_____ **Research Report** _____

**Profile and Programming Needs of Federal**

**Offenders with histories of Intimate Partner**

**Violence**

**2012 Nº R-265**

**Profile and Programming Needs of Federal Offenders with histories of Intimate Partner Violence**

Lynn A. Stewart

Jenelle Power

&

Colette Cousineau

Correctional Service Canada

May 2012

**Acknowledgements**

# Executive Summary

**Key words:** *Program needs of d*omestic violence offenders, profile of domestic violence offenders, typologies.*

The Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) has been screening, assessing and treating domestic violence (DV) perpetrators since 2000. Several evaluations of this menu of programs have indicated that the interventions reduced reoffending. The current study provides a profile of male perpetrators of domestic violence that points to key criminogenic need areas and program targets.

The snapshot data from male offenders currently under warrant in CSC who have been assessed on the Family Violence Risk Assessment (FVRA) screening indicate that 40% had a suspected history of DV. Results of the screening determine if a more in-depth assessment on the Spousal Assault Risk Assessment (SARA) is required. Of those assessed on the SARA, 44.5% were rated as moderate or high risk. This provides an estimate of at least 18% of the CSC male population with a confirmed history of DV. A second analysis drew data from the complete population of federal offenders assessed as moderate or high risk on the SARA since 2002 and compared them with a sample of offenders under warrant during the same time period who did not have any history of DV. Results indicate that DV offenders had higher criminal history risk ratings, more learning disabilities, more mental health problems and were rated as having higher criminogenic need than non-DV offenders. DV offenders had extensive and varied offence histories with over 90% having previous adult convictions, 79% having at least one other violent offence, 48% having a property offence and 18% having had a sexual offence. Secondary analyses indicated that offenders rated as high risk on the SARA were also higher risk in terms of their criminal histories and rated as having higher criminogenic need than those assessed as moderate risk on the SARA. These results demonstrate the concordance of the SARA evaluation with other risk assessments and suggest that federal offenders can most often be grouped under the Antisocial typology described by Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart.

A breakdown of the sample by Aboriginal status showed that Aboriginal offenders were over–represented among the DV perpetrators with 56.7% having a suspected and 30% a confirmed history of DV. Aboriginal offenders with DV histories were in general rated higher on criminal history risk and criminogenic need; in particular, they had more substantial histories of alcohol abuse than non-Aboriginal DV offenders. The rates of DV among the Inuit offenders are particularly high with over 48% having a confirmed history of DV.

Further analyses determined the extent to which DV offenders overlap with offenders from different offence categories. When the DV group was assessed against the current referral criteria for correctional programs, 40% meet the criteria for a violence prevention program, although this is in part due to the number of domestic violence offences in their histories; over 37% meet the criteria for a substance abuse program and 22% meet the criteria for a sex offender program.

Of concern, is a result showing that under the new program referral guidelines almost half of the confirmed DV offenders would not meet criteria for participating in a family violence prevention program unless the override provision is invoked.

# Table of Contents

# List of Tables

# List of Appendices

## Introduction

Domestic violence is a serious social issue in Canada. While the latest surveys indicate that the rates of lethal and non-lethal partner abuse have declined over the last 10 years (Statistics Canada, 2009), the 2004 General Social Survey (GSS) on victimization found that 7% of women over 15 still report having had an experience with violence by their partners and 6% of men report similar violence within a 5-year period. Aboriginal people, however, are three times more likely to be victims of domestic violence (Mihorean, 2005). There is evidence that the number of domestic assaults recorded through Uniform Crime Statistics vastly underestimates the actual numbers. The same GSS study found that fewer than 3 in 10 (28%) victims reported the abuse to police (36% of women and 17% of men; Mihorean, 2005).

Domestic violence (DV) is linked with a number of negative outcomes for the women who are victims of abuse as well as for their children. Women suffer physical injury and death as a result of domestic violence; in fact, intimate partner violence is a leading cause of death among young women and women who are pregnant or post partum (Chang, Berg, Saltzman, & Herndon, 2005). Women who have been abused are more likely to experience health and psychological problems and reductions in productivity on the job (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 2003). A history of being abused is associated with criminality among adult women. In a recent report on the mental health status of federally sentenced women in Canada, it was found that 52% had a lifetime diagnosis of PTSD associated with being victims of physical and sexual assault (Derkzen, Booth, McConnell & Taylor, 2011).

In addition to the negative effects of domestic violence on the direct victims of the abuse, children who witness domestic violence are also affected. They appear to be differentially affected depending on the extent and duration of the abuse and the age at which it occurs. Research has indicated that witnessing abuse of their mothers may contribute to developmental delays among infants and toddlers, and other psychological and behavioural problems in later childhood; school-aged children who witness abuse are more likely to experience school failure, to have behavioural problems, and suffer post traumatic stress symptoms. Although the large majority of children exposed to domestic violence do not become perpetrators as adults, there is compelling evidence that it does increase the risk to perpetuate violence in adulthood. Rates of future general violence and violence against intimate partners are higher respectively for boys

exposed in childhood to the abuse of their mothers (Alksnis & Taylor, 1995; Delsol & Margolin, 2004; Holt, Buckley & Whelan (2008). Girls who witness abuse are also more likely to be violent and criminal and more likely to become a victim of abuse themselves, thus perpetuating the inter-generational cycle of violence (Geffner, Ingelman, & Zellner, 2003; Maker, Kemmelmeier & Peterson, 1998). Canadian society, then, has a vested interest in reducing the rates of domestic and intimate partner violence.

Research on profiles of domestic violence perpetrators indicate that their characteristics are dependent on the population from which they are drawn. For example, community samples (from probation or self-referral sources) of abusers are heterogeneous with respect to their education, social status, extent of their criminal histories, and attitudes and these client characteristics contribute to differential outcomes following the initial assaultive incident. Three broadly defined typologies of abusers have been identified by Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) and have been generally supported through several years of research (Holtzworth-Munroe & Meehan, 2004): 1) perpetrators who are generally violent and lacking in empathy (Antisocial, sometimes referred to as Generalized Aggressors) estimated at about 25% of community samples; 2) those who are emotionally volatile and dependent (Borderline Personality Organization) estimated at another 25% of community samples, and 3) those who experience discomfort dealing with intimacy but are not violent outside intimate relationships (Non-Pathological group; sometimes referred to as the Family Only group) estimated at about 50% of community samples (Saunders, 1992).

Federally sentenced men with histories of violence against their partners, however, are somewhat more homogenous in their profiles. Wexler (2000) reviewed the files of all Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal federal offenders with histories of spousal violence admitted into federal custody in 1997 (*n* = 847) and assigned them to one of three typologies based on criminal histories, degree of substance abuse, history of child abuse in family of origin, and indicators of personal, emotional, and attitude problems based on the Offender Intake Assessment process. The Family Only group restricted their violence to their spouse; their violence was less severe and they were remorseful after the incidence; they had fewer drug and alcohol problems; they had no substantial criminal histories and were less likely to have histories of being abused as a child than offenders in the other two groups. The Violent group had the highest rates of general violence and the Antisocial group were intermediate between the two other groups. Of her sub-

sample of non-Aboriginal men, only 16%[1] were classified in the Family Only group. Virtually none (1%) of the Aboriginal spousal abusers were in the Family Only group. Another research project on federal male spousal abusers suggests there may be only two broadly defined profiles: offenders who are generally violent and assaultive and offenders who have specific histories of problematic relationships marked by attachment anxiety, jealousy, and dependency (Kerry, 2000). A profile of federal offenders attending the high intensity domestic violence program confirmed that this sample had multiple treatment targets including high rates of violence against partners and others outside of intimate relationships and very high rates of having been victimized or witness to abuse themselves as children (Stewart, Gabora, Kropp, & Lee, 2005).

