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HOMICIDE IN BATTERING RELATIONSHIPS

- 40 - 50% OF US WOMEN KILLED BY HUSBAND, BF OR EX (vs. 5-8% of men) (9 times rate killed by a stranger)
- 7th leading cause of premature death for women in US; 2nd leading cause of death 15-24 yo; leading cause of death for African American women 15-44 yo
- US – At least 2/3 of women killed – battered prior – if male killed – prior wife abuse in 75% of cases (Campbell, ‘92; Morocco et al, ‘98)
- More at risk when leaving or left (Wilson & Daly, ‘93; Campbell et. al. ’01; Websdale ‘99) – 1st 3 mos & 1st year - but eventually will be more safe
- Women far more likely to be victims of homicide-suicide (29% vs. .1% in US)
- 44-47% of women killed seen in health care system before killed (Sharps, Campbell ’02; Wadman & Muelleman ‘99)
Homicide of women in Ohio – #35 in US in 2001 – good work!! [www.vpc.org]

- 55 women killed – .95/100,000 – overall US rate 1.35 per 100,000
- When perpetrator identified, 90% killed by someone they knew, and 61% of those killed by an intimate
- Therefore approximately 30 killed by intimate partner & 271 victims of attempted homicide by partners
INTIMATE PARTNER FEMICIDE BY PERPETRATOR IN TEN CITIES (N= 311)

- Spouse: 40.5%
- Boyfriend: 29.6%
- Ex-spouse: 8.0%
- Ex-BF: 19.3%
- Other: 2.6%
U.S. INTIMATE PARTNER HOMICIDE RATE DECLINE 1976-03 FBI (SHR, 1976-01)

- Female
- Male

a = no ex's
Number of Female Homicide Victims

- All Victims
- Victims of Intimate Violence
Decline in Intimate Partner Homicide and Femicide

- Decline in male victimization in states where improved DV laws and services - resource availability (Browne & Williams ’89; ‘98)
- Exposure reduction - increased female earnings, lower marriage rate, higher divorce rate (Dugan, Nagin & Rosenfeld ‘97)
- Gun availability decline (Wilt ‘97; Block ‘95; Kellerman ‘93, ‘97- gun increases risk X3)
U.S. INTIMATE PARTNER HOMICIDE RATES & DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SERVICES 1976-9
(Resources per 50 million - Dugan, Nagin & Rosenfeld ‘03)
INTIMATE PARTNER HOMICIDE: WEAPON USE in U. S. ‘76-'95 (SHR)
Intimate Partner Homicides, by Offender Relationship

- Spouse
- Ex-spouse
- Boy/girlfriend
“Prediction is very hard to do - especially if it is about the future”

Yogi Berra
Overview of Issues

- High demand for both lethality & reoffending risk assessment by criminal justice, advocacy, victim service, & health systems
- Low base rates
- Relatively young science in intimate partner violence & risk assessment particularly
- 4 interacting parts to consider - instrument, risk assessor, perpetrator & one specific potential victim (vs. sexual assault or mental health – MacArthur study)
- Fears that risk assessment will be used to limit service to victims
- High stakes with either false negatives or false positives
Overlapping Concerns

Similar; Not the same

- Risk Assessment
- Lethality Assessment
- Safety Assessment
Risk Prediction 4 Quadrant Model
(Webster et. al. ‘94)

(A) TRUE POSITIVES
Predicted violence, Violent outcomes
Sensitivity

(B) FALSE POSITIVES
Predicted violence, No violent outcomes

(C) FALSE NEGATIVES
No violence predicted, Violence occurs

(D) TRUE NEGATIVES
No violence predicted, No violence occurs
Specificity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Assessment Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evaluation Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Navy (DoD) FAP Risk &amp; Safety</td>
<td>Victim &amp; Offender - reoffend &amp; safety (FA, MP, health)</td>
<td>Evaluation 2002-04 (Stith, Milner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV Mosaic (20) (deBecker)</td>
<td>Computerized/Victim (criminal justice) - lethality risk system</td>
<td>Evaluation underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVSJ (Williams &amp; Houghton)</td>
<td>Offenders (criminal justice) short – reoffending</td>
<td>Predictive validity 63% (Williams, '03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-SID (Gelles &amp; Lyon)</td>
<td>Offender – reoffend (CJ)</td>
<td>Some evaluation data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.D.A.R.A. (Z. Hilton)</td>
<td>Offender - reoffend – (CJ)</td>
<td>77% under ROC ('04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI (Duluth)</td>
<td>Victim &amp; offender - both (advocates &amp; criminal justice)</td>
<td>Process evaluation (CDC) - no outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAS (D. Dutton)</td>
<td>Offender – intervention programs, prevention</td>
<td>Cross sectional validation good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARA (Kropp et al)</td>
<td>Offender (criminal justice) - reoffending</td>
<td>Most data published best if perp. psych exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger Assessment (Campbell)</td>
<td>Victim- Lethality (Advocates, Health)</td>
<td>Evaluation continuing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Femicide Risk Study

