	
10*	Battered wives are responsible for their abuse because they intended it to happen	
12*	Wives who are battered are responsible for the abuse because they should have foreseen it would happen	
13*	battered wives try to get their partners to bat them as a way to get attention from them	
14*	When a wife is beaten, it is caused by her behaviour in the weeks before the battering	
16*	Most wives secretly desire to be beaten by their husbands	
17*	Wives try to get beaten by their husbands to get sympathy from others	
24	Women feel pain and no pleasure when beaten up by their husbands	
	SUBSCALE HG: HELP SHOULD BE GIVEN	

21	If I heard a woman being attacked by her husband, it would be best that I do nothing	
22*	If I heard a woman being attacked by her husband, I would call the police	
32*	Wife beating should be given a high priority as a social problem by government agencies	
33*	Social agencies should do more to help battered women	
34*	Women should be protected by law if their husbands beat them	
	SUBSCALE OP: OFFENDER SHOULD BE PUNISHED	
27*	If a wife is beaten by her husband, she should divorce him immediately	
28*	The best way to deal with wife beating is to arrest the husband	
29	How long should a man who has beaten his wife spend in prison? No time; 1 month; 6 months; 1 year; 3 years; 5 years; 10 years; don't know	
30*	A wife should move out of the house if her husband beats her	
31*	Husbands who batter are responsible for the abuse because they intend to do it	
	SUBSCALE OR: OFFENDER IS RESPONSIBLE	
25*	Cases of wife beating are the fault of the husband	
36*	Husbands who batter should be responsible for the abuse because they should have foreseen that it would happen	
37	The best way to deal with wife beating is to arrest the husband	
38	Husbands who batter are responsible for the abuse because they intend to do it	

* = reverse scored items

Appendix H
BIDR

BIDR
Version 6 - Form 40A

Name: _____ **Date:** _____

We would like you to tell us how true the statements listed on the following pages are for you personally. Using the following scale, please write 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 in the blank next to each statement.

Not True			Somewhat True			Very True
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Give your own opinions about each statement. There are no right or wrong answers on this questionnaire.

Example:

_____ 1. All politicians are crooks.

If you believe this statement to be **very true** you should write "7" in the blank next to the statement. If you believe this statement to be **not true** then you should write "1". If you believe the statement to be **somewhat true** you should write "4". You can also write "2", "3", "5" or "6" in the blank next to the statement if it better describes what you believe about that item.

Not True Somewhat True Very True
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

- ___ 1. My first impressions of people usually turn out to be right.
- ___ 2. I don't care to know what other people really think of me.
- ___ 3. I always know why I like things.
- ___ 4. Once I've made up my mind, other people can seldom change my opinion.
- ___ 5. I am fully in control of my own fate.
- ___ 6. I never regret my decisions.
- ___ 7. The reason I vote is because my vote can make a difference.
- ___ 8. I am a completely rational person.
- ___ 9. I am very confident of my judgments.
- ___ 10. It's all right with me if some people happen to dislike me.
- ___ 11. It would be hard for me to break any of my bad habits.
- ___ 12. I have not always been honest with myself.
- ___ 13. When my emotions are aroused, it biases my thinking.
- ___ 14. I am not a safe driver when I exceed the speed limit.
- ___ 15. It's hard for me to shut off a disturbing thought.
- ___ 16. I sometimes lose out on things because I can't make up my mind soon enough.
- ___ 17. My parents were not always fair when they punished me.
- ___ 18. I rarely appreciate criticism.
- ___ 19. I have sometimes doubted my ability as a lover.
- ___ 20. I don't always know the reasons why I do the things I do.

Not True Somewhat True Very True
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

- ___ 21. I never cover up my mistakes.
- ___ 22. I never swear.
- ___ 23. I always obey laws, even if I'm unlikely to get caught.
- ___ 24. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.
- ___ 25. I always declare everything at Customs.
- ___ 26. I have never dropped litter on the street.
- ___ 27. I never read sexy books or magazines.
- ___ 28. I never take things that don't belong to me.
- ___ 29. I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without reporting it.
- ___ 30. I don't gossip about other people's business.
- ___ 31. I sometimes tell lies if I have to.
- ___ 32. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.
- ___ 33. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
- ___ 34. I have said something bad about a friend behind his/her back.
- ___ 35. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him/her.
- ___ 36. When I was young I sometimes stole things.
- ___ 37. I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.
- ___ 38. I have done things that I don't tell other people about.
- ___ 39. I have taken sick leave from work or school even though I wasn't really sick.
- ___ 40. I have some pretty awful habits.

Appendix I
Semi-Structured Interview
(Based on PCL-R Interview)

I want to talk first about what happened with this offense that got you here. I'd like to hear your side of the story of where it happened, how it came about, things like that. After that, I'll just ask you about some general stuff, like your family background, school, what you were doing for work before you came to jail, and a little bit about your past relationships.

Offense

Ok, tell me a little bit about what happened with this offense. What happened, where did it happen, things like that.

If not covered in offense description by offender, follow-up with these questions:

Who was the victim

Had you been drinking or using any drugs prior to the offense – when?

Was it planned or more spur of the moment

Were there any injuries, and if so, what were they

Have you ever used a weapon in your offences?

(FOR VIOLENT OFFENDERS) What did you actually do (kind of violence) - slap/punch/kick/choke, etc.

Have you been violent with any family members over the past year?

Ever had any physical fights (like bar fights) in the past? How long ago? What happened? How often will stuff like that happen?

Do you think this sentence is fair?

What kind of effect do you think the current charge will have on your life?

What other adult offences have you committed?

What's the most serious one you've been convicted of? What happened

Ever convicted of Fraud/Forgery/Impersonation? How often

Who was to blame for these offences

Why do you commit crime

Why did you start committing crime

Have you ever tried to get out of this lifestyle? How

Do you regret committing this offense? Why/Why not

What do you think about the victims of your crimes?

How old were you when you started getting into trouble? How old were you when you first got arrested. Ever get caught by the police under the age of 12

When you were young did you used to steal from your parents, vandalize other property, tell a lot of lies or hurt animals for fun? How often; How old were you

Did you get caught? What happened

School/Work

How many different elementary schools did you attend? Why did you change

How many different high schools did you attend? Why did you change

What was your attendance like in school? How old were you when you started skipping

What were your grades like? Did you ever fail? Which grade

Did you like school? How would your teachers describe you?

How was your behaviour at school?

Fights? How often; How old were you; How often did you start them; ever hurt anyone badly; ever used a weapon

Classroom problems? Did you get into trouble a lot in class? Why? How old when it started

Ever suspended/expelled? From what grade? What did you do after that?

What grade did you get up to? Why did you leave

What were you doing for work before this incarceration?

What kind of work have you done in the past?

How many different jobs have you had

What was your longest job?

For the past three longest jobs - what did you do; how long did you stay; did you like it; why did you leave

Are you a reliable employee; Ever get in trouble at work (lateness; substance use; absenteeism)

How often have you been fired?