A review on the risk factors for domestic violence that are appropriate targets for treatment noted that substance abuse, particularly alcohol abuse, emotion mismanagement, and emotion mismanagement specifically related to dependency were the targets that had the greatest empirical support (Stewart & Flight, 2007). In addition, attitudes supportive of the abuse of women, problems in self-regulation and impulse control, poor communication and social skills, association with antisocial peers who are supportive of woman abuse, and dealing with the impact of a previous histories of having been a child witness of domestic abuse were also appropriate targets for treatment of domestic violence offenders although there was less research support for them (Stewart & Flight, 2007).

The Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) has been assessing and providing programs for federal offenders with histories of intimate partner violence in a systematic way since their involvement in the third national Interdepartmental Initiative to address violence towards women was launched in 1997. At this time, administrators contracted outside service providers to deliver family violence prevention programs nationally, mostly in the community. In 2000, a national standardized menu of programs and assessment procedures to address family violence among federal male offenders were implemented in CSC. The process screens offenders at intake for suspected intimate partner violence and provides more in-depth assessment on the Spousal Assault Risk Assessment (SARA) guide for those who meet the initial screening criteria. Male offenders with histories of intimate partner violence who were rated as moderate or high risk on

---

[1] Men with histories of violence against children or those whose race could not be identified were excluded from the study.

the SARA were referred to either the moderate intensity or high intensity programs depending on the number of previous incidents of partner assault and on Aboriginal status. Evaluations of CSC's process of assessment and treatment of domestic violence perpetrators have been positive. An initial program evaluation pointed to significant reductions in violent reoffending as well as reductions in violence against women (Stewart, et al, 2005) and more recent studies confirmed a significant treatment effect for the moderate intensity program (CSC, 2009). In addition, researchers at the Conference Board of Canada (CB of C) calculating a net cost benefit analysis of CSC's correctional programs and concluded that the government saved $6,449 per family violence program participant through reductions in recidivism relative to program costs (CB of C, 2009).

The current menu of domestic violence programs in CSC includes three programs: a moderate program, a high intensity program, and the high intensity Aboriginal program that provides a culturally specific intervention for Aboriginal offenders rated as high risk. National implementation of the generic program that will address all criminogenic targets and include all offenders with the exception of sex offenders is being considered within CSC. This change would mean the deletion of the current menu of specialized family violence programs. An up-to-date profile of male offenders in the federal system who have histories of intimate partner violence is required to determine the programming needs for this high profile group and to examine to what extent this group is unique. This study provides a general profile of male offenders who have been rated as moderate or high risk on the SARA (Spousal Assault Risk Assessment guide) and compares them with a sample of offenders from the general population incarcerated over the same time period without a documented history of violence towards women. The domestic violence offenders' criminal histories, criminogenic needs, risk profile and mental health problems will be compared to those offenders without histories of domestic violence. Where appropriate, the profile will be broken down by Aboriginal status and DV risk rating since these categories determine program allocation according to the family violence programs' referral criteria. The results will also present the extent to which federal domestic violence offenders would meet the referral criteria for other correctional programs in CSC's current menu. This analysis will provide a clearer picture of the diversity of treatment needs of this group.

A note on vocabulary is warranted. This report uses the terms intimate partner violence

(IPV), domestic violence (DV), and family violence interchangeably to mean violence perpetrated by men on their female partners within an intimate relationship. A previous study (Gabora, Stewart, & Allegri, 2007) has profiled female perpetrators of intimate partner violence. While there is a need to further explore the profile and treatment needs of perpetrators of same sex violence and those involved in the larger area of violence against all family members, these issues are beyond the scope of the current study.

**Method**

**Participants**

All incoming male federal offenders are required to be assessed on the Family Violence Risk Assessment Screening (FVRAS) process. This screening process assesses the presence of three indicators suggestive of a history of intimate partner violence. A hit on any one of these indicators results in further assessment on the Spousal Assault Risk Assessment (SARA) guide. This study profiled two groups of domestic violence offenders drawn from the same pool. The first profile includes a snap shot of all male offenders in CSC on (January 11, 2011) who had been assessed on the FVRAS, who had a hit on at least one item, and who subsequently had a SARA assessment. A rating of moderate or high risk confirms a history of intimate partner violence. This analysis allows for an estimate of the current number of federally sentenced offenders with a history of violence against their partners.[2] The breakdown by moderate or high risk and by Aboriginal status is provided as it reflects the type of family violence program that would be appropriate for offenders. A moderate risk rating on the SARA with one incident of partner violence suggests a moderate program and a high risk rating with two or more incidents of intimate partner violence suggests the need for the high intensity family violence program. The Aboriginal program is designed for Aboriginal offenders scoring high on the SARA and having two or more incidents of partner violence. The second series of profiles is drawn from the complete population of male offenders over an eight-year period who were screened in on the FVRAS and subsequently assessed on the SARA as either moderate or high risk. The comparison group is composed of male offenders under CSC supervision over the same time period who were screened on the FVRAS but did not have hits on any of the indicators[3]. This second historic sample allows for an examination of the programming history of offenders with intimate partner violence offences as well as an assessment of their eligibility for participation in further correctional programming applying the current referral criteria.

---

[2] For a number of operational reasons, not every offender who has a hit on the FVRA is given a SARA. For this reason, the estimate of the percentage of the population with a DV history is probably an under-estimate.

[3] It should be noted that while this selection process reliably selects offenders with histories of intimate partner violence and offenders without this pattern, it cannot be concluded that those offenders who are not assessed on the FVRA screening have no history of domestic violence. For a number of reasons, unrelated to their result on the FVRA screening, some offenders have not been assessed on the SARA.

## Procedure/Analytic Approach

Comparisons between the moderate and high risk family violence perpetrators, between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal offenders and between offenders with and without histories of intimate partner violence were conducted using Chi-square procedures. Effect sizes were also calculated to provide a measure of the strength of the relationships given the large sample sizes.