**Purpose:** Identify and establish risk factors for IP femicide – (over and above domestic violence)

**Significance:** Determine strategies to prevent IP femicide – especially amongst battered women – Approximately half of victims (54% of actual femicides; 45% of attempteds) did not accurately perceive their risk – that perpetrator was capable of killing her &/or would kill her
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# Case Control Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASES</strong> - women who are killed by their intimate partners</td>
<td>Police Homicide Files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTROLS</strong> - women who are physically abused by their intimate partners</td>
<td>Proxy informants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(second set of nonabused controls – for later analysis)</td>
<td>Women themselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Addition of Attempted Femicides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>CASES - women who are killed by their intimate partners</th>
<th>CONTROLS - women who are physically abused by their intimate partners</th>
<th>CASES - women who are ALMOST killed by their intimate partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Homicide files</td>
<td>Women themselves</td>
<td>Women themselves – to address issue of validity of proxy information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definition: Attempted Femicide

- GSW or SW to the head, neck or torso.
- Strangulation or near drowning with loss of consciousness.
- Severe injuries inflicted that easily could have led to death.
- GSW or SW to other body part with unambiguous intent to kill.
- If none of above, unambiguous intent to kill.
Recruitment of Attempted Femicides

- From police assault files – difficult to impossible in many jurisdictions
- From shelters, trauma hospital data bases, DA offices – attempted to contact consecutive cases wherever located – many victims move
- Failure to locate rates high – but refusals low (less than 10%)
- Telephone interviews – subsample of 30 in depth
- Safety protocols carefully followed
In Depth Interviews (N = 30) (Nicolaidis et al. 2003, J of General Internal Medicine)

- Interviews conducted on phone or anywhere woman wished
- Baltimore, Houston, Kansas City, Portland, Tampa, & Wichita – approximately 15% from each city
- Age 17-34 – 40% African American, 40% Anglo, 20% Hispanic; across income categories
- 10 (67%) had history of escalating physical &/or sexual assault; 5 (17%) with minor violence and controlling behavior, 2 with controlling behavior only; 2 with NO history of violence OR controlling behavior – similar to larger study
In Depth Interviews (N = 30)

- Even so, 14 women (almost half) said they had NO clue how dangerous he was – but with DA, all but 3 could have been identified.

- 73% of cases – significant relationship change – majority – she was leaving him but in 4 cases he had left her but got enraged when she started seeing someone else or wouldn’t take him back when he changed his mind.

- About 30% – clearly at risk – she was scared & we would have been scared for her – about 55% could have been identified with skilled risk assessment – but 15% almost totally out of the blue.
### Prior Physical Abuse & Stalking Experienced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Femicide</th>
<th>Attempted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior physical abuse</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased in frequency</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased in severity</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalked</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No prior physical abuse</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalked</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Femicide**

- 70%

**Attempted**

- 72%
- 54%
- 60%
- 95%
- 28%
- 72%
INTIMATE PARTNER ABUSED CONTROLS (N = 356)

- Random sample selected from same cities as femicide and attempted femicide cases
- Telephone survey conducted 11/98 - 9/99 using random digit dialing
- Women in household 18-50 years old & most recently celebrated a birthday
- Women abused (including sexual assault & threats) by an intimate partner w/in 2 years prior – modified CTS
- Safety protocols followed
Sample – (only those cases with prior physical abuse or threats)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEMICIDE CASES</strong></td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATTEMPTED FEMICIDE CASES</strong></td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABUSED CONTROLS</strong></td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sociodemographic comparisons

Mean Age
Fem/Att Perp = 36
Abuse Perp = 31
Fem/Att Victim = 34
Abuse Victim = 29
DANGER ASSESSMENT (Campbell ‘86)

www.son.jhmi.edu – CNR, research, homicide

- Developed in 1985 to increase battered women’s ability to take care of themselves (Self Care Agency; Orem ‘81, 92) – original DA used with 10 samples of 2251 battered women to establish preliminary reliability & validity

- Interactive, uses calendar - aids recall plus women come to own conclusions - more persuasive & in adult learner/ strong woman/ survivor model

- Intended as lethality risk instrument versus reassault (e.g. SARA, K-SID) - risk factors may overlap but not exactly the same
Danger Assessment – Independent Predictive Validity Studies - Reassault

(Goodman, Dutton & Bennett, 2001) N = 92; 53% returned; successful prediction of reabuse, DA stronger predictor than CTS2 (4.2 vs. 2.8 OR per 1 SD DA vs. CTS2)

Women’s perception of danger stronger predictor than any of the 10 DA items available in criminal justice records – (Weisz, Tolman, & Saunders, 2000)

Heckert & Gondolf ('02; in press) N = 499 – DA- 66% sensitivity but 33% false positives - Women’s perception of risk PLUS DA best model (over SARA & K-SID) but women’s perception of risk by itself not quite as good as DA

Williams & Houghton (in press) – DA factors (not all available) comparable or slightly better than SARA & DVSI - N = 1465 criminal record check reoffending & 125 victim reports
DANGER ASSESSMENT - Actual (N = 263) & Attempted (N=182) Femicides & Abuse Victims (N=342)*

Reliability (Coefficient Alpha)