When you're unemployed, how long does that usually last?

Ever been on UI/welfare? How often

On the street how do you usually support yourself?

Health

Ever been to see a psychologist/psychiatrist? For what? How long ago? Any diagnosis? Are you on any meds now or have you ever been? (if yes, for what?)

As a kid, were you ever diagnosed as hyper active? By whom? How old were you? Were you ever on any meds as a kid?

Ever thought of or tried to commit suicide? When? How often? How serious were your injuries?

In the past year, have you ever thought of killing anyone else? How long ago? Who?

Family

Tell me a little about your childhood.

Where were you born and raised

Were you raised by your natural parents. If not, by whom

Did your parents work; What did they do

Describe your parents; Did you get along with them; Were they affectionate to you; Did they get along ok with each other or did they fight a lot? Did they have physical fights that you know about? Did they separate? How did this affect you

Any brothers or sisters? Describe your relationship with them - do you get along with them?

Was there any substance abuse in your family; By whom

Was there any violence in the family; By whom

Did your parents have any psychiatric issues? Any criminal involvement?

Did you have strict rules; how often did you break them? What happened when you got in trouble – how were you disciplined?

Were you ever physically; emotionally or sexually abused; By whom; How old were you

Ever run away; how old were you; How old were you when you left home for good; Why did you leave

What's your relationship like now with your family

Relationships

Tell me a bit about your current or most recent partner (girlfriend/wife)

How long have/had you been together; Did you love her or was it more a physical relationship

Did you argue a lot? Tell me a bit about what would happen when you would disagree or argue.

Were there any physical fights? Was there any violence? did the violence escalate over the past year

Was there any swearing or name-calling? Would you say stuff to put her down?

(If it ended) Why did it end? How did you feel when you broke up

How many past live-in relationships have you had

(If no live-in relationships) How many serious relationship have your had?

(If a lot) Why have you had so many relationships?

Has there been any physical violence in your past relationships

Has there been any emotional violence in your past relationships (yelling, swearing, name-calling)

Are there any problems with jealousy in your relationships?

Have you ever been deeply in love? With who

How many one night stands have you had?

Have you ever had a relationship with more than one person at a time?

Ever cheated on any of your partners?

Do you have any children? How many? How old are they? How well did you know their mom?

How is your relationship with your kids? Do you keep contact with them? How often

Substance use

Do you use alcohol or drugs? How often? What do you use? How old were you when you started

Why do you use them?

Ever do anything really dangerous or get into trouble when you were drinking or stoned?

Do you ever do crazy or dangerous things just for fun?

General Questions

Ever done anything that you feel really guilty about (Other than crime)? What?

Why did you feel badly

Do you lie a lot; get bored easily

Do you think people are easy to con or manipulate? Do you ever do it?

Do people tell you you've got a bad temper? What makes you really angry?

What do you do when you're angry

How many close friends do you have? How long have you known them? Do you keep in touch? What makes them such close friends?

How do you feel about yourself

Are you satisfied with your life right now? What is missing? What are your biggest failures?

When you get out of here, what are you planning on doing? Where are you going to live? Do you have work? How are you going to support yourself

Do you sometimes put on a show of feelings even though you're not feeling it, just because that's what you think others expect

So, which treatment programs are you interested in right now? What are some of the things you want to work on or address in treatment? How come you're taking a program – what different this time?

Background Coding Questionnaire (From interview and file)**DETACH THIS SHEET AFTER COMPLETION****Subject Number****Date Interviewed****Date File Reviewed****Name of Offender**

Subject Number

Age

Date Remanded

Date Sentenced

Date Incarcerated

- Group
1. DV only
 2. Stranger only
 3. Generally violent
 4. No Violence

- Ethnicity
1. Caucasian
 2. Black
 3. Asian
 4. Native
 5. Other
 9. Unknown

LSI-OR Total score:

Crim. History:	Educ./Employment:	Family/Mar.:	Leisure:
Companions:	Attitudes:	Sub. abuse:	Antisoc. Pattern:

Highest Grade Achieved

- Employment Status at time of offense
1. Full-time
 2. Part-time/seasonal
 3. Unemployed receiving UI
 4. Unemployed receiving welfare
 5. Receiving pension (ie. disability)
 6. Student
 7. Other
 9. Unknown

Occupation during the year leading up to the offense

1. student
2. (semi/un) skilled labour (construction)
3. skilled labour (trade)
4. clerical/sales
5. lower management/supervisor
6. management/professional
7. other
8. not applicable
9. unknown

Marital/ Family Background

Living situation at time of offense

1. alone/transient (shelter, YMCA)
2. alone but stable (apartment, house)
3. parent/sibling
4. wife (married or common-law > 6 months)
5. partner in heterosexual relationship (CL < 6 months)
6. roommate/friend
7. other
9. unknown

Marital status at time of offense

1. single
2. common-law (>6 months)
3. married
4. separated
5. divorced
6. widowed
9. unknown

Total number of past common-law or marital relationships at time of offense

Dissatisfaction with marital status (anger about break-up, depression, wants to separate)

1. yes
2. no
9. unknown

Abuse History

Was there any reported physical abuse by a parent or caregiver prior to age 16

1. yes
2. no
9. unknown

If yes, who was the perpetrator

1. father
2. mother
3. both parents
4. other caregiver (step parent, foster parent)
9. unknown

Was there any reported emotional abuse/neglect by a parent or caregiver prior to age 16 (verbal abuse, abandonment, malnutrition)

1. yes
1. No
9. Unknown

If yes, who was the perpetrator

1. father
2. mother

- 3. both parents
- 4. other caregiver (step parent, foster parent)
- 9. unknown

Was there any reported sexual abuse prior to age 16

- 1. yes
- 2. no
- 9. unknown

If yes, gender of the perpetrator

- 1. male
- 2. female
- 3. both
- 9. unknown

If yes, relationship to perpetrator

- 1. biological parent
- 2. step-parent
- 3. sibling
- 4. other relative (uncle, grandparent)
- 5. friend
- 6. casual acquaintance
- 7. stranger
- 8. authority figure
- 9. unknown

Did subject witness any violence between his caregivers?

- 1. yes
- 2. no
- 9. unknown

If yes, what was witnessed?

- 1. Father-to-mother violence
- 2. Mother-to-father violence
- 3. Bi-directional violence

Did parent/Caregiver have and alcohol/drug problem

- 1. yes
- 2. no
- 9. unknown

If yes, who?

- 1. father
- 2. mother
- 3. both
- 4. other caregiver (step-parent)
- 9. unknown

Did parent/caregiver have a psychiatric problem

- 1. yes
- 2. no

9. unknown

If yes, who?

1. father
2. mother
3. both
4. other caregiver (step-parent)
9. unknown

Did parent/caregiver have a criminal history

1. yes
2. no
9. unknown

If yes, who?