## Measures/Material

The Family Violence Risk Assessment (FVRA) screening conducted at intake on all incoming male federal offenders consists of three indicators: documented partner abuse, documented victim of abuse, and suspected partner abuse perpetrator (based on parole officer's observations of attitudes and fear expressed by partner or ex-partner). A positive response on any one of these indicators requires a more in-depth assessment on the SARA. The SARA (Kropp, Hart, Webster & Eaves, 1995) is a structured risk assessment tool that assesses the risk for intimate partner violence in order to guide appropriate monitoring and intervention. The measure contains 20 items that are scored from zero to two depending on the strength of the evidence for the presence of the risk factor. The final evaluation provided by the assessor determines risk for future abuse against an intimate partner or former partner on a three point scale from low, moderate, or high and overall risk rating for violence towards others associated with the partner is also assessed as low, moderate, or high. The SARA was developed based on retrospective data on offenders with previous histories of partner abuse. The tool has been used internationally to assess the dynamic risk of offenders with histories of partner abuse and case managers rely on the tool to determine the focus of intervention and supervision. Research has confirmed that the measure has good inter-rater reliability and internal consistency (Kropp & Hart, 2000). Recent research has demonstrated that the results of the measure administered closest to the assessment of outcome are significantly associated with violent recidivism against partners (Kropp, Hart, Gibas, & Stewart, in preparation). In CSC, the tool has been incorporated into the risk assessment of all incoming offenders since 2002[4] and results are recorded in the Offender Management System (OMS), the electronic record that contains all case management information on offenders in CSC. An updated SARA is required if there is a change of risk status

---

[4] Note that prior to this date some offender were assessed using the SARA but this was not done systematically for all incoming offenders. Therefore, although almost all the cases date from 2002, there are some cases as early as 1986.

related to additional incidents of abuse or concerns related to a deterioration in a relationship, or alternatively if the risk is lowered because of stabilisation of risk factors.

The SIR (Statistical Information on Recidivism) scale is an actuarial tool that assesses risk for general reoffending within three years of release. The scale contains 15 static risk items that are related to recidivism (e.g., volume of previous offending, types of offending, age at first offence and current age). Each item is weighted according to the strength with which it is associated with recidivism. The total score results in an overall numerical risk rating that places each offender in a risk category from Very Poor to Very Good.

The Custody Rating Scale (CRS) is currently used by Reintegration Programs as a proxy for risk ratings to determine program criteria for Aboriginal offenders. It was designed, however, to determine the security classification of offenders. It consists of two independently scored sub-scales: a five-item Institutional Adjustment sub-scale and a seven-item Security Risk sub-scale. Security classification is determined based on the total sub-scale scores, in accordance with specified cut-off values for minimum and maximum security. Item weight and classification cut-values are, for the most part, empirically derived from a sample of federal offenders. In some cases, item weights are defined by policy priorities. For example, Offence Severity is weighted to prevent the initial placement of an offender serving a life sentence in minimum-security. Cut-off values are designed to produce an offender distribution of 15% minimum-, 73% medium- and 12% maximum-security (Luciani, Motiuk, & Nafekh, 1996).

The background information on the offenders was extracted from components of the Offender Management System (OMS), the official electronic record on all federally sentenced offenders. Risk variables were drawn from the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) which is a comprehensive evaluation conducted on all incoming offenders in CSC. The Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) component of the OIA assesses a wide variety of dynamic risk factors grouped into seven domains, with each domain consisting of multiple indicators. The DFIA yields ratings of need levels for each domain, as well as an overall level of dynamic need ranging from low to considerable (high). In addition to the SIR, the Static Factors Assessment (SFA) provides comprehensive information pertaining to the criminal history and risk factors of each offender yielding an overall level of low, medium, or high static risk assigned to offenders at their time of admission. CSC policy does not permit the use of the SIR for Aboriginal offenders. Therefore, for this study, the estimate of risk for Aboriginal offenders is provided

through the overall static risk rating.

The Computerized Substance Abuse Assessment (CASA) is the part of the intake assessment that evaluates the extent of substance misuse and its relationship to offending. This assessment procedure includes the results of several well validated measures of substance misuse including the 20-item Drug Abuse Screening Test (DAST; Skinner, 1982) and the Alcohol Dependency Scale (ADS; Skinner & Horn, 1984), and the 15-item Problems Related to Drinking Scale (PRD)[5] and the 25-item Michigan Alcohol Screening Test (MAST; Selzer, 1981). The CASA uses the ADS, the DAST, and the PRD to derive overall substance abuse scores and program referral recommendations.

---

[5] The PRD was developed within CSC based on the MAST.

## Results

Table 1 presents a recent snapshot of all male offenders in custody and in the community within CSC who have been assessed on the Family Violence Risk Assessment Screening process. The results provide an estimate of the percentage of male offenders within CSC who have a suspected history of intimate partner violence. Of the 15,166 offenders assessed on the screening tool, 40.4% have a least one hit on the screening criteria. Of the 6,144 offenders for whom SARAs are completed 44.5% are rated as either moderate or high risk. Therefore, at least 18% (2,731/15,166) of the current male offender population has a confirmed history of domestic violence.

Table 1

*Male Federal Offenders with Suspected and Confirmed Histories of Intimate Partner Violence (Snapshot January 2011)*

|  | Non-Aboriginal Male offenders $N = 17,214$ | | Aboriginal male offenders $N = 3,747$ | | Total male offender population $N = 20,961$ | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | $n$ | % | $n$ | % | $n$ | % |
| Assessed on FVRA | 12,258 |  | 2,908 |  | 15,166 | 72.3 |
| One or more positive indicators on FVRA | 4,487 | 36.6 | 1,649 | 56.7 | 6,136 | 40.4 |
| SARA | $n = 4,495$ |  | $n = 1,649$ |  | $n = 6,144*$ |  |
| Low | 2,622 | 58.3 | 786 | 47.7 | 3,409 | 55.5 |
| Moderate | 1,303 | 29.0 | 542 | 32.9 | 1,840 | 30.0 |
| High | 570 | 12.7 | 321 | 19.4 | 891 | 14.5 |

*Note.* FVRA = Family Violence Risk Assessment Screening. SARA = Spousal Abuse Risk Assessment. Some offenders can be assessed on the SARA despite not having been screened in on the FVRA if, during the course of their sentence, information emerges suggesting a potential history of domestic assault (e.g., behaviour during private family visits, comments during program participation, etc.

The next series of analyses present the profile of the population of male offenders who have been assessed on the SARA and rated as high or moderate risk since it has been

incorporated into the intake risk assessment process in 2002. For the remainder of this report, *DV offenders* will refer to offenders assessed on the SARA who have received a moderate or high rating. Offenders with a Low risk rating on the SARA are usually offenders who have had some previous history of relationship abuse but present no current risk to partners.

Table 2 provides the percentage of offenders assessed on the SARA who received a moderate or high rating and the security levels of DV and non-DV offenders by Aboriginal status. More than twice as many DV offenders were rated as moderate than high risk (1,305 to 2,956). The DV offenders were more likely to be housed at a medium or high security facility than offenders without this history. Aboriginal offenders with histories of intimate partner violence are significantly more likely to be rated high risk on the SARA than non-Aboriginal offenders ($\chi^2(1, N = 4,249) = 5.15$, $p = .023$). However, the effect size of the relationship is small ($\varphi = .03$).

