



SAFETY, RESPECT
AND DIGNITY
FOR ALL

LA SÉCURITÉ,
LA DIGNITÉ
ET LE RESPECT
POUR TOUS

A Profile of Incarcerated Female Perpetrators of Intimate Partner Violence:

Implications for Treatment

Natalie Gabora, M.A.

Rhonda Cochrane

Reintegration Programs

Correctional Service of Canada



Outline of Presentation

- Review of the literature
 - Rates of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) by women
 - Context of women's IPV
 - Characteristics of women perpetrators
- Profile of CSC's women perpetrators of IPV
 - Treatment targets



Gender Differences in Rates of Intimate Partner Violence

- Considerable controversy
- Large scale surveys: equal rates for men and women
- Criminal justice and social service data: 5% of violence is perpetrated by women



Gender Differences in Rates of Intimate Partner Violence

- Meta-analysis (Archer, 2000): women slightly more likely to use physical aggression and to use such acts more frequently. However, men were more likely to inflict an injury. *Acts vs. Consequences*
- Common couple violence vs. Patriarchal terrorism (Johnson, 1995)



The Context of Women's Violence Against Intimate Partners

- Not particularly well understood
- Some studies: women are violent in the context of violence against them by their male partners (retaliation or self-defence)
- Other studies: women are as likely to initiate violence, but men are more likely to control the dynamics of violence



Characteristics of Women Offenders of IPV

- Recent large scale studies compared men and women offenders of IPV (Henning, Jones & Holdford, 2003; Henning & Feder, 2004)
- Women had less severe histories of IPV
- Similar childhood family experiences
- Suicide attempts, medication more common among women
- Discrepancies regarding personality disorders



Characteristics of Women Offenders of IPV

- Relationship distress similar
- Substance abuse and serious conduct problems during childhood more likely for men
- Overall, men ranked higher than women on risk factors for recidivism



Typology of Women Offenders

Babcock, Miller and Siard (2003)

- Based on breadth of violence
 - *Partner-only*
 - *Generally Violent*
- *Generally violent women*
 - more violent to partner
 - motivated by a desire to control
 - more emotionally abusive
 - externalised more blame
 - violence was more instrumental and used in a greater variety of situations



Women's Use of Violence in Lesbian Relationships

- High rates of violence in lesbian relationships (25% to 48%)
- Very little attention
- Many of the same risk factors and correlates as male-to-female intimate violence



Programs for Women Offenders

- Only a few programs take into account the unique motives and dynamics of women's violence
- Some focus entirely on the women's victimization
- Women Ending Abusive/Violent Episodes Respectfully (WEAVER) program
 - recognizes the heterogeneity of women perpetrators



Current study

- To investigate the existence and nature of relationship violence by federally sentenced women offenders in Canada and to suggest appropriate areas for intervention



Current Study Design

- **Part 1: Population profile**
 - To identify percentage of women who have a history of intimate partner violence (IPV)
 - To profile general characteristics
- **Part 2: Sample profile (n=58)**
 - To more fully explore the motives and interpersonal context of the IPV
 - To investigate whether risk factors for male IPV (SARA) are similar for women

An aerial photograph of the Parliament Hill in Ottawa, Canada. The image shows the iconic Gothic Revival architecture of the buildings, including the Peace Tower, surrounded by green lawns and a large crowd of people gathered in the foreground. The Ottawa River is visible on the left, and a bridge spans across it. The background shows a dense urban area with various buildings and streets.

The Correctional Service of Canada
(CSC) administers the sentences of
offenders imprisoned for two years or
more



CSC Women Offenders

- Women represent 3% of the federal offender population
- About 46% are incarcerated while about 54% are on conditional release



CSC Women perpetrators of IPV

- About 15% of women offenders perpetrated IPV (135 of 897 offenders)
- This is likely an underestimate
- Rates of IPV for CSC women offenders is about half that for male offenders



Profile of CSC Women Offenders of IPV

- Average age: 37 years (20 – 71 years)
- Most common marital status: single (38%), common law (34%)
- 70% completed a grade 10 level of education



CSC Women Offenders: Current Sentence

- 12% were serving life sentences
- Average sentence: 3.3 yrs
- 61% were incarcerated, the rest were in the community
- Over half (59%) were convicted of violent offence
 - Homicide and related (27%)
 - Traffic/import drugs (24%)
 - Robbery (19%)