1. father
2. mother
3. both
4. other caregiver (step-parent)
9. unknown

Substance Abuse History

Reported history of alcohol abuse as an adult

1. yes
2. no
3. not applicable
9. unknown

Reported history of drug abuse as an adult

1. yes
2. no
3. not applicable
9. unknown

Individual consumed alcohol or was intoxicated prior to offense

1. yes
2. no
9. unknown

Individual consumed illegal drugs prior to offense

1. yes
2. no
9. unknown

Past Relationships

Has there been any physical violence in your past relationships

1. yes
2. no
9. unknown

Has there been any emotional violence in your past relationships (yelling, swearing, name-calling)

- 1. yes**
- 2. no**
- 9. unknown**

Was there an escalation of violence over the past year in this relationship?

- 1. yes**
- 2. no**
- 9. unknown**

Generalized Lifestyle Impulsivity (adapted from Prentky & Knight, 1986)

1. Evidence of unstable employment history (frequent job changes (3 or more in 5 years), significant unemployment (6 months or more in 2 years), serious absenteeism, walking off several jobs)
 0. no, definitely not
 1. somewhat
 2. yes, definitely
2. Evidence of aimlessness or failure to settle down, traveling from place to place without a clear goal, lack of fixed address from one month or more
 0. no, definitely not
 1. somewhat
 2. yes, definitely
3. Reckless behaviour without regard for the consequences (violations for speeding, risk taking)
 0. no, definitely not
 1. somewhat
 2. yes, definitely
4. Inability to maintain attachments to a sexual partner (2 or more divorces, series of relationships, sexual promiscuity)
 0. no, definitely not
 1. somewhat
 2. yes, definitely
5. Repeated instances of aggression/destructive behaviour in response to frustration
 0. no, definitely not
 1. somewhat
 2. yes, definitely

IMPULSIVITY SCORE (sum of 1-5)

Level of Denial for Offense (Nugent and Kroner, 1996)

1. complete admitter (accepts responsibility, does not use excuses)
2. semi-admitter (acknowledges what he did, but excuses behaviour (eg. with substance abuse)
3. semi-denier (minimizes what he did eg. didn't punch, only slapped), justifies behaviour that she deserved it)
4. complete denier (totally denies the offense)

Criminal History (from file information)

# NON-VIOLENT OFFENCES	OFFENSE
	Theft, B&E, Possession B&E tools, Possession Stolen property, Forcible Entry
	Drug offences
	Criminal Negligence, Impaired, Dangerous Driving, Fail to Stop
	Fraud, Forgery, Possession stolen credit card
	Escape, UAL
	Obstruct Justice, Resist Arrest
	Miscellaneous (mischief, vandalism, drive while license suspended)
	FTC, Breach probation
#VIOLENT OFFENCES	
	Robbery
	Assault, Assault -CBH
	Utter Threats
	Attempted Murder
	Murder/Manslaughter
	Possession weapon, explosives
	Assault with weapon
	Arson
	Unlawful confinement, kidnapping
	Sexual offences
	Other

Freedom of Information (F.O.I.) Notice: This personal information is being collected under the authority of Section 5 of the Ministry of Corrective Services Act, Chapter M22 and may be used for the purposes of assessment, classification and program placement during this and future periods of community supervision or incarceration. Questions about the collection of this information should be directed to the Probation and Parole Officer, Area Manager, or Superintendent.

Surname	Given Name	OAS Client Number	Status ☐ Youth ☐ Adult
Setting	Sources of Information	Birthdate DD MM YY	☐ Male ☐ Female
Context: Community ☐ PSR/POR ☐ Parole Intake ☐ Probation Intake ☐ P&P Reassessment		Institution ☐ Classification ☐ Internal/Program ☐ Community Release ☐ Reclassification ☐ Parole Hearing	
		Youth ☐ Secure Custody ☐ Open Custody	

A. GENERAL RISK/NEED FACTORS

1. CRIMINAL HISTORY

- 1 Any prior y.o. dispositions (number =)
or adult dispositions (number =)
- 2 Two or more prior adult/youth dispositions
- 3 Three or more prior adult/youth dispositions
- 4 Three or more present offences (number =)
- 5 Arrested or charged under age 16
- 6 Ever incarcerated upon adjudication
- 7 Ever punished for institutional misconduct/
behaviour report (number =)
- 8 Charge laid, probation breached or parole
suspended during prior community supervision
- Subtotal Strength —

2. EDUCATION/EMPLOYMENT

- 9 Currently unemployed
- 10 Frequently unemployed
- 11 Never employed for full year
- 12 Less than regular grade 10 or equivalent
- 13 Less than regular grade 12 or equivalent
- 14 Suspended or expelled at least once
- 15 Participation/Performance ()
- 16 Peer interactions ()
- 17 Authority interactions ()
- Subtotal Strength —

3. FAMILY/MARITAL

- 18 Dissatisfaction with marital or equivalent
situation ()
- 19 Nonrewarding, parental ()
- 20 Nonrewarding, other relatives ()
- 21 Criminal - Family/Spouse
- Subtotal Strength —

4. LEISURE/RECREATION

- 22 No recent participation in an organized activity
- 23 Could make better use of time ()
- Subtotal Strength —

5. COMPANIONS

- 24 Some criminal acquaintances
- 25 Some criminal friends
- 26 No anti-criminal acquaintances
- 27 No anti-criminal friends ()
- Subtotal Strength —

6. PROCRIMINAL ATTITUDE/ORIENTATION

- 28 Supportive of crime ()
- 29 Unfavourable toward convention ()
- 30 Poor, toward sentence/offence
- 31 Poor, toward supervision/treatment
- Subtotal Strength —

7. SUBSTANCE ABUSE

- 32 Alcohol problem, ever
- 33 Drug problem, ever
- 34 Alcohol problem, currently ()
- 35 Drug problem, currently ()
- 36 Law violations
- 37 Marital/Family
- 38 School/Work
- 39 Medical or other clinical indicators
- Subtotal Strength —

8. ANTISOCIAL PATTERN

- 40 Specialized assessment for Antisocial
pattern
- 41 Early and diverse antisocial behaviour:
Arrested/charged under age 16
(Item 5),
plus at least one of:
a) official record of assault/
violence ()
b) escape history ()
c) charge laid, probation breached or
parole suspended during prior
community supervision community
supervision (Item 6)
- 42 Criminal attitude. At least one of:
(Item 28), (Item 29),
(Item 31)
- 43 A pattern of generalized trouble. At
least four of:
Financial problems (),
3 or more address changes ()
(Item 11), (Item 12),
(Item 14), (Item 19),
(Item 23), (Item 27)
- Subtotal Strength —

B. SPECIFIC RISK/NEED FACTORS

1. PERSONAL PROBLEMS WITH CRIMINOGENIC POTENTIAL

- 1 Clear problems of compliance
(specific conditions)
- 2 Diagnosis of "psychopathy"
- 3 Diagnosis of other personality
disorder
- 4 Threat from third party
- 5 Problem-solving/self-
management skill deficits
- 6 Anger management deficits
- 7 Intimidating/Controlling
- 8 Inappropriate sexual activity
- 9 Poor social skills
- 10 Peers outside age range
- 11 Racist/sexist behaviour
- 12 Underachievement
- 13 Outstanding charges
- 14 Other (specify) _____