Table 2

*SARA Scores and Security Levels of DV and Non-DV Offenders: Cumulative Sample*

| | DV offenders | | Non-DV offenders | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Non-Aboriginal | Aboriginal | Non-Aboriginal | Aboriginal |
| | $N = 3,014$ | $N = 1,247$ | $N = 3,648$ | $N = 613$ |
| Profile Variable | % | % | % | % |
| SARA | | | | |
| Moderate | 71.8 | 66.8 | -- | -- |
| High | 29.6 | 33.7 | -- | -- |
| Security Level[a] | | | | |
| Minimum | 6.4 | 4.3 | 32.2 | 13.8 |
| Medium | 72.0 | 76.3 | 57.1 | 70.1 |
| Maximum | 21.7 | 19.5 | 10.7 | 16.1 |

*Note.* DV = domestic violence. SARA = Spousal Abuse Risk Assessment. [a]$n = 153$ missing.

Table 3 presents the distribution of DV and non-DV offenders by region. The table presented in the appendix presents the data by custody status. Overall the distribution of DV offenders is consistent with the regional population although they appear to be slightly

overrepresented in the Pacific region ($\chi^2(1, N = 1244) = 31.83$, $p < .001$, $\varphi = .16$) and slightly underrepresented in the Quebec region ($\chi^2(1, N = 851) = 22.70$, $p < .001$, $\varphi = .16$). The breakdown of the profile by region provides an indication of the regional need for the various intensity levels of family violence programs.

Table 3

*Regional Distribution of the DV Offenders and Non-DV Offenders: Cumulative Sample*

|  | DV Offenders[a] | Non-DV Offenders | Total Male Offender Population |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | $N = 4,260$ | $N = 4,261$ | $N = 21,457$ |
| Region | % | % | % |
| Atlantic | 8.4 | 11.6 | 9.3 |
| Québec | 20.8 | 22.2 | 22.5 |
| Ontario | 27.9 | 26.6 | 28.8 |
| Prairies | 26.0 | 27.4 | 26.1 |
| Pacific | 16.9 | 12.3 | 13.2 |

*Note.* DV = domestic violence. $n = 1$ missing.

Demographic and background information for DV and non-DV offenders are presented in Table 4. With an average age of 40.2 ($SD = 10.74$), DV offenders were significantly older than non-DV offenders, whose average age was 36.6 ($SD = 11.65$, $t(8520) = 7.292$, $p < .0001$). There is a larger group of offenders in the 41-60 year age range among the DV offenders. In this table, Inuit offenders are not included with other Aboriginal offenders since they do not participate in the Aboriginal Family Violence Prevention program. If they are incarcerated in the Ontario region where the majority of Inuit offenders are housed, their treatment needs related to sexual and domestic violence are met through participation in Tupiq (a culturally specific program designed to meet the needs of Inuit offenders, see Stewart, Hamilton, Wilton & Cousineau, 2009). Inuit offenders are disproportionately represented among the DV offenders relative to their numbers in the non-DV group ($\chi^2(1, N = 8486) = 66.60$, $p < .001$)[6]. The combined First Nations & Metis group are also disproportionately represented among the group of DV offenders ($\chi^2(1, N = 8486) = 208.72$, $p < .001$)). DV offenders were significantly less likely than non-DV

---

[6] Based on screening on the results of the FVRA screening tool, 65% of Inuit offenders were further assessed on the SARA. Of these, 74% had a rating of moderate or high, confirming a history of domestic violence. This results in an estimate of at least 48% of the population of Inuit offenders with a history of domestic violence.

offenders to be married (($\chi^2$(1, $N = 8521$) = 24.32, $p < .001$, $\varphi = .05$).  There were no differences in education level between the DV and non-DV groups; both groups have low educational attainment with nearly three-quarters of them achieving less than a high school education.

Table 4

*Demographic Profile of Domestic Violence (DV) Offenders: Cumulative Sample*

| | DV offenders | | Non-DV offenders |
|---|---|---|---|
| Demographics | High<br>$N = 1,305$<br>% | Moderate<br>$N = 2,956$<br>% | $N = 4,261$<br>% |
| Age | | | |
| Under 25 | 3.6 | 5.2 | 15.1 |
| 25-40 | 46.4 | 50.1 | 50.8 |
| 41-60 | 43.9 | 40.9 | 29.0 |
| >60 | 6.0 | 3.8 | 5.0 |
| Race[a] | | | |
| Caucasian | 53.3 | 59.2 | 65.4 |
| First Nations & Metis | 28.5 | 26.2 | 14.2 |
| Inuit | 3.2 | 2.0 | 0.3 |
| Black | 9.4 | 7.4 | 9.3 |
| Other | 5.6 | 5.2 | 10.8 |
| Marital Status[b] | | | |
| Single | 47.6 | 44.8 | 48.4 |
| Common Law | 26.8 | 34.8 | 33.3 |
| Married | 6.6 | 6.8 | 9.6 |
| Other[c] | 19.01 | 13.6 | 8.7 |
| Education level at last admission | | | |
| Less than Grade 8[d] | 25.2 | 22.3 | 20.7 |
| Less than Grade 10[e] | 51.5 | 50.1 | 44.9 |
| Less than High School[f] | 76.7 | 78.3 | 72.4 |

*Note.* [a]$n = 36$ missing. [b]$n = 1$ missing. [c]Includes divorced, separated, widowed. [d]$n = 3,071$ missing. [e]$n = 3,075$ missing. [f]$n = 3,107$.

Risk-need profiles of offenders by Aboriginal status and SARA ratings are presented in Table 5. Offenders with histories of domestic violence are compared to the overall offender population without domestic violence histories. The percentages provided for each of the specific needs areas represent the proportion of offenders with any need in that area (i.e., ratings of some to high need, or on the revised OIA, moderate to high need). DV Aboriginal offenders were more likely to be rated as high on criminal history risk than non-Aboriginal offenders with a DV history (($\chi^2$(2, $N$ = 1,258) = 22.61, $p$ < .001, $\phi$ = .13; $\chi^2$(2, $N$ = 2,825) = 41.20, $p$ < .001, $\phi$ = .12); they were also more likely to be rated as high on criminogenic need (($\chi^2$(2, $N$ = 1,258) = 14.54, $p$ < .001, $\phi$ = .10; ($\chi^2$(2, $N$ = 2,823) = 22.09, $p$ < .001, $\phi$ = .09). Aboriginal DV offenders were rated higher need than non-Aboriginal DV offenders on individual domains related to employment, substance abuse, family/marital and associates, and community function. The substance abuse domain is a particularly high needs area for the Aboriginal offenders with histories of domestic violence.

Compared to non-DV offenders, DV offenders were more likely to be rated as high overall criminal history risk (($\chi^2$(2, $N$ = 7,976) = 830.03, $p$ < .001, $\phi$ = .32) and high overall criminogenic need (($\chi^2$(2, $N$ = 7931) = 847.91, $p$ < .001, $\phi$ = .33). They are particularly higher needs in the family-martial and substance abused domains. Offenders assessed as high risk or the SARA in general have higher criminal risk ratings and higher ratings on criminogenic needs than those assessed as moderate risk, providing evidence for the concurrent validity of the SARA ratings.

Federal male offenders with histories of domestic violence have significant criminal histories. Table 6 shows that over 90% have previous adult histories and almost one-half have juvenile criminal histories. Their offence histories are diverse and include violence as well as property offending. A significant proportion of these offenders (16%) have previous histories of sexual offending as well. The DV group has considerably higher rates of histories of violent, sexual, and property crimes than the non-DV group. However, they have significantly lower rates of drug-related offences. On the current sentence, the same pattern holds; DV offenders are more likely to have a major admitting offence of homicide, sex offending or assault and significantly less likely to have a major offence that was drug-related or non-violent compared to non-DV offenders.