Intimate Relationships

- 71% of women involved only in heterosexual
- 7% involved only in same-sex relationships
- 22% involved in both
- Half of the women had intimate relationships longer than 5 years



Serious problem for Aboriginal women

- 44% Aboriginal
- Aboriginal people comprise less than 3% of the Canadian population and 28% of women inmates
- Rates of men's violence against women, including lethality, are particularly high in Aboriginal communities



Criminogenic Needs

- Majority had no difficulty in community functioning (69%) or attitude (68%)
- Most commonly reported some/considerable difficulty with:
 - employment (73%)
 - social interaction (64%)
 - marital/family (81%)
 - personal/emotional (95%)
 - substance abuse (89%)



Childhood victimization

- 76% experienced emotional abuse and 77% physical/sexual as a child
- Abuse most often committed by someone other than a family member (64%), father (31%), mother (50%), other family member (44%)
- 71% experienced first episode between 5 – 15 years
- About $\frac{3}{4}$ experienced long-term or severe abuse



IPV by Womens' Partners

- 60% of the women had been victimized by IPV in some of their relationships; 17.5% in most; 17.5% in all relationships
- This violence is most often long term/ severe
- Multi-abuse experiences of women offenders



Women's violence

- Index offence was IPV for 22% of women
- 73% were violent in some of their intimate relationships; 14% most; 14% all relationships
- Victim was male for 83% of women
- Most often, 2 – 3 violent episodes over relationship



Women's Violence

- Violence was physical in almost all cases (sexual violence in 11%)
- About 64% used a weapon at some time
- 3% used poison
- 2% stalked victim



Consequences of Women's Violence

- In most incidents of IPV, there was no injury to the victim
- However, 12% resulted in death and 18% required hospitalization



Motives for Most Incidents of Violence

- 59% mutual violence/combat
- 15% primary perpetration
- 8% revenge/retaliation
- 8% instrumental violence
- 5% self-defence
- 5% fear of further control/abuse



Motives for At Least One Incident

- 82% mutual violence/combat
- 64% primary perpetration
- 38% revenge/retaliation
- 32% instrumental violence
- 19% fear of further control/abuse
- 18% self-defence
- 2% defence of children



Factors Contributing to Women's IPV

- 84% Physically/sexually abused by victim
- 84% Emotionally abused by victim
- 67% Alcohol abuse
- 54% Drug abuse
- 31% Financial issues
- 27% Jealousy



Typology of Women Offenders of IPV

- 67% Generally violent
- 33% Partner only
- Generally violent more likely:
 - Past violations of community supervision
 - Use weapons/death threats during past incidents



Indicators of Risk (SARA)

- 95% Past physical assault against intimate partner (89%)
- 88% recent substance abuse (81%)
- 88% recent employment problems (67%)

- Risk factors consistent with literature for women arrested for IPV, but more common for CSC women offenders



Indicators of Risk (SARA)

- 85% severe violence and/or sexual assault in index offence
- 75% past violations of conditional release/community supervision (74%)
- 75% victim and or witness to family violence as a child (58%)
- 63% Past assault of strangers/acquaintances (69%)
- 63% Use of weapons/death threats in index offence



Indicators of Risk (SARA)

- 46% Personality disorder -anger, impulsivity, behavioural instability (36%)
- 42% Past use of weapons/death threats of against partner (47%)
- 41% Recent relationship problems (66%)
- 36% Recent suicidal/homicidal ideation (23%)
- 35% Recent escalation in frequency/severity of partner assault (35%)



Indicators of Risk (SARA)

- 29% Extreme minimization/denial of spousal assault (65%)
- 28% Attitudes that support/condone spousal assault (57%)
- 27% Past assault of family members (43%)
- 22% Recent psychotic/manic symptoms (8%)
- 19% past sexual assault/jealousy against intimate partner (29%)
- 7% violation of a “no contact” order in index offence
- 6% past violations of “no contact” orders (30%)



Risk for IPV

Women Offenders

- 7% high
- 29% moderate
- 64% low

Male Offenders

- 28% high
- 40% moderate
- 32% low



Treatment for Women's IPV

- Dutton's (1994) Nested Ecological Model of relationship violence
- Contextual factors; intervention tailored according to whether the woman is a victim, an aggressor or both (coercive control)
- Culturally appropriate for Aboriginal women