2. HISTORY OF PERPETRATION

- 1 Sexual assault (extrafamilial)
- 2 Sexual assault (intrafamilial)
- 3 Physical assault (extrafamilial)
- 4 Physical assault (intrafamilial)
- 5 Assault on an authority figure
- 6 Weapon use
- 7 Fire setting
- 8 Escapes/U.A.L.
- 9 Impaired Driving

C. PRISON EXPERIENCE: INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS

- 1 Last classification maximum
- 2 Last classification medium
- 3 Last classification minimum
- 4 Protective custody
- 5 Treatment recommended/ordered
- 6 Misconduct/Behaviour Report
current incarceration
(number =)
- 7 Administrative segregation
- 8 Security management concerns
- 9 Past federal penitentiary

D. RISK/NEED SUMMARY

187

Total LSI-OR Score _____
(From Section A)Total Strengths _____
(From Section A)Specific risk/need factors _____
(From Section B)

Summary of strengths (Positives: reasons for lowering security/supervision or releasing clients. From Section A)

Summary of added concerns (Negatives: reasons for increasing security/supervision or not releasing clients. From Sections B & C)

E. RISK/NEED PROFILE

Very High	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30+	Very High
High	7-8	-	-	-	4	4	-	4	20-29	High
Medium	5-6	8-9	3-4	2	3	3	6-8	2-3	11-19	Medium
Low	3-4	3-7	1-2	1	1-2	1-2	2-5	1	5-10	Low
Very Low	0-2	0-2	0	0	0	0	0-1	0	0-4	Very Low
Risk Category	Crim. Hist.	Employ. Educ.	Fam. Mar.	Leis. Rec.	Comp.	Procr. Attit.	Subs. Abuse	Antisoc. Pattern	Total (Section A)	Override: Yes No

F. OTHER CLIENT ISSUES**1. SOCIAL, HEALTH, AND MENTAL HEALTH**

- ☐ 1 Financial problems
- ☐ 2 Homeless or transient
- ☐ 3 Accommodation problems
- ☐ 4 Health problems
- ☐ 5 Depressed
- ☐ 6 Physical disability
- ☐ 7 Low self-esteem
- ☐ 8 Shy/withdrawn
- ☐ 9 Diagnosis of psychosis
- ☐ 10 Suicide attempt/threat
- ☐ 11 Learning disability
- ☐ 12 Other evidence of emotional distress
(Specify) _____

- ☐ 13 Immigration issues
- ☐ 14 Victim: family violence
- ☐ 15 Victim: physical assault
- ☐ 16 Victim: sexual assault
- ☐ 17 Victim: emotional abuse
- ☐ 18 Victim of neglect
- ☐ 19 Other (specify) _____

2. BARRIER TO RELEASE

- ☐ 1 Community supervision inappropriate

(Specify reason) _____

G. SPECIAL RESPONSIVITY CONSIDERATIONS

- ☐ 1 Motivation as a barrier
- ☐ 2 Engages in denial/minimization
- ☐ 3 Interpersonally anxious
- ☐ 4 Cultural issues
- ☐ 5 Ethnicity issues
- ☐ 6 Low intelligence
- ☐ 7 Communication barriers
- ☐ 8 Other (specify) _____

H. PROGRAM/PLACEMENT DECISION**Type of Decision****Recommendation/Decision****Program/Institutional Placement**

- ☐ Institution, Secure/Open Custody: ☐ Minimum ☐ Medium ☐ Maximum
- ☐ Release Recommendation: ☐ Yes ☐ No
- ☐ Community: ☐ Minimum ☐ Moderate ☐ Maximum

Comments _____

Assessor's Name

Assessor's Position

Assessor's Signature

DD MM YY

Placement Decision

Explanation (if different from above)

Authorizing Name

Authorizing Position

Authorizing Signature

DD MM YY

British
Columbia
Institute
Against
Family
Violence

Spousal Assault Risk Assessment Guide

Assessment Information

Name of Accused: _____ DoB: _____

Name of Assessor: _____ Title: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Criminal History

- Past assault of family members
- Past assault of strangers or acquaintances
- Past violation of conditional release or community supervision

Rating
(0-1-2)

Critical Item
(Check box)

☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐

Psychosocial Adjustment

- Recent relationship problems
- Recent employment problems
- Victim of and/or witness to family violence as a child or adolescent
- Recent substance abuse/dependence
- Recent suicidal or homicidal ideation/intent
- Recent psychotic and/or manic symptoms
- Personality disorder with anger, impulsivity, or behavioral instability

☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐

Spousal Assault History

- Past physical assault
- Past sexual assault/sexual jealousy
- Past use of weapons and/or credible threats of death
- Recent escalation in frequency or severity of assault
- Past violation of "no contact" orders
- Extreme minimization or denial of spousal assault history
- Attitudes that support or condone spousal assault

Rating
(0-1-2)Critical Item
(Check box)☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐**Alleged (Current) Offence**

- Severe and/or sexual assault
- Use of weapons and/or credible threats of death
- Violation of "no contact" order

☐☐☐☐☐☐**Other Considerations**

- _____
- _____
- _____

☐☐☐☐☐☐**Summary Risk Ratings**

	Low	Moderate	High
1. Imminent risk of violence towards partner	☐	☐	☐
2. Imminent risk of violence towards others	☐	☐	☐
Specify: _____			

Appendix L
PCL:SV

Factor 1: Affective Characteristics	Present	Possibly/ Partially Present	Not Present
Superficial	2	1	0
Grandiose	2	1	0
Deceitful	2	1	0
Lack of Remorse	2	1	0
Lack of Empathy	2	1	0
Does not Accept Responsibility	2	1	0
Factor 2: Behavioural Characteristics	Present	Possibly/ Partially Present	Not Present
Impulsive	2	1	0
Poor Behavioural Control	2	1	0
Lacks Goals	2	1	0
Irresponsible	2	1	0
Adolescent Antisocial Behaviour	2	1	0
Adult Antisocial Behaviour	2	1	0

Scoring

Total

Factor 1

Factor 2

Appendix M

Informed Consent Form

The purpose of an informed consent is to make sure that you understand the purpose of the study and the nature of your involvement. The informed consent must provide enough information so that you have the opportunity to decide whether you want to participate in the study.

Research Personnel. The following people are involved in this research project and may be contacted at any time: Vicki Léger (Main Investigator, Rideau Correctional and Treatment Centre, 269-4771, extension 294); Dr. Robert Hoge (Research Supervisor, Carleton University, 520-2653).