Table 5

*Risk-Need Profile of DV and Non-DV Offenders by Risk Level and Aboriginal Status: Cumulative Sample*

| | Non-Aboriginal DV Offenders | | Aboriginal DV Offenders | | Non-DV Offenders |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | High $N = 891$ | Moderate $N = 2,123$ | High $N = 414$ | Moderate $N = 833$ | $N=4,261$ |
| Profile Variable | % | % | % | % | % |
| Overall Criminal History Risk[a] | | | | | |
|    Low | 2.8 | 3.2 | -- | 0.7 | 15.6 |
|    Medium | 15.4 | 32.2 | 8.9 | 22.3 | 40.1 |
|    High | 81.8 | 65.5 | 91.1 | 76.7 | 44.4 |
| Overall Need[b] | | | | | |
|    Low | 0.9 | 0.8 | -- | -- | 10.1 |
|    Medium | 9.8 | 20.4 | 4.4 | 14.2 | 34.1 |
|    High | 89.3 | 78.8 | 95.6 | 85.8 | 55.8 |
| Employment[b] | 52.6 | 62.5 | 73.3 | 77.9 | 59.2 |
| Personal Emotional[b] | 95.1 | 91.1 | 97.1 | 94.1 | 79.0 |
| Attitude[b] | 71.6 | 74.6 | 77.3 | 70.7 | 67.8 |
| Associates[c] | 45.7 | 59.3 | 68.9 | 68.9 | 70.9 |
| Family/Marital[b] | 86.1 | 76.4 | 92.9 | 84.5 | 17.6 |
| Substance Abuse[c] | 69.7 | 72.4 | 94.4 | 92.8 | 59.2 |
| Community Function[c] | 27.1 | 26.0 | 44.7 | 33.5 | 23.7 |

*Note*. DV = domestic violence. *N* values vary due to missing values. [a]*n* = 144 missing. [b]*n* = 146 missing. [c]*n* = 147 missing.

Table 6

*Comparison of Offence History of DV Offenders in CSC with Non-DV Offenders*

| | DV Offenders N = 4,261 | Non-DV Offenders N = 4,261 | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | % | % | $\chi^2$ | $\Phi$ |
| Current offence (major)[a] | | | | |
| Homicide | 21.2 | 15.9 | 38.15*** | .17 |
| Sexual offence | 15.7 | 13.8 | 5.02* | .07 |
| Robbery | 15.8 | 16.7 | 0.79 | .02 |
| Assault | 18.7 | 13.5 | 46.37*** | .20 |
| Other violent | 2.5 | 2.3 | 0.33 | .04 |
| Drug-related | 5.2 | 12.9 | 152.85*** | .37 |
| Other non-violent | 20.2 | 24.8 | 23.00*** | .10 |
| Previous offence history | | | | |
| Previous adult offence[c] | 91.3 | 72.9 | 401.75*** | .25 |
| Previous federal sentence[d] | 39.4 | 26.5 | 119.12*** | .13 |
| Previous juvenile offence[e] | 49.3 | 43.8 | 19.01*** | .05 |
| Previous sex offence[f] | 15.8 | 7.6 | 127.17*** | .13 |
| Type of offence history | | | | |
| Ever a property offence | 48.3 | 44.1 | 15.13*** | .04 |
| Ever a violent offence[g] | 78.9 | 57.9 | 654.30*** | .28 |
| Ever a drug or alcohol related offence | 27.4 | 41.6 | 190.10*** | .15 |

*Note.* Tests are comparing DV offenders to non-DV offenders. [a]$n = 55$ missing. [b]other violent offence includes abduction, kidnapping, hijacking, torture, hostage taking, extortion, intimidating with treats of violence, and uttering threats [c]$n = 238$ missing. [d]$n = 241$ missing. [e]$n = 267$ missing. [f]$n = 316$. [g]Violent offence is defined here as Homicide, Other Violence, Assault, Sexual Offence, or Robbery.
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 7 further outlines the specific needs profile of offenders DV offenders by SARA rating and Aboriginal status. Both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal offenders assessed as high risk on the SARA were significantly more likely to have current mental health issues compared to those assessed as moderate risk (($\chi^2(1, N = 2820) = 23.97, p < .001, \varphi = .09$). However, among non-Aboriginal offenders, the moderate group has more severe drug problems.

Table 7

*Specific Needs Profile of DV Offenders by SARA Rating and Aboriginal Status*

| | Non-Aboriginal | | | | Aboriginal | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | High | Moderate | | | High | Moderate | | |
| | $N = 891$ | $N = 2,123$ | | | $N = 414$ | $N = 833$ | | |
| Profile Variable | % | % | $\chi^2$ | φ | % | % | $\chi^2$ | φ |
| History of MH problems[a] | 23.8 | 18.3 | 3.50 | .07 | 23.8 | 20.3 | 3.11 | .04 |
| Current MH problems[b] | 19.3 | 11.3 | 9.58** | .11 | 20.4 | 13.6 | 14.90*** | .09 |
| Learning disability[c] | 21.5 | 17.7 | 1.59 | .05 | 20.6 | 16.9 | 3.31 | .04 |
| Alcohol dependence[d] | | | | | | | | |
| None | 43.8 | 46.9 | | | 18.2 | 18.7 | | |
| Low | 39.7 | 36.3 | | | 37.1 | 38.8 | | |
| Moderate | 8.3 | 8.8 | 3.17 | .03 | 20.1 | 22.2 | 17.14** | .12 |
| Substantial | 5.1 | 5.3 | | | 18.4 | 13.5 | | |
| Severe | 3.1 | 2.7 | | | 6.8 | 6.8 | | |
| Drug abuse[d] | | | | | | | | |
| None | 42.4 | 35.6 | | | 23.9 | 23.3 | | |
| Low | 22.6 | 19.3 | | | 25.2 | 24.5 | | |
| Moderate | 14.6 | 15.9 | 25.17*** | .10 | 23.3 | 22.5 | 1.5 | .04 |
| Substantial | 13.9 | 20.4 | | | 17.6 | 20.6 | | |
| Severe | 6.5 | 8.9 | | | 10.0 | 9.0 | | |

*Note*. DV = domestic violence. SARA = Spousal Abuse Risk Assessment. Alcohol dependence is measured by the Alcohol Dependence Scale. Drug abuse problems is measured by the Drug Abuse Screening Test. [a]$n$=1449 missing. [b]$n$=1461 missing. [c]$n$=1,887 missing. [d]$n$=520.
* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ ***$p < .001$.

Table 8 compares the profile of DV offenders and non-DV offenders on specific needs. The strongest relationship was found for alcohol abuse, where the DV offenders have significantly more issues with alcohol abuse than non-DV offenders (($\chi^2(4, N = 7526) = 762.75$, $p < .001$, φ = .19). Twice as many DV offenders have severe or substantial substance and alcohol abuse problems as non-DV offenders. They were also more likely to have severe or substantial drug problems, to have current and past mental health problems and to have been identified as having a learning disability.