- Attempted Femicide Victims .75
- Abused Control Victims .74
- Actual Femicides .80

* Presence of DA items within one year prior to femicide and attempted femicide and within one year prior to worst incident of physical abuse experienced by abused controls
### DANGER ASSESSMENT SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abused Controls</td>
<td>2.9*</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Femicide</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Femicides</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femicide w/o suicide</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femicide/suicide</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attempted and Femicide scores significantly higher than abused controls (*p<.05)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Att/Actual</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence increased in frequency*</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence increased in severity *</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner tried to choke victim *</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A gun is present in the house *</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner forced victim to have sex *</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner used street drugs *</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner threatened to kill victim *</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim believes partner is capable of killing her *</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrator AD Military History (ns.)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking score*</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VICTIM & PERPETRATOR OWNERSHIP OF WEAPON IN FEMICIDE (N = 311), ATTEMPTED FEMICIDE (N = 182), ABUSED CONTROL (N=427) & NON-ABUSED CONTROL (N=418) CASES

\[ \chi^2 = 125.6, P < .0001 \]
Arrest, Protective Orders & Weapon Use

- 48 (33.6% of 156) of attempteds were shot
  - 15 of the 45 (33.3%) with data - perpetrator either had prior DV arrest or PO at the time of the incident
- 91 of 159 (57.3%) femicides that had weapon information were shot
  - Of 74 with data, 27 (36.5%) had a prior DV arrest or had a restraining order at the time of the incident
- According to federal legislation – these men should NOT have had possession of a gun
DANGER ASSESSMENT ITEMS COMPARING ACTUAL & ATTEMPTED FEMICIDE SURVIVORS (N=493) & ABUSED (WITHIN PAST 24 MONTHS) CONTROLS (N=427) (*p < .05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Att/Actual</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner is drunk every day</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner controls all victim’s activities</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner beat victim while pregnant</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner is violently jealous of victim (says things like “If I can’t have you, no one can”)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim threatened/tried to commit suicide</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner threatened/tried to commit suicide</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner is violent toward victim’s children</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner is violent outside house</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner arrested for DV <em>(not criminality)</em></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner hurt a pet on purpose</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nonsignificant Variables of note

- Hurting a pet on purpose - 10% of attempted/actual victims vs. 8.5% of controls
  - BUT – some clear cases of using cruelty to a pet as a threat to kill
  - WAS a risk for women to be abused (compared with nonabused controls)
  - AND more risk in attempted femicide sample – perhaps proxies not as knowledgeable about pets – warrants further investigation

- Perpetrator military history – 16% actual/attempteds vs. 22% of controls
Risk Models

- Femicides with abuse history only (violence & threats) compared to abused controls (*N=181 femicides; 319 abused controls – total = 500 (18-50 yo only)

- Missing variables
  - variables had to be excluded from femicide model due to missing responses – if don’t know – no – therefore underestimate risk

- Logistic Regression Plan – comparing cases & controls
  - Model variable in blocks – background characteristics – individual & couple, general violence related variables, violent relationship characteristics – then incident level
  - Interaction terms entered – theoretically derived
Significant (p< .05) Variables (Entered into Blocks) before Incident (overall fit = 85% correct classification)

- Perpetrator unemployed OR = 4.4
- Perpetrator gun access OR = 5.4
- Perpetrator Stepchild OR = 2.4
- Couple Never Lived Together OR = .34
- Highly controlling perpetrator OR = 2.1
- Estranged X Low control (interaction) OR = 3.6
- Estranged X Control (interaction) OR = 5.5
- Threatened to kill her OR = 3.2
- Threatened w/weapon prior OR = 3.8
- Forced sex OR = 1.9
- Prior Arrest for DV OR = .34
**Significant (p<.05)**

**Variables at Incident Level**

- Perpetrator unemployed OR = 4.4
- Perpetrator Stepchild OR = 2.4
- Couple Never Lived Together OR = 0.31
- Threatened w/weapon prior OR = 4.1
- Highly controlling perpetrator OR = 2.4
- Estranged X Low control (interaction) OR = 3.1
- Estranged X Control (interaction) OR = 3.4
- Perpetrator Used Gun OR = 24.4
- Prior Arrest for DV OR = 0.31
- Trigger - Victim Leaving (33%) OR = 4.1
- Trigger – Jealousy/she has new relationship OR = 4.9
Femicide – Suicide Cases (32% of femicide cases in study – 29% US)

- Significant explanatory power for same femicide – suicide risk factors.
  - Partner access to gun
  - Threats with a weapon
  - Step child in the home
  - Estrangement

- Unique to femicide – suicide:
  - Partner suicide threats – history of poor mental health
  - Married
  - Somewhat higher education levels (unemployment still a risk factor), more likely to be white
CONCLUSIONS

- ALL DV IS DANGEROUS
- But 10 or more yeses on revised scale very dangerous
- Much more sensitive & specific if weighted items used – ROC curves – area under curve .91 (vs. .88 & .83 original version) with acceptable PPV at identifiable higher and lower danger ranges
- But with weighted DA scores – highest possible score is 45 & 18 or more is at severest range of danger for identifying most women at risk
- 26 or more for denial of liberty
Revisions to DA – still in progress