For ethical questions or concerns regarding this experiment, please contact: Dr. Kim Matheson (Chair, Psychology Department, Carleton University, 520-2600, extension 2648); Dr. Mary Gick, (Chair, Ethics Committee, Carleton University, 520-2600, extension 2664); Dr. Barbara Armstrong (Chief Psychologist, Rideau Correctional and Treatment Centre, 269-4771, extension 299).

Purpose. The purpose of this research is to look at the differences between different types of offenders with respect to their intimate relationships (girlfriends, wives, etc.). It is thought that different types of offenders have different sorts of attitudes about their partners, and behave in different ways towards their female partners. It is hoped that your participation will help give us some insight into this matter.

Task Requirement, Duration and Location. As part of the study, you will have a 45 minute interview with the Main Investigator, Vicki Léger. In this interview, we'll talk a little about your background growing up and your current intimate relationship. After that, you will fill out some paper and pencil questionnaires about your general thoughts and feelings. This will take about 30 minutes. All testing and interviewing will be completed at Rideau Correctional and Treatment Centre. Part of this research will also involve a review of your institutional file.

Potential Risk/Discomfort. Some people find talking about their past and/or their relationships upsetting, especially while they are incarcerated. Your participation is completely voluntary, and you are under no obligation to continue with the study if you find it to be too upsetting.

Anonymity/Confidentiality. The information gathered in the interview and questionnaires are confidential and will only be used by the researchers involved in the study. The information is also anonymous, and there will be no information included that would identify any one individual.

Right to Withdraw. Once again, your participation is totally voluntary, and you may withdraw at any point in time. If you choose to withdraw, there will be no penalty to your stay at this institution, or with regards to other decisions regarding your sentence (TAP's, parole, etc.). This is an independent study from the institution, and the information you provide me will in no way affect any of the above.

I have read the above information and understand the conditions of my participation. My participation is totally voluntary, and, if for any reason I wish to leave the experiment, I may do so at any time without any effects to my stay at this institution. I am also aware that the information collected in this study is completely confidential and anonymous with respect to my personal identity. My signature indicates that I agree to participate in this study.

Participants Name:

Investigators Signature:

Participants Signature:

Date:

Appendix N

Consent to Audio-tape Interview

I, _____, hereby authorize the audiotaping of my interview with _____ as part of my participation in the study on offenders and intimate relationships.

I understand that this information is for research purposes only, and that the information in no way will affect any other part of my stay at this institution. I also understand that the audiotape will be destroyed upon completion of this research.

Again, the information collected will remain completely confidential, and will not be available to anyone not associated with this research.

My signature indicates I consent to have my interview audiotaped.

Participants Signature:

Appendix O

Information Slip for Participants

Thanks again for agreeing to participate in this study. Your help is appreciated and once again, your information will be kept strictly confidential.

Should you have any other questions about this research, please contact Vicki Léger (Principal Investigator, 269-4771, ext. 294) or Dr. Robert Hoge (Faculty Advisor, 520-2653)

If you have any ethical concerns about your participation in this study, you are welcome to discuss them with the psychologists listed below:

Dr. Kim Matheson (Chair of Psychology Department, 520-2600, ext. 2648)

Dr. Mary Gick (Chair of Ethics Committee, 520-5600, ext. 2664)

Appendix P

Verbal Debriefing for Subjects

Thanks again for allowing me to use some of your information for this research. I really appreciate your help with my study.

Basically, the purpose of this research was to investigate the differences between different types of offenders. So, I'm looking at guys who are violent only with their wife or girlfriend, those who are only violent with strangers, those who are violent with both their partner and strangers and those who aren't violent at all. As you can probably tell from the questionnaires, I'm interested in the different attitudes that offenders have about women and about domestic violence. It is thought that certain attitudes, certain feelings, and other factors are important in understanding why some men are violent with certain people, while others aren't violent at all. This is really important because it'll help us figure out what kinds of things might be best to focus on in treatment for different types of offenders.

Your help not only makes this research possible, but it will also help other offenders in the future in understanding different kinds of aggressive behaviour and what treatment might be helpful.

I'll give you this (Information Slip) in case you have any other questions or concerns about the study. You can call my advisor, Dr. Hoge or me. If you have any ethical concerns, for example if you have concerns about how you were treated while participating in this study, you can contact either of these two people (show them Dr. Matheson's and Dr. Gick's names).

Do you have any other questions? Ok, great, I'll send you back to the dorms now.

Appendix Q

Table Q1

Inter-correlations of Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. LSI-OR	1											
2. Neur.	.16*	1										
3. Extrov.	-.12	-.47**	1									
4. Agree.	-.27**	-.46**	.15	1								
5. Consc.	-.18*	-.61**	.36**	.50**	1							
6. Open.	.04	-.23**	.51**	.25**	.29**	1						
7. Auth.	.22**	.24**	-.09	-.45**	-.13	-.15	1					
8. Int/Fam.	.11	.37**	-.16	-.41**	-.24**	-.34**	.51**	1				
9. Acquain.	.15	.10	-.07	-.17*	.07	-.16	.32**	.33**	1			
10. Work	.06	.19*	-.17*	.29**	-.11	-.28**	.57**	.53**	.30**	1		
11. Anon.	.09	.20*	-.11	.29**	-.03	-.15	.61**	.47**	.30**	.50**	1	
12. HIQ Total	.17*	.29**	-.15	.43**	-.11	-.26**	.82**	.73**	.62**	.77**	.78**	1
13. Overgen	.12	.20*	-.06	-.31**	-.03	-.08	.66**	.54**	.46**	.55**	.53**	.74**
14. Att. Hos.	.16*	.17*	-.05	-.37**	-.03	-.10	.68**	.60**	.48**	.58**	.64**	.80**
15. Pers Res.	.02	-.09	-.06	-.04	.07	-.09	.08	.15	.13	.16*	-.12	.10
16. Hos Reac.	.21*	.39**	-.17*	-.52**	-.29**	-.35**	.72**	.66**	.42**	.64**	.60**	.82**
17. Ext. Blame	.10	.30**	-.15	-.28**	-.14	-.21**	.70**	.63**	.41**	.56**	.65**	.79**
18. CSS Total	-.04	-.29**	.20*	.28**	.10	.05	-.40**	-.17*	-.13	-.13	-.28**	-.30**
19. LCP	-.16	-.35**	.25**	.49**	.23**	.15	-.61**	-.33**	-.22**	-.32*	-.44**	-.52**
20. TLV	.17	.26**	-.20*	-.58**	-.27**	-.15	.58**	.41**	.27**	.42**	.47**	.58**
21. ICO	.29*	.23**	-.18*	-.38**	-.31**	-.31**	.48**	.25**	.18*	.37**	.32**	.44**
22. Jealousy	.13	.53**	-.30**	-.33**	-.36**	-.29**	.29**	.39**	.14	.18*	.23**	.32**
23. Abuse Total	.08	.39**	-.09	-.38**	-.40**	-.15	.17*	.21**	.09	.11	.10	.18*
24. Phys. Abuse	.04	.28**	-.07	-.21**	-.29**	-.09	.09	.08	.02	-.00	-.01	.03
25. Emot. Abuse	.10	.38**	-.08	-.40**	-.39**	-.15	.19*	.23**	.11	.14	.13	.21**
26. ATWS	-.05	-.19*	.12	.23**	.17*	.29**	-.40**	-.31**	-.11	-.41**	-.37**	-.42**
27. IBWB Total	-.02	-.09	.07	.19*	.18*	.16*	-.25**	-.23**	-.09	-.21*	-.25**	-.27**
28. Off. Punished	.11	-.05	.00	.10	.132	.10	-.10	-.11	.01	-.14	-.04	-.10
29. Off. Respon.	.06	.02	.05	.17*	.09	.10	-.20*	-.16*	-.09	-.27**	-.24**	-.25**
30. Beating Justified	.07	.12	-.07	-.15	-.12	-.20*	.18*	.18*	.06	.15	.25**	.21**
31. Women Gain	.01	.06	.04	-.14	-.09	-.10	.21*	.26**	.10	.20*	.21**	.26**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
32. Help Give	.05	.12	-.11	-.29**	-.26**	-.19*	.42**	.27**	.09	.27**	.29**	.36**
33. PCL Total	.45**	.14	.05	-.31**	-.16*	.04	.22*	.18*	.16	.14	.15	.23**
34. PCL Factor 1	.19*	-.03	.14	-.11	-.02	.03	.03	.12	.08	.02	.07	.08
35. PCL Factor 2	.53**	.25**	-.05	-.38**	-.24**	.04	.32**	.17*	.17*	.20*	.17*	.29**
36. SARA Factor 1	.55**	.26**	-.17	-.33**	-.27**	-.07	.21**	.20*	.09	.16*	.16*	.22**
37. SARA Factor 2	.02	.12	-.09	-.03	-.08	-.10	.02	.15	.06	.07	.01	.08
38. SARA Total	.28**	.20*	-.13	-.17*	-.18*	-.09	.13	.22**	.09	.14	.10	.18*
39. Impulsivity	.55**	.30**	-.05	-.36**	-.26**	.04	.20*	.17*	.14	.14	.12	.21**

