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.

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600**

UMI[®]

**Can Typologies of Male Batterers Be Generalized To Populations Of
Federal Inmates?**

by

Audrey F. Wexler, B.Sc. (Hons.), B.A. (Hon.)

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Psychology

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

January 3, 2000

© Copyright

2000, Audrey Wexler

**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.

0-612-52374-8

Canada

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

Can Typologies of Male Batterers Be Generalized to Populations of Federal Inmates?
A File Review Study

submitted by

Audrey Wexler

in Partial fulfillment of the requirements for

the degree of Master of Arts

Chair

/
Thesis Supervisor

Carleton University
January, 2000

Abstract

The study evaluates the applicability of spouse abuse typologies with a population of male offenders incarcerated in Canadian federal institutions, and examines the rate of recidivism as a function of group membership. A sample of 847 (603 non-native and 229 native) offenders admitted to federal institutions in 1997 was used to assess the typology and to develop a classification scale. A second sample of 760 released offenders (571 non-native and 199 native) was used to test the typology and to assess criminal and spousal assault recidivism. Data were obtained from the electronic data system maintained by the Correctional Service of Canada. The study's findings suggest a trichotomy of batterers appropriately classifies non-native offenders and a dichotomy of batterers may be most appropriate for native offenders. Differential rates of criminal and spousal assault recidivism were identified. The findings of the study are discussed in terms of implications for treatment and decisions of conditional release.

Acknowledgements

There are several people that I would like to thank for their help, contribution, and support which led to the completion of this thesis.

Ben Vuong for setting up the data files and for his help during the data analysis stage. Marlo Gal for her help with the data analysis.

Sara Johnson for taking the time to explain the data system of the Correctional Service of Canada and the SAS program, and for her guidance during the data analysis stage. I would also like to thank Sara for her patience and her support through the difficult times.

A very special thank you to my supervisor, Brian Grant. Completion of this thesis would not of been possible without his continual support, patience, and guidance.

The members of my thesis committee, Dr. A. Forth, Dr. T. Pychyl, Dr. D. Robinson, and Dr. K. Kelley for their valuable contributions.

To several close friends (Shawna, Mary, and Ilana) who provided me with support and a listening ear during many difficult times.

To Dr. Raoul Korngold and Mrs. Sandra Korngold for being there, listening, and

providing emotional support throughout.

To my grandmother, Diane Wexler, for providing emotional support.

Finally, a very special thank you is extended to my parents (Muriel and Michael Wexler) and my brother (Shawn Wexler) who believed in me, who listened to me, who provided me with a shoulder to lean on during difficult times, who encouraged me, and who gave me the confidence to complete the thesis.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
List of Tables.....	viii
List of Figures	x
 INTRODUCTION.....	 1
The Rate of Spousal Violence in Canada	3
Defining spouse abuse.....	3
The incidence of spousal violence in Canada.....	3
The Incidence of spousal violence amongst federally incarcerated offenders.....	5
Theoretical Perspectives And Risk Factors Of Spousal Violence.....	8
Theoretical perspectives.....	8
Risk factors of spousal abuse.....	12
Summary.....	24
Batterer Typology.....	25
Summary.....	35
Present Study.....	36
 Method.....	 45
Participants.....	45

Development sample.....	45
Test sample.....	46
Measures.....	47
Offender Intake Assessment.....	48
Operationalization of typology.....	49
Scoring and classification.....	55
Assessing group assignment.....	58
Other variables.....	59
Criminal history record.....	59
Progress summary report and special report.....	61
Follow-up.....	61
 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS.....	 63
 RESULTS.....	 66
Development Sample	66
Classification and item endorsement of non-native offenders.....	66
Classification and item endorsement of native offenders.....	77
Other Variables.....	88
Test Sample.....	102
Typology.....	102
Non-native sample.....	102

Readmission as a function of group membership.....	103
Characteristics of spousal assault.....	105
Survival analysis.....	106
Summary.....	108
Native offenders.....	108
Readmission as a function of group membership.....	108
Survival analysis.....	112
Summary.....	114
DISCUSSION.....	116
Hypotheses.....	116
Limitations.....	128
Theoretical Consideration.....	130
Clinical Implications and Implications for Correctional Planning.....	133
REFERENCES.....	137
APPENDIX A.....	143
Spousal Coding Sheet.....	144
APPENDIX B.....	146

List of Tables

Table 1:	Criminal History Indicators Of Group Classification	51
Table 2:	Substance Abuse Indicators Of Group Classification.....	52
Table 3:	Family-of-Origin And Marital Relations Indicators Of Group Classification.....	54
Table 4:	Personal And Emotional Orientation Indicators By Group Classification.....	56
Table 5:	Cut-Off Scores For Batterer Group Classification.....	58
Table 6:	Other Variables.....	60
Table 7:	Distribution of Non-native Spouse Abusing Offenders By Classification	67
Table 8:	Non-Native Offenders: Criminal History Domain Items Endorsed By Classification.....	69
Table 9:	Non-Native Offenders: Substance Abuse Items Endorsed By Classification.....	72
Table 10:	Non-Native Offenders: Family-Of-Origin And Marital Relations Items Endorsed By Classification.....	73
Table 11:	Non-Native Offenders: Personal And Emotional Orientation Items Endorsed By Classification.....	76
Table 12:	Distribution of Native Spouse Abusing Offenders By Classification.....	78
Table 13:	Native Offenders: Criminal History Items Endorsed By Classification	80
Table 14:	Native Offenders: Substance Abuse Items Endorsed By Classification.....	83

Table 15: Native Offenders: Family-Of-Origin And Marital Relations Items	
Endorsed By Classification.....	84
Table 16: Native Offenders: Personal And Emotional Orientation Items Endorsed By	
Classification	87
Table 17: Comparison of Non-Native Batterer Groups on Background Variables.....	90
Table 18: Comparison of Non-Native Offenders on Variables of Criminal	
History, Substance Abuse, and Mental Health.....	93
Table 19: Comparison of Groups On Background Variables Of Native Sample.....	98
Table 20: Comparison of Native Batterer Groups On Criminal History, Substance Abuse,	
and Mental Health By Group.....	100
Table 21: Comparison of Non-Native Development and Test Sample By Group	
Membership.....	101
Table 22: The Percentage of Non-Native Offenders In Batterer Groups With an	
Offence.....	104
Table 23: Survival Estimates Of Non-Native Offenders As A Function Of Group	
Membership.....	109
Table 24: Comparison of Native Development and Test Sample By	
Group.....	110
Table 25: Offence Type as a Function of the Percentage of Native Offenders in Batterer	
Groups.....	111
Table 26: Survival Estimates of Native Offenders as a Function of Group	
Membership.....	115

List Of Figures

Figure 1: Recidivism Rates (Survival Curves) For Non-Native Offenders Of Three Batterer Groups.....	107
Figure 2: Recidivism Rates (Survival Curves) For Native Offenders Of Three Batterer Groups.....	113

INTRODUCTION

Nearly thirty years have passed since the women's movement pushed the issue of woman battering to the forefront of both public and professional attention. During this period of time, we have witnessed the emergence of a social conscience regarding woman battering. This has been reflected by provisions of protective and treatment services to the victims, as well as amendments to the legal system (Rodgers, 1995). Although protective and treatment services are both essential and necessary to the welfare of the victims of spousal violence, they only address one side of the issue. On the other side is the batterer (Sonkin, 1988). Given the batterer's abusive behavior, it is much easier to dismiss spouse abusers as less than human or to view all men as inherently violent (Dutton, 1995). However, by taking this viewpoint we limit ourselves to a superficial understanding of the abuser and his behavior. Research efforts over the past decade have been focused on identifying psychological, physiological, behavioral, and social factors associated with spouse abusers (e.g., Hamberger & Hastings, 1991; Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986), in an effort to understand the batterer and his behavior.

In a continuing effort to understand and address the needs of the batterer, characterizing factors (e.g., psychological, behavioral, demographic factors) of spouse abusers have been examined at length. Developing a unitary profile of the batterer from the existing literature has been an arduous process. Inconsistencies and contradictions in the empirical research have created ambiguity regarding a stereotypic profile of the male batterer (Gondolf, 1988). The vagueness of the research has spurred several researchers

(e.g., Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; Gondolf, 1988) to reassess the concept of batterer profile which could be generalized to the entire batterer population. Instead, a categorical approach to batterer profiling has been undertaken, with the intention of establishing a batterer topology (Cadsky & Crawford, 1988; Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin, 1996; Hanson, Cadsky, Harris, & Lalonde, 1997; Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; Gondolf, 1988). There is general agreement that the development of a typology of spouse abusers could have important implications (Hamberger, et al., 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994, and Gondolf, 1988). Treatment programs can be constructed to address specific needs of subtype of abusers, and social and judicial policies can be tailored to meet the risk of each sub-type.

The purpose of this study is two-fold. First and foremost, it is to evaluate the applicability of a batterer typology using an incarcerated population of federal male offenders. Second, the study assesses the rate of recidivism as a function of group membership. To properly address these issues, some background information is provided in the Introduction which has been divided into four sections: (1) the prevalence of spouse abuse in both community and correctional settings, (2) theoretical perspectives and risk factors of spouse abuse, (3) empirical support for a typology of male batterers, and (4) a description of the current study. The research to follow only addresses intimate female partners of spousal violence. The terms partner violence and spousal violence are used interchangeably in the paper and are to be understood as acts of aggression directed toward an intimate partner. Because the current study precludes verbal and emotional abuse, only research related to physical and sexual violence are presented.

The Rate of Spousal Violence in Canada

Defining Spouse Abuse

Prior to addressing the issue of a spouse abuse, it is necessary to define spouse abuse. There are various definitions of spouse abuse in the literature (e.g., Edelson, Eisikovits, & Guttman, 1985; Hart, Kropp, Roesch, Ogloff, & Whittemore, 1994; Straus, 1995). It appears to encompass a host of factors including, but not restricted to, physical aggression, verbal abuse, emotional terror experienced by the female victim, and lastly, societal and familial contexts of the violent behavior (Edelson et al., 1985). For this paper, however, spouse abuse is restricted to any actual, attempted, or threatened physical or sexual harm "...perpetrated by a man against a woman with whom he has (or has had) an intimate relationship" (Hart et al., 1994, p.436). As such, a spouse consists of a past or present wife, a girlfriend, or a common-law spouse. Acts of abuse include any actual, attempted, or threatened acts, such as physical assault (e.g., hitting, slapping, and so on), sexual assault, threats of harm or death, or destruction of the woman's property (Hart et al., 1994).

The Incidence of Spousal Violence in Canada

In 1993, Statistics Canada was commissioned to conduct a nationwide survey on Violence Against Women (Rodgers, 1995). To date, it is the best estimate of both the prevalence and incidence of spousal violence in Canada. Women (18 years and older) from ten Canadian provinces were randomly surveyed about their experiences of physical and sexual violence since the age of 16 (Rodgers, 1995). The results of the study suggest that domestic violence is a serious social problem (Rodgers, 1995); 29% of Canadian

women currently or previously involved in a spousal relationship (married or common-law) have been victimized physically and/or sexually as well as threatened by a partner. Reports of marital partnerships with physical violence indicate that 25% of women have been victimized by a spouse. Lifetime rates of spousal violence indicate that 48% of women have been abused by previous spouses, whereas 15% of women are currently intimate with an abusive spouse (Rodgers, 1995).

Physical violence is the most prevalent form of violence. Three quarters of the women have been pushed, grabbed, or shoved by their current and/or previous spouse. Nearly half of the violent spouses (44%) have used a weapon during the assault. In fact, 16% of the women report that a spouse has used a gun or knife on them. Of significance, the majority of the women have been subjected to more than one type of violence during the assault; only 5% report that pushing, grabbing, or shoving is the only form of violence that they have experienced (Rodgers, 1995). Although sexual assault is not as common as physical assault, the rate of sexual assault by spouses is still disturbingly high. Nearly one third of the women have been sexually assaulted by a current and/or previous spouse.

In sum, the Violence Against Women survey demonstrates that spousal violence within Canada is a phenomenon that affects a significant proportion of females within the population; 3 out of 10 women will have been abused by their current or previous spouse. Given that the bulk of the spousal violence literature is formulated on the basis of community samples, understanding the prevalence of spousal violence in our communities is of value. It can facilitate decisions made regarding treatment for victims and their abusers, community shelters, and legislation. In addition, a national survey, such as the

Violence Against Woman survey, provides a measuring stick to which idiosyncratic communities can be compared.

The Incidence of Spousal Violence Amongst Federally Incarcerated Offenders

A number of researchers have attempted to assess the incidence of partner violence amongst offenders. Hart et al. (1994) used a file review methodology to assess the prevalence of wife assault amongst community-resident offenders in British Columbia; i.e., offenders on bail, probation, and provincial parole. Approximately one in five provincially sentenced offenders in British Columbia had a history of wife assault. This statistic included current and past charges and convictions for wife assault, in addition to offenders with a history of wife assault and not receiving any official charges or convictions. Slightly over 18% of the offenders had official convictions or charges for wife assault.

Dutton and Hart (1992) examined the incidence of family violence amongst federally incarcerated male offenders. Seventy inmates and 27 of their partners were interviewed regarding the rate of partner violence in the past year. Interestingly, there were discrepancies in reports of violence between the offenders and the sub-sample of female partners. "One third of the wives/partners in this sample reported violence against them when their husbands reported no violence" (p.108). Similarly, there were discrepancies with respect to the average number of acts of physical violence (e.g., shoving, slapping) and severe violence (e.g., beating up, punching) per year; offenders reported 3.6 acts of violence and 0.46 acts of severe violence while spouses/girlfriends reported 15.5 acts of violence and 6.6 acts of severe violence.

The Family Violence Incidence study conducted by Robinson and Taylor (1995) is, in all probability, the most complete file review to date which elucidates the incidence of spousal violence amongst incarcerated offenders in federal institutions across Canada. A total of 935 offender files were randomly sampled from federal Canadian institutions. Nearly one third of the files (29%, $n=225$) contained evidence of violence against a current female spouse (married or common-law). Also, slightly less than a quarter of the files contained reports of violence against a previous spouse. Among men who had never been in a marital union, 8% ($n=8$) of the men reported abuse in their dating relationships. Interestingly, the incidence of partner violence (i.e., married, common-law, and girlfriend) amongst aboriginal offenders was nearly double the rate of perpetration of partner violence amongst non-aboriginals (25% vs. 47%, respectively).

Similar to the findings of Statistics Canada's Violence Against Woman survey (Rodgers, 1994), physical abuse was the prevalent form of abuse; 27% of the offenders involved in a marital union (married or common-law, $N=721$) had physically abused their partner. For offenders in dating relationships, 7.4% ($n=11$) of them had been physically abusive with their girlfriend. Information on the type of physical violence was found in 81% ($N=170$) of the 210 files containing official charges for spousal abuse (married, common-law, girlfriend). The most frequently reported type of violence was hitting (65%). Pushing (32%) and threats (31%) were less common. Additionally, there was evidence of shooting (4%) and stabbing (7%). Sexual abuse was only reported in 4% of the 210 files with an abuse record.

For the most part, researchers have relied upon documented official reports and/or the

cooperation of the abuser to formulate the spousal assault statistic for offenders. This raises the possibility that the rate of spousal violence may be more prevalent than previously estimated (Dutton, 1988; Hart et al., 1994; Robinson & Taylor, 1995). Nonetheless, nearly one third of federally sentenced offenders have a history of wife assault. A rate that is comparable to the nation-wide Violence Against Woman survey (Rodgers, 1995). Interestingly, the rate for provincial offenders is lower than the spousal assault rate for the Violence Against Women survey (Rodgers, 1994) or federally incarcerated offenders. The source of the information used to assess spousal assault may account for the discrepancy between provincial and federal offenders. More specifically, Hart et al. (1994) used police reported numbers to assess the incidence of spousal assault amongst provincial offenders, whereas the federal offender's complete case file was used to estimate spousal assault in the Robinson and Taylor (1995) study.

In conclusion, the issue of spousal violence should be considered a source of concern for forensic professionals working within the federal correctional system. There are several reasons as to why forensic professionals should attend to the spousal violence issue. First, the level of spousal violence among offenders is most likely higher than figures reported in the literature. As previously stated, researchers are relying on self-reports by offenders. Dutton and Hart (1992) found the incidence of spousal violence to be higher when based on reports by the victim. Moreover, offenders in general share many characteristics with spouse abusing men (e.g., substance abuse, childhood victimization) (Robinson & Taylor, 1995). The rate of spouse abusing men in federal institutions may in fact range between 40 and 50% given the characteristics of the offender

population and the under-reporting of spouse abuse. Second, reintegration into the community after a period of incarceration is often stressful and can result in new incidents of spousal violence. Often this occurs six to nine months following the offender's release into the community (Solicitor General of Canada, 1991). Thus, forensic professionals need to address the needs of the spouse abusing man prior to release into the community in order to ensure the safety of the spouse. Lastly, violence of any sort and at any level should be viewed as problematic.

Theoretical Perspectives And Risk Factors Of Spousal Violence

At the present time, no single theory has been able to integrate all of the findings of the spouse abuse research. As such, current theories of spousal violence may be considered as theoretical perspectives of spousal violence which have been used to guide empirical studies investigating risk factors and correlates of spousal violence. The current section will briefly address theoretical perspectives of spousal violence, while correlates and risk factors of spousal violence are presented in the next section.

Theoretical Perspectives

Theoretical perspectives can be organized into two broad areas, either person-centered or environmental. The person-centered perspective views characteristics of the man as inherently responsible for the violence. The environmental perspective maintains that spousal violence is the product of the environment in which the person lives. The rest of the section is organized around these central themes.

From these theoretical perspectives, several correlates of spousal violence have been found. These correlates include violence in the family-of-origin, substance use, personality, criminal history, and demographic factors (e.g. employment, education, age, and marital status). Each correlate is discussed in the section on Risk Factors.

Person-Centered Perspective

There are two principal themes to the person-centered perspective of spousal violence. The first theme attributes the behavior of the spouse abuser to personality and psychological disturbances (Bersani, Pendleton, & Denton, 1992; Dutton, Starzomski, & Ryan, 1996; Hastings & Hamberger, 1988; Hastings & Hamberger, 1991; Maiuro, Cahn, & Vitaliano, 1986), and the second maintains that spousal assault incidents are associated with the consumption of alcohol or other drugs by the spouse abuser. Results are presented in the Risk Factor section to illustrate the relationship between personality and spousal violence as well as substance use and spousal violence.

Environmental Perspective

The majority of spouse abuse themes maintain that the behavior of the abuser can be explained in the context of the man's family-of-origin and the society in which he lives. In total, there are five themes: inter-generational transmission, sociological/frustration-aggression, spousal violence as a subset of violence in general, feminist/social norms/pro-abuse attitudes, and ecological perspective.

Intergenerational transmission. The intergenerational transmission of family violence is frequently implicated in a social learning explanation of battering; i.e. observations of parental violence as a child or as an adolescent may serve as an effective "education" tool

of the role of violence in intimate relationships (Edelsson et al., 1985; Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986). Batterers may also try to “explain away” their behavior by blaming their childhood for their violent behavior (Edelsson, et al., 1985). The batterer is then able to justify his violent behavior as a condition which developed from childhood, and offer an opportunity for the batterer to portray his violent behavior as the result of fate rather than personal responsibility (Edelsson et al. 1985). Findings of spousal violence research presented later will illustrate the relationship between intergenerational transmission and spousal violence.

Sociological perspective/frustration-aggression perspective. One prominent sociological perspective maintains that spouse abuse is caused by the interaction of social class, social isolation, and situational stress factors (Howell & Pugliesi, 1988; Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986). According to this theory, a man will experience frustration as well as anger and anxiety when he is prevented from reaching a desired goal (Howell & Pugliesi, 1988). For example, those in lower socioeconomic status groups may experience more frustrations than those in higher status groups because of fewer opportunities for achievement, power, prestige and/or income (Howell & Pugliesi, 1988). The frustration experienced as a result of these structural contingencies can result in aggressive actions towards the spouse (Howell & Pugliesi, 1988). The relationship between social class and spousal violence will be presented in the Risk Factor section.

Family violence as a subset of violence in general. Family violence is increasingly being viewed as a general form of violence. For many years, spousal violence was considered separately from violent crime (Appleford, 1989; Shields, McCall, & Hanneke,

1988). The term spousal violence described the violent actions carried out by violent husbands, whereas violent crime described the traditional violent offender (Shields et al., 1988). In recent years, there has been empirical evidence to indicate that some men who are violent with their spouse are also violent with strangers, suggesting a possible overlap between spousal violence and violent crime.

Feminist/social norms/attitudinal. These themes espouse that spouse abuse is a manifestation of a male-dominated society. According to this perspective, spouse abuse does not simply reflect the violence which exists between a husband and his spouse but is an inherent component of a male-dominated society. Society's tolerance of spouse abuse is a reflection of a patriarchal system which legitimizes male dominance in marriage (Smith, 1990; Yllo & Straus, 1990). Male dominance in the marriage is required in order to maintain subordination of their wives (Yllo & Straus, 1990).

The feminist/societal norm/attitudinal theme has been widely adopted by spouse abuse treatment programs. These programs are structured to educate the spouse abuser about myths surrounding male/female roles and husband/wife roles. Moreover, this theme has had a strong influence in establishing battered women shelters (Appleford, 1989).

Ecological. The ecological perspective is an eclectic perspective that integrates many of the spouse abuse themes outlined above into a single perspective. It contains four sub-systems: the macrosystem, the exosystem, the microsystem, and the ontogenetic system (Appleford, 1989).

The macrosystem takes into account the attitudes and beliefs espoused by patriarchal and societal norms. The exosystem contains the sociological theme, and takes into

consideration such factors as unemployment and family stress. The microsystem includes the interactions in the spousal relationship, such as autonomy and control, and global investment in the relationship. Lastly, the ontogenetic system includes the childhood history of the individual and personality factors.

Given that an array of factors have been found to be correlated with spouse abusing men, the ecological perspective appears to have the most merit. It combines the contributions of the various approaches into a single theoretical perspective, and is able to account for the heterogeneity in the spouse abusing population.

Risk Factors Of Spousal Abusers

The published literature pertaining to domestic violence has grown geometrically since its inception three decades ago. At present, there are a host of presumed causes and predictors of adult spousal violence. The current section is restricted to risk factors of male to spouse violence. A risk factor refers to “an attribute or characteristic that is associated with an increased probability” (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986, p.102) of men using violence with their spouse. The presence of a risk factor does not imply that it is a causal factor (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986). The literature regarding risk factors for domestic violence appear to be configured around five predominate themes (Edelson et al., 1985). These themes are: (1) violence in the man’s family of origin, (2) personality characteristics, (3) attitudes, (4) substance abuse and violence, (5) demographic and relationship variables, and (6) criminological factors. The rest of this section is organized around these central themes.

Violence in the man’s family of origin. The inter-generational transmission of family

violence is perhaps one of the most common findings in the family violence literature (Appleford, 1989). In effect, it has been found that a significant proportion of abusive males have a childhood history of physical and emotional abuse in their family backgrounds (Appleford, 1989; Caesar, 1988; Edelsson et al., 1985; Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986; Howell & Pulglesi 1988). For instance, a review of 52 case-comparison studies by Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) found that violence in the man's family of origin was frequently documented amongst spouse abusers (i.e., married, common-law, engaged). Over half the studies ($n=29$) reported a childhood history of spousal violence.