Table 8

*Comparison of DV and Non-DV Offenders on Specific Needs*

| | DV | | | | | |
| Profile Variable | High $N = 1,305$ | Moderate $N = 2,956$ | Total DV $N = 4,261$ | Non-DV $N = 4,261$ | $\chi^2$ | $\Phi$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| History of MH problems | 23.8 | 19.8 | 21.1 | 14.8 | 36.75*** | .08 |
| Current MH problems[b] | 20.0 | 13.0 | 15.3 | 9.4 | 45.14*** | .09 |
| Learning disability[c] | 20.9 | 17.1 | 18.4 | 15.2 | 8.42** | .04 |
| Alcohol dependence[d] | | | | | | |
| None | 35.1 | 38.8 | 37.7 | 52.7 | | |
| Low | 38.8 | 37.01 | 37.6 | 35.0 | | |
| Moderate | 12.3 | 12.6 | 12.5 | 7.2 | 262.75*** | .19 |
| Substantial | 9.6 | 7.7 | 8.2 | 3.4 | | |
| Severe | 4.1 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 1.7 | | |
| Drug abuse problems[c] | | | | | | |
| None | 36.1 | 32.1 | 33.2 | 40.0 | | |
| Low | 23.5 | 20.8 | 21.6 | 23.4 | | |
| Moderate | 17.5 | 17.8 | 17.7 | 15.9 | 67.46*** | .09 |
| Substantial | 15.2 | 20.4 | 18.9 | 14.9 | | |
| Severe | 7.7 | 8.9 | 8.6 | 5.9 | | |

*Note.* Alcohol dependence is measured by the Alcohol Dependence Scale. Drug abuse problems is measured by the Drug Abuse Screening Test. [a]$n = 2,961$ missing. [b]$n = 2,990$ missing. [c]$n = 3,763$ missing. [d]$n = 996$.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Actuarial risk ratings based on the SIR scale are presented in Table 9. Only non-Aboriginal offenders are included because the SIR scale is not typically used with Aboriginal offenders. DV offenders were significantly higher risk than non-DV offenders as rated on the SIR. Additional analyses determined that of the 39.8% ($n = 1,187$) of DV offenders who rated as Very good or Good risk on the SIR over 40% ($n = 486$) were serving sentences for homicide.

Using the SIR as the metric to assess risk, DV offenders assessed as moderate risk on the SARA are actually higher risk for any type of reoffending than those assessed as high risk on the

SARA. They are also higher risk than non-DV offenders. Fewer offenders rated moderate risk on the SARA have scores of Very Good on the SIR scale compared to DV offenders rated high risk on the SARA ($\chi^2$(1, $N$ = 2851) = 26.87, $p$ < .001, $\varphi$ = .10). Additionally, DV offenders who rate as moderate risk on the SARA are significantly more likely to have scores of Very Poor on the SIR scale compared to both DV offenders who rate as high on the SARA ($\chi^2$(1, $N$ = 2,851) = 13.89, $p$ < .001, $\varphi$ = .07) and non-DV offenders ($\chi^2$(1, $N$ = 4,838) = 17.87, $p$ < .001, $\varphi$ = .06).

Table 9

*SIR Profile of DV Offenders by Risk Band*

| | DV Offenders | | | Non-DV Offenders[d] | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | High[a] | Moderate[b] | Total[c] | | | |
| | $N$ = 870 | $N$ = 2,062 | $N$ = 2,932 | $N$ = 3,648 | | |
| SIR level | % | % | % | % | $\chi^2$ | $\varphi$ |
| Very good | 32.3 | 23.0 | 25.8 | 36.0 | 74.18*** | .11 |
| Good | 14.8 | 14.7 | 14.0 | 14.2 | .026 | .002 |
| Fair | 16.0 | 19.6 | 18.5 | 16.0 | 6.96** | .03 |
| Poor | 15.9 | 15.3 | 15.5 | 13.7 | 4.00* | .03 |
| Very poor | 21.0 | 27.5 | 25.5 | 20.2 | 25.29*** | .22 |

*Note.* Tests are comparing DV offenders to non-DV offenders. [a]$n$ = 21 missing. [b]$n$ = 61 missing. [c]$n$ = 81 missing. [d]$n$ = 425 missing.
*$p$ < .05. **$p$ < .01. ***$p$ < .001.

Table 10 presents the rates of each type of initial release granted to both the DV and non-DV offenders. Again, the extensive criminal histories, the seriousness of the crimes, and the proportion of the DV sample who are serving life sentences directly affects the initial release decisions for this group of offenders. DV offenders are much less likely to get a discretionary release in the form of Day Parole or Full Parole. They are twice as likely to be released on their Statutory Release dates, and 4 times more likely to be placed under a long term supervision order. This may be in part because they are more than twice as likely to be serving indefinite sentences as non-DV offenders (18% as opposed to 7.6%).

Table 10

*Parole Release Type by DV Offender Status*

|  | Released DV Offenders | Released Non-DV Offenders |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | *N* =1,545 | *N* = 2,163 |
|  | *%* | *%* |
| Day parole | 30.9 | 61.9 |
| Full Parole | 1.6 | 4.4 |
| Statutory Release | 63.1 | 32.8 |
| Long Term Supervision Order | 3.0 | 0.7 |

*Note.* 1.5% of the DV offenders and .2% of the Non-DV offenders were released after their WED or on a court ordered jurisdiction or freedom.

**DV Offenders and Correctional Programs**

Given the extensive criminal histories and high criminogenic need profiles of the DV offenders, it is not surprising that most have been involved in correctional programming. Table 11 presents the number and proportion of DV offenders in each region who participated in each type of program. Aboriginal-specific programs are included in these categories. It should be noted that the percentage is probably an under-estimation of the actual proportion of DV offenders who will take a correctional program since some offenders may have been recently admitted and may not yet have had an opportunity to participate in a program. A correctional program is defined as a program that directly targets criminogenic needs and does not include social or mental health programs. The table reveals considerable disparity between regions with the lowest number of DV offenders receiving programming for domestic violence in Quebec. Nationally, DV offenders are more likely to be treated for a substance abuse problem than for a family violence problem.

Table 11

*Correctional Program Participation History for DV Offenders by Region*

| | Atlantic N = 356 % | Quebec N = 887 % | Ontario N = 1,190 % | Prairies N = 1,106 % | Pacific N = 721 % | National N = 4,260 % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Any Program | 84.3 | 66.1 | 69.4 | 80.5 | 72.5 | 73.4 |
| Family Violence | 49.4 | 18.6 | 35.5 | 36.8 | 23.9 | 31.5 |
| Substance Abuse | 59.6 | 35.2 | 37.1 | 61.1 | 57.7 | 48.3 |
| Sex offender | 8.7 | 8.3 | 8.9 | 7.5 | 10.1 | 8.6 |
| Violence Prevention | 16.3 | 11.3 | 11.0 | 20.4 | 19.3 | 15.4 |
| Anger Management | 12.9 | 20.2 | 13.7 | 15.6 | 19.8 | 16.5 |
| Cognitive Skills/R&R | 26.7 | 22.4 | 23.3 | 24.3 | 31.8 | 25.1 |
| Counterpoint | 5.1 | 1.5 | 4.6 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 2.7 |
| AAA | 5.9 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 4.3 | 3.1 | 3.3 |

*Note. n* = 1 missing from entire table.