- Using threaten to harm children – does not trigger a mandated report to CPS (although a yes response may indicate a more thorough assessment for child abuse)
- Added arrest for DV, removed violent outside of the home – not present in final models
- Divided threats to kill and perception of danger
- Stalking & stepchild added
- Formatting changed slightly
Developed in 1985 to increase battered women’s ability to take care of themselves (Self Care Agency; Orem ‘81, 92)

Interactive, uses calendar - aids recall plus women come to own conclusions - more persuasive & in adult learner/ strong woman/ survivor model – has been used with >3000 women in prior research (Campbell et. al. 02)

Intended as lethality risk instrument versus reassault (e.g. SARA, K-SID) - risk factors may overlap but not exactly the same
Instructions for Scoring Revised Danger Assessment

- Add total number of “yes” responses: 1 through 19. _____
- Add 4 points for each “yes” to question 2  _____
- Add 3 points for a “yes” to questions 3 & 4. _____
- Add 2 points for each “yes” to questions 5, 6, and 7. _____
- Add 1 point to each “yes” to questions 8 and 9. _____
- Subtract 3 points if 3a is checked. _____

Total  _____
Danger Assessment Certification

has completed the Danger Assessment Training Program and is **certified** to use the Danger Assessment and Levels of Danger Scoring System to evaluate the level of danger in domestic violence cases.

Jacquelyn C Campbell, PhD, RN, FAAN
Anna D Wolf Chair
Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs
The Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF VICTIM:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Danger Assessment Scoring**

Add total number of “Yes” responses, 1 through 19.
Add 4 points for a “Yes” to question 2
Add 3 points for a “Yes” to questions 3 and 4.
Add 2 points for a “Yes” to questions 5, 6 and 7.
Add 1 point for a “Yes” to questions 8 & 9
Subtract 3 points if 3a is checked

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Danger</th>
<th>Variable Danger</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 13</td>
<td>Increased Danger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 17</td>
<td>Severe Danger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 or more</td>
<td>Extreme Danger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of this Danger Assessment Scoring system is restricted to

____________________________
Danger Assessment Certified
xx/xx/2005
ROC Curve Analysis – 92% under the curve for Attempted Femicides; 90% for actuals
Revised DA Scores (ANOVA p<.000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not abused</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abused Controls</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Femicides</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Femicides</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cutoff Ranges - VISE

Based on sum of weighted scoring place into 1 of the following categories:

- Less than 8 - “variable danger”
- 8 to 13 - “increased danger”
- 14 to 17 - “severe danger”
- 18 or more - “extreme danger”
Comparisons on Cutoffs – Sensitivity/Specificity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Danger</th>
<th>Femicides</th>
<th>Attempteds</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 8</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – 13</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 – 17</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 +</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tentative suggestions for ranges

- NEVER DENY SERVICES ON BASIS OF DA or ANY OTHER RISK ASSESSMENT AT CURRENT STATE OF KNOWLEDGE

- **Variable danger range** – be sure to tell women level can change quickly – watch for other signs of danger, believe their gut

- **Increased and severe danger** – advise women of risk, assertive safety planning; consult with judges, high level of supervision recommendations

- **Highest level** – advise of serious danger – take assertive actions – call for criminal justice or other professional help - recommend highest bail, highest probation supervision
Conclusions

- Danger Assessment has some support for validity in a large national case control study.
- DA can be an important basis for safety planning but use of cutoffs can now be used with great caution.
- Has been revised with this data – ranges were determined – & tested with attempted femicides.
- Additive scoring in front, algorithm on back.
- Being further evaluated (along with DVSI, K-SID & Mosaic in large prospective “Risk Assessment Validity Evaluation” supported by NIJ).
GENERAL PRINCIPLES FOR RISK ASSESSMENT IN DV

- More sources of information the better – “gold standard” for information is victim – without information from victim, cutoffs for lethality risk problematic – criminal record check important
- Perpetrators will minimize perpetration
- No actuarial methods for DV, few independent evaluations – use any cutoffs with great caution – DVS1 best if criminal justice records only & SARA with psych evaluation
- Instrument improves “expert judgment” – but clinician wisdom important also
- Never underestimate victim’s perceptions (Weisz, 2000; Gondolf, 2002) but often minimize victimization – therefore victim assessment of risk not enough if low

N = 782 women who had accessed system through calling police, civil court, shelter or hospital ED’s – NY & CA (LA County)

- Relatively severely abused – 43% severe abusive tactic from CTS last 6 mos
- 60% retention from Time 1 – more severely abused. employed & Latina less like to return
- 38% foreign born; 28% African American; 48% Hispanic/Latina
NIJ “RAVE” study