Howell and Pugliesi (1988) used a multivariate approach to assess the independent and combined effects of age, occupational status, parental modeling and employment status on self-reported violence by husbands against wives. The researchers found that observations of inter-parental violence had an effect independent of the other factors considered. In fact, males who had witnessed parental violence as children were 3 times as likely as those not observing inter-parental violence to be involved in spousal violence. Similarly, Caesar (1988) found spouse abusers were significantly more likely than non-abusive males to have a childhood history of spousal abuse.

Of significance, witnessing spousal violence, rather than experiencing child abuse, has been found to be more consistently related with incidents of spousal violence as an adult (e.g., Hotaling & Sugarman, 1988, Caesar, 1988). For instance, Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) found that witnessing violence as a child was significantly related to spousal violence in at least 14 of the 16 studies reporting childhood histories of spousal

violence. In comparison, experiencing child abuse was not as consistently related to future incidents of spousal violence. Only 9 of the 13 studies reported that the spouse abuser had experienced violence as a child or adolescent.

While a childhood history of domestic violence may increase the likelihood for future incidences of spousal violence, it does not in itself explain the batterer's behavior. Not all children with a family history of domestic violence develop into abusive males, and conversely, many abusive males do not have a childhood history of domestic violence (Caesar, 1988; Sonkin, 1988). In fact, Caesar (1988) found 38% of the batterers did not have a history of violence in their family-of-origin, and 28% of the comparison subjects were exposed to violence and were not physically abusive in their intimate relationships. There is little doubt that violence in the family-of-origin is an influential risk factor of domestically abusive behavior, especially a childhood history of witnessing parental violence. However its absence from the childhood background of some abusive males, and the fact that not all males from violent childhoods become spouse abusers, indicates that there must be mediating factors in the relationship between this risk factor and future violence in adult relationships (Edelsson et al., 1985). Hence, the factor of violence in the family-of-origin must act in concert with other factors to produce the behavior exhibited by domestically abusive males.

Personality correlates. Several studies have attempted to ascertain a batterer profile with a variety of personality factors (Bersani et al., 1992; Dutton et al., 1996; Hastings & Hamberger, 1988; Hamberger & Hastings, 1991; Maiuro et al., 1986). A brief review of these findings is presented.

Hastings and Hamberger (1988) compared male spouse abusers to age-matched, non-abusive males on measures of personality style, personality disorder, and unhappiness. On the whole, batterers were more alienated, more sensitive to rejection, more in need of approval, and less conforming to social conventions. There was evidence of higher levels of anxiety, depression, somatic complaints, and alcohol and drug abuse problems. Moreover, batterers were found to display more symptoms of borderline personality disorder and passive-aggressive tendencies. A few years later, Hamberger and Hastings (1991) extrapolated from their previous study. The sample size was increased to permit matching of subjects by age and education from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds. Once again, batterers as a group showed higher levels of personality pathology, aggressiveness, and passive-aggressiveness.

Hastings and Hamberger (1988) and Hamberger and Hastings (1991) have also compared batterers with and without alcohol problems to non-batterers on the personality measures. This was done in an effort to control for the interactive effect of alcohol abuse with other personality factors. Nonalcoholic batterers shared many characteristics with alcoholic batterers; however, they were less hostile and had fewer personalized perceptual distortions. Overall, alcoholic batterers had the most severe psychopathology; they were extremely moody, volatile, depressed, and alienated. If the alcoholic batterer perceived himself to have been wronged, he responded vindictively, aggressively, and violently.

Maiuro et al. (1986) examined assertiveness and anger/hostility in a sample of domestically abusive males in comparison to non-abusive males. Assertiveness was differentiated into two types; the ability to refuse a demand or request and the ability to

initiate a request of a personal need in a direct and positive manner. There was no significant difference between the two groups on the former type of assertiveness; however, the domestically violent group had more difficulty on the latter. It appears that the domestically violent group has few problems in protecting their rights and property, yet that they have significant difficulty expressing their wants and needs in a positive and socially appropriate manner. Additionally, there was evidence of a significant and negative relationship between initiating behavior and covert anger/hostility. This suggests spouse abusers may have difficulties in expressing their needs to their others, and when their needs are not met, they may become angry and frustrated. Bersani et al. (1992) also found that batterers were extremely outgoing and enjoyed social interactions; however, their manner of interaction with others was often filled with conflict and hostility. They also had a high level of internal conflict, and very rigid viewpoints.

As poignantly stated by Hastings and Hamberger (1988), many domestically-abusive males have a “Jekyll and Hyde” persona. During their habitual interactions, they may appear charming, calm, outgoing and may act in a prosocial manner. All in all, they appear “normal.” When their interactions, however, become more personal and intimate in nature, the negative features of the batterer emerge. This often occurs when they perceive their sense of personal control in their relationships to be threatened. At which time, they will react violently and abusively.

In summation, spouse abusers may be perceived as “normal” by non-family members due to their calm and prosocial behavior. However, spouse abusers appear to be more psychologically distressed, unhappy, volatile, and alienated in comparison to non-abusive

males. According to Hastings and Hamberger (1988), their perception of intimate and personal situations is distorted, and this can lead spouse abusers to overreact to situations both violently and aggressively.

Attitude. Several studies have found spouse abusing men to have attitudes and beliefs that are more supportive of spousal violence than non-abusing men. Further, there have been findings to suggest that the incidence of spouse abuse may be higher in regions that have high levels of gender inequality in the workforce.

Yllo and Straus (1990) examined the relationship between patriarchy and spouse abuse in the U.S. Overall, the researchers found a curvilinear relationship between patriarchal structure and the severity of spousal violence. Spouse abuse was greatest in States which had the greatest inequality in economic, educational, political, and legal institutions. Similarly, those states which had the most structural equality had high rates of spousal violence. An interaction between societal norms and structural factors accounts for this finding. Spousal violence was more common in States where the women's status in economic, political, education, and legal institutions was high, but where the norm favored their subordination in the marriage.

Smith (1990) examined supportive attitudes of spousal violence. In this study, 604 currently or formerly married or cohabitating women (18 years or older) from the Toronto area were randomly surveyed. Husbands who maintained beliefs and attitudes supportive of patriarchy were more likely to have assaulted their spouse than husbands who did not share similar beliefs. Moreover, husbands of lower-income, less education, and low status jobs were significantly more likely to espouse to an ideology of family patriarchy.

Unfortunately, the findings of this study have limited generalizability since it relies upon the wife's accounts of her husbands ideological views.

Neidig, Friedman, and Collins (1988) examined attitudes toward women among a sample of spouse abusing men in the military and a matched sample of non-abusive men. The measure of attitudes toward women did not significantly differentiate the two samples. Neidig et al. (1988) proposes that measures of stress and marital adjustment are better predictors of spouse abusing males than measures of attitudes towards women. The study's results, however, were founded on a military population. The generalizability of the findings may be limited to the military population.

Hanson and Wallace-Capretta (in press) examined pro-abuse attitudes (i.e., justification of spouse abuse), sexist attitudes, and abuse among Canadian men and their spouses. Overall, a moderate correlation was found between pro-abuse attitudes and abusive behavior, as well as sexist attitudes and abusive behavior. The strength of the correlation was similar regardless of whether the report of abuse was provided by the wife or the spouse. In addition, it was found that abusive males had significantly more pro-abuse attitudes and more sexist abusive attitudes than non-abusive males.

In summation, empirical evidence suggests that attitudes of gender roles of spouse abusing men are more conservative than non-spouse abusing men.

Substance use and spousal violence. The relationship between substance use and domestic violence has attracted a lot of attention from researchers and practitioners alike (Edelsson et al., 1988). For the most part, the literature has been focused on the relationship between alcohol use and spouse abuse. Overall, a high correlation has been

established between alcohol usage and spousal violence (Rosenbaum & O'Leary; 1981; Sonkin, 1988).

Roberts (1987) examined the relationship between domestic abusive behavior and several psychosocial variables of 234 men from Indianapolis with charges of domestic abuse. Alcohol and/or drug usage were among the factors examined. Of the total sample, 164 (70.5%) of the men were under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs during the domestically-violent incident. Sixty percent of the abusers were solely under the influence of alcohol at the time of the abusive incident. Although not as common, drug usage was found in approximately one third (32.3%) of the batterers. In addition, less than a quarter of the sample of men (21.8%) were under the influence of both alcohol and drugs. Similar results were obtained by Robinson and Taylor (1995) using a sample of incarcerated male offenders. Alcohol usage was found to be strongly and significantly correlated with spousal violence; however, significantly fewer offenders with a problem of drug abuse had a history of being violent towards their partner.

Kaufman Kantor and Straus (1990) examined the relationship between alcohol consumption and marital violence among 5,159 American couples. The authors' findings suggest that the male's usual pattern of drinking behavior is directly related to the rate of spousal abuse; namely, as the drinking behavior increased in severity from abstain to binge drinking, there was a higher percentage of violence between spouses. In comparison to men who abstained or who were low to low-moderate drinkers, the spousal assault rate amongst males classified at the extreme end of the continuum (ie., high drinkers and bingers) more than doubled. Statistics Canada's national survey of Violence Against

Women (Rodgers, 1995) also found that spousal violence increased monotonically with drinking behavior. In particular, men who drank regularly (minimum four times per week) assaulted their female partner at a rate that was triple the rate of assaultive men who never drank. Further, the rate of wife assault increased to sixfold for woman residing with partners who frequently consecutively consumed five or more drinks.

There are limitations to the research linking substance abuse and spousal abuse. Edlsson et al. (1985), for example, point out that the samples in many studies are clients of social services or criminal populations. High incidences of substance use has been recorded in both populations. Moreover, disentangling the role of substance use in the violent event has been difficult. Very few studies directly assess whether substance use immediately preceded the violent episode. Amongst those studies which attempt to establish a causal link, there is wide variability of the role of chemical use in the incident. And although a relationship between substance use and wife abuse has been repeatedly touted in the literature, not all substance users are wife abusers and not all wife abusers are substance users. For instance, Kaufman Kantor and Straus (1990) found that 80% of binge drinkers in a one year period had not been violent with their wives. In sum, there is evidence to support a link between substance use and wife abuse. However, the nature of the relationship is ambiguous and remains to be clarified.

Demographic and relationship factors. Demographic correlates of wife abusers and their relationship status have been examined in numerous studies. The most common demographic factors assessed are age of the abuser, occupational status or employment status, income, and educational level. Relationship factors include marital status (i.e.,

married, dating, co-habiting).

Spouse abusers tend to be younger than non-abusers (Howell & Pugliesi, 1988; Robinson & Taylor, 1995; Rodgers, 1994). Statistics Canada's national survey on Violence Against Women (1994) found that the incidence of wife assault declined with age. In general, males (community residents and incarcerated offenders) under 40 tend to be more abusive with their spouses than males above this age mark (Cadsky & Crawford, 1988; Caesar, 1988; Hart et al., 1994; Howell & Pugliesi, 1988), with an average age range of early 20's to middle 30's (Edelson et al., 1985; Roberts, 1987; Rodgers, 1994). Howell and Pugliesi (1988), for instance, found males below the age of 40 were three times more likely to be violent with their spouses than males above the age of 40. Howell and Pugliesi (1988) suggest that the age-related difference in spousal violence may be partially due to under-developed coping strategies among younger males. They postulate that coping skills may improve with age; thus, older males may be more adept with coping with various stressors.

Spouse abusers, in comparison to non-abusing spouses, are generally reported to be either unemployed or occupy blue collar positions (e.g., construction worker) (e.g., Caesars, 1988; Howell & Pugliesi, 1988; Rodgers, 1994), and have lower levels of education (e.g., Rodgers, 1994; Roberts, 1987). Of significance, Howell and Pugliesi (1988) found that unemployment status had a much stronger effect on younger males. For males under 40, being unemployed increased the rate of spousal violence by a factor of 19. In comparison, unemployment for older males (above 40 years of age) increased the rate of violence by a factor of 3. In contrast, the Violence Against Woman survey (Rodgers,

1994) reported that more men who were employed than unemployed had been violent towards their partner. The sociological/frustration perspective may account for the higher incidence of spousal violence among lower income men; i.e., men of lower socioeconomic status may experience high levels of frustration and anger because of fewer employment opportunities, power, lower income, and less ability to financially support their spouse and/or their family (Howell & Pugliesi, 1988). With respect to their extent of education, spouse abusers in both the community and in the institution frequently have less than a high school education (Hart et al., 1994; Robinson & Taylor, 1995; Rodgers, 1994).

In general, couples who are in common-law relationships have higher rates of spousal violence in comparison to couples that either are married or are dating (Hart et al., 1994; Roberts, 1987; Rodgers, 1994; Stets & Straus, 1990). Stets and Straus (1990) found this effect to be independent of age and education; however, occupational status does have a significant interaction with marital status. The assault rate was the highest for men in a co-habiting relationship and who held blue collar jobs (31%). The lowest assault rate was for married men with white collar jobs (24%). The Violence Against Women survey (Rodgers, 1994) also found newer marriages to have the highest rate of spousal assault. Marriages of less than two years, for example, had the highest rate of violence in the past year (8%). In comparison, marriages of more than 20 years reported the lowest rate (1%).

In sum, domestically-violent men are generally in their twenties or thirties and have a low level of education. There also appears to be a higher percentage of blue collar workers and unemployed men among spouse abusing men. The sampling pool used for the batterer research, however, may account for this finding. Researchers often rely on women from

battered women shelters for their study. Women residing in shelters are frequently from homes of lower socioeconomic status (Bonnie Hutchinson Enterprises, 1988). With respect to their relationship status, it appears that men who are co-habiting or who have lived with their spouse for less than 10 years have a higher rate of spouse abuse (Edelson et al., 1985).

Criminal history. Few studies have examined the criminal history of spouse abusers. For the most part, studies exploring criminal factors have sampled from a population of spouse abusing men who are presently in contact with the law (i.e., incarcerated or on probation).

Several researchers have found that prior convictions for criminal offenses are common among men with a history of wife assault (Hanson et al., 1997; Hart et al., 1994; Roberts, 1987; Robinson & Taylor, 1995). Roberts (1987), for instance, found 60% of wife abusers had a prior history of criminal charges, and many of the men had more than one charge filed against them. Most of these charges (77%) were for minor offenses (i.e., public intoxication, disorderly conduct, possession of an illegal drug). Hanson et al. (1997) found abusive men, in comparison to non-abusive men, to have significantly more criminal convictions for impaired driving, license suspensions, and serious motor accidents. A minority of the offenders (14%) in Roberts (1987) study had prior convictions for major felony offenses (i.e., rape, robbery, criminal assault, theft, and burglary). However, this small group of offenders were responsible for a considerable proportion of the offenses (23%). Hanson et al. (1997) also found spouse abusers to have significantly more violent offenses than non-abusive men.

With respect to conditional sentencing and juvenile records, significantly more offenders with a history of spouse abuse are on probation rather than parole or bail (Hart et al., 1994; Hanson et al., 1997), and fewer offenders with a history of wife assault have been found to have a juvenile record in comparison to other offenders (Hart et al., 1994).

Several criminological factors have been found to not be significantly related to spouse abuse. Robinson and Taylor (1995), for instance, found that amongst incarcerated spouse abusers there was no significant difference with respect to revocation or suspension of conditional release, prior incarceration, aggregate sentence of over 3 years, assaults against strangers, and offense type. Hanson et al. (1997) found spouse abusers were not significantly different in regards to age at first conviction, total time in prison, number of property offenses, drug offenses, and total convictions.

Although the literature on the spouse abuse criminal history is sparse, there appears to be a few general trends. First, men with a history of wife assault have a criminal history which includes both violent and non-violent offenses. Second, a juvenile criminal history is less common among offenders with a history of wife assault than among other offenders. And lastly, a larger proportion of offenders with a history of wife assault are on probation.

Summary

In sum, an array of factors have been found to be correlated with spouse abusing men. For instance, a childhood history of spousal violence (especially witnessing spousal violence) is frequently reported by spouse abusing men. A relationship has also been established for substance abuse and spousal violence. Interestingly, the correlation is

stronger for alcohol abuse than drug abuse. Moreover, commonalities have been found amongst spouse abusing men for several demographic variables. In general, spouse abusing men appear to be younger than 40 years of age, are unemployed or hold a blue collar position, and have less than high school education. In addition, men in common-law relationships are more likely to abuse their spouses than men who are either married or in dating relationships. Lastly, a proportion of spouse abusing men have a history of criminal offenses (violent and non-violent). Frequently, their offence history includes drug and alcohol related offences. Spouse abusing men with conditional sentences are also more likely to be on probation than parole or bail.

Batterer Typology

Research exploring the correlates of spouse abusing men have, in general, treated spouse abusers as a homogenous group (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). The implication of homogeneity is that spouse abusers share similar qualities; i.e., psychological, behavioral, and demographic factors. The concept of homogeneity in the spouse abusing population, however, is increasingly being questioned due to discrepancies and contradictions in the spousal violence literature (Dutton, 1988; Gondolf, 1988). Spouse abusers appear to vary both in degree and in kind (Dutton, 1995). There have been variations in demographics, behavior, personality, and attitude. In addition, batterers as a group have been shown to be inconsistent with respect to their choice of victim(s) (spouse and strangers or spouse), as well as severity and frequency of the violence perpetrated against the victim(s). These variations amongst spouse abusers have raised the question as to whether the stereotype of the spouse abuser can in fact be applied to all members of the

spouse abusing population (Gondolf, 1988).

Over the past decade, there has been increasing interest in the concept of a typology of spouse abusers. In essence, researchers have been attempting to identify relatively homogenous classes of spouse abusers within spouse-abusing populations through the use of cluster analysis (Skinner, 1981). For the most part, researchers have adopted a categorical model in which the men are grouped into discrete classes. Classes are generated on the basis of one of three indices: “(a) the severity of marital physical violence and related abuse, such as frequency of the violence and psychological and sexual abuse; (b) the generality of the violence (i.e., family-only or extra-familial violence) and related variables such as criminal behavior and legal involvement; and (c) the batterer’s psychopathology or personality disorders” (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; p.481).

Gondolf (1988) established a batterer typology from intake interviews with battered women residing in shelters. Information was gathered regarding the history of spousal violence, demographics of the male partner, and the extent of the spouse’s generality of violence. Using cluster analysis, three groups of spouse abusers emerged and were labeled: sociopathic, antisocial, and typical batterers.

The sociopathic abuser (5%-8% of the sample) is described as extremely abusive towards his wife and children. In all probability, he is sexually abusive, and weapons are involved in the violent incidents. His behavior following the abusive incident is extremely diverse and unpredictable; it includes blame, threats, or sexual demands of the victim. This type of abuser also has had more marital unions (3 or more) than the other abuser types. Lastly, the sociopathic abuser can be distinguished from the other abuser

subtypes by his extensive arrest record for non-family violence, and his wide range of arrests for property and drug-or alcohol-related crimes.

The antisocial batterer (30%-40% of the sample) is abusive physically as well as verbally towards his partner. The antisocial batterer, like the sociopathic batterer, has a history of general violence; however, it is not as extensive and as a result there is a lower incidence of arrest. In comparison to the sociopathic batterer, the incidence of drug and alcohol abuse is considerably lower. Similarly, there are significantly fewer arrests for such offences as robbery and drunken driving.

Finally, the typical abuser “conforms more to the prevailing clinical profiles of batterers” (Gondolf, 1988; p.197). Overall, the abuse is less severe with respect to the use of verbal, physical, and sexual abuse towards family members, and the typical abuser is less likely to use weapons. Following abusive incidents, the typical abuser feels remorse for his behavior and will apologize to his spouse. Lastly, the batterer’s antisocial behavior, general violence, and arrest record is significantly lower than the sociopathic or antisocial batterer subtypes.

Cadsky and Crawford (1988) distinguished batterers according to the object of the subject’s violence. Thus, batterers were grouped into either wife assaulters (men who assault their partners only) or mixed assaulters (men who assault their partners and non-family members). There were trends and significant differences between batterer types in terms of upbringing and childhood behavior, alcohol consumption, criminal behavior, DSM-III diagnoses, and attitudes and scores on psychological tests (Cadsky & Crawford, 1988).

On the whole, the mixed assaulter group were younger than the wife assaulter group. Men in the mixed assaulters group were reported as aggressive, experiencing greater situational dyscontrol, and unhappy with themselves. Although violence in the family-of-origin was a common factor to both groups, the mixed assaulter group reported witnessing and experiencing more parental violence, and requiring more medical attention as a result of domestic physical abuse experienced as a child. Mixed assaulters also left home at a significantly earlier age than wife assaulters. Lastly, significantly fewer mixed assaulters were married, and current relationships were significantly shorter in duration. Mixed assaulters also had a higher rate of partner violence in previous relationships.

Mixed assaulters were more likely to engage in violent and antisocial behavior as children (e.g., arrested as juvenile, setting fires, school truancy, involved in physical fights), and the antisocial behavior carried into adulthood. As adults, mixed assaulters were more likely to be diagnosed with Antisocial Personality Disorder (APD). They had their first conviction at an earlier age, and they were convicted more times in comparison to wife assaulters. Moreover, the mixed assaulter group had more convictions for violent offenses, and offenses involving strangers. Lastly, there was a significant difference in DSM-III diagnoses of alcohol abuse, and for drunken driving arrests; more than half of the mixed assaulters and a third of wife assaulters had been diagnosed for alcohol abuse, and almost half of the mixed assaulters and a third had been arrested for driving while under the influence of alcohol.

Shields et al. (1988) also differentiated spouse abusers according to their object of violence; Generally Violent men and Family-Only men. Many of their findings appear to

be congruent with those of Cadsky and Crawford (1988). Generally Violent men were violent with both spouses and others (family members, acquaintances, and strangers). Interestingly, the same degree of severity of violence was used with spouses as with others. These men were more likely to be abusing illegal drugs and to be involved in gambling. They were more likely to seek help for drug and alcohol problems, and were more likely to be involved in professional crime. In contrast, Family-Only men had fewer marital relationships, they were more law-abiding, had fewer problems with drugs, and they had higher occupational status. Although the overall severity of violence was higher for Generally Violent abusers, Family-Only men were reported to be more severely violent with their spouse. However, Family-Only men were more likely to feel remorse after the violent incident. These men were also more likely to seek counseling help for marital problems. Of significance, Family-Only men experienced more childhood victimization; a finding that was contrary to Cadsky and Crawford's (1988) study.

Hanson et al. (1997) attempted to establish a batterer typology based on the severity of spouse abuse. Their sample was divided into three mutually exclusive categories; non-abusive men (no reports of spousal violence), moderately abusive men (i.e., physically assaulted his partner), and severely abusive men (physically assaulted his partner and threatened with a weapon). Distinguishing subtypes according to severity of violence failed to identify distinct differences between the two groups of maritally violent men; severely and moderately abusive men had similar problems, only the problems of the severely abusive men were more severe. Failure to find distinct group differences may be due to the sample used in the study. First, the majority of the sample consisted of men

selected from a forensic outpatient clinic ($n=780$). Thus, the sample may have been homogenous with respect to a variety of characteristics associated with criminal, violent, and antisocial behavior. Many of the men had a history of violence outside of the family or sexual assault, while a proportion of the men (5%) were being treated for a serious mental disorder that was believed to have contributed to their criminal behavior. Hence, there were few significant differences between the moderate and severe maritally violent men of the forensic sample. Secondly, a sample of men from an unemployment center ($n=217$) were also included in the study. It is possible that there may have been insufficient variability on several of the demographic variables (i.e., education, employment histories, education) to produce significant differences for the sample base that was selected for this study (Hanson et al, 1997).