Treatment Targets

- Violence in the family of origin
 - Develop an understanding of the role of early modeling in establishing adult relationship patterns
 - Parenting without abuse
- Victim of violence in intimate relationships
 - Safety planning
 - Problem solving
 - Positive goal setting
 - Understanding of how previous victimisation can heighten the response to threats



Treatment Targets

- Relationship distress/marital discord
 - Interpersonal skills
 - Establishing networks of support
- Mutual conflict/general aggression
 - Self monitoring and arousal reduction techniques
 - Training to anticipate consequences of aggressive acts
 - Cognitive restructuring
 - Development of behavioural strategies to approach interpersonal problems
 - Identifying "behavioural chains"



Treatment Targets

- Power and control issues
 - Education on the range of abusive behaviour and training in prosocial alternatives
 - Cultural exploration and identification of systemic forms of violence
- Problems in emotional self control (depression, anxiety)
 - Training in cognitive techniques to manage thinking related to emotional mismanagement
 - Training in behavioural techniques to manage distress



Treatment Targets

- Substance abuse
 - For women whose relationship violence is related to misuse of drugs and alcohol



Limitations

- Profile of CSC women perpetrators may be unrepresentative, especially those outside the criminal justice system
- Further research on the treatment needs, particularly for women offenders in lesbian relationships

A sunset scene over a body of water with mountains in the background. The sun is low on the horizon, creating a bright glow and reflecting on the water. The sky is filled with dark, dramatic clouds.

Any Questions?

**Thank you for
your time!**



If you would like
more information

Internet:

www.csc-scc.gc.ca

Natalie Gabora

Reintegration Programs

(613) 947- 0586

GaboraRothNJ@CSC-SCC.GC.CA

A Profile of Incarcerated Female Perpetrators of Intimate Partner Violence: Implications for Treatment

Natalie Gabora, Kellie Lilley, Lynn Stewart, Nicole Allegri and Mathew Duncan
Correctional Service of Canada¹

There is now mounting evidence that the incidence of female-to-male intimate partner violence is as high as that of male-to-female intimate violence, although there are important gender differences with respect to the context, the motives, and the consequences of the violence. Research findings within the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) indicate that at least 15% of federally sentenced women have been violent against an intimate partner. In the majority of cases, women were violent in the context of mutual violence/ combat. Using the typology identified for abusive women (Babcock, Miller & Siard, 2003), 67% of the CSC women offenders were classified as *Generally Violent* while 33% of the sample were classified as *Partner-only*. High rates of past victimization in families of origin or by intimate partners, substance abuse, and employment problems are identified as risk factors/correlates of women offenders' intimate partner violence. Treatment targets to meet the needs of female perpetrators are identified.

Introduction

Historically, domestic violence has been conceptualized as male violence against female partners, and social, political and research attention on the perpetration of domestic violence has focused on male offenders. There has been a strong social and political bias against viewing females as perpetrators of abuse and violence, based on concern that attention would be diverted from the more serious problem of male-to-female violence (Koonin, Cabarcas & Geffner, 2002; Mills, 2003). Accordingly, there has been very little discussion about women perpetrators of intimate partner violence and very little attention on developing effective interventions for women offenders. Despite high prevalence rates, violence in lesbian relationships in particular has received very little consideration (Mills, 2003; Worcester, 2002).

Over the years, more than 30 surveys have found approximately equal rates of intimate violence perpetrated by men and women (Currie, 1998). A recent large scale Canadian survey supports these findings, with 8% of women and 7% of men reported being victimized in the previous five year period by their partner (Johnson & Hotton, 2001). In contrast, a second set of researchers **has** provided evidence to suggest that female-to-male intimate violence exists, but in only about 5% of all domestic violence cases (Dobash & Dobash, 2000; Pagelow, 1992; Wilson & Daly, 1992).

Johnson (1995) argues that the different rates of violence described by these two research traditions arise because they are sampling different, largely non-overlapping populations, experiencing distinct forms of violence. *Common couple violence*, which is relatively gender balanced, is tapped by the survey research methodology, while *patriarchal terrorism*, which involves men's terroristic attacks on their female partners, is tapped by research from the

¹ Requests should be directed to the first author at gaborarothnj@csc-scc.gc.ca
Paper presented at the World Conference on Prevention of Family Violence 2005, Banff, Alberta.

criminal justice system or other social agencies such as shelters. A recent meta-analysis found gender differences in the severity of violence and supported the view that studies examining *acts* of violence result in different results than those investigating *consequences* of violence. Archer (2000) found that women were slightly more likely than men to report using physical aggression in intimate relationships and to use such acts more frequently. However, men were more likely to inflict an injury than women.