- Women randomly assigned to 2 of 4 risk assessment methods
  - Also CTS, WEB scale, HARASS
  - Also 40 other items hypothesized to increase risk
  - Also 2 items to assess victim’s perceived risk
- Recontacted 6 – 12 months later – interviewed by phone
  - Also a criminal justice record check for violent crime & DV offenses – only identified of the assaults women reported
  - 31% of victims were reassaulted according to victim reports & an additional 16% stalked – yet only 6% of men rearrested for DV & 11% for other crimes
- Women – especially those who saw themselves at high risk took many impressive protective actions – all kinds
- Their accuracy of perception of re-assault – significantly better than chance but
Areas ROC curve (excluding 27 victims w/no exposure to abuser) with potential confounders

- Chance - 0.50
- Any & severe re-assault – all significant at <.01
  - DA - 0.711; 0.714
  - DV-MOSAIC 0.618; 0.665
  - DVSI - 0.650; 0.664
  - K-SID - 0.639; 0.657
  - Victim perception 0.635; 0.627

- Instruments/method improved on victim assessment
- But none of approaches without serious margin of error
Women’s Statements After Risk Assessment Process (NIJ RAVE study)

“I never knew – this makes me much more resolved to not go back”

“I’m gonna’ go get that permanent thing (PO) – I wasn’t gonna’ go through the hassle before but now I surely will”

“Damn…. He is really dangerous, isn’t he? I keep foolin’ myself about that – now I know I gotta do something”

“I knew he was scary but no one believed me – I’m going to keep pushing now”
Implications for Policy & Safety Planning

- Clinical assessment (psychiatry, psychology) needs specific DV training
- Batterer intervention - she needs to stay gone until he completes & his attendance monitored
- Employment issues – especially for African American men
- Protective order for stalking - or use stalking laws
- Issues with various “risk” lists included in safety planning
- Petrone vs. Pike – Probation department in PA successfully sued for failure to provide adequate supervision for batterer with signs of dangerousness (probation officer now a DC area state police officer)
Implications for Policy & Safety Planning

- Engage women’s mothering concerns & skills (Henderson & Erikson ’97 ‘93; Humphreys ‘93; Sullivan et. al.‘00)
- If she says she’s going to leave, cannot leave face to face
- Importance of forced sex & stepchild variables – not on most risk assessment instruments
- Make sure she knows entire range of shelter services
- Be alert for depressed/suicidal batterer
- Batterer intervention programs working with partners
Gun Issues

- Get the gun(s) out!!! Implementation of Brady Bill – judges need to order removal of all guns – specify in search warrants & PO’s

- Ohio law – “Court discretion” gun removal with protective order (TPO – about ½ states) – PO information is entered into federal data base but not flagged as are convictions for DV misdemeanors & felonies – prohibits purchase ONLY – (& only at licensed dealer, not gun shows)

- Does not prohibit possession – no disarming; no removal (about 10 states) but judges can still order removal
Future Directions

- “Danger Assessment is a Process not a Product” (B. Hart)
- Field developing rapidly – watch literature
- Differentiating lethality & reoffending risk - different batterer typologies may explain differences (Holtzworth-Munroe)
- Strategies for working with victims important – to increase their realistic appraisal and to determine risk factors not available from criminal record checks or from perpetrators never previously arrested – e.g. as part of batterer intervention programs
- Assessing safety – protective strategies as well as danger – implications for interventions
- Two parallel processes – reoffending risk for criminal justice cases; danger (lethality) – e.g. DVSI risk for victim safety planning
Conclusions – Advice for Fatality Reviews

- Vital to get information from family members of victims – sisters, brothers, best friends, parents – most knowledgeable about circumstances – otherwise will miss true dynamics
  - Family members want to contribute to process
  - DV vastly underreported in official statistics
- More sources of information the better
Conclusions – More Advice for Fatality Reviews

- Be careful to remember that cases that close quickly are often homicide-suicides – those are not the only dynamics – keep track of other cases not closed yet
- Importance of comparisons – certain risk factors will look common but without comparing to nonfatal cases can be mislead
- Importance of own biases – knowledge you bring is valuable but also can be misleading
- Getting cases – reviewing newspapers, working with advocacy groups, consider including attempted homicides
“He Killed My Mommy” – Lewandowski, Campbell et al. JFV ’04: kids in the homes of
59% of Actual Femicides; 74% of Attempteds

- 32% Witnessed Femicide; 58% Witnessed Attempts
- 43% & 37% Found Mother
- Received Counseling
  - 60% - all children of actuals; only 28% of attempteds
  - 56% & 40% of children who witnessed femicide & attempts
  - 57% & 54% of children who found the body

- 71% & 76% of mothers abused
- 22% & 27% threats to take children if she left
- 20% & 13% threats to harm children if she left
- 8% fathers reported for child abuse – both actuals & attempteds
DISRUPTION OF CHILDREN AFTER HOMICIDAL EVENT

- Moved from home
  - Femicide: 86%
  - Attempted: 25%
- To mother’s kin
  - Femicide: 40%
  - Attempted: 16%
- To father’s kin
  - Femicide: 12%
  - Attempted: 6%
- Split between mother’s and father’s kin
  - Femicide: 5%
  - Attempted: 0%
- With others (e.g. foster home)
  - Femicide: 14%
  - Attempted: 2%
SERVICES FOR CHILDREN WITNESSING INTIMATE PARTNER HOMICIDE