Saunders (1992) cluster analyzed the responses of 165 spouse abusers on their background history, spousal violence history, use of generalized violence, alcohol use, attitudes towards women, and several personality characteristics. Three clusters were found and were labeled: Family-Only aggressors, Generalized aggressors, and Emotionally Volatile aggressors.

The Family-Only men were least likely to be violent outside the home. On the whole, they were not assertive, avoided conflict, and they had lower levels of depression. In general, they were least likely to be psychologically abusive towards their spouse. Alcohol use was associated with the violent incident half the time. Several of the men had been arrested for driving while intoxicated. In comparison to the other groups, Family-Only men reported higher levels of marital satisfaction, and lower levels of marital

conflict. They also were least likely to have been severely abused as children.

Generally Violent men were more likely to be severely violent both inside and outside the home. Although there was a high prevalence of severe abuse during childhood, Generally Violent men had the lowest levels of depression and anger. Their violence was associated with alcohol use, and they had high rates of arrest for drunk driving and violence. Men in this group held very rigid attitudes of sex roles. Lastly, their level of marital satisfaction and marital conflict was moderate in comparison to the other groups.

The third group, Emotionally Volatile, were younger and better educated. These men had the highest level of anger, depression, and jealousy, and were more likely to be suicidal. Although they were not as severely violent as the Generally Violent men, they were more psychologically abusive than either the Family-Only or Generally Violent men (Saunders, 1992). Of significance, alcohol use was not strongly correlated with spousal violence. Lastly, these men had the least satisfaction with their marital relationships, and were the most likely to receive marital counseling.

Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) conducted a review of the literature on batterer typologies ($n=15$) and found three major subtypes of batterers could be identified. The subtypes were organized around three central themes: the severity of physical violence towards the spouse, the target of the violence (i.e, the spouse, spouse and stranger) and the batterer's criminal behavior and legal involvement, and batterer's psychopathology. They refer to these subtypes as "family only", "dysphoric/borderline", and "generally violent/antisocial".

The "family only" batterers were involved in the least severe marital violence and were

the least likely to engage in psychological and sexual abuse. It was found that the men in this group generally restricted their violence to family members. Moreover, there was little evidence of psychopathology, and either no personality disorder or a passive-dependent personality disorder. Approximately 50% of batterers in treatment programs and residing in the community fall within this category. This type of batterer is comparable to Gondolf's (1988) typical batterer, Saunder's (1992) and Shields et al. (1988) "family-only" batterer (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994).

The "dysphoric/borderline" batterers were moderately and severely abusive towards their spouses. In addition to being physically abusive, they were psychologically and sexually abusive. Although violence was primarily confined to family members, there was evidence of extra-familial violence and criminal behavior. It was found that these men were the "most dysphoric, psychologically distressed, and emotionally volatile" (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994, p.482). Furthermore, these batterers may exhibit borderline and schizoid personality characteristics and may have alcohol and drug abuse problems. Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) estimate that this group should constitute approximately 25% of batterer samples. Many of the properties possessed by this group are also common to Gondolf's (1988) typical batterer, and the "family-only" batterers of Cadsky and Crawford (1988) and Shields et al., (1988) (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994).

The "generally violent/antisocial" batterers were involved in moderate to severe marital violence, including psychological and sexual abuse. The violence in this group was not limited to the family; these men had a history of extra-familial violence and a

history of criminal behavior. Alcohol and drug abuse were prevalent amongst this subtype. Moreover, they were the most likely to have an antisocial personality disorder or psychopathy. Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) estimate that 25% of batterer samples will belong to this group. This subtype is most similar to Gondolf's (1988) antisocial and sociopathic batterers, and both Saunderson's (1992) and Cadsky and Crawford's (1988) "generally violent" abuser (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994).

The subtypes identified by Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) were tested by Hamberger et al. (1996) using data from 833 abusive men in a domestic counseling program. Using a clustering method, a three-cluster solution was identified on the basis of a psychometric personality test. Batterers were partitioned into three mutually exclusive groups: Nonpathological, Antisocial, and Passive Aggressive-Dependent.

The Nonpathological batterers were similar to the "family only" batterers proposed by Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994). This subtype limited its violence to intimate partners. They showed no personality disorders, and had the lowest depression, anger proneness, violence severity and self-reported violence frequency. Moreover, these men were the least likely to report alcohol problems and prior counseling histories. Their extent of childhood history (witnessing and experiences) of parental violence, as well as their criminal history, were intermediate to the other groups.

The Antisocial cluster is similar to the "generally violent/antisocial" batterers identified by Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994). These men were the most generally violent and had the most extensive police records for both violent and nonviolent crimes (i.e., acting-out offenses). With respect to partner violence, antisocial batterers reported

significantly more severe and frequent violence in comparison to the “family only” batterer. This group was also found to be the most antisocial, narcissistic, histrionic, and were more anger prone. These men did report the greatest likelihood of alcohol abuse by their mothers. Lastly, a higher number of men in this group had some college education, and were younger than the men in the other clusters.

The Passive-Aggressive subtype was consistent with the “dysphoric/ borderline” type from the Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) model. The generality of violence for the men in this group is intermediate to the “family only” batterers and the “antisocial” batterer; i.e., they showed higher rates of partner-only violence than the antisocial subtype, and higher rates of extra-familial violence than “family only” batterers. Similarly, rates of police contact for both violent and nonviolent acting out offences were intermediate to the other two clusters. However, this group did report a higher frequency of partner violence. They also had higher rates of child abuse victimization, and more extensive histories of prior alcohol and drug abuse counseling. Lastly, the men in this group were found to be depressed significantly more often.

In comparison to past research in the area of batterer typology, the work of Hamberger et al., (1996) has several advantages. Namely, it attempts to replicate a typology established by another researcher. This has been one of the predominant shortcomings of the research in this area (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994), with each new study developing a new typology. In addition, this study used a large sample (833 men) to study the characteristics of men who batter which, in turn, enhanced the reliability of the findings (Hamberger et al. 1996).

Summary

In conclusion, researchers examining the concept of a typology of male batterers have found preliminary support for subtypes of male spouse abusers. In essence, three sub-types of spouse abusers have been identified on the basis of such factors as their severity of violence, their choice of victims, their psychopathology, and their criminal history. Of significance, there have been few differences between the typologies on the basis of sociodemographic factors (e.g., age, education, and employment). Among sub-types, there is a significant sequential escalation in spousal violence, generality of violence, and criminal history. Men in the first sub-type restrict their violence to their spouse, their violence is less severe and they are remorseful after the incident, they have fewer drug and alcohol problems, and have a less extensive criminal history, and they are the least likely to have been abused as a child. Men in the second sub-type may be violent with other family members, acquaintances, and strangers; however, they are violent with their wife more often than they are violent with others. Their violence is also more severe than the “family-only” batterer, and includes threats and weapons. In addition, they have the highest levels of marital conflict, jealousy, and problems with anger control. These men also have moderate alcohol problems and hold rigid views of women. Interestingly, these men were the most likely to have been abused as children. The third subtype is generally classified as the “generally violent”. These men are equally violent with spouses as with others. Their spousal violence is the most severe, and includes physical and sexual abuse, threats, and weapons. They are the least likely to feel remorse following a spousal violent incident, and hold conservative sex role attitudes in comparison to the other

sub-types. Lastly, men in this group have extensive criminal histories, high prevalence of drug and alcohol problems, and poor impulse control.

All in all, the research investigating typologies of batterers have produced valuable descriptive variation in behavior and psychopathology (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). However, typology research in the area of spousal violence needs to move on to the next level of classification research. Similar to other areas of research, classification research consists of a stage of theory formulation, internal validation, and external validation (Skinner, 1981). The first stage, theory formulation, consists of selecting and defining a classification model, and “specifying relationships to external variables (e.g., intervention)” (Skinner, 1981, p.70). The next stage, internal validation, involves selecting appropriate statistical techniques, replicating findings, and evaluating reliability of typology. The final stage, external validation, assesses generalizability of the typology, and examines the validity of the typology (i.e., predictive, descriptive, and clinical). At this point in time, theoretical frameworks have been established; however, more research is needed in the area of internal and external validation. Emphasis has to be placed on the reliability of findings and generalizability of results. Once this has been accomplished then clinical and predictive validity can be addressed.

Present Study

The majority of the research examining a typology of male spouse abusers has drawn its samples from community based treatment programs (e.g., Saunders, 1992; Shields et al., 1988). As such, it is unclear as to whether current typologies of male abusers are

applicable to other populations in general, and more specifically, to a correctional population (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; Straus, 1993). To address this question, the current study assesses whether current typologies are appropriate for federally incarcerated male offenders with a history of spouse abuse.

Federal offenders, as a whole, have many of the behavioral, psychological, demographic, and attitudinal factors associated with the profile of spouse abusing men (Robinson & Taylor, 1995). For instance, both groups often have a high incidence of violence in the family-of-origin, high rates of drug and alcohol abuse, and have a high occurrence of psychiatric and personality disorders (Dutton & Hart, 1992). Replicating the current typologies with federal offenders can be useful to forensic psychologists and correctional policy makers; it can guide sentencing requirements, decisions for conditional release, safety of the spouse and the public, as well as routing the offender to appropriate intervention strategies.

In addition, a batterer typology of spouse abusing offenders could aid in diagnostic assessment (Gondolf, 1988) and the development of appropriate treatment programs for each sub-type (Gondolf, 1988; Moore, Greenfield, Wilson, & Kok, 1997; Saunders, 1992). Current interventions for spouse abusers have been aimed at all types, and as a result may be too broad in their approach (Saunders, 1992). These interventions are generally anger management programs (Appleford, 1989; Gondolf, 1988; Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; Moore et al., 1997), and may be of a duration of six months or less (Sonkin, 1988). Unfortunately, spouse abusing offenders who are high risk and high need are unlikely to benefit from this type of program (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; Gondolf, 1988). In

particular, sociopathic/ generally violent abusers as well as antisocial/emotionally volatile abusers who have a history of abuse and antisocial behavior will receive very little benefit from a program that is too short in duration (Saunders, 1992; Sonkin, 1988) and which is too eclectic in its approach (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; Gondolf, 1988).

Intervention programs for sociopathic/generally violent abusers, for example, may want to place greater emphasis on problems with substance abuse and experiences of childhood victimization, and assertiveness training (Saunders, 1992). In addition, these men may benefit from a program which addresses their violent lifestyle. Antisocial/emotionally volatile spouse abusers may receive greater benefit from cognitive re-structuring programs which address issues of rigid sex roles, jealousy, and depression (Saunders, 1992). Lastly, family-only batterers may receive greater benefit from programs which emphasize communication, and this can be in the form of couples counseling (Saunders, 1992). Couples counseling could be undertaken in the community after the offender has been released. In sum, a batterer typology of offenders can guide correctional service providers in identifying the need areas of the offender, and the type and the level of treatment intervention required.

A second objective of the current study was to examine the rate of recidivism as a function of group membership. Kropp, Hart, Webster, and Eaves (1995) suggest that violent recidivism during the offender's conditional release may be considered as a prognostic indicator of general recidivism and recidivistic spousal assault (Hart et al., 1995). Gaining an understanding of each group's potential rate of violent recidivism can aid correctional services in planning supervision frequency for parole officers (Hamberger

et al., 1996), and safety planning (Hamberger et al., 1996) for the offender's spouse.

The applicability of the batterer typology was assessed for native and non-native offenders separately. The rationale for this was two-fold. First, Robinson & Taylor (1995) found the prevalence of spousal abuse to be higher among native offenders than non-native offenders. Because a substantial proportion of the spouse abusing population were native, it was of interest to determine if the typology would apply to this particular population. And second, community research has generally drawn upon spouse abuse treatment programs (e.g., Caesars, 1988; Hamberger et al., 1996; Roberts; 1987; Saunders, 1992). It has been noted that within these programs Caucasian males are the largest racial group (e.g., Caesar, 1988; Roberts, 1987; Saunders, 1992). As such, batterer typologies have been founded using a sample base that has predominantly consisted of Caucasian men. Although many of the spousal violence risk factors identified with non-native community samples are common to native offenders (i.e., the high rate of childhood victimization in the family-of-origin, the high incidence of substance abuse, and low levels of employment and education) (Johnston, 1997), there was still concern as to whether the typology would apply to native men.

The batterer typology was examined using variables grouped into four domains: Criminal History, Substance Abuse, Family-of-Origin and Marital Relations, and Personal and Emotional Orientation. A domain is a broad category which consists of items that are descriptive of the category. For instance, the criminal history domain contains such items as total number of adult convictions, extent of psychological harm, extent of physical harm, and weapons use. A scale is developed by summing up the scores on the four

domains to produce a weighted composite score. Offenders with a history of spouse abuse are divided into groups on the basis of this scale.

The current study draws upon and extrapolates from community findings. The applicability of the typology was assessed as well as the percentage and rate of recidivism between the groups. In addition, factors related to criminal behavior which have not been studied in previous batterer typology research were investigated. It was felt that these variables can add depth to the current typologies by providing additional dimensions on which the batterer groups may be different. The variables examined pertain to employment, education, mental health, criminal offences, family-of-origin, and marital relations. Given that the applicability of the batterer typology with native offenders was exploratory, the hypotheses assessed with native offenders were the same as non-native offenders. The following hypotheses are offered.

Hypothesis One

Given that the majority of studies have developed three groups within their typology, a batterer trichotomy was followed. For the purpose of this study, these groups were referred to as “family only” batterers, “antisocial” batterers, and “generally violent” batterers. Offenders with a history of spouse abuse can be divided into the three batterer groups using the variables identified in previous studies. It was hypothesized that there will be different levels of endorsement for each domain between batterer groups. Specific differences for each domain are presented in the following sub-hypotheses.

Sub-hypothesis one. With respect to the criminal history domain, it was postulated that men in the “generally violent” batterer group will have the most extensive and violent

criminal history (e.g., greater number of convictions, use of weapons, severe physical harm). In contrast, men in the “family only” batterer group will have less extensive and less violent criminal history. The criminal history of men in the “antisocial” batterer group will be less extensive and less violent than the “generally violent” batterer group, but more extensive than the “family only” batterer group.

Sub-hypothesis two. With respect to the substance abuse domain, it was postulated that the level of severity of substance abuse of the men in the “generally violent” batterer group was greater than the men in the “antisocial” batterer group, and that the level of severity of substance abuse of the men in the “antisocial” batterer group was greater than the men in the “family only” batterer group. For the purpose of this study, the level of severity was reflected by the frequency of substance use (i.e. none vs. frequent vs. binge), and the impact the substance had on the life of the offender (ie., legal violations, marital disruption).

Sub-hypothesis three. With respect to the domain of family-of-origin and marital relations, it was postulated that the dysfunction in the family-of-origin of the men in the “generally violent” batterer group was of a different nature than that of the men in the “antisocial” batterer group and the “family only” batterer group. It was also expected that the dysfunction of the men in “antisocial” batterer group was different than that of the men in the “family only” batterer group. Dysfunction in the family-of-origin included either the presence of spousal abuse, parental dysfunction, and family involved in crime, or any combination of these factors.

Moreover, it was expected that the severity of marital problems of the men in the

“generally violent” batterer group was greater than that of the men in the “antisocial” batterer group and the men in the “family only” batterer group, and that the severity of marital problems of the men in the “antisocial” batterer group was greater than that of the men in the “family only” batterer group. For the purpose of this study, men with a high severity of marital problems endorsed both communication problems and marital dissatisfaction, men with a moderate level of marital problems only endorsed marital dissatisfaction, and men with a low level of marital problems only endorsed marital communication problems.

Sub-hypothesis four. With respect to the domain of personal and emotional orientation, it was postulated that men in the “generally violent” batterer group had severe behavior and emotional problems. Further, these men were the most supportive of domestic violence as well as instrumental violence. Men in the “antisocial” batterer group had moderate emotional and behavior problems. Of the three groups, men in the “antisocial” batterer group were the most likely to hold rigid sex role attitudes. Men in the “family only” batterer group had a low level of emotional and behavior problems. These men also had the most liberal attitudes towards women.

Hypothesis Two

There will be meaningful differences between the groups with respect to general and violent recidivism. The prolific criminal history of the “generally violent” batterer (Gondolf, 1988; Hamberger et al., 1996; Saunders, 1996), and their high rate of previous arrests (Gondolf, 1988), suggests that the highest percentage of men to recidivate will be “generally violent” batterers. In contrast, the limited criminal history of the “family only”

batterers suggests that this group will have the lowest percentage of recidivism. The percentage of “antisocial” batterers to recidivate will be intermediate to the other groups.

Hypothesis Three

There are meaningful differences between the groups with respect to new convictions related to spousal assault. Given that spousal assault recidivists are reported to have an extensive substance abuse history (Babcock & Steiner, 1999; Hamberger & Hastings, 1988) and greater criminal involvement (Babcock & Steiner, 1999), it was postulated the percentage of new convictions related to spousal assault will be highest for men in the “generally violent” batterer group. Men in the “antisocial” batterer group were hypothesized to have a moderate percentage of new convictions related to spousal assault. Despite the criminal record of the “antisocial” batterer, “antisocial” batterers are reported to have the highest rate of program completion (Gondolf, 1988; Saunders, 1992) and program completion has been associated with lower rates of spousal assault recidivism (Babcock & Steiner, 1999). Because “family only” batterers have little or no substance abuse history and a less extensive criminal history, it was postulated that men in the “family only” batterer group had the lowest percentage of new convictions of spousal assault.

Hypothesis four

It was hypothesized that factors related to criminal behavior which have not been studied in previous research of batterer typologies will discriminate the batterer groups. Sub-hypotheses specific for each batterer group are as follows:

Sub-hypothesis one. It was postulated that a greater percentage of men in the

“generally violent” batterer group, in comparison to the other batterer groups, will have a lower level of education and poorer employment histories, more violent crimes, poor relationship with mother or father, financial and sexual problems in marital relationship, and will be victims of spousal violence.

Sub-hypothesis two. It was postulated that a greater percentage of men in the “family only” batterer group had a higher level of education and better employment histories, and non-violent offences. A lower percentage of men in this group, in comparison to the other groups, had mental health problems, an absent mother or father, financial problems or sexual problems, and are victims of spousal violence.

Sub-hypothesis three. It was postulated that a greater percentage of men in the “antisocial” batterer group will have received a psychiatric or psychological diagnosis for a mental disorder than men in the other batterer groups. The percentage of men in the “antisocial” batterer group will be intermediate to the other two groups for each of the other variables.

METHOD

Participants

Two samples were used in the study: a development sample and a test sample. Information regarding each of these samples is provided in their respective sections. Each sample was sub-divided into non-native or native groups. The distinction “non-native” included Arabic, Asiatic, Black, Caucasian, East Indian, and Hispanic, whereas “native” was applied to the Innu, the Inuit, the Metis, and the North American Indian.

Excluded from the study were subjects with an admission offence(s) (past or present) involving a child. Since the present study is not focusing on the issue of family violence, offenders whose victims were children were excluded from the study.

Development sample. The development sample consisted of men admitted to Canadian federal institutions in 1997 who were identified in the Offender’s Intake Assessment (see Measure section for details) as having been abusive towards a spouse. Only offenders sentenced to prison terms of two years or more serve their sentence in a federal institution. The information gathered about these men was used to assess the applicability of the batterer typology and to gather additional descriptive information regarding the characteristics of the batterer types.

There were 5,654 male and female offenders admitted to Canadian federal institutions in 1997. Of these admissions, there were 1,056 (19%) males with a history of spouse abuse. However, 192 of these offenders were excluded from the study because they had a

criminal history involving children, and 17 were excluded because their race was unknown. Therefore, 847 offenders were included in the study. Non-native spouse abusing offenders accounted for 72% ($n=608$) of the male spouse abusing population, while native spouse abusing offenders accounted for 28% ($n=229$) of the male spouse abusers. Interestingly, the percentage of native offenders with a history of spouse abuse is approximately twice the total percentage of natives incarcerated in Canadian federal institutions (15%).

A larger percentage of native offenders (85%) were below the age of 40 than non-native offenders (75%). The age of non-native offenders ranged from 18 years to 68 years, with a mean age of 35 ($SD=8.0$). The age of native offenders ranged from 19 to 65, with a mean age of 32 ($SD=7.9$).

Given that there is an association between the incidence of spousal violence and relationship status (i.e., married, common-law, girlfriend), the percentage of spousal violence was assessed according to relationship status. Most of the non-native and native subjects were involved in either common-law relationships (36% and 42%, respectively) or were single (35% and 44%, respectively). It should be noted that the term single includes dating relationships. A small percentage of the non-native and native men were in a marital relationship (10% and 7%, respectively).

Test sample. The test sample consisted of men identified in the OIA as having been abusive towards a spouse and who were released with a conditional sentence (i.e., day parole, full parole, statutory release) from a federal institution between January 1997 and December 1997. This sample served two purposes. First, it provides a test of the batterer

typology created with the development sample. And second, criminal recidivism and spousal assault recidivism could be examined for the releases.

In 1997, there were 787 men with a history of spouse abuse who were released from federal correctional institutions. Seven of these men were excluded from the study due to an index offence involving children, and 10 were excluded because information on race was not available. There were 571 non-native offenders (73%) and 199 native offenders (26%).

The age of non-native subjects ranged from 18 years to 70 years, with a mean age of 33 ($SD=8.0$). The age of native subjects ranged from 19 to 55, with a mean age of 31 ($SD=7.9$).

Most of the non-native and native subjects were involved in either common-law relationships (38% and 46%, respectively) or were single (37% and 35%, respectively). Marital relationships of non-native and native offenders (10% and 9%, respectively) were less common than either common-law relationships or single status.

Measures

The data in this study were extracted from three areas of the Offender Management System (OMS) maintained by the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC). More specifically, information was obtained from the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA), the Criminal History Profile reports, and Progress Summary and Special Reports. Information extracted from the data base was used to: (i) categorize the spouse abusers and assess group assignment; (ii) cross-tabulate other variables not included in the typology; and (iii) measure recidivism across groups. Each measure and its function are described below.

Offender Intake Assessment (OIA)

The OIA is a comprehensive questionnaire which is completed by case management officers for all offenders admitted to a federal institution. The OIA is completed on the basis of information obtained from both internal and external sources (i.e., courts, police, victims, family members, and employer of offender) as well as assessments of education and employment, psychology, family violence and psychopathy (Taylor, 1998). The assessment has a yes-no-unknown format, and is divided into two broad sections; Criminal Risk Assessment and Case Needs Identification and Analysis. The Criminal Risk Assessment is further divided into three sections; Criminal History Record, Offence Severity Record, and Sex Offence History. The Case Needs Identification section is sub-divided into seven parts based on known criminogenic need areas. These sections are Employment, Marital/Family, Associates/Social interactions, Substance Abuse, Community Functioning, Personal/Emotional Orientation, and Attitude. Responses for risk factors pertinent to the study were obtained from each section, with the exception of the Sex Offence History. Of significance, items from the Criminal History Record and the Offence Severity Record were used as proxies for severity of spousal violence. To illustrate, the level of psychological and physical harm directed at a stranger by the “generally violent” batterer is reported to be at the same level of psychological and physical harm directed at a spouse (Shields et al., 1988). The level of physical and psychological harm indicated in the Offence Severity record represented the level and psychological harm towards the spouse. The extent of psychological and physical harm perpetrated by the “generally violent” batterer is frequently more severe than either the

“antisocial” batterer or the “family only” batterer (Gondolf, 1988).