Reintegration Programs has recently initiated a pilot of an Integrated Correctional Program Model (ICPM) that incorporates offenders with various offence histories and criminogenic needs into a single program. This includes offenders who under the current model would meet the criteria for substance abuse programs, violence prevention programs, programs for property offences, and programs for domestic violence perpetrators. Table 12 presents the estimate of the percentage of offenders with DV histories who would meet the criteria for each of the current programs. Note that for some offender groups the proportion is an estimate based on key criteria available through OMS that would not entail a file review. It is important to note that over-ride provisions for some offenders who not reach the risk threshold can be invoked. In each case, the programs areas have been consolidated so that all levels of intensity along with Aboriginal versions of the programs are included in the category. Results indicate that over 40% of the DV offenders would qualify for a violence prevention program. It should be noted, however, that domestic violence offences would have been considered a violent offence contributing to their qualification for a violence prevention program. The overlap of offender

qualifying for both violence prevention programs and family violence programs, therefore, would be expected. Over one-third of DV offenders qualify for a substance abuse program and over 20% meet the criteria for a sex offender program. Of concern, is the surprisingly low percentage who would meet the referral criteria to attend a family violence prevention program under the new referral guidelines. The new guidelines that require a threshold risk rating on the SIR or the CRS mean that almost half of the offenders with a high or moderate rating on the SARA (47%) would not be able to attend a family violence prevention program unless there was an over-ride consideration applied.

Table 12

*DV Offenders Meeting the Criteria for Correctional Programs Under the New Guidelines*

|  | In custody | Under community supervision | In custody/Under community |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | $N = 3,169$ % (n) | $N = 1,092$ % (n) | $N = 4,261$ % (n) |
| General Violence program |  |  |  |
| Yes | 39.0 (1,236) | 43.5 (475) | 40.1 (1,711) |
| No | 61.0 (1,933) | 56.5 (617) | 59.9 (2,550) |
| Substance Abuse Programs |  |  |  |
| Yes | 34.8 (1,104) | 38.2 (417) | 35.7 (1,521) |
| No | 65.2 (2,065) | 61.8 (675) | 64.3 (2,740) |
| Sex Offender Programs |  |  |  |
| Yes | 22.8 (724) | 20.4 (223) | 22.2 (947) |
| No | 77.2 (2,445) | 79.6 (869) | 77.8 (3,314) |
| FV Programs |  |  |  |
| Yes | 51.8 (1,631) | 57.6 (629) | 53.0 (2,260) |
| No | 48.5 (1,538) | 42.4 (463) | 47.0 (2,001) |
| Meets criteria for AAA |  |  |  |
| Yes | 11.8 (374) | 16.4 (179) | 13.0 (553) |
| No | 88.2 (2,795) | 83.6 (913) | 87.0 (3,708) |

**Discussion**

The profile of all male federal offenders currently under supervision in CSC indicates that approximately 40% have suspected history of domestic or intimate partner violence that requires a more in-depth assessment. Of those who have been screened in for an assessment on the specialized family violence measure, the SARA, 55.5% are rated low risk, 30% are rated moderate risk, and 14.5% are rated high risk. The profile of all male domestic violence offenders who have received a moderate or high risk rating on the SARA over an eight-year period illustrates that federal male offenders have varied criminal histories including previous convictions for violent offences[7] (79%), property offences (48%), and sex offences (approximately 16%)[8]. They also have significant problems with substance abuse, especially alcohol; they have personal-emotional problems, and low educational attainment. This finding suggests that federal male offenders with histories of intimate partner are best categorized as members of the Antisocial typology described by Holzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994). Their research, based on community samples, found that only 25% of the sample of DV perpetrators from a community sample fell into this category, while previous research suggests that in CSC, the proportion is much higher, with upwards to 84% of non-Aboriginal offenders being classified as either Antisocial and Generally Violent and virtually all Aboriginal offenders being classified in either of these typologies (Wexler, 2000).

DV offenders pose a challenge in terms of programming. As a group, they are significantly higher on criminal history risk and criminogenic needs than non-DV offenders. Twenty percent of this group has current mental health problems–50% more than among the non-DV group. They also have higher rates of learning disabilities and are twice as likely to have substantial to severe alcohol dependence problems. It should be noted, however, although DV offenders have higher rates of substance abuse issues compared to non-DV offenders, approximately two-thirds of them have no identified problem with alcohol dependence and over 50% had no or low problems with drugs. A generic program that focuses on substance abuse therefore would not be relevant for 67% of the family violence population. At least 60% of the DV offenders have identified criminogenic needs on six of the seven need domains. The most

---

[7] Note that this could include domestic violence offences

[8] Violent offence is defined here as Homicide, Other Violence, Assault, Sexual Offence or Robbery.

significant need areas are in the Personal-Emotional and Family/Marital domains. DV offenders are much more likely to have needs in these two domains than the non-DV offenders. The high criminal history risk and criminogenic need profile of the offenders is reflected in their participation rates in correctional programs. Over 70% have participated in at least one program, most commonly a substance abuse program, followed by a family violence program.

The results demonstrate that, on almost all risk and need factors, the offenders rated as high risk on the SARA were overall higher need in multiple areas than those rated as moderate risk, providing concurrent validity for the SARA tool. While this pattern does not hold on all the individual need domains, both the moderate and high risk DV offenders have significant criminogenic needs.

Aboriginal and Inuit DV offenders were disproportionately represented among the DV offenders relative to their representation in the offender population. Approximately 30% of the offenders with a DV history are Aboriginal, whereas they represent fewer than 20% of the male offender population. This pattern is even more marked for the Inuit offenders who represent fewer than 1% of the offender population but almost 3% of the DV offenders. In general, the Aboriginal DV offenders were more likely to be rated as high on criminal history risk and crimnogenic needs than the non-Aboriginal DV offenders although these differences did not represent a strong effect. The most marked difference in the needs area between the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal DV offenders was on the measure of alcohol dependence where the Aboriginal DV offenders were three times more likely to have substantial and severe problems.

A number of DV offenders meet the referral criteria for other correctional programs. Of concern, however, is that almost half of offenders with high or moderate risk ratings on the SARA would not meet the referral criteria to participate in a family violence prevention program under the new referral guidelines unless an over-ride provision is evoked. This includes five offenders who have had convictions for murder or manslaughter.