- Vary city to city
- Private - Victim Assistance Funds
- Public - Specialized City Agency
- Services offered but no follow-up
- Coordination with school fragmented
- Custody issues
- *Nothing* systematic for attempted homicides
As important as the “instrument or system” – the protocol – Elements Needed:

- Agreement on purpose of risk assessment in system
- Approach to victims if involved
  - What is said to encourage participation
  - What is said regarding use of results – confidentiality
  - If perpetrator – what are legalities of use of results
- Who conducts the risk assessment – first responders? In depth assessors?
  - Credentials – training necessary
Protocol - continued

- What happens to results
  - What is communicated to victim
  - What is communicated to system – what parts and for what use
  - Where is paperwork stored – who has access
  - How can victim access later?
Maryland Process - 2004

- Under leadership of Dave Sargent – sargent47@msn.com - Maryland Domestic Violence Network
- Coalition – researchers, criminal justice, advocates - identified need for risk assessment for first responders
- Identified need for quick lethality risk assessment (vs. re-assault)
- Based on research (modification of DA) & practitioner/first responder wisdom – identified 10 factors
  - e.g. – query about stepchild felt too dangerous
Maryland Process Continued

- Protocol developed – any of first 3 items plus any 6 of 10 – high risk
  - Victim told of high risk
  - Told first line of defense is advocacy network – told about options available there – full range of services
  - Urged to call DV shelter hotline – officer dials
  - She can talk but does not have to – officer gives case specifics if she does not want to talk – questions & safety planning advice given
  - She is given one last opportunity to talk to advocate
  - Protective Order information also offered
Maryland Protocol – top 3

- Has he/she threatened to kill you or your children?
- Has he/she used a weapon against you or threatened you with a weapon?
- Do you think he/she might try to kill you?

Yes to any one screens in
Maryland Protocol – any 3 triggers protocol

- Does he/she have a gun or can get one easily?
- Has he/she ever tried to choke you
- Is he/she violently jealous or control most or all of your daily activities?
- Have you left him or separated after living together or being married in the past year?
- Is he/she unemployed?
- Has he/she threatened or tried to kill self?
- Do you have a child that he/she knows is not his/hers?
- Does he/she follow or spy on you or leave threatening messages?

Is there anything else that worries you about your safety? – assessor judgment about response
Maryland Process

- Several meetings and emails for agreement on process
- Training for first responders and advocacy system
- Training video developed
- Pilot roll out 8-9/04
Maryland Pilot

- 142 Screens completed in 1 month – 3 jurisdictions
  - 85 victims (62% of the 142 screens) "screened in"
  - 52 (62% of the 85 positive screens) spoke with a counselor
  - 2 (of 3 top 3) factors with highest number of positive responses
    - Severe jealousy and controlling factor (77 yeses out of 142)
    - Strangulation (choking) factor (73 out of 142).

- Screens not problematic to administer - 95% of officer screens were understandable according to victims & to officers administering the Screens
  - 82% of officers said the Screen was "very easy" to "fairly easy" to administer
  - Screens very consistent with full DA - 89% at High-Extreme range of danger

- To be conducted - 33 in depth interviews of officers, counselors, and pilot contacts
Never forget who it’s for -

“please don’t let her death be for nothing – please get her story told”

(one of the Moms)
Partner Alcohol Use Among Homicide And Attempted Homicide Perpetrators/Partners (N=456) Compared To Abused Controls (N=427) And Non-Abused Controls (N=418) * <.05 ** <.001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HOMI/ATT Perpetrators</th>
<th>ABUSED CONTROLS</th>
<th>NON_ABUSED CONTROLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=456+-48 †</td>
<td>N=427</td>
<td>N=418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunk every day** †</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alc/prob drinker**</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency ** †</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=1 / week</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times/week</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;= 4 / week</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity* †</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 drinks/episode</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 drinks/episode</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 drinks/episode</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or more/episode</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Drunk every or almost everyday plus AUDIT for alcohol use
Victim Alcohol Use Of Homicide And Attempted Homicide Victims (N=456) Compared To Abused Controls (N=427) And Non-Abused Controls (N=418) *<.05 **<.001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HOMI/ATT VICTIMS</th>
<th>ABUSED CONTROLS</th>
<th>NON_ABUSED CONTROLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=456+-48</td>
<td>N=427</td>
<td>N=418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alc/prob drinker*</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency †</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=1 / week</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times/week</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;= 4 / week</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity** †</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 drinks/episode</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 drinks/episode</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 drinks/episode</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or more/episode</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Drunk every or almost everyday plus AUDIT for Alcohol Abuse
All comparisons also significantly different between perpetrator and victim - abused & femicides
Summary Victim & Perpetrator Alcohol Use

- Problem Drinker
- >4 per wk
- 7+/episode 5-7 for women

Legend:
- Femicide Victim
- Fem. Perpetrator
- Abuse Victim
- Abuse Perpetrator
- Non abused
- Non abused partner
Logistic Regression (controlling for demographic differences)