The internal reliability (alpha coefficient) of the OIA ranges from 0.66 to 0.95 for each of the need domains, suggesting good internal consistency. It also has good predictive validity (Motiuk, 1997). A series meta-analytic reviews and predictive outcome studies have examined the relationship between OIA need and risk factors and criminal recidivism (Brown, 1998). Meta-analytic findings support the overall relationship between each domain and recidivism, with weighted effect sizes between 0.10 and 0.17 (Brown, 1998). Studies examining the OIA’s ability to predict return to prison also have found moderate correlations ($r=0.11$ to $r=0.19$) between OIA factors and return to prison (Motiuk, 1998). Further, meta-analytic findings are consistent with predictive outcome studies examining OIA’s ability to predict recidivism (Brown, 1998). A moderate correlation also has been found with other risk assessment instruments, including the Statistical Information on Recidivism Scale.

Operationalization Of Typology

Spouse abusers in both the development sample and the test sample were classified into three mutually exclusive groups on the basis of four domains: (1) criminal history, (2) substance abuse history, (3) family-of-origin and marital relations, and (4) personal and emotional orientation. Each domain consisted of items, and each item consisted of a set of variables that were descriptive of each batterer group. The variables were selected from the OIA on the basis of a review of the batterer typology literature (Cadsky & Crawford, 1988; Dutton, 1988; Elbow, 1977; Gondolf, 1988; Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994, Hamberger et al., 1996; Hanson et al., 1997; Saunders, 1992; Shields et al., 1988). Tables

1 to 4 describe the items and the variables from each domain for each group.

Criminal history. The reason for the selection of criminal history variables were two-fold. First, Gondolf (1988) has successfully used similar criminogenic variables to group his sample of spouse abusers identified in the community. Second, the literature demonstrates that each group of batterers had a history of criminal activity; however, there were significant differences between the groups with respect to the number of previous arrests, the amount of general violence, and the use of weapons and/or threats (Gondolf, 1988, Saunders, 1992, Hanson et al., 1997; Hamberger et al., 1996). In particular, the total number of violent and drug and alcohol related crimes were higher among “generally violent” batterers in comparison to “family only” batterers. “Antisocial” batterers were intermediate to the other two groups (Gondolf, 1988; Hamberger et al., 1996). In addition, weapon use and threats of harm using a weapon were predominantly found among “generally violent” batterers, while “antisocial” batterers were more likely to threaten their victim(s) without weapons (Gondolf, 1988).

A set of criminal history indicators is used to describe each batterer group. The indicators were taken from the OIA and follow the OIA classification. For example, the OIA has four categories of counts of youth conviction; 1-4, 5-9, 10-14 and 15 or more. The criminal history indicators were used as a measure of the criminal history of the batterer groups. Table 1 provides the criminal history indicators by group classification.

Table 1

Criminal History Indicators Of Group Classification

Item	Batterer group		
	Family-Only	Antisocial	Generally Violent
Total number of youth convictions	0-4	5-9	10 or more
Total number of adult convictions	1-4	5-9	10 or more
Threats &/or weapon use	none	threats of violence	threaten victim with a weapon or used a weapon on victim
Degree of psychological harm	mild	moderate	serious
Degree of physical harm	No injury	minor injury (e.g., hitting)	serious injury (e.g., disfigurement) or caused death

Substance abuse. Although substance use is a common variable to all batterer groups (Gondolf, 1988; Hamberger et al., 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; Shields, 1992), it is more severe and more problematic among “generally violent” batterers than the other two groups. In particular, “generally violent” batterers appear to have more legal infractions due to substance use (Hamberger et al., 1996; Saunders, 1992). Moreover, the marital relations of “generally violent” batterers are more affected by their substance use than the other two groups (Shields et al., 1988). Despite the high rate of substance use amongst “generally violent” batterers, participation in substance abuse treatment programs is not prevalent. Rather, “antisocial” batterers have a higher probability of being involved in a substance abuse program (Hamberger et al., 1996). Despite their higher

level of involvement, “antisocial” batterers had lower levels of substance abuse than “generally violent” batterers (Gondolf, 1988; Hanson et al., 1997). Men in the “family only” batterer group are generally noted as having little or no substance abuse problems (Gondolf, 1988; Hamberger et al., 1996).

Each batterer group is described by a set of substance use indicators. These indicators were used as a measure of substance use of each batterer group. Table 2 provides the substance use indicators by group classification.

Table 2

Substance Abuse Indicators Of Group Classification

Item	Group classification		
	Family-Only	Antisocial	Generally-Violent
Substance abuse	drinks to relieve stress or uses drugs to relieve stress or no substance abuse problem	drinks or uses drugs frequently, or participated in substance abuse program, or completed substance abuse program	<p><i>In order to be placed in this category, need one item from A in addition to Item B and Item C</i></p> <p>A: 1) alcohol or drug abuse (2) binge alcohol or drug use</p> <p>B: Drinking or drug use interferes in family/marital relations</p> <p>C: Drinking or drug use has resulted in law violations</p>

Family-of-origin and marital relations. Family-of-origin and marital relations have also been shown to be significantly different between groups. In general, “antisocial” batterers witness the most spouse abuse between their parents, whereas “family only” batterers are the least likely to witness spousal abuse as children (Hamberger et al., 1996; Saunders, 1992). Moreover, “antisocial” batterers express greater dissatisfaction during their marital relationship. These men are also the most likely to complete marital therapy (Saunders, 1992). “Family only” batterers have greater communication problems with their spouse in comparison to the other groups. Nonetheless, they express the highest level of marital satisfaction (Saunders, 1992).

A set of family-of-origin and marital relations indicators describes each batterer group. These indicators were used as a measure of the family-of-origin and marital relations of each batterer group. Table 3 provides the set of indicators of group classification.

Insert Table 3 About Here

Personal and emotional orientation. Distinct differences on personal and emotional orientation have been found between batterer groups. Antisocial personality disorder (APD) and psychopathy are prevalent among the “generally violent” men (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; Saunders, 1992). These men are also the most supportive of instrumental violence (Saunders, 1992). “Antisocial” batterers are more often asocial, depressed, psychologically distressed, aggressive, and hostile (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). These men hold the most rigid sex-role beliefs and

Table 3

Family-Of-Origin and Marital Relation Indicators Of Group Classification

Item	Group classification		
	Family-Only	Antisocial	Generally Violent
Family-of-origin	did not witness spousal abuse	witnessed spousal abuse	dysfunctional parents (e.g., parental neglect) or family involved in crime
Marital relations	communication problems or not dissatisfied with relationship	dissatisfied with relationship or completed marital counseling	<p><i>To be placed in this category need one item from A and one item from B:</i></p> <p>A: (1) dissatisfied with relationship (2) communication problems</p> <p>B: (1) participated in marital counseling (2) completed counseling</p>

are the most supportive of domestic violence. “Family only” batterers show little psychopathology in comparison to the other groups. In general, these men have problems in asserting their wants and needs in a prosocial manner, have poor conflict resolution, and cope poorly with stress (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; Saunders, 1992).

A set of indicators were used to measure the personal and emotional orientation of each batterer group. The indicators were taken from items available in the OIA, but their selection was based on a review of items used in the Psychopathy Checklist Revised (PCL-R) (Hare, 1991) and the fourth edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM-IV) criteria for APD (American Psychological Association, 1994). These items include grandiose feelings of self, thrill-seeking, unrealistic goals, manipulative, narrow and rigid thinking, and disregard for others. Table 4 provides the set of indicators of each batterer group.

Insert Table 4 About Here

Scoring and classification. A scoring system was used to determine group membership. As shown in the previous sections, items were classified, based on the review of the typologies, into three groups: “Family only” batterers, “antisocial” batterers, and “generally violent” batterers. Given that the groups were designed to be mutually exclusive, a set of hierarchical steps were used for group assignment on each item. Variables of each batterer group were entered in the following order: 1) “generally violent”, 2) “antisocial”, and 3) “family only”. Variables in the “generally violent” group

Table 4

Personal And Emotional Orientation Indicators By Group Classification

Item	Group classification		
	Family-Only	Antisocial	Generally-Violent
Cognition	Do not fulfill factors of Antisocial or Generally Violent	Narrow & rigid thinking or insensitive to others	<i>To be placed in this category, need more than one of the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ grandiose feelings of self ▶ impulsive ▶ disregard for others
Behavior	<i>To be placed in this category, need more than one of the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ poor stress management ▶ assertion problem ▶ poor conflict resolution ▶ interpersonal problem solving poor 	<i>To be placed in this category, need more than one of the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ hostile ▶ low frustration tolerance ▶ aggressive 	<i>To be placed in this category, need more than one of the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ manipulative ▶ takes risks ▶ thrill seeking ▶ unrealistic goals
Attitude	not supportive of domestic violence, or not supportive of instrumental violence, or does not believe women are unequal to men	women and men roles are unequal	<i>To be placed in this category, need more than one of the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ marital relations no value ▶ support domestic violence ▶ support instrumental violence ▶ non-conforming

were assigned a value of 3, in the “antisocial” group a value of 2, and in the “family only” group were assigned a value of 1. Using a stepwise system, offenders that endorsed one or more variables of the “generally violent” batterer group were removed from subsequent group assignment for the item being examined. Endorsement of “antisocial” batterer variables were examined with the remaining offenders. Offenders who endorsed “antisocial” batterer variables were removed from subsequent group assignment for the item being examined. Offenders who did not endorse “antisocial” batterer variables were entered into the next level (i.e., “family only” batterer) and endorsement of “family only” batterer variables were examined with these offenders. Individual items endorsed in each domain were summed to obtain a total domain score for each offender.

Since the number of items in each domain varied and no research was found to indicate that any one domain was more important than another, the domains were weighted so each domain contributed equally to the total cumulative score. The weighted score produces a value between 0 and 3 for each domain. A total cumulative score for each offender was then calculated on the basis of the summation of the weighted domain scores. Using the weighted scores individual scores could range from 0 to 12.

Cut-off scores for group classification were established following an examination of the cumulative percentages of each cumulative weighted score (see Tables 1B in Appendix B) as well as an examination of the distribution of total cumulative weighted scores on a line graph (see Figure 1B in Appendix B). The range of scores for each batterer group were identified by finding points of discontinuity in the curve. These points reflected

shifts in the slope of the curve. The final cut-offs are shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Cut-Off Scores For Batterer Group Classification

Batterer Group	Score Range
Family-only	0-6
Antisocial	7-8
Generally violent	9-12

Assessing group assignment. Given that the selection of cut-off scores was somewhat arbitrary it is necessary to determine if, in general, offenders classified into the three groups actually had the characteristics expected for each group. That is, in general, offenders classified as “family only” batterers should have “family only” items endorsed, and should not have items for the “generally violent” batterer group endorsed.

The test sample was used to assess item endorsement between groups. The percentage of members classified in each batterer group who endorsed the corresponding batterer category for each domain (Tables 1 to 4) were examined. If the classification of batterer types was effectively classifying the offenders, then the members of the “family only” group would show the highest level of endorsement (as reflected by the percentages) of the “family only” category items, the members of the “antisocial” group would show the highest level of endorsement of the “antisocial” batterer category items, and the members of the “generally violent” batterer group would show the highest level of endorsement of the “generally violent” batterer category items. Conversely, there should

be low levels of endorsement (as reflected by the percentages) of items that are not in accordance to the batterer group identified by the scale.

Other variables. Only variables identified in the literature to be associated with the typologies were included in the classification scale. However, other variables have been shown to be related to abuse and these were included in an analysis of other variables (e.g., employment, education, age). In addition, a small set of other variables generally associated with criminal behavior (e.g., type of offence) were included in the analysis comparing batterer groups. These variables can provide additional descriptive data for each batterer category in the test sample, and confirmation and support as to the uniqueness of each batterer group. Variables of each item were scored as present or absent. The variables are presented in Table 6.

Insert Table 6 About Here

Criminal History Record

To follow up offenders after release for the purpose of validating the scale, the criminal history records were examined. The Criminal History record indicates all current and past federal offences for which time was served in a federal institution. Information from this data base assisted in determining if any new offences were committed after release, and the nature of the new offence.

Table 6

Other Variables

Item	Description
Age	Percentage above the age of 40 or below the age of 40
Educational history	Less than grade 8 education, No high school diploma
Employment history	Unstable job history, Unemployed 50% or more, No skill area/profession, Negative rapport with supervisor, Negative rapport with co-worker
Relationship status	Married, co-habiting, single Financial problems Sexual problems Victim of spousal violence
Relationship with mother and father	Poor quality relationship, Absent mother/equivalent, Absent father/equivalent
Mental health and threats of suicide	Psychiatric/psychological problems, Current diagnosis, Depression, Suicidal
Criminal history	Provincial term, Federal term, Number of victims Criminogenic living, Nature of current offence
Substance Abuse	Early age drinking/early age drug use Social drinking/social drug use Associate drinking/associate drug use

Progress Summary Report and Special Report

The purpose of reviewing the progress summary report and the special report was to obtain descriptive information about new convictions involving spousal assault. Both the progress summary report and the special report are descriptive reports which account for the offender's performance during his period of conditional release. The progress summary report draws on information from psychiatric and psychological reports evaluations, and includes interviews with the offender, family and friends. In general, the progress summary report contains biographical information of the offender, as well information regarding the offender's criminal history, need areas of the offender, and performance during conditional release. The Special report contains information regarding specific incidents during the offender's release (e.g., violation of a condition of parole).

Follow-up

The test sample was used for the follow-up portion of the study to demonstrate the validity of the scale. Follow-up data were collected for offenders released with a conditional sentence as of January 1, 1997. The end date of the study was February 2, 1999. The follow-up period ranged from 12 months to 24 months. For offenders released in 1997, there was the potential to follow the offenders for a period greater than 12 month. Information on new incidents of spousal assault were collected using the men sentenced for an assault or a sexual assault.

All of the men were categorized into the appropriate group using the typology described earlier. The following information for each subject was obtained from the OIA,

criminal history reports, progress summary reports, and special reports including: (a) the number of new convictions, (b) the number of violent and nonviolent convictions by group membership (see following paragraph), (c) percentage of new sentences for assault or sexual assault, and (d) amount of time in the community prior to commission of new crime. The offender's sentencing date was used as the index of conviction of a new charge.

Violent and non-violent offences were grouped using the provisions of Schedules 1 and 2 of the Corrections and Conditional Release Act. Violent offences included such acts as murder, assault, sexual assault, use of a weapon, threats, and break and enter with violence. Non-violent offences included drug cultivation, drug trafficking, drug possession, fraud, and laundering of proceeds gained by illegal activity.

To identify cases of spousal assault, information regarding new incidents of assault (sexual and non-sexual) were reviewed using the coding guide shown in Appendix A. Information about the incident (e.g., type of violence, victim, etc.) were obtained from the criminal profile report, progress summary report, and special report of each offender.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

All the data were analyzed using SAS version 12.0. Three types of statistics were used to examine the effects of each measure; frequencies (number of offenders and percentage), the chi square statistic, and the phi coefficient or Cramer's $\sqrt{V}$.

Considering that all dependent variables were either nominal or ordinal, between-group data analysis were conducted using the chi square statistic. The assumptions of the chi square statistic were addressed. These assumptions are as follows: (a) each observation is independent of each other, (b) each observation qualifies for only one cell in the table, and (c) the sample size is large (Hays & Winkler, 1971). To protect against violation of the first and second assumption, a separate chi square statistic was computed for each categorical variable. This provided a safeguard so that each individual did not contribute more than one entry to the table (i.e., the subject responded either "yes" or "no" to the item). To protect against violation of the third assumption, the chi square statistic was not computed for expected cell frequencies of fewer than five observations. This decision was based on a general rule that states "for tables with more than a single degree of freedom, a minimum expected frequency of 5 can be regarded as adequate" (Hays & Winkler, 1971, p.800). An Alpha significance level of 0.05 was used. It should be noted that as the sample size increases, the probability of finding statistically significant results increases. As such, the statistical significance of the chi square statistic was used in conjunction with measures of association to assess the relationship between batterer groups and the variable of interest. For the purpose of pairwise comparison, a 10%

difference was used based on the sample size of non-native ($n=608$) and native ($n=229$) offenders.

Either the Phi Coefficient or the Cramer's V statistic were used to depict the measure of association between the variable and the category classification. The Phi coefficient (ϕ) was used for 2x2 contingency tables, while the Cramer's V statistic was used for contingency tables larger than 2x2. The Cramer's V statistic, like the Phi Coefficient, ranges from 0 to 1. The advantage of the Cramer's V statistic is that the strength of association for any contingency table can be compared, and it has an association with the chi square value (Hays & Winkler, 1971). As a comparative indication of the strength of the measure, Cohen's guidelines for effect size were followed (Wolf, 1986). Although Cohen's guidelines are typically used for the Pearson r , the guidelines were applied to the phi coefficient and the Cramer's V on the basis that both of these statistics can be shown to be mathematically equivalent to the Pearson's r . Hence, the guidelines that were followed was that a modest effect was a value of 0.10, a medium effect was a value of 0.30, and a large effect was 0.50. In correctional research, a measure of association of 0.30 to 0.40 is considered highly significant (e.g., Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Bonta, Gendreau, & Cullen, 1990).

Lastly, a Kaplan Meier survival analysis curve was calculated on all three groups to examine time spent in the community prior to the commission of a new offence. Survival analysis provides the opportunity to examine the probability of a subject in each batterer group re-offending for each monthly time period provided that the offender has not yet re-offended. Once the offender has re-offended, he is removed from the analysis of

subsequent time periods (Hanson & Thornton, 1999). The survival analysis provides the additional benefit of extending the follow-up period beyond 12 months to examine differential rates of survival between the groups. It should be noted that the survival data was random censored. Random censoring occurs when the offenders have a single termination date, but the release times vary. All the offenders who are not re-admitted as of February 1999 (i.e., end study date) are considered censored, but their survival times will vary since offenders are released between January and December 1997 (Allison, 1995). For example, an offender that is released in May 1997 and followed until February 1999 will have a follow-up period of 19 months. Because this offender's follow-up period is 19 months, he will be censored between the 20th and the 24th month. Offenders that are censored are removed from the calculation estimating the proportion of subjects who have re-offended by a given month (i.e., survival calculations). Censoring increases as the observations approach the end of the study. As such, estimates calculated on the basis of these observations are less stable.

RESULTS

There are two broad sections in Results. The first section describes the results for the development sample. In this section, the results of classification and item analysis are presented for the offenders. In addition, other variables related to criminal behavior are examined. The second section of the Results addresses the follow-up of release using the test sample. In this section, the data of criminal and spousal assault recidivism are presented. The results of the non-native and native samples are presented separately in each section.

Development Sample

Classification And Item Endorsement Of Non-Native Offenders

Non-Native Classification

Classification of the offenders addresses, in part, the first hypothesis. Namely, that the offenders can be categorized into three groups on the basis of four domains (criminal history, substance abuse, family-of-origin, and personal and emotional orientation).

On the basis of the classification, there were three groups of spouse abusing non-native offenders. The frequency of men distributed in each group is displayed in Table 7. As illustrated by the table, the group of “generally violent” batterers was the largest group (51%), whereas the group of “family only” batterers was the smallest group (16%). The “antisocial” batterer group was intermediate to the other two groups (33%).

Table 7

Distribution of Non-Native Spouse Abusing Offenders By Classification

Category	Percent	<u>n</u>
Family-only	16.00	97
Antisocial	33.40	203
Generally violent	50.60	308
Total	100	608

Item Endorsement by Classification

The following section presents results by domain showing how each item was endorsed by offenders in each group as determined by the scale score. The aim of this section was to determine whether classification items were able to effectively discriminate the batterer groups on the basis of their scale score. If the classification of batterer types was effectively classifying the offenders, then there would be a greater percentage of members of the “family only” group endorsing the “family only” items than other items, a greater percentage of the members of the “antisocial” group would endorse the “antisocial” batterer items than other items, and a greater percentage of the members of the “generally violent” batterer group would endorse the “generally violent” batterer items. Thus the classification of offenders would be considered effective if, for instance, a higher percentage of men in the “family only” batterer group endorsed the items descriptive of “family only” batterers, and a low percentage of men in the “family only” batterer group endorsed the items contained in the “antisocial” batterer and “generally violent” batterer groups.

As an additional note, each item of the domain had variables that were descriptive of the batterer group (see Tables 1 to 4 of Method). The endorsement of the variables in each domain can be found in Appendix B.

Criminal history domain. An examination of the classification items assigned for each group shows that items were for the most part endorsed by the appropriate batterer group (Table 8). There are five items in the criminal history domain: total youth conviction, total adult convictions, degree of physical harm, psychological harm, and threat/weapon use. As reflected by the Cramer's χ^2 co-efficient, total convictions as an adult ($\chi^2=0.26$), the extent of psychological harm ($\chi^2=0.25$), and threat/weapon use ($\chi^2=0.23$) were particularly strong correlates of group classification.

Insert Table 8 about here

Items for "family only" batterers were generally endorsed by a greater percentage of men in the "family only" batterer group than men in the other batterer groups. For instance, on the item of threat/weapon use, 64% of the men in the "family only" group endorsed the "family only" item (i.e., no threats/weapon), while 54% of men in the "antisocial" batterer group and 26% of the men in the "generally violent" batterer group endorsed this item. A similar pattern to the "family only" batterer group was found among men in the "generally violent" batterer group. Men in the "antisocial" batterer group were not as effectively classified using items descriptive of the "antisocial" batterer. These men tended to more strongly endorse items of the "family only" group than items of the

Table 8

Non-Native Offenders: Criminal History Domain Items Endorsed By Classification

Item classification	Total score classification		
	Family-Only (<u>n</u> =97)	Antisocial (<u>n</u> =203)	Generally Violent (<u>n</u> =308)
<u>Total Convictions as Youth</u>			
Family-only batterers	95.88	90.15	85.39
Antisocial batterers	1.03	5.42	8.44
Generally violent batterers	3.09	4.43	6.17
	χ^2 (4, <u>N</u> =608)=9.44		Cramer's <u>V</u> =0.09
<u>Total Convictions As Adult</u>			
Family-Only Batterers	48.45	31.03	10.06
Antisocial Batterers	14.43	20.69	15.91
Generally Violent Batterers	37.11	48.28	74.03
	χ^2 (4, <u>N</u> =608)=80.49***		Cramer's <u>V</u> =0.26
<u>Degree of Physical Harm</u>			
Family-Only Batterers	65.98	60.59	40.91
Antisocial Batterers	9.28	15.76	26.95
Generally Violent Batterers	24.74	23.65	32.14
	χ^2 (4, <u>N</u> =608)=32.03***		Cramers' <u>V</u> = 0.16
<u>Psychological Harm</u>			
Family-only batterers	81.44	74.88	44.48
Antisocial batterers	8.25	6.40	25.00
Generally violent batterers	10.31	18.72	30.52
	χ^2 (4, <u>N</u> =608)=73.41***		Cramer's <u>V</u> =0.25

Table 8 (cont.)