**Conclusions**

These results provide evidence that the largest portion of incarcerated male offenders with histories of domestic violence present a profile described in the domestic violence literature as an Antisocial typology, having substantial criminal histories and significant levels of substance abuse. Many of their treatment needs will therefore differ from domestic violence perpetrators not given a custodial sentence who are more likely to fall within the Non-

Pathological or Family Only typology. The results attest to the multiple treatment needs of federal male offenders with histories of domestic violence; in particular there is a need to address dynamic factors in the Family/Marital, the Personal Emotional, Substance Abuse and Attitude domains. More research is required to isolate the dynamic factors within these domains that are both associated with domestic violence and, when addressed, reduce domestic violence. By definition, offenders with histories of domestic violence differ from non-DV offenders in their pattern of problems in the family and marital domain and they are also more likely than other offenders to have mental health problems. These offenders all have specific needs in the area of violence in intimate relationships that cannot be addressed in a generic violence prevention program that targets general violence. Aboriginal offenders with histories of domestic violence have even higher criminogenic needs ratings than non-Aboriginal DV offenders and their profiles suggest that their histories of intimate partner violence may be more frequently associated with serious problems with alcohol abuse. Thus, an intervention with Aboriginal offenders to address intimate partner violence should be conducted in tandem with a strategy to address alcohol abuse.

Finally, administrators are advised to re-examine the decision to use stringent SIR-based criteria for admission to domestic violence programs since this has resulted in almost half of the offenders at moderate to high risk on the spousal assault risk assessment tool being ineligible to participate in a program to address domestic violence unless over-ride exceptions are applied.

## References

Alksnis, C. & Taylor, J. (1995). *The impact of experiencing and witnessing family violence during childhood: Outcomes on child and adult behaviour.* Ottawa: Correctional Service Canada.

Campbell, J.C., Jones, A.S., Dienemann, J., Kub, J., Schollenberger, J., & O'Campo, P. (2002) Intimate Partner Violence and Physical Health Consequences. *Archives of Internal Medicine, 162* (10): 1157-1163

Chang, J., Berg, C., Saltzman, L., & Herndon, J. (2005). Homicide: A Leading Cause of Injury Deaths Among Pregnant and Postpartum Women in the United States, 1991-1999. *American Journal of Public Health, 96* (3): 471-477.2003

Conference Board of Canada (2009). *The Net Federal Fiscal Benefit of CSC Programming* Research report N° R-208, Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada.

Correctional Service of Canada (2009). *Evaluation report: Correctional Service Canada's correctional programs*. Evaluation Branch. Ottawa, ON: CSC.

Delsol, C. & Margolin, G. (2004). The role of family-of-origin violence in men's marital violence perpetration, *Clinical Psychology Review*, 24(1), 99-122.

Derksen, D., Booth, L., McConnelle, A., & Taylor, K. (2011). Mental Health Needs of Federal Women Offenders. Research report, Research Branch, Ottawa, Correctional Service of Canada.

Gabora, N., Stewart, L., Lilley, K., & Allegri, N. (2007) *A Profile of Female Perpetrators of Intimate Partner Violence: Implications for Treatment*. Research Report #175**.** Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada.

Holt, S. Buckley, H., & Whelan, S. (2008). The impact of exposure to domestic violence on children and young people: A review of the literature. *Child Abuse & Neglect 32* 797–810.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Stuart, G.L. (1994). Typologies of Male Batterers: Three Subtypes and the Differences Among Them. *Psychological Bulletin,* 116 (3), 476-497

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Meehan, J.C. (2004) Typologies of men who are maritally violent: scientific and clinical implications. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence.* 19(12):1369-89.

Kerry, G. (2000). *Typologies of federal offenders convicted of intimate femicide*. Workshop Presentation, International Community Corrections Association Conference. Ottawa.

Kropp, P. R. & Hart, S. D. (2000). The Spousal Assault Risk Assessment (SARA) Guide: Reliability and validity in adult male offenders. *Law and Human Behavior, 24*, 101-118.

Kropp, P. R., Hart, S.D., Webster, C.D., & Eaves, D. (1995).  *Manual for the Spousal Assault Risk Assessment Guide (2nd edition).*  The British Columbia Institute Against Family Violence:  British Columbia.

Kropp, P.R., Hart, S.D., Gibas, A., & Stewart, L. (in preparation). The predictive validity of the SARA and SIR instruments on a sample of Canadian Federal offenders. Manuscript in Preparation.

Luciani, F. P., Motiuk, L. L., & Nafekh, M. (1996). An operational review of the custody rating scale: Reliability, validity and practical utility (Report R-47). Research Division, Correctional Service of Canada, Ottawa, Canada.

Maker, A. H.,  Kemmelmeier, M., & Peterson, C. (1998). Long-Term Psychological Consequences in Women of Witnessing Parental Physical Conflict and Experiencing Abuse in Childhood.  *J. of Interpersonal Violence*, 13(5), 574-589.

Mihorean, K. (2005).   Trends in Self Reported Family Violence. In, K. AuCoin (ed.) *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile*. Statistics Canada, Ministry of Industry. Report 85-224-XIE

National Center for Injury Prevention and Control (2003).  *Costs of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in the United States*. Atlanta (GA): Center for Disease Control and Prevention.

Saunders, D.G. (1992).  Typology of men who batter: Three types derived from cluster analysis. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 62(2),* 264-265.

Selzer, M.L. (1981). The Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test: The quest for a new diagnostic instrument. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 127*, 1653-1658.

Skinner, H.A. (1982). The Drug Abuse Screening Test. *Addictive Behaviours, 7*, 363-371.

Skinner, H.A. & Horn, J.L. (1984). *Alcohol Dependence Scale (ADS): User's Guide*. Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation.

Statistics Canada (2009).  *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile*. Catalogue no. 85-24-X

Stewart, L. A., Hamilton, E., Wilton, G., & Cousineau, C. (2009). An Examination of the Effectiveness of Tupiq: A Culturally Specific Program for Inuit Sex Offenders. Research Report R-213-Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada.

Stewart, L. &  Flight, J. (2007) . *Principles of Effective Family Violence Programming*: White Paper presented at the AAPCJ conference, Miami, Florida.

Stewart, L., Gabora, N., Kropp, R., & Lee, Z. (2005).  *Family Violence Programming: Treatment Outcome for Canadian Federally Sentenced Offenders*. Correctional Service Canada Research report R-74E.

Stewart, L. & Gabora, N. (2003). What works in the treatment of family violence in correctional populations.   In V.L. Gadsend (ed.), *What Works series Heading Home: Offender Reintegration in the Family*.  APA publications.

Wexler, A. (2000). *Can typologies of male batterers be generalised to populations of federal inmates?* Unpublished Masters Thesis. Carleton University.

**Appendix A**

Table A1

*Regional Distribution of the Domestic Violence Offenders and Non-Domestic Violence Offenders by Custody Status: Cumulative Sample*

| Region | DV offenders[a] | | | Non-DV offenders | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | In custody $n = 3,169$ | Released $n = 1,091$ | Total $N = 4,260$ | In custody $n = 2,098$ | Released $n = 2,163$ | Total $N = 4,261$ |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Atlantic | 8.0 | 9.35 | 8.4 | 9.2 | 14.0 | 11.6 |
| Québec | 19.8 | 23.9 | 20.8 | 23.0 | 21.4 | 22.2 |
| Ontario | 29.7 | 22.8 | 27.9 | 28.8 | 24.4 | 26.6 |
| Prairies | 26.2 | 25.2 | 26.0 | 27.1 | 27.7 | 27.4 |
| Pacific | 16.3 | 18.7 | 16.9 | 11.9 | 12.6 | 12.3 |

*Note*. DV = domestic violence. Released refers to offenders released on community supervision. [a]$n = 1$ missing.