	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
13. Overgen	1											
14. Att. Of Hostility	.79**	1										
15. Personal Responsibility	-.21**	-.25**	1									
16. Hostile Reaction	.47**	.56**	.08	1								
17. External Blame	.45**	.50**	.05	.55**	1							
18. CSS Total	-.36**	.31**	.10	-.28**	.86**	1						
19. LCP	-.50**	-.48**	.03	-.48**	-.38**	.86**	1					
20. TLV	.47**	.52**	.06	.51*	.42**	-.33**	-.73**	1				
21. ICO	.31**	.31**	.06	.45**	.32**	-.12	.32**	.56**	1			
22. Jealousy	.23**	.20*	-.02	.39**	.33**	-.07	.33**	.14	.20	1		
23. Abuse Total	.03	.02	.01	.32**	.19*	-.11	.19*	.17*	.15	.49**	1	
24. Physical Abuse	-.05	-.06	.01	.17*	.04	-.01	.04	.11	.12	.28**	.79**	1
25. Emotional abuse	.06	.05	.01	.34**	.22**	-.14	.22**	.18*	.14	.51**	.97**	.62**
26. ATWS	-.36**	-.38**	.06	-.39**	-.33**	.22**	-.33**	-.30**	-.19*	-.32**	-.19*	-.10
27. IBWB Total	-.22**	-.23**	.01	-.27**	-.21*	.07	-.21*	-.30**	-.27**	-.29**	-.30**	-.30**
28. Offender Punished	-.02	-.07	-.04	-.14	-.09	.02	-.09	-.19*	-.09	-.05	-.34**	-.42**
29. Offender Responsible	-.16*	-.24**	.02	-.20*	-.19*	.12	-.19*	-.25**	-.17*	-.07	-.22**	-.19**
30. Beating Justified	.17*	.19*	-.02	.16	.20*	-.04	.20*	.17*	.20*	.28**	.19*	.18*
31. Women Gain	.23**	.19*	.05	.19*	.24**	-.01	.24**	.27**	.22**	.24**	.16*	.10
32. Help Give	.30**	.28**	.01	.42**	.26**	-.23**	.26**	.39**	.38**	.25**	.29**	.25**
33. PCL Total	.14	.24**	.03	.25**	.11	-.09	.11	.25**	.23**	.02	.17*	.19*
34. PCL Factor 1	.01	.13	.03	.07	.03	-.07	.03	.16	.07	-.07	.12	.14
35. PCL Factor 2	.22*	.25**	.02	.32**	.15	-.07	.15	.25**	.30**	.10	.16*	.17*
36. SARA Factor 1	.16	.18*	-.01	.31**	.10	.02	.10	.20*	.28**	.23**	.29**	.37**
37. SARA Factor 2	-.03	.05	.09	.18*	-.01	.03	-.01	-.04	.0	.23**	.48**	.60**
38. SARA Total	.06	.14	.07	.27**	.06	.04	.06	.06	.13	.25**	.46**	.59**
39. Impulsivity	.09	.18*	.07	.27**	.11	-.03	-.17*	.20*	.30**	.10	.22**	.17*

	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36
25. Emotional abuse	1											
26. ATWS	-.20**	1										
27. IBWB Total	-.26**	.39**	1									
28. Offender Punished	-.26**	.23**	.60**	1								
29. Offender Responsible	-.21*	.29**	.58**	.68*	1							
30. Beating Justified	.17*	-.36**	-.78**	-.27**	-.25**	1						
31. Women Gain	.17*	-.33**	-.76**	-.30**	-.35**	.60**	1					
32. Help Give	.27**	-.33**	.59**	.41**	.42**	.33**	.32**	1				
33. PCL Total	.15	-.06	-.06	-.06	-.08	-.05	.0	.14	1			
34. PCL Factor 1	.09	-.01	-.08	-.15	-.17*	-.04	.03	.08	.79**	1		
35. PCL Factor 2	.15	-.09	-.02	.05	.04	-.03	-.03	.14	.80**	.27**	1	
36. SARA Factor 1	.24**	-.16*	-.21**	-.10	-.05	.16*	.05	.22**	.59**	.34**	.60**	1
37. SARA Factor 2	.37**	-.08	-.34**	-.41**	-.26**	.18*	.18*	.21**	.37**	.39**	.19*	.41**
38. SARA Total	.36**	-.14	-.30**	-.32**	-.21**	.17*	.12	.22**	.57**	.45**	.45**	.75**
39. Impulsivity	.21**	.00	.04	.05	.02	-.11	-.09	.13	.77**	.45**	.78**	.61**

	37	38	39
37. SARA Factor 2	1		
38. SARA Total	.89**	1	
39. Impulsivity	.29**	.51**	1

Note: * $p < .01$
 ** $p < .001$

Legend:

1. LSI-OR Total score	14. Attribution of Hostility = HIQ	27. IBWB Total = Inventory of Beliefs About Wife Beating Total
2. Neuroticism = NEO-PI-R	15. Personal Responsibility = HIQ	28. Offender Punished = Offender Should be Punished scale (IBWB)
3. Extroversion = NEO-PI-R	16. Hostile Reaction = HIQ	29. Offender Responsible = Offender is Responsible scale (IBWB)
4. Agreeableness = NEO-PI-R	17. External Blame = HIQ	30. Beating Justified = Wife Beating is Justified scale (IBWB)
5. Conscientiousness = NEO-PI-R	18. CSS Total = Total score for CSS	31. Women Gain = Women Gain from Beatings scale (IBWB)
6. Openness = NEO-PI-R	19. LCP = Law Court & Police (CSS)	32. Help Give = Help Should Be Given scale (IBWB)
7. Authority = HIQ	20. TLV = Tolerance for Law Violations (CSS)	33. PCL Total = PCL:SV Total score
8. Intimate/Family = HIQ	21. ICO = Identification with Other Criminals (CSS)	34. PCL Factor 1 = Factor 1 score (PCL:SV)
9. Acquaintance = HIQ	22. Jealousy = Interpersonal Jealousy Total (IJS)	35. PCL Factor 2 = Factor 2 score (PCL:SV)
10. Work = HIQ	23. Abuse Total = ABI Total score	36. SARA Factor 1 = Criminal History factor (SARA)
11. Anonymous = HIQ	24. Physical Abuse = Physical Abuse scale (ABI)	37. SARA Factor 2 = Spousal Assault Pattern factor (SARA)
12. HIQ Total = Hostile Interpretations Total (HIQ)	25. Emotional Abuse = Emotional abuse scale (ABI)	38. SARA Total = Total score (SARA)
13. Overgeneralization = HIQ	26. ATWS = Attitudes Towards Women Scale Total	39. Impulsivity

Appendix R Results from 3-Group MANOVA and Special Contrasts

Comparisons Among Violent Groups (FOV, GV, SOV)

PCL:SV, Overgeneralization, Personal Responsibility, External Blame. In order to test the hypotheses of whether there were differences among the three violent groups, and the Batterers and the SOV group a 3-group (FOV, SOV, GV) between subjects multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) with special contrasts on four predictor variables was performed: PCL:SV Total, Overgeneralization (HIQ), Personal Responsibility (HIQ) and External Blame (HIQ). With the use of Wilks' criterion for multivariate significance, the combined variables failed to differentiate the three groups, $F(8, 212)=1.47$, ns. No further analyses were interpreted.

When combining the two Batterer groups (FOV, GV) in comparison with the Stranger-only violent group, and with the use of Wilks' criterion for multivariate significance, the combined variables again failed to differentiate the groups, $F(4, 146)=1.18$, ns. The results together indicate that once the impact of non-violent offender scores is removed from the equation, the three violent groups do not differ significantly from each other in terms of psychopathy, or other measures of hostility.

Impulsivity, HIQ Total, CSS Subscales. A 3-group (FOV, SOV, GV) between subjects multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) with special contrasts on five predictor variables was performed: Impulsivity, Hostile Interpretation Total, Law, Courts and Police (CSS), Identification with Other Criminals (CSS) and Tolerance for Law Violations (square root) (CSS). With the

use of Wilks' criterion for multivariate significance, the combined variables differentiated the three groups, $F(10, 210)=1.88$, $p<.05$. The results reflected a moderate association between groups and the combined DV's (partial $\eta^2=.16$). Only two variables made a unique contribution in distinguishing the three groups; Identification with Other Criminals, $F(2,112)=7.00$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.11$ and Tolerance for Law Violations, $F(2,112)=5.36$, $p<.01$, $\eta^2=.09$. Follow-up post hoc Tukey HSD analyses revealed that for both Identification with Other Criminals and Tolerance for Law Violations, FOV offenders scored significantly lower than did GV and SOV offenders, indicating slightly more prosocial attitudes on the part of Family-Only batterers.

Abuse, Negative Attitudes Toward Women, Supportive of Abuse. A 3-group (FOV, SOV, GV) between subjects multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) with special contrasts on three dependent variables was performed: Abuse Total (log), Attitudes Towards Women, and Inventory of Beliefs About Wife Beating Total. With the use of Wilks' criterion for multivariate significance, the combined variables differentiated the three groups, $F(6, 216)=10.25$, $p<.001$. The results reflected a strong association between groups and the combined DV's (partial $\eta^2=.40$).

Both the Abuse variable ($F(2,113)=17.83$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.25$) and IBWB Total ($F(2,113)=17.83$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.25$) made a unique contributions in distinguishing the three groups. Follow-up post hoc Tukey HSD analyses revealed that the GV group were significantly different from both the SOV group and the FOV group, indicating GV offenders engaged in more relationship abuse and also held

attitudes more supportive of domestic violence. Not surprisingly, the FOV group also had significantly higher abuse scores than did the SOV group.

When combining the two Batterer groups (FOV, GV) in comparison with the Stranger-only violent group, obviously the above noted findings were confirmed, with the Batterers together scoring significantly differently than the SOV group.

IBWB Subscales. To further break down the IBWB into its five subscales, a 3-group (FOV, SOV, GV) between subjects multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) with special contrasts was performed on the five subscales scores: Offender Should Be Punished, Offender is Responsible, Wife Beating is Justified (log), Wives Gain from Beatings (log), Help Should be Given (log). With the use of Wilks' criterion for multivariate significance, the combined variables differentiated the three groups, $F(10, 212)=5.99, p<.001$. The results reflected a strong association between groups and the combined DV's (partial $\eta^2=.39$). All five variables made unique contributions in distinguishing the three groups; Offender Should be Punished ($F(2,113)=17.47, p<.001, \eta^2=.24$); Offender is Responsible ($F(2,113)=6.79, p=.002, \eta^2=.11$); Wife Beating is Justified ($F(2,113)=8.37, p<.001, \eta^2=.13$); Wives Gain from Beatings ($F(2,113)=7.61, p=.001, \eta^2=.12$) and Help Should be Given ($F(2,113)=7.39, p=.001, \eta^2=.11$). Follow-up post hoc Tukey HSD analyses revealed that the GV group were more likely to believe that wife beating is justified and that help should *not* be given than were FOV and SOV offenders. Both GV and FOV offenders were less likely to believe that spousal abusers should either be punished or were responsible for

their behaviour. Lastly, GV offenders were more likely than were SOV offenders to endorse that women gained from being beaten.

When combining the two Batterer groups (FOV, GV) in comparison with the SOV group, obviously the above noted findings were confirmed. One exception was that wife Beating is Justified ($F(1,150)=3.23$, ns) and Help Should be Given ($F(1,150)=1.22$, ns) did not make unique contributions to differentiating the groups.