Item classification	Total score classification		
	Family-Only (<u>n</u> =97)	Antisocial (<u>n</u> =203)	Generally Violent (<u>n</u> =308)
<u>Threat/weapon use</u>			
Family-only batterers	63.92	54.19	26.30
Antisocial batterers	8.25	12.81	25.00
Generally violent batterers	27.84	33.00	48.70
$\chi^2(4, N=608)=64.82^{***}$			Cramer's $\underline{V}=0.23$

* $p<0.05$. *** $p<0.001$

“antisocial” batterer group. For example, on the item of threat/weapon use only 13% of the men in the “antisocial” batterer group endorsed the item for “antisocial” batterers, and 54% of men in the “antisocial” batterer group endorsed the “family only” batterer item.

These results suggest that the criminal history items were able to effectively classify offenders with a history of spouse abuse into “family only” batterer and “generally violent” batterer groups. These items, however, were not as effective in classifying the “antisocial” batterer. Offenders who fall into the “antisocial” batterer group appear to have a criminal history that is more similar to the “family only” batterer.

The batterer typology literature reports that during a spousal assault incident the degree of physical harm, the degree of psychological harm, and the use of threats and/or weapons of the “antisocial” batterer is more severe than “family only” batterers. Given that criminal history items were used as proxies of spousal violence, these findings were unexpected. It may be that the level of violence used by “antisocial” batterers with strangers is not as severe as the level of violence used with their spouse.

Substance abuse domain. There was a strong association between classification items and total score classification. This was reflected by the strong Cramer’s χ^2 co-efficient (0.46) (Table 9). An examination of percentages in Table 9 illustrates that two of the three batterer groups were appropriately discriminated on the basis of substance abuse classification items. More specifically, 64% of “family only” batterers endorsed items for “family only” batterers and 89% of “generally violent” batterers endorsed items descriptive of “generally violent” batterers. Men in the “antisocial” batterer group, however, were less likely to endorse items descriptive of “antisocial” batterers (24%)

Instead, there was a high endorsement of items for “generally violent” batterers (57%).

Table 9

Non-Native Offenders: Substance Abuse Items Endorsed By Classification

Classification item	Total score classification		
	Family-Only (<u>n</u> =97)	Antisocial (<u>n</u> =203)	Generally-Violent (<u>n</u> =308)
Family-only batterer	63.64	18.91	0.65
Antisocial batterer	26.14	24.38	10.39
Generally violent batterer	10.23	56.72	88.96
$\chi^2 (4, N=597)=256.70^{***}$			Cramer's <u>V</u> =0.46

***p.<0.001

In sum, men in the “family only” batterer group and men of the “antisocial” batterer group were effectively classified on the basis of the substance abuse item, but this was not the case for men in the “antisocial” batterer group.

Family-of-origin and marital relation. Table 10 presents item endorsement by classification for the family-of-origin and marital domain.

Insert Table 10 about here

The family-of-origin domain showed a strong association, as reflected by the Cramer's V statistic, between the item and the total score classification. An examination of the percentages exemplifies this association. More specifically, 71% of the subjects in the “family only” batterer group endorsed the “family only” item, and 82% of men in the

Table 10

Non-Native Offenders: Family-Of-Origin And Marital Relation Items Endorsed ByClassification

Classification items	Total score classification		
	Family-Only (<u>n</u> =97)	Antisocial (<u>n</u> =203)	Generally Violent (<u>n</u> =308)
<u>Family-of-origin</u>			
Family-only batterers	71.13	42.36	16.88
Antisocial batterers	1.03	3.94	1.62
Generally violent batterers	27.84	53.69	81.49
$\chi^2 (4, N=608)=111.7^{***}$			Cramer's <u>V</u> =0.30
<u>Marital Relations</u>			
Family-only batterers	87.63	73.50	57.00
Antisocial batterers	9.28	18.50	26.71
Generally-violent batterer	3.09	8.00	16.29
Missing	0	1.5	0.3
$\chi^2 (4, N=604)=37.81^{***}$			Cramer's <u>V</u> =0.18

Note: Missing refers to cases which did not respond to question

*** $p < 0.001$

“generally violent” batterer group endorsed the “generally violent” batterer item.

“Antisocial” batterer items were more likely to be endorsed by offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group (4%) than offenders in the “family-only” group (1%) or offenders in the “generally violent” group (2%). Nonetheless, offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group were more likely to endorse “generally violent” batterer items (54%) than “antisocial” batterer items.

The marital relation item displayed an association of moderate strength between the item and total score classification. Although a high percentage of subjects in each batterer group endorsed the “family only” batterer item, there was still discrimination between batterer groups on the basis of the classification item. In other words, the largest percentage of batterers who endorsed the “family only” batterer item is men in the “family only” batterer group (88%). Similarly, the largest percentage of batterers who endorsed the “generally violent” item is men in the “generally violent” batterer group (16%). Men in the “antisocial” batterer group were more likely to endorse the “antisocial” item than “family only” batterers (18% vs. 9%); however, this percentage of “antisocial” batterers was lower than the percentage of “generally violent” batterers who endorsed this item (18% vs. 27%).

In sum, men in the “family only” batterer group and men in the “generally violent” batterer group were effectively classified by the family-of-origin classification item. Although men in the “antisocial” batterer group more strongly endorsed “antisocial” batterer items than men in other batterer groups, their strongest level of endorsement was for “generally violent” batterer items (as reflected by the percentage of group members).

With respect to the marital relation item, the majority of offenders of each batterer group endorsed the “family only” batterer item. This would suggest that most of the offenders report not being dissatisfied in their relationship and report having little or no communication problems with their spouse. There may be difficulties in other aspects of their spousal relationship (e.g., financial problems) which may produce more meaningful differences between the groups. These other aspects of their relationship are examined in the section on Other Variables.

Personal and emotional domain by total score classification. Table 11 reflects item endorsement by classification for the personal and emotional domain. As illustrated by the table, there are three sections to the domain; cognitive, behavior, and attitude.

Insert Table 11 about here

There were significant differences between groups on each item of personal and emotional orientation. Moreover, the measure of association between each item and group classification was strong, suggesting that offenders were being classified into the appropriate batterer group. An examination of the percentage distributions for each item found that men in the “generally violent” batterer group and men in the “family only” batterer group strongly endorsed their respective classification items. Men in the “antisocial” batterer group, however, were more likely to endorse classification items that were descriptive of “family only” batterers or “generally violent” batterers. On the item

Table 11

Non-Native Offenders: Personal And Emotional Orientation Items Endorsed By Classification

Item classification	Total score classification		
	Family-Only (<u>n</u> =97)	Antisocial (<u>n</u> =203)	Generally Violent (<u>n</u> =308)
<u>Cognitive</u>			
Family-only batterers	58.76	37.93	10.06
Antisocial batterers	25.77	27.59	25.65
Generally violent batterers	15.46	34.48	64.29
χ^2 (4, <u>N</u> =608)= 125.03***			Cramer's <u>V</u> =0.32
<u>Behavior</u>			
Family-only batterers	47.76	29.19	6.21
Antisocial batterers	20.90	25.95	21.90
Generally violent batterers	31.34	44.86	71.90
χ^2 (4, <u>N</u> =558)=91.11***			Cramer's <u>V</u> =0.29
<u>Attitude</u>			
Family-only batterers	69.07	54.19	21.10
Antisocial batterers	8.25	4.43	2.92
Generally violent batterers	22.68	41.38	75.97
χ^2 (4, <u>N</u> =608)= 112.38***			Cramer's <u>V</u> =0.30

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$

of attitude, for example, 69% of men classified as “family only” batterers endorsed the “family only” item, and 76% of men classified as “generally-violent” batterers endorsed the “generally violent” batterer item. Only 4% of men in the “antisocial” batterer group endorsed the “antisocial” batterer item. Instead, 54% of the men in the “antisocial” batterer group endorsed the “family only” item and 41% of the men in this group endorsed the “generally violent” batterer item.

In sum, the classification scale was able to effectively classify men in the “family only” batterer group and the “generally violent” batterer group. A higher percentage of men in each of these batterer groups endorsed their respective classification item (e.g., “family only” men endorsed family-only” classification items), and a lower percentage of men in each of these batterer groups endorsed classification items from other groups. Although the cognitive item and the behavior item of the “antisocial” batterer were more strongly endorsed by offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group, the majority of “antisocial” batterers did not endorse these items. Offenders classified as “antisocial” batterers were more likely to endorse the “generally violent” batterer behavior item and the family-only” cognitive and attitude items. Thus, offenders classified as “antisocial” batterers have the cognition and attitude of the “family only” batterer but the behavior of the “generally violent” batterer.

Classification and Item Endorsement of Native Offenders

The same method and procedure for the classification and item endorsement used with the non-native offenders was used with the native offenders. As such, the same cut-off scores for classification were used with the native sample, and the same measure

was used for item endorsement. The same cut-off scores were used so that the scale used with the non-native and native offenders would be consistent between samples. Given that batterer typologies of community samples generally use non-native subjects, it was of interest to determine if the typology used with non-native offenders could be used with native offenders. By using the same scale, the application of the batterer typology with non-native and native offenders could be assessed.

Native Total Score Classification

Table 12 illustrates the percentage of subjects in each batterer group as a function of the total score classification. On the basis of the classification, the majority of native subjects fell into either the “antisocial” batterer group (27%) or the “generally violent” batterer group (72%). The “family only” batterer group contained a very small percentage of the native batterer sample (1%). Since the “family only” batterer group contained a small number of subjects, it was felt that further analysis of the group would be of little value and it was dropped from subsequent analysis.

Table 12

Distribution of Native Spouse Abusing Offenders By Total Score Classification

Category	Percent	<u>n</u>
Family-only	1.30	3
Antisocial	27.20	65
Generally violent	71.50	171
Total	100	239

Item Endorsement by Classification

Table 13 to table 16 show the percentage of items for each domain endorsed by group classification. As previously stated, these tables provide the opportunity to examine whether the items are able to discriminate the batterer groups using the scale.

Comparisons between batterer groups for the individual variables in each domain can be found in Appendix B.

Criminal history. Table 13 presents the criminal history items endorsed by classification. As illustrated by the table, there are five categories in the criminal history domain; total youth conviction, total adult convictions, degree of physical harm, psychological harm, and threat/weapon use.

Insert Table 13 about here

An inspection of the data in the table indicates that total convictions as an adult, the degree of physical harm, and threat/weapon use were useful items for classification of “generally violent” batterers since a higher percentage of “generally violent” batterers than “antisocial” batterers endorsed the “generally violent” item. While total convictions as a youth and psychological harm were not useful in classifying offenders in the group of “generally violent” batterers. None of the “antisocial” batterer items were able to classify the “antisocial” batterers using the scale. With the exception of total convictions as an adult, the majority of the “antisocial” batterers endorsed classification items that were deemed appropriate for “family only” batterers. Despite the fact that offenders in the

Table 13

Native Offenders: Criminal History Items Endorsed As A Function Of Classification

Item classification	Total score classification		
	Family-Only (n=3)	Antisocial (n=65)	Generally Violent (n=171)
<u>Total convictions as youth</u>			
Family-only batterers		76.92	81.87
Antisocial batterers		15.38	10.53
Generally violent batterers		7.69	7.60
	$\chi^2 (2, N=236)=1.08$		Cramer's $V=0.07$
<u>Total convictions as adult</u>			
Family-only batterers		24.62	9.36
Antisocial batterers		21.54	17.54
Generally violent batterers		53.85	73.10
	$\chi^2 (2, N=236)=11.07^{**}$		Cramer's $V=0.22$
<u>Degree of physical harm</u>			
Family-only batterers		56.92	32.16
Antisocial batterers		16.92	25.15
Generally violent batterers		26.15	42.69
	$\chi^2 (2, N=236)=12.18^{**}$		Cramer's $V=0.23$
<u>Psychological harm</u>			
Family-only batterers		64.62	36.26
Antisocial batterers		21.54	26.90
Generally violent batterers		13.85	36.84
	$\chi^2 (2, N=236)=17.29^{***}$		Cramer's $V=0.27$

Table 13 (cont.)

Item classification	Total score classification	
	Family-Only (<u>n</u> =3)	Antisocial (<u>n</u> =65) Generally Violent (<u>n</u> =171)
<u>Threat/weapon use</u>		
Family-only batterers		53.85 27.49
Antisocial batterers		16.92 20.47
Generally violent batterers		29.23 52.05
$\chi^2 (2, N=236) = 15.08^{***}$ Cramer's $V = 0.25$		
* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.001$. *** $p < 0.001$		

“antisocial” batterer group did not endorse items for “antisocial” batterers, there were significant differences between men in the “antisocial” batterer group and men in the “generally violent” batterer group for each criminal history item. This indicates that there are significant descriptive differences between groups of spouse abusing native offenders.

Substance abuse items. Table 14 presents the substance abuse item endorsed by the percentage of offenders classified in each group. As illustrated by the table, the “generally violent” batterer item was endorsed by a high percentage of offenders in the “generally violent” batterer group (95%), and the “generally violent” batterer item was endorsed by a higher percentage of “generally violent” batterers than “antisocial” batterers (95% vs. 72%). Albeit men in the “antisocial” batterer group were more likely than men in the “generally violent” batterer group to endorse the “antisocial” batterer item, it did not effectively classify the “antisocial” batterers. Only a minority of the men in the “antisocial” batterer group (20%) endorsed this item. Instead “antisocial” batterers were more likely to endorse the “generally violent” batterer item (72%). Thus, the typology model does not appear to be able to qualitatively distinguish the spouse abusing native offenders on the domain of substance abuse. Differentiation between native spouse abusing offenders may not be possible due to the high level of substance use among native offenders.

Table 14

Native Offenders: Substance Abuse Classification Items Endorsed By Classification

Classification item	Total score classification		
	Family-Only (<u>n</u> =3)	Antisocial (<u>n</u> =65)	Generally Violent (<u>n</u> =171)
Family-only batterers		7.81	0.00
Antisocial batterers		20.31	5.26
Generally violent		71.88	94.74
Missing		1.5	0
$\chi^2 (2, N=597)=27.37^{***}$ Cramer's $V=0.34$			

Note: Missing refers to cases which did not respond to question

*** $p < 0.001$

Family-of-origin and marital relation. Table 15 provides the classification items of the family-of-origin and marital domain endorsed as a function of total score classification.

Insert Table 15 about here

Men in the "generally violent" batterer group and men in the "antisocial" batterer group could be significantly differentiated on the basis of their endorsement of the family-of-origin item. A greater percentage of native offenders classified as "generally violent" batterers endorsed the "generally violent" item than offenders classified as "antisocial" batterers (92% vs. 69%, respectively). Moreover, men in the "generally violent" batterer group were more likely to endorse the "generally violent" batterer item than the other items. Men in the "antisocial" batterer group were more likely than men in

Table 15

Native Offenders: Endorsement Of Family-Of-Origin and Marital Relation Items By**Classification**

Classification items	Total score classification		
	Family-Only (<u>n</u> =3)	Antisocial (<u>n</u> =65)	Generally Violent (<u>n</u> =171)
<u>Family-Of-Origin</u>			
Family-only batterers		27.69	6.43
Antisocial batterers		3.08	1.17
Generally violent batterers		69.23	92.40
	χ^2 (2, <u>N</u> =236)=21.27***		Cramer's <u>V</u> =0.30
<u>Marital Relations</u>			
Family-only batterers		69.23	66.08
Antisocial batterers		23.08	22.81
Generally violent batterers		7.69	11.11
	χ^2 (2, <u>N</u> =236)=0.61		Cramer's <u>V</u> =0.05

***p.<0.001

the “generally violent” batterer group to endorse the “antisocial” batterer item (3.1% vs., 1.2%). The percentage of men in the “antisocial” batterer group endorsing this item was relatively small. Overall, men in the “antisocial” batterer group were more likely to endorse the “generally violent” batterer item (69%) than the “antisocial” batterer item.

The results of the family-of-origin item suggests that offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group and offenders in the “generally violent” batterer group have had a high level of dysfunction in their family-of-origin. Nonetheless, the “antisocial” batterer group can be differentiated from the “generally violent” batterer group. A third of the offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group have had little or no dysfunction in their family-of-origin. In comparison, a high level of dysfunction in the family-of-origin was predominant among offenders in the “generally violent” batterer group.

For the item of marital relations men in the “generally violent” batterer group and men in the “antisocial” batterer group were not significantly different. This was reflected by the very low association measure (Cramer’s $V=0.05$). An inspection of the percentage distribution of men in each batterer group by endorsement of the marital relation item shows that the majority of men in both groups endorsed the “family only” item. Thus, the marital relation item did not effectively classify the native offenders into batterer groups.

Personal and emotional orientation. There are three items in the personal and emotional orientation domain; cognitive, behavior, and attitude. Table 16 provides the item classification by group classification.

Insert Table 16 about here

As illustrated by the table, there was a significant difference between offenders who scored in the range of “antisocial” batterers and “generally violent” batterers on the basis of items for cognition, behavior, and attitude. The Cramer’s $\underline{V}$ co-efficient for each item of the personal and emotional orientation domain was strong. This further attests to the significant difference between the offenders in the “generally violent” batterer group and offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group. Of all three items, the attitudinal item had the strongest Cramer’s $\underline{V}$ co-efficient ($\underline{V}=0.50$).

In general, a large percentage of the men within the group of “generally violent” batterers endorsed the item of “generally violent” batterers. For example, 72% of the “generally violent” batterer group endorsed the “generally violent” batterer attitudinal item. Also, a greater percentage of the “generally violent” batterers in comparison to “antisocial” batterers endorsed “generally violent” items. For instance, 77% of the “generally violent” batterer group as opposed to 23% of the “antisocial” batterer group endorsed the “generally violent” batterer attitudinal item.

“Antisocial” batterers were more likely than “generally violent” batterers to endorse “antisocial” cognitive and attitudinal items. Nonetheless, “family only” items were more strongly endorsed by men in the “antisocial” batterer group, in general. For instance, 71% of the “antisocial” batterer group endorsed the “family only” batterer attitudinal item, whereas 6% of the “antisocial” batterer group endorsed the “antisocial” batterer. Table 16

Native Offenders: Percentage of Personal/Emotional Orientation Items Endorsed By Classification

Item classification	Total score classification		
	Family-Only (<u>n</u> =3)	Antisocial (<u>n</u> =65)	Generally Violent (<u>n</u> =171)
<u>Cognitive</u>			
Family-only batterers		43.08	9.36
Antisocial batterers		33.85	30.41
Generally violent batterers		23.08	60.23
χ^2 (2, <u>N</u> =236)=41.91***			Cramer's <u>V</u> =0.42
<u>Behavior</u>			
Family-only batterers		59.32	12.35
Antisocial batterers		22.03	34.71
Generally violent batterers		18.64	52.94
Missing		9.20	0.60
χ^2 (2, <u>N</u> =229)=53.43***			Cramer's <u>V</u> =0.48
<u>Attitude</u>			
Family-only batterers		70.77	19.30
Antisocial batterers		6.15	3.51
Generally violent batterers		23.08	77.19
χ^2 (2, <u>N</u> =236)= 60.20***			Cramer's <u>V</u> =0.50

Note: Missing refers to cases which did not respond to question

***p < 0.001

item.

In sum, the typology was effective in discriminating groups of batterers for the domain of personal and emotional orientation. Overall, there was a high level of endorsement of the “generally violent” batterer group for “generally violent” batterer items, suggesting that these items were effective in classifying these men. However, “antisocial” batterer items were less effective at classifying “antisocial” batterers than items classifying “generally violent” batterers. In general, men in the “antisocial” batterer group were more likely to endorse “family only” batterer items than “antisocial” batterer items. Native offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group appear to have less psychopathology and more liberal attitudes than non-native spouse abusers in the community.

Other Variables

The purpose of this section was to address the fourth hypothesis of the study; namely, that there would be meaningful differences between the batterer groups on variables not included in the typology with an offender population. The presence of meaningful differences between the groups would provide additional confirmation and support for the typology with this unique population. Meaningful differences were ascertained by cross-tabulation of variables within each domain by batterer group. For the purpose of pairwise comparison, a 10% difference was used based on the sample size of non-native (n=608) and native (n=236) offenders. Similar to the previous section the results of the non-native and native offenders will be presented separately for each domain.

Demographic and Background Variables of Non-Native Offenders

Table 17 present cross-tabulations for background variables of marital history,

childhood background, education, and employment. In total, there were 14 between group comparisons. Of these comparison, 10 were statistically significant. The measures of association for significant results ranged between 0.10 to 0.23, suggesting weak to medium strength of association between the variable and group membership.

Overall , items were more likely to be endorsed by the “generally violent” batterers, indicating that a larger percentage of men in the “generally violent” batterer group had financial problems in their marital relationships, were victims of spousal violence, poorer relationships with their parent(s), had an absent parent, and poor job histories. There was no significant difference between the groups with respect to education.

Insert Table 17 about here

Age and Marital Status. Given that the spouse abuse literature has reported that spouse abusers, in general, are under the age of 40 and involved in common-law relationships, it was of interest to determine if there were differences between the groups with respect to their age and their spousal relationship.

There was no significant difference between the groups with respect to age of the offenders, $\chi^2(2, N=608)=1.32, ns$. The average age of offenders in the “family only” group was 35 (SD=9), the average age of “antisocial” group was 35 (SD=8), and the average age of “generally violent” group was 34 (SD=7).

Table 17

Comparison Of Non-Native Batterer Groups on Background Variables

Indicator	Variable	Group classification			χ^2 (df=2)	Cramer's V
		FO (n=97)	A (n=203)	GV (n=308)		
Family- of-origin	Absent mother	8.25	15.27	19.87	7.56*	0.11
	Absent father	24.74	27.72	41.69	15.25***	0.16
	Poor relationship:					
	Mother	9.38	16.50	33.11	31.38***	0.23
	Father	16.67	41.21	61.64	64.18***	0.33
Marital relations	Financial problems	22.58	40.31	50.17	22.63***	0.20
	Dissatisfied sexually	8.33	9.47	15.09	4.72	0.09
	Spouse abuse victim	20.21	35.15	35.53	8.25*	0.12
Education	Under grade 8	20.00	28.00	26.95	2.31	0.06
	No highschool diploma	72.34	82.56	80.39	4.24	0.08

Table 17 (cont.)

Indicator	Variable	Group Classification			χ^2 (df=2)	Cramer's V
		FO (n=97)	A (n=203)	GV (n=308)		
Employment	No job 50% or>	44.68	50.50	69.41	27.59***	0.22
	Unstable job history	59.38	68.18	78.50	15.47***	0.16
	No skill	55.79	50.00	59.42	4.38	0.08
	Poor rapport:					
	Supervisor	4.21	10.66	19.58	16.77***	0.17
	Co-worker	2.11	4.06	10.45	11.50**	0.14

Note: FO= Family-Only, A=Antisocial, GV=Generally Violent

*p<0.05. **p<0.01. ***p<0.001.

Offenders in each group were, for the most part, either in a common-law relationships or single. Single includes dating relationships. Offenders in the “generally violent” batterer group and offenders in the “family only” batterer group were more likely to be single (39%, 39%, respectively) than offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group (31%). In contrast, a higher percentage of offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group (40%) were in a common-law relationship than “family only” batterers (30%) and “generally violent” batterers (35%).