- Perpetrator problem drinking increased risk of IPV (OR = 6.6 p = .001) & femicide/attempted femicide (OR = 2.01, p=. 014)
- Both frequency of drinking & drinking >5 drinks per episode increased risk of abuse (OR=3.08 p=.001; 3.53 p=.004).
- Perpetrator problem drinking & frequency (not binge) increased risk for femicide/attempted femicide (OR = 2.01, p=.004 & OR = 2.08, p = .039) vs. Abused Controls
- Adjusted relative risk - controlling for demographics - all victim associations disappear
### Drug Use Of Homicide And Attempted Homicide Victims and Partners (N=456) Compared To Abused Controls (N=427) And Non-Abused Controls (N=418) *<.05 **<.001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HOMI/ATT VICTIMS</th>
<th>ABUSED CONTROLS</th>
<th>NON_ABUSED CONTROLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=456</td>
<td>N=427</td>
<td>N=418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Drug use**</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment*†</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Drug Use**</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*† 4 of 28 non-abused controls and 2 of 57 abused controls received treatment
Also significantly different between victim and perpetrator - abused & homicides/attempted
Victim and Partner Use of Alcohol or Drugs at Time of Homicide or Attempted Homicide Incident (N=456) Compared to Time of Worst Incident for Abused Controls (N=427) *<.05 **<.001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HOMI/ATT VICTIMS</th>
<th>ABUSED CONTROLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=456</td>
<td>N=427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Use of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Use of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also significantly different between victim and partner
Use of Alcohol &/or Drugs - Time of (n=456)
Homicide/Attempt or Worst Abuse (n=427)
MISSED OPPORTUNITIES: ATTEMPTED & ACTUAL VICTIMS SEEN IN SYSTEM ONE YEAR PRIOR TO INCIDENT

- 47% went to a medical care provider for physical/injuries
  - 35% of them went to ED
- 25% went to mental health professional
- Called police - 29% overall - 38% of abused
- Called or went to a shelter - 4% overall
- Alcohol or Drug Treatment - 7% overall
  - 24% of alcohol abuse had alcohol treatment
  - 18% of those with drug abuse problems had drug treatment
ATTEMPTED & ACTUAL VICTIMS SEEN IN SYSTEM

- Called Police
- Called/Stayed Shelter
- Physical health
- Mental health
- Drug/Alc Tx

Abuse
No Abuse
MISSED OPPORTUNITIES: ACTUAL & ATTEMPTED PERPETRATORS
Characteristics of Perpetrators:

- More abusive perpetrators described with poor mental health
  - Abusive = 38%
  - Non Abusive = 30%

- However, significantly more non-abusive perpetrators saw MH professionals ($p=0.001$)
  - Abusive = 15%
  - Non Abusive = 37%
MISSED OPPORTUNITIES: PERPETRATORS

- Alc. Ab.
- Drug Use
- Alc/Drug Tx
- Prior Arrest
- Child Ab.
- Physical/mental care

Abusive vs. Non Abusive
MISSED OPPORTUNITIES:
PREVENTION - 83% of Cases

VICTIMS
- Police Contacts - 66% of stalked & battered women
- Any Medical Visit - 56% (27% ED visits only)
- Shelter Contacts - 4% of battered women
- Substance abuse Tx - 6%

PERPETRATORS
- Prior Arrest - 56% of batterers (32% of non)
- Mental Health System - 12%
- Substance Abuse Tx - 6%
- Child Abuse - 11% of batterers; 6% of non
BATTERER TYPOLOGIES

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE BATTERER TYPOLOGY

ANTISOCIAL TYPE BATTERER
INCREASING VIOLENCE
SEVERELY TRAUMATIZED VICTIM
VIOLENCE IN OTHER CONTEXTS

“ORDINARY BATTERER”
INTERMITTENT VIOLENCE
VICTIM “FIGHTS BACK”
LITTLE VIOLENCE OUTSIDE

DEPENDENT BATTERER
LITTLE PHYSICAL ABUSE
VARIES OVER TIME
SEPARATION RAGE/TERROR
BATTERER TYPOLOGY RESEARCH

- Faulk, 1974; Elbow, 1977
- Fagan, Stewart & Hansen, 1983
- Shields, Hanneke, 1983, 1988
- Hamberger & Hastings, 1985, 1986
- Gondolf, 1988
- Flournoy & Wilson, 1991
- Saunders, 1992
- Stith, Jester & Bird, 1992
- Holtzworth-Munroe....Stuart ’94; ’00; ‘02
- Johnson ’95; ’00
- Jacobson & Gottman ’95, ‘98
ANTISOCIAL BATTERER
(15-25% -- HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE)

- Escalating & severe physical, sexual & emotional partner violence – 7% (n = 1) – desisted; 88% of relationship dissolution
- Little remorse; blame others; refuse responsibility
- Power and control tactics obvious and severe
- From Jacobson – sexual violence more frequent & severe
- Less amenable to treatment
- Dismissing attachment
- Deviant peers
ANTISOCIAL BATTERER

- Impulsive; few controls
- Substance abusers
- Arrest records – 40% jailed in follow-up period
- Hx of violence in intimate relationships & outside
- Attitudes supportive of violence & hostile toward women (not necessarily sexist in traditional sense – rather can’t trust women etc.)
- Abused as child
- Probably a subgroup of psychopaths
“FAMILY ONLY” “COMMON COUPLE VIOLENCE”