Comparisons Between Batterers (FOV, GV)

PCL:SV, Overgeneralization, Personal Responsibility, External Blame. In order to test the hypotheses of whether there were differences between the two batterer groups, MANOVA with special contrasts on four predictor variables was performed: PCL:SV Total, Overgeneralization (HIQ), Personal Responsibility (HIQ) and External Blame (HIQ). With the use of Wilks' criterion for multivariate significance, the combined variables once again failed to differentiate the groups, $F(4, 146)=1.51$, ns.

Impulsivity, HIQ Total, CSS Subscales. MANOVA with special contrasts on five predictor variables was performed: Impulsivity, Hostile Interpretation Total, Law, Courts and Police (CSS), Identification with Other Criminals (CSS) and Tolerance for Law Violations (square root) (CSS). With the use of Wilks' criterion for multivariate significance, the combined variables differentiated the groups, $F(5, 145)=2.85$, $p=.02$. The results reflected a modest association between groups and the combined variables (partial $\eta^2=.09$). Law, Courts, Police ($F(1,$

149)=6.67, $p=.01$, Identification with Other Criminals ($F(1, 149)=11.57$, $p=.001$) and Tolerance for Law Violations ($F(1, 149)=7.06$, $p=.009$) were the only variables to make a significant unique contributions, suggesting that the Generally violent offenders hold more antisocial attitudes and criminally oriented attitudes than do Family-only violent offenders.

Abuse, Negative Attitudes Toward Women, Supportive of Abuse.

MANOVA with special contrasts on three dependent variables was performed: Abuse Total (log), Attitudes Towards Women, and Inventory of Beliefs About Wife Beating Total. With the use of Wilks' criterion for multivariate significance, the combined variables differentiated the groups, $F(3, 147)=7.71$, $p<.001$. The results reflected a modest association between groups and the combined variables (partial $\eta^2=.14$). All three variables made a significant unique contribution. Abuse ($F(1, 149)=9.28$, $p=.003$), Attitudes Towards Women ($F(1, 149)=6.23$, $p=.01$) and IBWB Total ($F(1, 149)=15.70$, $p<.001$) all indicated that GV offenders were more abusive, held more conservative/negative attitudes towards women and held attitudes that were more supportive of domestic violence than did FOV offenders.

IBWB Subscales. To further break down the IBWB into its five subscales, MANOVA with special contrasts was performed on the five subscales scores: Offender Should Be Punished, Offender is Responsible, Wife Beating is Justified (log), Wives Gain from Beatings (log), Help Should be Given (log). With the use of Wilks' criterion for multivariate significance, the combined variables differentiated the groups, $F(5, 146)=4.24$, $p<.001$. The results reflected a modest association between groups and the combined variables (partial $\eta^2=.13$). Help

Should be Given ($F(1,150)=12.50, p=.001$) and Wife Beating is Justified ($F(1,150)=12.70, p=.001$) made significant unique contributions, indicating that GV were more to believe that beatings were justified and were more hesitant to become involved in helping a woman in a battering situation than were FOV offenders.

SARA Comparison Among Violent Groups. In order to test the hypotheses of whether there were differences between the Batterer groups together and the SOV group, as well as between the two Batterer groups, a 3-group (FOV, SOV, GV) between subjects multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) with special contrasts on three predictor variables was performed: Factor 1 (Criminal History), Factor 2 (Spousal Assault history) and SARA Total score. With the use of Wilks' criterion for multivariate significance, the combined variables differentiated the three groups, $F(6, 216)=36.56, p<.001$. The results reflected a strong association between groups and the combined variables (partial $\eta^2=.75$). All variables made unique contributions in distinguishing the four groups.

The greatest contribution was made by Spousal Abuse factor, $F(2, 113)=111.12, p<.001, \eta^2=.67$. Follow-up post hoc Tukey HSD analyses revealed that the SOV group had significantly lower spousal abuse scores than either of the Batterer groups. Criminal history also made a unique contribution, $F(2, 113)=10.10, p<.001, \eta^2=.16$. Follow-up post hoc Tukey HSD analyses revealed that the FOV and SOV offenders had significantly lower scores than did GV offenders.

Finally, SARA Total score also made a unique contribution, $F(2, 113)=45.57$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.45$. Follow-up post hoc Tukey HSD analyses revealed that the Batterer groups had higher SARA Total scores than did the SOV group.

When combining the two Batterer groups (FOV, GV) in comparison with the SOV group, and with the use of Wilks' criterion for multivariate significance, the combined variables differentiated the groups, $F(3,148)=90.70$, $p<.001$. The results reflected a modest association between groups and the combined variables (partial $\eta^2=.65$). Factor 2 (Spousal Assault history) ($F(1, 150)=234.55$, $p<.001$) and SARA Total ($F(1, 150)=91.06$, $p<.001$) both significant unique contributions, suggesting that the Batterer groups, not surprisingly, were scored significantly higher than were Stranger-only offenders on spousal assault risk factors and SARA Total.

SARA Comparisons Between Batterers. A second set of custom analyses was completed to assess any differences between the two Batterer groups. With the use of Wilks' criterion for multivariate significance, the combined variables differentiated the groups, $F(3,148)=15.00$, $p=.001$. The results reflected a modest association between groups and the combined variables (partial $\eta^2=.24$). Only Factor 1 (Criminal history) made a significant unique contribution, $F(1, 150)=19.95$, $p<.001$, suggesting that the Generally violent offenders scored higher in risk factors associated with overall risk for criminality than did the FOV offenders.

Appendix S SARA Subscale MANOVA Results

A 4-group MANOVA was performed on the SARA subscales. With the use of Wilks' criterion for multivariate significance, the combined variables differentiated the four groups, $F(15, 403.44)=39.59$, $p<.001$, reflecting a strong association between the groups and combined variables ($\eta^2=.43$). All variables made unique contributions in distinguishing among the four groups; Criminal History, $F(3,154)=54.32$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.52$; Psychosocial History, $F(3,154)=10.96$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.18$; Spousal Assault History, $F(3,154)=201.35$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.80$; Current Offense, $F(3,154)=20.27$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.29$; and Other Considerations, $F(3,154)=7.81$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.14$. Means are presented below.

Table S1

Means and Standard Deviations for MANOVA (SARA subscales)

Variable	FOV (1)		SOV (2)		GV (3)		NV (4)		Posthoc
	<u>n</u> =37		<u>n</u> =35		<u>n</u> =41		<u>n</u> =41		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
Criminal History	1.84	1.32	3.77	1.11	4.22	1.24	1.20	1.31	1,4<2,3
Psychosocial Adjustment	7.27	1.68	6.31	2.56	7.34	1.78	5.07	2.04	4<2,1,3
Spousal Assault History	8.49	2.92	1.09	.89	7.83	1.87	.78	.82	2,4<3,1
Current Offense	2.30	1.76	.80	1.32	1.66	1.57	.07	.26	1<2<3,1
Other Considerations	.59	.83	.11	.47	.20	.56	.02	.16	4,2,3<1