Criminal History, Substance Abuse, and Mental Health Variables of Non-Native Offenders

A comparison of the groups on variables of criminal history, substance abuse, and mental health were examined (Table 18). The variables included in the comparisons are variables that have not been included in the typology of spouse abusers; thus, they serve as additional information to the description of batterer groups.

Insert Table 18 about here

All of the criminal history variables were significantly related to group classification. Measures of association for these effects range from 0.14 to 0.27, suggesting a moderate strength of association between the variable and group membership.

Overall, men in the “generally violent” batterer group were significantly more likely than men in the “antisocial” batterer group or men in the “family only” batterer group to

have served a provincial term as well as a federal term, and to have a criminal lifestyle.

Table 18

Comparison of Non-Native Offenders On Variables Of Criminal History , Substance Abuse, And Mental Health

Item	Variable	Group classification			χ^2 (df=1)	Cramer's $\underline{V}$
		FO (n=97)	A (n=203)	GV (n=308)		
Criminal history	Provincial term	61.86	79.80	90.58	43.40***	0.27
	Federal term	19.59	29.06	45.13	26.80***	0.21
	No. of victims:					
	One	52.58	61.88	83.44	47.60***	0.28
	Two	10.31	23.27	35.39	25.89***	0.21
	Three or more	6.19	10.89	14.94	5.75	0.10
	Criminal lifestyle	19.57	19.49	32.09	12.02*	0.14
Offence	Drug cultivation	0.00	0.00	0.65	1.95	0.06
	Drug traffic	25.77	11.33	5.21	33.24***	0.23
	Drug import	2.06	1.48	0.32	3.03	0.07
	Used weapon	7.22	12.32	10.06	1.90	0.06
	Violent (e.g., assault, robbery)	28.87	40.89	69.81	69.58***	0.33

Table 18 (cont.)

Item	Variable	Group Classification			χ^2 (df=1)	Cramer's <u>V</u>
		FO (<u>n</u> =97)	A (<u>n</u> =203)	GV (<u>n</u> =308)		
Offence history (cont.)	Attempt murder	7.22	2.96	1.95	6.79*	0.11
	Homicide	9.28	11.82	8.44	1.62	0.05
Alcohol/ drug use	Early age drinking	16.67	49.50	70.03	87.36***	0.38
	Early age drug use	16.67	46.77	66.89	77.31***	0.36
	Excess social drinking	15.96	44.44	69.18	89.53***	0.39
	Social drug use	18.75	52.26	73.51	92.96***	0.40
Mental health	Psych/psychol problems	11.34	17.73	23.78	7.99*	0.12
	Depressive symptoms	9.28	9.85	16.23	5.82	0.10
	Suicidal	6.38	5.97	7.62	0.55	0.03
	Present diagnosis	2.13	7.07	6.64	3.08	0.07

Note: FO= Family-Only, A=Antisocial, GV=Generally Violent

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$.

Moreover, a significantly greater percentage of “generally violent” batterers (35%), in comparison to “antisocial” batterers (23%) and “family only” batterers (10%), had two victims. Offenders in the “family only” batterer group and the “antisocial” batterer group were equally likely to have a criminal lifestyle (20% and 20%, respectively).

The current offence by group membership was examined. The goal was to determine if there was an offence that was group specific. An inspection of the Cramer’s χ^2 coefficients found that drug trafficking offences ($\chi^2=0.23$) and violent offences ($\chi^2=0.33$) showed moderate to strong associations with group membership. Furthermore, there was a weak association between attempt murder ($\chi^2=0.11$) and group membership.

A greater percentage of men in the “generally violent” batterer group had a current offence of assault (70%), whereas men in the “family only” batterer group had the highest percentage of drug trafficking as well as attempted murder.

There were also differences between the groups with respect to substance use and abuse. For instance, “generally violent” batterers had the highest frequency of early age drinking (70%) and early age drug use (50%), while “family only” batterers had the lowest frequency of early age drinking (17%) and early age drug use (17%). The frequency of early age drinking and early age drug use among “antisocial” batterers was intermediate to the other two groups (50% and 47%, respectively).

There was a significant difference between the groups with respect to current psychological/psychiatric problems. A greater percentage of “generally violent” batterers (24%) in comparison to “family only” batterers (11%) had psychiatric/psychological problems.

Summary

There were significant differences between the groups with respect to marital relations, employment history, family-of-origin, criminal history, offences, substance abuse, and psychiatric/psychological problems. Overall, men in the “generally violent batterer group” had the highest frequency of absent fathers and absent mothers, poor maternal relationship, and financial problems. Interestingly, both “antisocial” batterers and “generally violent” batterers were more likely to be victims of spousal abuse than “family only” batterers. Further, a greater percentage of men in the “generally violent” batterer group than in the other batterer groups had served a previous term (provincial or federal), had more than one victim, had a criminal lifestyle, and convictions of a violent offence (e.g, assault, robbery). “family only” batterers were more frequently involved in drug trafficking or attempted murder. Men in the “generally violent” batterer group also had a higher degree of alcohol and drug abuse as reflected by the high percentage of early age drinking, early age drug use, excess drinking in social situations, excess drug use in social situations, and associates substance use interfering in the subject’s life. Lastly, there was a greater percentage of psychiatric/psychological problems among “generally violent” batterers than “family only” batterers.

Demographic and Background Variables: Native sample

The batterer groups are compared on variables of age, marital history, childhood background, employment history, and education. Of the 18 between group comparisons, four of the comparisons were significant. For three of the four significant effects, the frequency of “generally violent” batterers was greater than the frequency of “antisocial”

batterers. An examination of the measure of association for the cross-tabulation corroborate the non-significant findings. In general, the co-efficient of association was below 0.08, indicating that the relationship between the variable and group membership was very weak. The comparisons are presented in Table 19.

Insert Table 19 about here

Age and spousal relationship. The age and the spousal relationship (single, married, or common-law relationship) of the native batterer groups were compared. The purpose was to determine if there were differences between the groups with respect to the average of the offenders and their spousal relationship.

There was no significant difference between the groups on age, $\chi^2(1, N=239)=0.28$, ns. The average age of offenders of the “antisocial” group was 33 (SD=9) and the average age of the “generally violent” group was 32 (SD=7).

Most of the “antisocial” batterers and “generally violent” batterers were single (42% and 44%, respectively). There was also a high frequency of common-law relationships among “antisocial” batterers (39%) and “generally violent” batterers (42%).

Criminal History, Substance Abuse, and Mental Health of Native Batterers

Cross-tabulation for the groups on indicators of criminal history, substance abuse, and mental health were examined (Table 20). Significant differences were found between groups on most variables of criminal history and substance abuse, and no significant differences were found on variables of mental health. The co-efficient of association for

Table 19

Comparison of Native Batterer Groups on Background Variables

Item	Variable	GroupClassification			χ^2 (df=1)	Cramer's V
		FO (n=3)	A (n=65)	GV (n=171)		
Family- of- origin	Absent mother		26.15	34.12	1.37	0.08
	Absent father		56.25	53.80	0.11	-0.02
	Relationship: Mother poor		26.15	38.82	3.30	0.12
	Father poor		36.92	61.31	11.24***	0.22
Marital relations	Financial concern		36.68	40.00	0.00	0.00
	Dissatisfied sexually		14.29	17.96	0.44	0.04
	Spouse abuse victim		43.08	39.05	0.32	-0.04
Education	Under grade 8		29.23	32.35	0.21	0.03
	No highschool diploma		83.08	88.24	1.09	0.07
Employ- ment	No job 50% or>		64.62	79.17	5.31*	0.16
	Unstable job history		70.77	88.89	11.45***	0.22
	No skill		60.00	70.76	2.50	0.10
	Negative rapport: Supervisor		4.69	8.88	1.14	0.07
	Co-Workers		3.13	5.33	0.50	0.05

Note: FO= Family-Only, A=Antisocial, GV=Generally Violent

*p<0.05 ** .p<0.01. ***p<0.001

the indicators with significant effects ranged from 0.13 to 0.29, suggesting weak to moderate relationship between the variable and group membership. Results will be discussed in terms of their significant effects.

Insert Table 20 about here

There was a significant difference between the groups on serving a previous provincial term. A greater percentage of “generally violent” batterers than “antisocial” batterers had served a previous provincial term, and had a criminal lifestyle.

With the exception of assault/robbery, there were no significant differences between groups on their current offence. Overall, a larger percentage of subjects in the “generally violent” batterer group had a current violent offence than “antisocial” batterers (71% vs. 52%, respectively).

There were significant effects on all indicators of substance use. A greater percentage of “generally violent” batterers, in comparison to “antisocial” batterers, began drinking at an early age, used drugs at an early age, had peers who drank alcohol, peers involved in drugs, excess social drinking, and social drug use.

Summary

In sum, there were significant differences between batterer groups of native offenders on items of family-of-origin, employment, criminal history, and substance use. “Generally violent” batterers were more likely to be unemployed 50% or more, and were more likely to have a poor relationship with their father. A significantly higher percentage of

Table 20

Criminal History, Substance Abuse, and Mental Health Variables By Group MembershipOf Native Offenders

Item	Variable	Group classification			χ^2 (df=1)	Cramer's V
		FO (<u>n</u> =3)	A (<u>n</u> =65)	GV (<u>n</u> =171)		
Criminal history	Provincial term		87.69	95.32	4.34*	0.14
	Federal term		29.23	32.75	0.27	0.03
	No. of victims:					
	One		70.77	88.30	10.50***	0.21
	Two		24.62	32.75	1.47	0.08
	Three or >		10.77	12.28	0.10	0.02
	Criminal lifestyle		31.75	62.20	17.0***	0.27
Offence	Drug cultivation		0.00	0.58	0.38	0.04
	Drug traffic		4.62	2.34	0.85	-0.06
	Drug import		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Used Weapon		3.08	5.88	0.76	0.06
	Violent (e.g., assault)		52.31	71.35	7.62**	0.18
	Attempt murder		0.00	0.00	--	--
	Homicide		12.31	12.87	0.01	0.00
	Early age drinking		80.00	91.23	5.68*	0.17
	Early drug use		47.69	61.99	3.95*	0.13

Table 20 (cont.)

Item	Variable	Group classification			χ^2 (df=1)	Cramer's <u>V</u>
		FO (<u>n</u> =3)	A (<u>n</u> =65)	GV (<u>n</u> =171)		
Substance abuse	Excess social drinking		78.46	95.32	15.84***	0.26
	Social drug use		50.77	77.78	16.47***	0.26
Mental health	Psych/psychol. problems		12.31	7.02	1.70	-0.08
	Depressive symptoms		6.15	7.65	0.16	0.03
	Suicidal		4.84	4.94	0.00	0.00

Note: FO= Family-Only, A=Antisocial, GV=Generally Violent

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$.

“generally violent” batterers had served a provincial term, had at least one victim, and had a current offence of violent assault. Men in the “generally violent” batterer group were also more likely to have used drugs and alcohol at an early age, and to use drugs while socializing with others. There was no significant difference between groups in terms of psychological and psychiatric difficulties, education, marital relations, and age.

Test Sample

Typology

As in the first part of the study, the characteristics and the attributes described in the spouse abuse literature of batterer typologies were applied to the released men with a history of spouse abuse. The objective of this procedure was twofold. First, it provided an assessment as to whether the typology established in the first part of the study could be replicated with similar results with a new group of men. Second, it provided the opportunity to examine between group differences on such factors as the percentage of recidivists, new crimes, and survival in the community.

Non-Native Offenders

Of the three groups, the “generally violent” group is the largest (47%), the “antisocial” batterer group is the second largest (40%), and the “family only” group is the smallest group of batterers (14%).

Table 21 provides a comparison of the development and test sample. Overall, the distribution in the two samples were quite similar.

Table 21

Comparison of Non-Native Development and Test Sample By Group Membership

Batterer group	Development sample		Test sample	
	(%)	<u>n</u>	(%)	<u>n</u>
Family-only	16.00	77	13.50	77
Antisocial	33.40	203	39.60	226
Generally violent	50.70	308	46.90	268
$\chi^2(4, N=1159)=4.87, ns$				

Readmission as a function of group membership. Table 22 provides the percentage of offenders in each group who committed an offence during the 12 month follow-up as well as the percentage who committed an assault and spousal assault.

Insert Table 22 about here

Of the 571 men released in 1997, 22% ($n=123$) committed a new offence within 12 months of their release. As illustrated by Table 27, there was a significant difference between the groups with respect to the commission of a new offence, $\chi^2(2, N=571)=10.6, p<0.001$, and there was a weak to medium measure of association between group membership and the commission of an offence ($V=0.14$).

Of the three batterer groups, the “generally violent” group had the highest rate of re-offending, (27%), while the “antisocial” batterer group had a lower rate of 19%. Only 9% of the “family only” group had a new offence within 12 months of release. With respect to the number of new offences, there was no significant difference between the

Table 22

The Percentage Of Non-Native Offenders In Batterer Groups With An Offence

Offence type	Family-Only (<u>n</u> =77)	Antisocial (<u>n</u> =226)	Generally Violent (<u>n</u> =268)	χ^2 (<u>df</u> =2)	Cramer's <u>V</u>
Any offence	9.10	19.0	27.2	10.60***	0.14
Non-violent	5.40	9.30	9.30	1.43	0.05
Violent	3.90	9.30	16.0	10.70**	0.14
Assault	0.00	2.20	7.5	12.10***	0.15
Sexual assault	0.00	0.90	0.00	3.06	0.07
Spousal assault	0.00	0.00	2.99	9.19**	0.13

Note. Offenders with both violent and non-violent offences were recorded as a violent offence. Percentages of violent and non-violent offences will not add up to any offence.

** $p < 0.05$. *** $p < 0.001$

groups, $\chi^2(2, N=571)=22.2$, ns. Most of the offenders of each batterer group did not have more than one new offence during the 12 month period.

The results also indicate that there were meaningful differences between the groups with respect to violent offences. A larger percentage of men in the “generally violent” batterer group (16%) committed a violent offence than men in the “antisocial” batterer group (9%) and men in the “family only” batterer group (4%). Interestingly, there was no significant difference between the “generally violent” batterer group and the “antisocial” batterer group with respect to non-violent offences. Both the “generally violent” batterer group and the “antisocial” batterer group had a higher percentage of violent and non-violent offences in comparison to the “family only” batterer group.

In all cases where an offender was convicted of an assault or sexual assault an examination of the parole officer report on the offence was examined in order to determine if the assault was against a spouse.

At the end of the 12 month follow-up, eight men (1%) had been convicted for an assault against a spouse, and two had been convicted twice. All of the offences against a spouse were committed by men in the “generally violent” batterer group.

Characteristics of spousal assaults. The report, on the assault, were examined to determine the nature of the spousal relationship (common-law, married, single), the type of violence, the extent of injury, and whether a weapon was used.

The spouse abuse literature has found that the percentage of abuse in common-law, married, or dating relationships is different with common-law spouses more frequently the target of abuse. However, in these data, four men victimized their girlfriend, one man

assaulted his wife, one man assaulted his common-law wife, and two men who assaulted both a spouse and a stranger/acquaintance.

An examination of the nature of the assaults found that the assaults were physical only ($n=5$) or involved both physical violence and verbal threat ($n=3$). Weapons were generally not involved in the assaults.

In the majority of cases there was some degree of injury ($n=6$) with medical attention required in three cases. Injury was defined as a physical or sexual act that resulted in such physical signs as bruises, bleeding, swelling, scratches, or broken bones.

Survival analysis. Another way of examining the differences between the groups was by survival analysis. Survival analysis provides the opportunity to examine the probability of a subject in each batterer group recidivating for each monthly time period for up to two year follow-up.

As shown by Figure 1, recidivism rates between batterer groups were significantly different, $\chi^2 (2, N=571)=14.4, p<0.05$. The steepest curve was for the “generally violent” group, indicating that this group has a higher rate of recidivism than the other batterer groups. In addition, the slope of the curve of the “antisocial” batterer group was steeper than the curve of the “family only” batter group. Thus, the rate or recidivism was higher among the “antisocial” batterer group than the “family only” batterer group. Furthermore, the difference between the groups remains throughout the follow-up period.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Figure 1. Recidivism rates (survival curves) for non-native offenders of three batterer groups

Table 23 provides the survival rates by group membership. The purpose of the table is to show that the probability of re-offending was most likely to occur within the first 12 months and there was a decreasing rate of failure thereafter. For instance, 27% of the “generally violent” group had re-offended during the first 12 months, and an additional 9% of the group re-offended during the last 12 months.

Insert Table 23 about here

Summary

The “generally violent” batterer group had the highest rate of recidivism, while the “family only” batterer group had the lowest rate of recidivism. The rate of recidivism of the “antisocial” batterer group was intermediate to the two other batterer groups. Further, the “generally violent” batterer group re-offended at a faster rate in comparison to the other groups. Lastly, the “generally violent” batterer group were the most likely to have a conviction for a violent offence, and were the most likely to have a conviction for an assault involving a spouse.

Native Offenders

The majority of the native men in the test sample were classified as “generally violent” spouse abusers (73%). The “antisocial” batterer group was the second largest group (27%). Similar to the development sample, there were very few men that were classified as “family only” batterers ($n=4$), and this group will not be included in the analyses. A comparison of the development and test sample shows that the distribution Table 23

Survival Estimates of Non-Native Spouse Abusing Offenders As A Function Of Group

Membership

Months	Survival			Number failed			Number left		
	FO*	A**	G***	FO *	A**	G***	FO *	A**	G***
6	92.21	90.27	85.07	6	22	40	71	204	228
12	90.91	80.97	72.76	7	43	73	70	183	195
18	87.95	75.56	67.20	9	53	86	36	106	125
24	87.95	73.31	64.21	9	55	90	5	12	13

Note. *FO=Family Only ($n=77$), **A=Antisocial ($n=226$), ***G=Generally Violent

($n=268$). Due to censoring, summing the number failed and the number left will not equal the total number of offenders in each group.

in the two samples was similar. The comparison of the percentages between the samples are provided in Table 24.

Table 24

Comparison of Native Development and Test Sample By Group

Batterer Group	<u>Development sample</u>		<u>Test sample</u>	
	(%)	<u>n</u>	(%)	<u>n</u>
Family-only	1.30	3	2.00	4
Antisocial	27.20	65	26.70	53
Generally violent	71.50	171	71.40	142
$\chi^2(4, N=438)=0.34, ns.$				

Examination of readmission as a function of group membership. Table 25 provides a comparison of the percentages of men between batterer groups who committed a violent or non-violent offence during the 12 month period. Further, the table provides the percentage of assault and spousal assault during the 12 month follow-up.

Insert Table 25 about here

Of the 199 offenders released in 1997, 24% (n=47) were convicted for a new offence within 12 months of their release. No significant difference was found for group membership and the commission of an offence. Nonetheless, there was a higher percentage of “generally violent” batterers (25%) who committed a new offence in comparison to “antisocial” batterers (21%).

Table 25

Offence Type As A Function Of The Percentage Of Native Offenders In Batterer Groups

Offence type	Family-Only (<u>n</u> =3)	Antisocial (<u>n</u> =53)	Generally Violent (<u>n</u> =142)	χ^2 (<u>df</u> =1)	Cramer's <u>V</u>
Any offence	--	20.75	25.35	0.02	0.03
Violent	--	7.55	14.79	1.81	0.10
Non-violent	--	14.29	10.74	0.42	0.05
Assault	--	2.27	4.80	0.52	0.06
Sexual assault	--	0.00	0.70	0.38	0.04
Spousal assault	--	0.00	1.41	0.79	0.06

Note. Offenders who committed both violent and non-violent offences were recorded as committing a violent offence.

*** $p < 0.001$

No significant difference was found for the commission of violent, $\chi^2(1, 195)=1.8$, ns, $V=-0.09$, or non-violent offences, $\chi^2(1, 170)=0.42$, ns, $V=-0.0$. An examination of the percentages, however, indicate that a higher percentage of “generally violent” batterers committed a violent offence than “antisocial” batterers. In addition, a higher percentage of “antisocial” batterers committed a non-violent offence than “generally violent” batterers.

At the end of the 12 month follow-up, there had been two men (1%) convicted for an assault offence against a spouse. All of the offences against a spouse were committed by men in the “generally violent” batterer group (1%). The victims of the spousal assaults were common-law wives, and physical violence was involved in the assault. The assaults resulted in injury, and medical attention was necessary in one case. A weapon was not used during the assault incident.

Survival analysis. Figure 2 shows survival curves for the “antisocial” batterer group and the “generally violent” batterer group. Although there was no significant difference between the curves for the groups, $\chi^2(1, N=195)=0.02$, ns, there was an interesting trend in the results.

Insert Figure 2 about here

The curves descended steadily during the first eight months of the study with no difference in the slope of the curves. Following the ninth month, the curve of the “antisocial” batterer group continued its decline while the curve of the “generally violent”

Note. Because of the small sample size of the “family only” group, it was not included in the data analysis

Figure 2. Recidivism rates (survival curves) for native offenders of two batterer groups

batterer group leveled off. These results suggest that the rate of re-offending between batterer groups was similar during the first eight months of the study. Following the ninth month, the rate of re-offending increased in the “antisocial” batterer group but remained constant in the “generally violent” batterer group.

Table 26 provides estimates of survival and the frequency of men who failed as a function of group membership at 6, 12, 18, and 24 months. As illustrated by the table, the rate of re-offending was higher during the first 12 months and decreased during the last 12 months of the study.

Insert Table 26 about here

Summary

Overall, the “generally violent” batterer group had a higher rate of recidivism and a higher percentage of crime in comparison to the “antisocial” batterer group during a 12 month period. Interestingly, the rate of recidivism of the “antisocial” batterers was higher than the “generally violent” batterers during the last 12 months of the 24 month follow-up. This finding may be due to a higher percentage of non-violent offences among “antisocial” batterer group whereas the “generally violent” batterer group have a higher percentage of violent offences. Only men in the “generally violent” batterer group had a conviction for an assault involving a spouse.

Table 26

Survival Estimates As A Function Of Group Membership

<u>Months</u>	<u>Survival</u>			<u>Number failed</u>			<u>Number left</u>		
	F O *	A **	G***	FO*	A **	G***	FO *	A **	G***
6		86.79	83.80		7	23		46	119
12		79.25	74.65		11	36		42	106
18		68.30	72		16	39		27	57
24		65.19	69.9		17	40		3	4

Note. *FO=Family Only (n=4), **A=Antisocial (n=53), ***G=Generally Violent (n=142).

Due to censoring, summing the number failed and the number left will not equal the total number of offenders in each group.

DISCUSSION

The present study had two objectives. The first objective was to assess whether current typologies of male abusers are appropriate for federally incarcerated male offenders with a history of spouse abuse. The batterer typology was examined using variables grouped into four domains: Criminal History, Substance Abuse, Family-of-Origin and Marital Relations, and Personal and Emotional Orientation. A scale was developed by summing up the scores on the four domains to produce a weighted composite score. Offenders with a history of spouse abuse were divided into groups on the basis of this scale.

The second objective was to assess criminal recidivism and spousal assault recidivism between batterer groups. This involved a 12 month and 24 month follow-up of spouse abusing offenders released with a conditional sentence.