The Context of Women's Violence Against Intimate Partners: The interpersonal context and motives of women who use violence against their partners are not particularly well understood. Many studies indicate that the majority of women are violent in the context of violence against them by their male partners. For instance, Saunders (1986) determined the vast majority of violence used by battered women against their partners was motivated by self-defence or fighting back when their partners were abusing them. Similar findings were obtained even with women who had been arrested for intimate partner violence (Hamberger & Polente, 1994; Henning, Jones & Holdford, 2003). These researchers concluded that women perpetrators of domestic violence differ from male offenders, whose violence is more often related to power and control issues, or concerns about abandonment.

Nevertheless, the finding that women are more likely to hit exclusively out of retaliation or self-defence has not been supported by all research studies. For example, research shows that women initiate violence as often as men (Stets & Straus, 1995), and their violence is not predominately a response to violence by male partners, at least for minor assaults (Morse, 1995). Hamberger and Guse (2002) found that both women court-ordered to attend counselling and women in a shelter were more likely than men to report feeling intense fear, and to call the police when their partners initiated violence than men who were court-ordered to attend counselling; in comparison, men more often denigrated their partner's violence. Court-ordered men and women appeared similar in the expressed violence, violence frequency and injurious outcome. However, the men exhibited more dominating and controlling behaviours than court-ordered women or women seeking shelter services, suggesting that in relationships with mutual violence, men are more likely to initiate and control the dynamics of violence, whereas many women use violence but do not control those dynamics. Similarly, Swan and Snow (2002) found that male aggressors were more coercively controlling than female perpetrators. In comparison to the women, the male partners committed more of the following classic battering behaviours: sexual coercion, coercive control, injury, and severe physical violence.

Harned (2001) found that women and men reported comparable amounts of violence from heterosexual and homosexual dating partners, although the type of violence was different. Women were more likely to experience sexual victimization, whereas men were more often the victims of psychological aggression. Rates of physical violence were similar across genders although the impact of such violence was more severe for women. Interestingly, the study indicated that men and women were equally likely to use physical violence for self-defensive purposes.

In summary, women may use violence as often as men do, but their motives for and the effects of women's violence appear to be quite different. Even in relationships in which women were the aggressors, the women usually experienced significant violence from their partners and are likely to be more negatively affected by partner violence.

Characteristics of Women Offenders of Domestic Violence: A significant body of research exists on the life histories and psychological characteristics of male perpetrators and this literature has guided the development of theoretical models and intervention strategies. In comparison, literature on women offenders of domestic violence is just starting to emerge. A large-scale study found that the male and female domestic violence offenders shared similar childhood family experiences (Henning, Jones & Holdford, 2003). One out of four women witnessed parental violence, a third were physically abused by a caregiver, and most (81.5%) reported that their parents used corporal punishment. Relationship distress was also similar between men and women; however, compared to male offenders, women were much more likely to be considering leaving their partners. Differences also emerged in mental health functioning between men and women offenders. Women were three times as likely as the men to have attempted suicide and use of psychotropic medication was more common among women. Fewer women than men had substance abuse problems and histories of serious conduct problems during childhood. Females, as compared to males, were more likely to evidence symptoms of compulsive, histrionic and borderline personality disorders, although there appear to be discrepancies in the literature with respect to gender differences in personality disorders (Magdol et al., 1997; Smith-Acuna, Henderson, Metzger, Watson, 2004).

Henning and Feder (2004) compared demographic characteristics, criminal history variables, and past history of domestic violence for 5,578 men and 1,126 women arrested for assault against a heterosexual intimate partner. Overall, the results indicated that men ranked higher than women on risk factors for recidivism (including general, violent and domestic violent). Out of 20 commonly cited risk factors, women ranked higher than men on just three of the risk items - severity of index offense, employment problems, and younger age. Compared to male offenders, the women's violence was less serious and their partners were less likely to feel seriously threatened. Women offenders were also less likely to have prior criminal charges than the men. Men were more likely to have alcohol and/or drug problems.

While some studies suggest that violence in lesbian relationships shares many of the same risk factors and correlates of male-to-female intimate violence (Glass, Koziol-McLain, Campbell and Block, 2004; Renzetti, 1992), there is **also** an absence of literature comparing women who are violent against female partners and women who are violent against male partners.