“ORDINARY BATTERER” (37-70%?) – may be 2 types –
- low level antisocial & family only (Holtzworth-Munroe ’02)

- Arrest & intervention less likely - good candidate for intervention
- Least severe, least sexual and emotional abuse
- Least child abuse
- More middle class
- Least abuse child
- If woman violent - self-defense
- Most liberal attitudes toward women
- If Low Level & Family Only 2 distinct types –
  - Family Only may occur only once – but neither group became more violent over time – 40% desisted (23% LLA)
DYSPHORIC-BORDERLINE
(15-25% - HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE, 1994)

- Moderate amount of violence – 14% desisted
- Dependent on relationship
- Volatile
- Dangerous when she leaves or perceives rejection
- Sometimes substance abuse
- Depressed/ threatens suicide
- Child abuse? -- Incest?
- Preoccupied attachment
- More stalking?
- Potential for homicide-suicide
ABUSIVE PERSONALITY
(DUTTON, 1988, 1994, 1995 etc. vs. Gondolf '99)

- Borderline personality organization
- Angry attachment
- Rejection by father (especially) and by mother
- Child abuse
- Verbal and physical abuse by parents (especially father)
MUTUAL VIOLENCE
(7% OF DV & INCREASING?)

- Both parents violent toward each other
- Both parents witness violence as children
- Mother as likely (or more so) to abuse child as father
- Association with poverty
- Either one may kill the other
**MISSED OPPORTUNITIES:**
**ATTEMPTED & ACTUAL VICTIMS SEEN IN SYSTEM ONE YEAR PRIOR TO INCIDENT**

- 47% went to a medical care provider for physical/injuries
  - 35% of them went to ED
- 25% went to mental health professional
- Called police - 29% overall - 38% of abused
- Called or went to a shelter - 4% overall
- Alcohol or Drug Treatment - 7% overall
  - 24% of alcohol abuse had alcohol treatment
  - 18% of those with drug abuse problems had drug treatment
ATTEMPTED & ACTUAL VICTIMS SEEN IN SYSTEM

- Called Police
- Called/Stayed Shelter
- Physical health
- Mental health
- Drug/Alc Tx

Abuse
No Abuse

Percentage distribution of different outcomes for attempted and actual victims seen in the system.
MISSED OPPORTUNITIES:
ACTUAL & ATTEMPTED PERPETRATORS

Characteristics of Perpetrators:

- More abusive perpetrators described with poor mental health
  - Abusive = 38%
  - Non Abusive = 30%
- However, significantly more non-abusive perpetrators saw MH professionals (p=0.001)
  - Abusive = 15%
  - Non Abusive = 37%
MISSED OPPORTUNITIES: PERPETRATORS

- Alc. Ab.
- Drug Use
- Alc/Drug Tx
- Prior Arrest
- Child Ab.
- Physical/mental care

Legend:
- Orange: Abusive
- Blue: Non Abusive
MISSED OPPORTUNITIES:
PREVENTION - 83% of Cases

VICTIMS
- Police Contacts - 66% of stalked & battered women
- Any Medical Visit - 56% (27% ED visits only)
- Shelter Contacts - 4% of battered women
- Substance abuse Tx - 6%

PERPETRATORS
- Prior Arrest - 56% of batterers (32% of non)
- Mental Health System - 12%
- Substance Abuse Tx - 6%
- Child Abuse - 11% of batterers; 6% of non
Implications for Policy & Safety Planning

- Making sure he doesn’t have access to her as part of the court process
- Importance of forced sex, stepchild & choking variables – not on most risk assessment instruments
  - Issues with marital rape prosecution
  - Strangulation issues
  - Blended families
- Make sure she knows entire range of shelter services
- Be alert for depressed/suicidal batterer
- Batterer intervention programs working with partners
Implications for Policy & Safety Planning

- Clinical assessment (psychiatry, psychology) needs specific DV training
- Batterer intervention - she needs to stay gone until he completes & his attendance monitored with systems for information back to judges or probation
- Employment issues – especially for African American men
- Issues with various “risk” lists included in safety planning
- Confidentiality issues – victim needs to be clear about use of risk assessment
- Potential increased risk for immigrant women from recent NYC data
Implications for Criminal Justice – Gun Issues

- Get the gun(s) out!!!
  - Order removal of all guns – find out all guns he has access to
  - Specify each gun in search warrants & PO’s – empowers police to retrieve
- May need to strategize with system as to storage etc.
- About 10 states have disarming, removal provisions – California has some of the best - most states do not
- Importance of protective order for stalking - or use stalking laws
Policy/Practice/Research Implications

- Need for substance abuse Tx in abusive men – concurrent with batterer intervention? Combination programs? New models needed with rigorous evaluations
- Coordinated community response with probation, courts, batterer intervention and DV victim services closely working together
- Need for collaborations btw. researchers & clinicians in substance abuse, health, criminal justice and advocacy – for advances in risk assessment – research and policy
- Deadly mix of guns, substances & IPV –