The discussion is organized into four parts; (a) addressing the hypotheses of the study, (b) limitations of the study, (c) theoretical implications, and (d) treatment and forensic implications of the typology.

Hypotheses

The study had four primary hypotheses. The first hypothesis related to the first objective, whereas the second and third hypothesis were related to the second objective. The aim of the fourth hypothesis was to provide confirmation and support of the typology, and to clarify group membership. For each hypothesis, the non-native offenders will be

discussed first and then the findings of the native offenders will be discussed.

Hypothesis 1: Support for the Typology

Non-Native Offenders

Overall, hypothesis 1, was supported. Non-native offenders with a history of spouse abuse could be divided into groups using variables identified from previous attempts to develop typologies. In addition, different levels of endorsement for each domain between batterer groups were found. Further, the percentage of spouse abusing offenders classified into batterer groups was similar for both the development and test sample, suggesting that a trichotomy of spouse abusers can be applied to a non-native offender population.

In contrast to the community literature (e.g., Gondolf, 1988; Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994), the largest proportion of batterers was found in the “generally violent” batterer group. This group was larger than the “antisocial” batter group which, in turn, was larger than the “family only” batterer group. Taking into consideration the behavioral and psychological nature of offender populations, this finding may not be unexpected. Offender populations, in general, have a high incidence of violence in the family-of-origin, high rates of drug and alcohol abuse, and a high incidence of psychiatric and personality disorders (Dutton & Hart, 1992). Based on the typologies (Cadsky & Crawford, 1988; Gondolf, 1988; Hamberger et al., 1996; Hanson et al., 1997; Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; Saunders, 1992; Shields et al., 1988), these characteristics are more commonly found among “generally violent” batterers and, to a lesser extent, among “antisocial” batterers and “family only” batterers.

Hypotheses one had four sub-hypotheses related to each domain. Items in each

domain reflect attributes of the batterer typologies described in the literature. For the most part, the sub-hypotheses were supported. Item endorsement analyses found meaningful differences between the batterer groups on each domain. Offenders in the “family only” batterer group and offenders in the “generally violent” batterer groups were effectively classified on the majority of domain items. Offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group, however, were less effectively classified on the basis of “antisocial” batterer items than the other typology groups. Each hypothesis will be discussed.

Sub-hypothesis 1. There was partial support of the predictions relating to the criminal history domain. Offenders with the most extensive and violent criminal history were classified as being in the “generally-violent” batterer group. Offenders in the “family only” batterer group had less extensive and less violent criminal history. The criminal history of offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group was comparable to the men in the “family only” batterer group. The differentiating factor between “antisocial” batterers and “family only” batterers was the higher number of convictions among offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group.

Sub-hypothesis 2. The hypothesis regarding substance abuse was supported. Offenders in the “generally violent” batterer group had more severe substance abuse problems than offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group, who, in turn, had a more severe substance abuse problem than offenders in the “family only” batterer group.

Sub-hypothesis 3. For the hypotheses regarding the family-of-origin and marital relations domain, predictions related to family-of-origin were supported while predictions regarding marital relations were not supported. Offenders in the “generally violent”

batterer group were the most likely to have had dysfunctional parents or criminal history in their family-of-origin. The “family only” group was the least likely to witness spouse abuse. Offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group were more likely to have had dysfunctional parents. Further, a history of child abuse was slightly higher among offenders in this group. This finding is concordant with the findings of Hamberger et al. (1996). In their study, men in cluster 1 (i.e., “antisocial”) reported more child abuse victimization than men in cluster 2 (i.e., “generally violent”) and cluster 3 (“family only”). Overall, the high endorsement of dysfunctional parents and child abuse of offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group suggests that the family-of-origin is more problematic among these men.

A large proportion of offenders in all three groups endorsed items at the “family only” level, suggesting that the severity of marital problems was low. However, the percentage of offenders in each batterer group endorsing this item was different between the groups. Offenders in the “family only” batterer group had a higher level of endorsement than offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group, who, in turn, had a higher level of endorsement than men in the “generally violent” batterer group.

The high level of endorsement at the “family only” level indicates that a large percentage of offenders in each batterer group have communication problems or were not dissatisfied with their relationship. For instance, over half of the offenders in the “family only” batterer group and the “antisocial” batterer group, and over three-quarters of the men in the “generally violent” batterer group had communication problems in their relationship. Furthermore, the high level of endorsement of the “family only” level can

also be explained by the low level of participation or completion of marital therapy among offenders. Participation or completion of marital therapy were variables that were descriptive at the “antisocial” batterer and the “generally violent” batterer level. A low percentage of offenders in each batterer group (less than 20%) participated and completed marital intervention programs (less than 1%). The low rate of participation and completion of intervention programs is inconsistent with previous findings. For example, Saunders (1992) reported that over half the men in the “antisocial” batterer group and slightly less than half of the men in the “generally violent” batterer group had completed marital counseling. Participation and completion of marital therapy is less common among spouse abusing offenders than those who have not been exposed to the criminal justice system.

Sub-hypothesis 4. There was partial support for the hypothesis regarding personal and emotional orientation. Offenders in the “generally violent” batterer group had severe behavior and emotional problems. These offenders were also the most supportive of domestic violence and instrumental violence. Offenders in the “family only” batterer group had a low level of emotional and behavior problems, and had the most liberal attitudes towards women.

Offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group were postulated to have moderate emotional and behavior problems, and were most likely to have rigid sex role attitudes. However, offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group were found to have mild emotional problems and severe behavioral problems. Further, their attitudes towards women were as liberal as “family only” batterers. This finding was inconsistent with the typology literature based on community samples. For example, Saunders (1992) found that “antisocial”

batterers had the most rigid attitudes towards women.

Implications of the item endorsement. The findings of the item endorsement support a trichotomy of batterers in offender populations, and that the typology developed with community samples can be applied to the “generally violent” and “family only” non-native offenders. The “generally violent” batterer group was similar to the “mixed assaulters” (Cadsky & Crawford, 1988), the “sociopathic” batterer (Gondolf, 1988), and the “generally violent/antisocial” batterers in the literature. The “family only” batterers, for the most part, resembled the “typical” batterers (Gondolf, 1988), the “family only” batterer (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; Saunders, 1992), and “non-pathological” batterers (Hamberger et al., 1996).

Offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group of this study were not as consistent with community-based typologies as the “family only” batterer group and the “generally violent” batterer group. Nonetheless, the findings in the present study did provide support for a third group among offenders. This group, as a whole, is qualitatively different from the “family only” batterer group and the “generally violent” batterer group. Its level of criminal history, severity of marital problems, attitude, and emotional problems are similar to “family only” batterers. While its level of substance abuse and severity of behavioral problems is similar to “generally violent” batterers. Because the “antisocial” batterer group has qualities of both the “generally violent” batterer group and the “family only” batterer group it cannot be collapsed into one or the other, and represents a distinct group in offender populations.

The findings of the item endorsement also illustrate that the scale developed in the

present study was relatively effective in grouping offenders. This scale was based on the cumulative weighted scores using four domains (criminal history, substance abuse, family-of-origin, and personal and emotional orientation). Items for each domain were drawn from the batterer typology literature. Previous studies have used cluster analysis to define their batterer groups (Hamberger et al., 1996; Gondolf, 1988; Saunders, 1992). The present study did not employ cluster analysis to avoid construction of a new typology that would be uniquely defined by the study's sample.

Native offenders

Support for the trichotomy among native offenders was not found. In the native offender sample, it appears that there are two global groups of batterers. One group which resembles the "generally violent" batterers of this study, and a second group which has the attributes of both the "antisocial" and "family only" batterers. Support for two batterer groups was found in both the development and test sample. Both the native development and test sample had similar percentage distributions between batterer groups.

Although the trichotomy could not be applied to native offenders, the trichotomy typology may be still be valid. The present study did find a few men who were categorized as "family only" spouse abusers. It may be that there are native men who qualify as "family only" spouse abusers but who have not interacted with the federal criminal justice system.

Results of item endorsement analyses for the "generally violent" and "antisocial" native offenders were similar to those found for non-native offenders, suggesting that these groups are identifiable in offender populations. Offenders in the native "generally violent"

batterer group strongly endorsed the “generally violent” items on all four domains. With the exception of the item of family background and the item of behavior, native offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group followed a similar pattern of endorsement as non-native offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group.

There were a few differences between non-native and native “antisocial” batterers. These differences may be due to the fact that empirical community-based spouse abuse research has predominantly examined the features and attributes of non-native populations (Caesar, 1988; Hamberger et al., 1996; Roberts, 1987; Saunders, 1992). Family-of-origin, for example, was not able to effectively classify native offenders, while it was able to classify non-native offenders. Family-of-origin is a problematic area among native offenders (Johnson, 1997). For instance, parental absence and neglect is frequently reported among native offenders (Johnson, 1997). Native and non-native “antisocial” batterer groups also endorsed different behavioral items. Native “antisocial” batterers tend to have mild behavior problems, whereas non-native “antisocial” batterers had severe behavior problems.

The findings of the item endorsement may be used to guide subsequent studies on native batterer typologies. In particular, researchers may want to consider the findings of the family-of-origin and marital relation domain. The variables used in the present study were based on the literature in the community, and not all of these variables were applicable to native offender batterer groups. Findings of the section of Other Variables may be used to clarify group membership. These findings will be discussed in the section of Other Variables.

Hypothesis 2: General and Violent Recidivism

Non-Native Offenders

Hypothesis 2, that there would be meaningful differences between the groups with respect to the general and violent recidivism, was supported. The “generally violent” group were the most likely to commit a violent crime during 12 months post-release, and had the highest rate of recidivism in the survival analysis which followed offenders for 24 months post-release. The “antisocial” batterer group had a higher rate of re-offending than the “family only” batterer group. Given that meaningful differences were found between batterer groups, the findings support a trichotomy of batterers among non-native offenders and validates the scale

The different levels of endorsement of domain items with the development sample illustrated a trichotomy of spouse abusers, and the results from the test sample confirm that there are different batterer types in offender populations. Given that the “generally violent” batterers of the development sample and the “generally violent” batterers of the test sample were the most likely to commit a violent offence provides support for this group of batterers in offender populations. Similarly, “family only” batterers in the development sample and the test sample were least likely to commit a violent crime. Lastly, the “antisocial” batterer group in the development sample did not have an extensive criminal history and were unlikely to have a violent offence. The test sample showed the same findings with the “antisocial” batterer group. These findings have implications for correctional planning of offenders with a history of spouse abuse. These implications will be addressed in the section of Clinical Implications and Implications for

Correctional Settings.

Native Offenders

The hypothesis regarding general and violent recidivism was also supported for native offenders. The “generally violent” batterer group were the most likely to commit a violent crime during 12 months post-release, suggesting that the “generally violent” group and the “antisocial” batterer group are different with respect to general and violent recidivism. Interestingly, the rate of recidivism between native batterer groups was not significantly different. This finding may be due to the high rate of recidivism among native offenders, with recidivism rates being nearly 50% higher among native offenders than non-native offenders (Grant & Gillis, 1997).

Overall, the differences of violent and general recidivism between batterer groups support the concept of a batterer typology in the native offender population. “Generally violent” batterer groups of the native test sample had the most prolific criminal history. Similarly, “generally violent” batterers of the native development sample were the most likely to have a violent offence. “Antisocial” batterers of the test sample had a criminal history that was non-violent. “Antisocial” batterers of the development sample were more likely to commit a non-violent offence. These findings confirm a typology of spouse abusers in the native offender population.

Hypothesis 3: New spousal assaults

For hypothesis 3, meaningful differences between the groups with respect to new convictions related to spousal assault, was supported. All new assault convictions involving a spouse during 12 months post-release, in the non-native and native samples,

were committed by the “generally violent” batterer group. Given that violent recidivism is a prognostic indicator of spousal recidivism during conditional release (Hart et al., 1995), this finding is not unexpected since the “generally violent” batterer group were the most likely to have a violent offence conviction. Taking into consideration the findings of criminal recidivism and spousal assault recidivism, the “generally violent” batterer group can be expected to interact with the criminal justice system more frequently than other batterer groups.

Spousal assault incidents of the “generally violent” batterer group were not consistent with the community-based spousal abuse literature (Hanson et al., 1997; Hart et al., 1995; Gondolf, 1988). The present study found the spousal assault incident involved physical violence, but no weapon was used during the assault. In comparison, Gondolf (1988) found that the “generally violent” batterer was very likely to use a weapon, and the batterer was often abusive sexually. The small number of new convictions of assault towards a spouse may account for the difference between the findings of the present study and the literature. The data of Gondolf’s (1988) study, for example, was based on interviews with 550 women. The spousal assault information in the present study was based on ten new convictions of assault towards a spouse.

Overall, the percentage of new assaults in both samples was lower than the percentage presented in community-based literature. Dunford (1992) found the percentage of spousal assault recidivism ranged from 13% to 20% during a 12 month period. The percentage was dependent on the source of information. Official reports (e.g., police records) had the lower bound percentage, whereas interviews with the victim had the higher bound

percentage. The low percentage of spousal assault recidivism in all probability reflects the study's methodology; namely, new convictions were used to record incidents of spousal assault. Because police reports will contain all new charges in addition to convictions of spousal violence, the percentage of recidivistic spousal assault will be higher.

Hypothesis five: Other variables

Non-Native Offenders

Factors related to criminal history were addressed by the fifth hypothesis. Overall, meaningful differences were found between non-native batterer groups on domains of employment, marital relations, family background, criminal history, offence history, substance abuse, and mental health. These findings provide confirmation and support of a batterer typology with non-native offenders, and these findings can improve the classification of offenders into spouse abusing groups. For instance, drug trafficking offences and attempt murder were found to be specific to "family only" batterers, and an assault offence was found to be specific to "generally violent" batterers. Also, financial problems were more common among "generally violent" batterers, and being the victim of a spouse abuse was more frequent among "antisocial" and "generally violent" batterers. These variables may clarify group membership in the family-of-origin and marital relations domain. "Antisocial" batterers had the highest percentage of mental health diagnoses. This finding could be used to help classify this group of offenders.

Native Offenders

Contrary to the finding of non-native offenders, native batterer groups were not significantly different with respect to education, offence history, mental health, and marital

relations. However, meaningful differences were found between batterer groups on variables of family-of-origin, employment, criminal history, and substance abuse.

Collectively, these findings indicate that not all variables related to criminal history are effective in classifying native offenders into batterer groups. Future studies may want to use different items in their typology on the basis of these findings.

Meaningful differences that were found between batterer groups can be used to further develop the typology and clarify the dichotomy of native spouse abusers. For instance, “generally violent” batterers had a poorer relationship with their father than “antisocial” batterers. Given that no meaningful difference was found between batterer group on endorsement of the family-of-origin item, the offender’s relationship with his father may help classify offenders into groups. The job history of the offender may also be used. The “generally violent” batterer group were more likely to have an unstable job history.

Limitations

Three factors may limit the generalizability of the results. The first limitation involves the reliability of archival data, the second limitation is the use of new convictions as a measure of recidivism, and the third limitation is that mental health measures were not used.

The archival data used in this study was created by case management officers and collected on admission of the offender. Therefore, the researcher used the data which existed in the file, and relied on the fact that it was relatively accurate and reliable. The quality of the information in the offender’s file is defined by the OIA, and the detail provided by case management officers. Although the type of information in the present

study was limited to the OIA, there was enough information to develop variables for the typology. In addition, the use of archival data for the present study provided the opportunity to gather large amounts of data, and provided the benefit of having a large sample base which would not of been possible through other methods (e.g., interviews with the offender or his spouse). Lastly, using the archival data available allowed for an extended follow-up of up to 24 months, and allowed for a development and testing sample.

New convictions rather than new charges were used in the study as an index of re-offence. In Canada, there is no central data base which provides a list of new charges for each offender. Rather, this information is held by each police force in the country. New convictions, however, are held in a single data base by the Correctional Service of Canada for offenders serving a federal sentence.

Using new convictions can result in a smaller number of cases identified as recidivists since not all criminal charges will proceed to the court system. However, the information obtained by using new convictions is more reliable since new charges may be unfounded or have no basis. Further, using new convictions provides a means to identify new cases of spousal assault since there is an official record of the incident. In general, spousal assault incidents would not be recorded in the offender's file because the incident occurred in the home and did not come to the attention of correctional authorities. In using new convictions, offenders who are abusive towards their spouse can be identified since the offender has been sentenced by the criminal justice system. Information can than be gathered regarding this assault.

Meaningful differences have been found between spouse abusing groups on measures of mental health. For instance, Hamberger et al. (1996) found that “antisocial” batterers had high scores on scales of depression (Hamberger et al., 1996) and tended to have high elevations on the Negativistic-Dependent scale of personality measures (Hamberger et al., 1996). Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) described “antisocial” batterers as schizoid, and “generally violent” batterers as having antisocial personality disorder. Measures of mental health were not included in the present typology. Inclusion of these measures may help clarify the characteristics of the “antisocial” batterer in the offender population.

Overall, the study found that the OIA may be an effective tool for classifying offenders. Additional variables may be needed to further develop the typology for use with offender populations. For instance, the frequency and severity of spousal violence may be useful in clarifying batterer groups of offender populations. The severity of spousal violence between batterer groups has been shown to be different between batterer groups (Hanson et al., 1997; Saunders, 1996).

Theoretical Consideration

This study adds to the growing body of literature which supports batterer typologies. The batterer groups showed meaningful differences on domain items, recidivism, and other variables related to criminal history. Collectively, these findings suggest that spouse abusers are a heterogeneous group with distinct behavioral, psychological, demographic, and criminal factors.

Despite empirical support for a batterer typology, there is still the issue of whether

there is a continuum of violence or a distinct typology. The continuum of violence would range from no abuse to severe abuse, with each sub-type as a point on this continuum. "Family only batterers would be located between non-abusive men and "antisocial" batterers. Their violence is restricted to their spouse, the severity of his violence can be considered mild, and they have little psychopathological and antisocial history. "Generally violent" batterers would follow the "antisocial" batterers on the continuum, and would be located at the distal end of the continuum. The "generally violent" batterer is violent towards intra- and extra-familial members, he rates high on violence severity, the existence of psychopathological disorders, and he has an extensive antisocial history and involvement with the law. If this is so, then as suggested by Gondolf (1988), there may exist a "continuum of escalating male control and the degradation of women suggested by pro-feminists" (p.198). According to this perspective, a subculture of male violence would be harbored at one distal end of the spectrum. "Generally violent" batterers would fall in this group. The overcompensation by the batterer to live up to the masculine stereotype would be at the end of the "family only" batterers (Gondolf, 1988).

Alternatively, it could be argued that each batterer sub-type represents a distinct phenomena in itself resulting from a particular form of psychological deficiency (Gondolf, 1988). In this case, each sub-type is being understood from an etiological perspective. Each type of batterer is likely to be "distinguished by a unique set of causal factors, like stress events of psychopathology. A subtheory for each type of batterer may be constructed around these factors" (Gondolf, 1988, p.198). There is some support for this argument. For example, Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) found that violent

batterers, in comparison to family-only batterers were the most likely to have witnessed physical violence between their parents. They found that "... the more parental violence a man witnessed as a child, the more violent he will end up being himself as an adult (i.e, a generally violent batterer)" (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994, p.487). In the present study a similar relationship was found. "Generally violent" batterers were the most likely to have witnessed spousal violence, and had the highest level of criminal involvement and physical and psychological harm was highest among their victims.

Each sub-type of batterers can also be understood by an ecological perspective (Appleford, 1989). The ecological perspective combines sociological perspectives, social learning perspectives, psychological perspectives, substance abuse, and patriarchal views into a single perspective. This perspective takes into account the differences on psychological, behavioral, criminal history, mental health, and demographic variables found among spouse abusers. Each group of spouse abusers is viewed as an independent group with its own set of personal and environmental causal factors. There are findings in the present study which provide preliminary support of the ecological perspective. For instance, the typology found that very few men in the "family only" group witnessed spouse abuse, whereas a large percentage of the "generally violent" batterer group have witnessed spouse abuse. The behavior of the "generally violent" spouse abuser may be due to witnessing spouse abuse as a child. Further the high level of substance abuse among "generally violent" batterers suggests that substance use may be related to the spousal assault incident. The "generally violent" batterer group were also found to have conservative attitudes towards women, suggesting a patriarchal perspective may partially

account for the spousal violence among “generally violent” offenders. “Family only” batterers had a poor ability to cope with stress and have a low frustration tolerance. It may be that they become abusive during periods of high stress. As such, psychological factors may be a factor related to spouse abuse among these men. “Antisocial” batterers had moderate substance abuse problems and were more likely to have a diagnoses of mental disorder, suggesting that substance use and psychological factors may account for their abusive behavior.

Whether the typology represents a continuum or a distinct phenomena, the typology has utility. It provides characteristics of groups of spouse abusers that can be used to design group specific treatment programs, safety planning of spouses, and for decisions of correctional officers. The implications of the typology are discussed in the next section.

Clinical Implications And Implications For Correctional Planning

The findings of the study illustrate that spouse abusing offenders are not a homogenous group, and they can be divided into distinct groups. Moreover, criminal and spousal assault recidivism are different between the groups. These findings can be used by forensic psychologists in diagnostic assessment and the development of appropriate intervention programs that target the needs of each batterer group. Further, the typology can be used by correctional policy makers to guide sentencing requirements, supervision during conditional release, and safety planning of the spouse. The clinical implications and the implications for correctional planning of the typology will be discussed.

Overall, the number of theories regarding spouse abusers has given rise to a corresponding continuum of intervention of strategies (Moore et al., 1997). The principal

intervention offered to spouse abusing offenders is a psycho-educational program. This program relies strongly on the feminist theory, and uses cognitive behavioral intervention to target the interaction style and attitudes of the abuser. However, a single cognitive-behavioral program is not sufficient to target all the needs of each batterer group. Rather an ecological perspective would be more adept at targeting the needs of the batterer groups since it does not rely on a single perspective to address the spouse abusing behavior of the individual.

The ecological perspective in conjunction with programs tailored to the needs and learning styles of offenders would be beneficial in correctional settings. Treatment intervention in correctional settings are guided by need and risk factors. Need factors are dynamic factors that if changed can result in variation in criminal conduct (Andrews et al., 1990). Risk factors are factors that increase the offender's chance of re-offending (e.g., substance abuse). The most effective interventions for reducing recidivism have been those that are delivered to high risk cases, target criminogenic needs, and are matched to the learning style of the offender (Andrews et al., 1990). Applying these principles to spouse abusing offenders, re-enforces the need of different interventions for different types of spouse abusers. An outline of treatment paradigms are provided below.

Offenders in the "family only" batterer group may benefit from couples counseling following successful completion of a psycho-educational program. As such, their attitudes towards women would be addressed, and the offender and the spouse would learn to communicate effectively. Moreover, family visits could be used as a practicum, where skills acquired from the intervention can be applied. These family visits provide a

controlled setting where the interaction between the spouse and the offender can be monitored. Offenders in the “antisocial” batterer group as well as the “generally violent” batterer group would need to address their substance abuse prior to initiating spouse abuse intervention programs. Hamberger & Hastings (1990) found that spousal assault recidivism was related to substance abuse, with a higher percentage of recidivism among men with substance abuse problems. In addition to addressing substance abuse, the men in the “antisocial” batterer group would require the psycho-educational family violence program, an anger management program, and psychological therapy to work through personal and emotional issues.

Offenders in the “generally violent” group, following completion of the substance abuse program, would require a program to address their violent lifestyle and anger management. Planned family visits would also be beneficial to these men. Considering the findings of previous studies that antisocial personality disorder and psychopathy are prevalent among men in the “generally violent” batterer group, the psycho-educational program may be of limited benefit to men in the “generally violent” batterer group. Hamberger & Hastings (1990) found that recidivists have less capacity for empathy than non-recidivist. Empathic capacity requires that the offender has the ability to appreciate and understand the perspective of the spouse and her experience. It is believed that a program, such as a family violence program, which requires a certain degree of empathy may not be beneficial to the men in the “generally violent” batterer group.

The findings can be taken into consideration in planning and implementing conditions of parole. For example, offenders in the “generally violent” batterer group may require

closer supervision taking into consideration the higher probability of criminal and spousal assault recidivism among “generally violent” batterers, the personal and emotional orientation of offenders in this group, and the high percentage of substance abuse. Further, special conditions to protect the spouse may be needed with “generally violent” batterers, as all new assault convictions towards a spouse were committed by offenders in this group. Also, parole officers will need to use special supervision strategies to maintain contact with the spouse or girlfriend of all spouse-abusing offenders. The goal of these strategies is to monitor for new incidents of spousal violence. Parole officers, for instance, may want to check in with the spouse on a weekly basis. Lastly, spouse abuse treatment in the community should also be included as condition of parole, with the goal of reducing recidivistic spousal assault.

In sum, the ability to categorize spouse abusing offenders can act as a diagnostic system. Information from the general body of knowledge of a spouse abuse typology to be applied to a specific batterer group to guide treatment interventions and planning release of the offender. The attributes of each batterer group can direct treatment interventions which target the needs of the spouse abusing group, and supervision strategies during conditional release.

REFERENCES

- Allison, P.D. (1984). Event history analysis: Regression for longitudinal event data.
Californica: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Allison, P.D. (1995). Survival analysis using the SAS system: A practical guide.
Cary, N.C.: SAS Institute Inc.
- American Psychiatric Association (1994). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (4th ed.). Washington, DC.: Authors.
- Andrews, D.A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R.D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., Cullen, F.T. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis. Criminology, 28, 369-392.
- Appleford, B. (1989). Family Violence Review: Prevention and Treatment Of Abusive Behavior. Ottawa: Solicitor General of Canada.
- Babcock & Steiner (1999). The relationship between treatment, incarceration, and recidivism of battering: A program evaluation of Seattle's coordinated community response to domestic violence. Journal of Family Psychology, 13, 46-59.
- Bersani, C.A., Chen, T.H., Pendleton, B.F., & Roberts, D (1992). Personality traits of convicted male batterers. Journal of Family Violence, 7, 123-134.
- Bonnie Hutchinson Enterprises, Inc.(1988). Breaking the Cycle of Violence. Prepared for the Correctional Service of Canada: Ottawa, Ont.:Solicitor General Of Canada.
- Brown, S.L. Dynamic factors and recidivism: what have we learned from the Case Needs Review Project? Forum On Correctional Research 10 (3), 46-51.

- Cadsky, O & Crawford, M (1988). Establishing batterer typologies in a clinical sample of men who assault their female partners. Canadian Journal Of Community Mental Health, 7, 119-127.
- Caesar, P.L. (1988). Exposure to Violence in the Families-Of-Origin Among Wife-Abusers And Maritally Nonviolent Men. Violence and Victims, 3, 49-63.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1994). Offender Intake Assessment. Ottawa: On.
- Dobash, R.E., & Dobash, R.P. (1984). The nature and antecedents of violent events. British Journal of Criminology, 2, 269-288.
- Dutton, D.G. (1988). Profiling of wife assaulter: Preliminary evidence for a trimodal analysis. Violence and Victims, 3, 1988.
- 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. (Ed.). (1995). The Batterer: A Psychological Profile. New York, NY: BasicBooks.
- Dutton, D.G., Starzmoski, A, & Ryan, L (1996). Antecedents of abusive behavior personality and behavior in wife assaulters. Journal of Family Violence 11, 113-131.
- Edelson, J.L., Eisikovits, Z., Guttman, E. (1985). Men who batter women: A critical review of the evidence. Journal of Family Issues, 6, 229-247.
- Elbow, M. (1977). Theoretical considerations of violent marriages. Social Casework, Nov., 515-526.
- Gondolf, E.W. (1988). Who are those guys? Towards a behavioral typology of batterers. Violence and Victims, 3, 187-203.

- Grant, B.A. & Gal, M. (1997). Case Management Preparation for Release and Day Parole Outcome. Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Grant, B.A. & Gillis, C.A. (1997). Day Parole Outcome, Criminal History and Other Predictors of Successful Sentence Completion. Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada
- Hamberger, L.K. & Hastings, J.F. (1990). Recidivism following spouse abuse abatement counseling: Treatment program implications. Violence and Victims, 5, 157-170.
- Hamberger, L.K. & Hastings, J.E. (1991). Personality correlated of men who batter and nonviolent men: Some continuities and discontinuities. Journal of Family Violence, 6, 131-147.
- Hamberger, L.K., Lohr, J.M., Bonge, D., & Tolin, D. F. (1996). A large sample empirical typology of male spouse abusers and its relationship to dimensions of abuse. Violence and Victims, 11, 277-292.
- Hanson, R.K., Cadsky, O., Harris, A., & Lalonde, C. (1997). Correlates of Battering Among 997 Men: Family History, Adjustment, and Attitudinal Differences. Violence and Victims, 12, 191-208.
- Hanson, R.K. & Thornton, D (1999). Static 99: Improving Actuarial Risk Assessments For Sex Offenders. Ottawa: Solicitor of General of Canada.
- Hanson, R.K. & Wallace-Capretta, (in press). Attitudinal support for wife assault: New findings and cumulative evidence. Ottawa: Solicitor General of Canada.
- Hare , R.D. (1991). The Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.

- Hart, S.D., Kropp, P.R., Roesch R., Ogloff, J.R.P., & Whittemore, K. (1994). Wife assault in community-resident offenders. Canadian Journal of Criminology, October, 435-466.
- Hastings, J.E., & Hamberger, L.K. (1988). Personality characteristics of spouse abusers: A controlled comparison. Violence and Victim, 3, 31-48.
- Hays, W.L., & Winkler, R.L. (Eds.) (1971). Statistics: Probability, inference, and decision. United States of America: Holt, Rinehart and Winstorn, Inc.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A. & Stuart, G.L. (1994). Typologies of male batterers: Three subtypes and the differences among them. Psychological Bulletin, 116, 476-497.
- Hotaling, G.T., & Sugarman, D.B. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife Violence: The current state of knowledge. Violence and Victims, 1, 101-124.
- Howell, M.J., & Pugliesi, K.L. (1988). Husbands who harm: Predicting spousal violence by men. Journal of Family Violence, 3, 15-27.
- Johnston, J.C. (1997). Aboriginal offender survey: Case files & interview sample. Prepared for the Research and Development Division, Correctional Service of Canada, Report No. 61; Ottawa.
- Kaufman Kantor, G. & Straus, M.A. (1990). The "Drunken Bum" theory of wife beating. In M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (Eds.), Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families (pp.203-224). New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Kropp, P.R., Hart, S.D., Webster, C.D. & Eaves, D (1995). Manual for the Spousal Assault Risk Assessment guide (2nd edition). Vancouver: The British Columbia Institute on Family Violence.

- Maiuro, R.D., Cahn, T.S., & Vitaliano, P.P. (1986). Assertiveness deficits and hostility in domestically violent men. Violence and Victims, 1, 279-289.
- Moore, K.J., Greenfield, W.L., Wilson, M. & Kok, A.C. (1997). Toward a taxonomy of batterers. Families in society: The journal of Contemporary Human Services, Jul-Aug., 352-360.
- Motiuk, L. (1998). Classification for correctional programming: The offender intake assessment (OIA) process. Forum on Correctional Research, 9, 18-22.
- Motiuk, L. (1998). Using dynamic factors to better predict post-release outcome. Forum on Correctional Research, 10, 12-15.
- Neidig, P.H., Friedman, D. H. & Collins, B.S. (1986). Attitudinal characteristics of males who have engaged in spouse abuse. Journal of Family Violence, 1, 223-233.
- Roberts, A.R. (1987). Psychosocial Characteristics of Batterers: A Study of 234 men Charged with Domestic Violence Offenses. Journal of Family Violence, 2, 81-93.
- Rodgers, K. (1994). Wife Assault: The Findings of a National Survey. Juristat Service Bulletin, 14 (9), 1-21.
- Robinson, D. & Taylor J. (1995). The Incidence of Family Violence Perpetrated by Federal Offenders: A File Review Study. Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Rosenbaum, A. & O'Leary K.D. (1981). Violence Characteristics of Abusive Couples. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 49, 63-71.
- Saunders, D.G. (1992). A typology of men who batter: three types derived from cluster analysis. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 62, 264-275.

- Shield, N.M., McCall, G.J., & Hanneke, C.R. (1988). Patterns of family and nonfamily Violence: violent husbands and violent men. Violence and Victims, 3, 83-97.
- Skinner, H.A. (1981). Toward the integration of classification: Theory and methods. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 90, 68-87.
- Smith, M.D. (1990). Patriarchal ideology and wife beating: A test of a feminist hypothesis. Violence and Victims, 5, 257-273.
- Solicitor General of Canada (1991). Family violence: Assessing the risk. Ottawa, On: Author.
- Sonkin, D.J. (1988). The male batterer: clinical and research issues. Violence and Victims, 3 (1), 65-79.
- Stets, J.E. & Straus, M.A. (1990). The marriage license as a hitting license: A comparison of assaults in dating, cohabiting, and married couples. In M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (Eds.), Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Straus, M.A. (1993). Identifying offenders in criminal justice research on domestic assault. American Behavioral Scientist, 36, 587-600.
- Taylor, G. (1998). Offender needs: Providing the focus for our correctional interventions. Forum On Correctional Research, 10 (3), 3-8.
- Yllo, K.A., & Straus, M (1990). Patriarchy and violence against wives: The impact of structural and normative factors. In M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (Eds.), Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Appendix A

Spousal Assault Coding Sheet

The coding sheet is to be completed for subjects who had an assault conviction following their 1997 release date.

FPS: _____

Sentence Commencement Date: _____

Date of Release: **DP** _____

FP _____

SR _____

WED _____

Date of new release: _____

Group:

1. Generally violent
2. Antisocial
3. Family-only

1. Are there any convictions of assault during conditional release or following WED?

1. No → Stop
2. Yes → Go to Q2

2. Are there any convictions of spousal assault during release or following WED?

1. No
2. Yes → Go to Q.3

3. Who was the victim of the spousal assault?
 1. Wife
 2. Common-law
 3. Girlfriend
 4. Both (spouse and other)

4. Type of spousal assault:
 1. Physical assault
 2. Sexual assault
 3. Psychological abuse
 4. Both physical and sexual assault
 5. Threats
 6. Both physical assault and threats
 7. Both sexual assault and threats
 8. Not stated

5. Degree of physical injury:
 1. No injury
 2. Injury-no medical attention necessary
 3. Injury-medical attention only
 4. No information

6. Was a weapon used during the spousal assault:
 1. No
 2. Yes
 3. Not stated

END

Appendix B

Table 1B

Total Composite Score Of Non-Native Offenders By Cumulative Percent

Total Cumulative Score	Cumulative Percent
4	1.20
5	5.40
6	16.0
7	28.50
8	49.30
9	76.20
10	95.70
11	99.80
12	100.00

Table 2B

Endorsement of Criminal History Variables by Percent of Non-Native Batterer Group Classification

Item	Variable	Group classification			χ^2 (df=2)	Cramer's V
		FO (n=97)	A (n=203)	GV (n=308)		
Total youth convictions	15 or more	5.9	7.2	9.3	--	--
	10-14	11.8	5.8	6.8	--	--
	5-9	5.9	15.9	22.0	--	--
	2-4	41.2	36.2	33.0	--	--
	1	35.3	34.8	28.8	--	--
Total adult convictions	15 or more	28.4	31.0	61.6	--	--
	10-14	16.0	20.5	15.2	--	--
	5-9	17.3	22.1	16.50	--	--
	2-4	23.5	19.5	5.40	--	--
	1	14.8	6.80	1.40	--	--
Threats or weapon use	Violence used					
	Yes	36.08	36.63	60.26	34.38***	0.24
	No	63.92	63.37	39.74		
	Threats violence	31.25	40.10	68.75	61.69***	0.32
	Threat-weapon	23.16	27.18	42.52	18.64***	0.18
	Weapon used	22.92	21.50	26.47	1.74	0.05

Table 2B (cont.)

Item	Variable	<u>Group classification</u>			χ^2 (df=2)	Cramer's <u>V</u>
		FO (<u>n</u> =97)	A (<u>n</u> =203)	GV (<u>n</u> =308)		
Extent of physical harm	Minor injury	22.11	26.87	43.14	21.58***	0.19
	Serious injury	16.84	17.41	27.09	8.39*	0.12
	Caused death	11.34	12.81	9.42	1.48	0.05
Extent of psychological harm	Mild	18.29	25.42	36.90	13.20***	0.16
	Moderate	16.46	17.44	44.61	45.58***	0.30
	Serious	12.99	21.71	36.58	21.46***	0.20

Note. F=Family-Only, A=Antisocial, GV=Generally Violent

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$

Table 3B

Endorsement of Substance Abuse Variables By Percent of Non-Native Group Membership

Variable	Group classification			χ^2 (df=2)	Cramer's V
	FO (n=97)	A (n=203)	GV (n=308)		
Abuses alcohol	31.25	64.85	82.79	92.36***	0.39
Abuses drugs	38.54	68.66	83.71	74.48***	0.35
Drinks frequently	11.58	49.00	67.55	92.19***	0.39
Often uses drugs	13.54	46.27	64.90	78.95***	0.36
Drink binges	18.95	46.00	64.33	62.39***	0.32
Drug use spreeds	14.89	45.18	63.82	70.54***	0.35
Drinks to relieve stress	11.58	42.93	68.98	103.43***	0.42
Uses drugs to relieve stress	14.58	45.69	65.89	79.97***	0.37
Alcohol interferes with marriage	6.38	44.00	68.95	118.25***	0.44
Drug use interferes with marriage	8.51	41.12	63.67	91.98***	0.39
Legal infractions substance use	19.79	51.74	75.24	98.56***	0.40
Participated in program	26.80	47.78	68.09	56.37***	0.30
Completed program	19.59	38.00	49.83	28.72***	0.22

Note. F=Family-Only, A=Antisocial, GV=Generally Violent

*p<0.05. **p<0.01. ***p<0.001

Table 4B

Non-Native: Endorsement of Family-Of-Origin and Marital Relations Variables By Percentage of Batterer Group

Item	Variable	Group classification			χ^2 (df=2)	Cramer's $\underline{V}$
		FO (n=97)	A (n=203)	GV (n=308)		
Childhood history	Spouse abuse					
	Yes	10.31	36.79	57.43	70.55***	0.35
	No	89.69	63.21	42.57		
	Dysfunctional parents	14.58	42.21	67.66	90.69***	0.39
	Family criminal	16.67	31.28	48.49	36.36***	0.25
Marital history	Dissatisfied					
	Yes	9.28	19.70	30.92	21.67***	0.19
	No	90.72	80.30	69.08		
	Communication problems					
	Yes	51.58	53.85	77.89	40.57***	0.26
	No	48.42	46.15	22.11		
	Participated in therapy	4.21	12.81	16.61	9.71**	0.13
	Completed therapy	0.00	2.50	5.59	7.62*	0.11

*p<0.05. **p<0.01. ***p<0.001

Table 5B

Non-Native: Endorsement Of Personal and Emotional Variables By Percentage of Batterer Group

Item	Variable	Group classification			χ^2 (df=2)	Cramer's $\underline{V}$
		FO (n=97)	A (n=203)	GV (n=308)		
Cognition	Grandiose	7.22	15.27	24.17	16.08***	0.16
	Impulsive	48.94	75.13	91.48	82.61***	0.37
	Disregard for others	32.29	52.00	80.84	91.81***	0.39
	Narrow & rigid thinking	21.88	40.10	64.14	62.35***	0.32
	Insensitive	15.96	32.99	61.31	76.35***	0.36
Behavior	Manipulative	28.41	40.21	67.11	57.72***	0.32
	Thrill-seeking	15.96	25.74	40.94	25.77***	0.21
	Risk-taking	44.21	52.71	74.75	41.41***	0.26
	Hostile	11.58	27.64	52.29	63.92***	0.33
	Low tolerance	28.72	56.78	79.80	87.33***	0.38
	Poor conflict resolution	65.26	80.00	94.79	56.67***	0.31
	Poor stress management	37.89	77.27	89.87	112.18***	0.43
	Assertion problem	29.17	33.83	52.63	25.92***	0.21
	Aggressive	37.89	58.91	86.47	96.61***	0.4
	Unrealistic goals	9.38	16.67	32.56	29.51***	0.22
	Poor problem solving	64.89	80.40	93.83	51.54***	0.29

Table 5B (cont.)

Item	Variable	Group classification			χ^2 (df=2)	Cramer's V
		FO (n=97)	A (n=203)	GV (n=308)		
Attitude	Women roles unequal	20.22	17.95	35.86	21.52***	0.19
	Support domestic violence	30.85	38.86	64.00	46.85***	0.28
	Marital/Family no value	4.17	10.45	20.92	20.75***	0.18
	Supportive instrumental violence	25.00	42.64	62.46	46.96***	0.28
	Non-conforming	36.08	54.04	75.82	57.90***	0.31

Note. F=Family-Only, A=Antisocial, GV=Generally Violent

*p<0.05. **p<0.01. ***p<0.001.

Table 6B

Native: Endorsement of Criminal History Variables By Batterer Group.

Item	Variable	Group classification			χ^2 (df=1)	Cramer's V
		FO (n=3)	A (n=65)	GV (n=171)		
Total youth convictions	15 or more		8.00	6.49	--	--
	10-14		12.00	10.39	--	--
	5-9		40.00	23.38	--	--
	2-4		20.00	37.66	--	--
	1		20.00	22.08	--	--
Total adult convictions	15 or more		46.6	63.9	--	--
	10-14		13.8	10.1	--	--
	5-9		24.1	17.8	--	--
	2-4		10.3	6.5	--	--
	1		5.2	1.8	--	--
Threats/ weapon Use threats/	Weapon used		23.44	35.09	2.91	0.11
	Threat-weapon		23.44	45.88	9.78**	0.20
	Threats		40.00	68.24	15.68***	0.26
	Violence used					
	Yes		46.15	64.91	6.89**	0.17
	No		53.85	35.09		

Table 6B (cont.)

Item	Variable	Group classification			χ^2 (df=1)	Cramer's $\underline{V}$
		FO (n=3)	A (n=65)	GV (n=171)		
Extent of physical harm	Caused death		12.31	13.45	0.05	0.02
	Serious injury		20.31	36.47	5.57*	0.15
	Minor injury		27.69	50.00	9.50**	0.2
Extent of psychological harm	Serious		15.52	39.13	10.77***	0.22
	Moderate		33.33	53.89	7.47**	0.18
	Mild		38.33	47.90	1.63	0.08

Note. F=Family-Only, A=Antisocial, GV=Generally Violent

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$.

Table 7B

Native: Endorsement of Substance Abuse Variables By Group Classification

Variable	Group classification			χ^2 (df=1)	Cramer's V
	FO (n=3)	A (n=65)	GV (n=171)		
Abuses alcohol		89.23	99.42	14.92***	0.25
Abuses drugs		56.92	83.04	17.54***	0.27
Drink binges		68.75	89.47	14.76***	0.25
Drug use spreeds		32.26	55.88	10.14***	0.21
Drinks frequently		70.77	86.98	8.54**	0.19
Often uses drugs		37.50	59.06	8.70**	0.19
Drinks to relieve stress		73.02	82.35	2.49	0.1
Uses drugs to relieve stress		38.10	65.09	13.71***	0.24
Alcohol interferes with marriage		67.19	92.94	25.46***	0.33
Drug use interferes with marriage		28.13	58.33	16.92***	0.27
Legal infractions substance use		84.62	97.65	14.25***	0.25
Participated program		58.46	79.53	10.80***	0.21
Completed program		49.23	52.94	0.26	0.03

Note. F=Family-Only, A=Antisocial, GV=Generally Violent

p<0.01. *p<0.001.

Table 8B

Native Offenders: Endorsement of Family-of-Origin and Marital History Variables By Group Classification

Item	Variable	Group classification			χ^2 (df=1)	Cramer's V
		FO (n=3)	A (n=65)	GV (n=171)		
Family-of-origin	Dysfunctional parents		52.31	79.04	16.43***	0.27
	Spouse abuse					
	Yes		41.94	69.51	14.52***	0.25
	No		58.06	30.49		
	Family criminal		43.55	71.69	15.52***	0.26
Marital history	Dissatisfied					
	Yes		21.54	25.29	0.36	0.04
	No		78.46	74.71		
	Communication problems					
	Yes		57.81	75.15	6.69**	0.17
	No		42.19	24.85		
	Participated In therapy		15.63	10.59	1.12	-0.07
	Completed therapy		4.76	5.85	0.10	0.02

Note. F=Family-Only, A=Antisocial, GV=Generally Violent

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$.

Table 9B

Native Offenders: Personal and Emotional Variables Endorsed By Group Classification

Item	Variable	Group classification			χ^2 (df=1)	Cramer's V
		FO (n=3)	A (n=65)	GV (n=171)		
Cognition	Grandiose		14.06	22.81	2.19	0.1
	Impulsive		68.25	87.13	11.14***	0.22
	Disregard for others		52.38	85.63	28.14***	0.35
	Narrow & rigid thinking		26.98	63.74	25.03***	0.33
	Insensitive		20.63	51.50	17.77***	0.28
Behavior	Manipulative		20.63	45.83	12.23***	0.23
	Thrill-seeking		12.31	26.04	5.12*	0.15
	Risk-taking		43.08	63.16	7.77**	0.18
	Hostile		23.08	49.41	13.38***	0.24
	Low frustration tolerance		49.21	72.62	11.23***	0.22
	Poor conflict resolution		80.00	96.47	17.16***	0.27
	Poor stress management		81.54	91.72	4.92*	0.14
	Assertion Problem		33.33	35.29	0.08	0.02
	Aggressive		56.92	83.04	17.54***	0.27
	Unrealistic goals		14.29	32.53	7.62**	0.18
	Poor problem solving		83.08	91.81	3.80*	0.13

Table 9B (cont.)

Item	Variable	Group classification			χ^2 (df=1)	Cramer's $\underline{V}$
		FO (<u>n</u> =3)	A (<u>n</u> =65)	GV (<u>n</u> =171)		
Attitude	Women roles unequal		14.06	41.10	15.09***	0.26
	Support domestic violence		32.31	66.07	21.76***	0.31
	Marital/family no value		1.54	16.47	9.69**	0.20
	Support instrumental violence		25.40	62.35	25.17***	0.33
	Non-conforming		40.63	77.19	28.27***	0.35

Note. F=Family-Only, A=Antisocial, GV=Generally Violent

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$.

Figure 1B Cumulative percentage distribution of non-native offenders by cumulative weighted score