It is recognized that perpetrators of domestic violence are not a homogeneous group and several typologies of women offenders have been recently proposed (Johnson, 2000; Swan & Snow, 2002). Babcock, Miller and Siard (2003) offered a typology based on the breadth of perpetrators' use of violence: *Partner only* violent women are exclusively violent to their intimate partner, while *Generally Violent* women use violence both within and outside intimate relationships. Half of the 52 women perpetrators of heterosexual and lesbian partner violence were classified as *Partner only* and half were classified as *Generally Violent*. In comparison to *Partner Only* women, *Generally violent* women were more violent toward their partner, were motivated by a desire to control their partner, were more emotionally abusive, and externalised more blame for their violence. Further, their violence was more instrumental and used in a greater variety of situations. *Generally violent* women reported more trauma symptoms than *Partner only* women, but they did not report a more severe abuse history, either in childhood or

in their relationships with their partner. *Generally violent* women reported more psychological problems and more extensive criminal histories. Developmentally, *Generally violent* women were more likely than *Partner Only* women to witness their mother being violent toward their fathers, suggesting that they were socialized that it is acceptable for women to use violence against intimates.

Current Study: Research to date has provided a preliminary insight into the issue of female relationship violence. Our review of the literature revealed a paucity of programs for women offenders of domestic violence that are based on theoretical and treatment models developed specifically for women offenders that take into account the unique motives and dynamics of women's violence (for an exception, see Koonin, Cabarcas, & Geffner, 2002). The current study aims to investigate the existence and nature of relationship violence by federally sentenced women offenders in Canada and to suggest appropriate areas for intervention.

Methodology

Women Perpetrators of Intimate Partner Violence: Within the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC), offenders are assessed through an Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process during the first weeks of their incarceration to identify static and dynamic factors that affect their safe and timely reintegration. Numerous indicators for each of seven domains (community functioning, attitude, employment, social interaction, personal/emotional orientation, substance abuse, and marital/family) are assessed. This information, along with other documentation related to the correctional planning of offenders is electronically managed by the Offender Management System (OMS) database. The OIA indicator "*spousal assault perpetration*" was used to identify women offenders serving a federal sentence who had any reported history of violence against (an) intimate partner(s). A subsequent query into the OMS database was performed to obtain demographic characteristics, information regarding current offence, and risk and need profiles of women federal offenders who perpetrate intimate partner violence.

Context, Consequences and Motives for Women's Violence: A random sample (n = 58) of the women identified as perpetrators of intimate partner violence was selected to examine the women's developmental and relationship history as well as the frequency, consequences, motives and contributing factors for their intimate partner violence. The sample was representative of the population of federally sentenced women who had a history of violence against (an) intimate partner(s) on variables such as age, sentence length, and overall risk. Each of the offender's OMS files was reviewed by one of two researchers and the variables of interest were coded using a standardized template. Inter-rater reliability was assessed on a small sample (n=5); the coders' responses agreed 80 - 100% of the time for 75% of the variables, and 40 - 60% of the time for 25% of the variables.

Evidence of Indicators of Risk: The Spousal Assault Risk Assessment Guide (SARA) is a checklist of twenty risk factors for spousal assault (Kropp, Hart, Webster & Eaves, 1995). Based on the evaluation of the indicators, an overall risk rating is completed. At present, the SARA is only validated for male offenders (Kropp & Hart, 2000) and accordingly, the instrument is not currently used in CSC for assessing risk for women offenders. An objective of this study was to

determine whether women offenders' risk for intimate partner violence is indicated by similar variables as for men, as outlined by the SARA. Researchers were formally trained on the administration, scoring, and interpretation of the SARA. The SARA was coded based on available OMS file material.

Results

Demographics: In September 2002, 897 women were serving a federal sentence in Canada. Of these, 15.1% (n=135) had a history of violence against (an) intimate partner(s). Their ages ranged from 20 to 71, with a mean age of 37 years. Seventy percent had completed at least a grade 10 level of education. The most common current marital status was single (38.3%), followed by common law (33.6%). A large percentage (43.6%) of the women in the sample was Aboriginal; 48.9% were Caucasian.

Current Offence: Sixteen of the 135 women were serving life sentences; the mean sentence length for those serving determinate sentences was 3.29 years. Over half (58.5%) of the women were convicted of at least one violent offence. The most common offence category was homicide and related (27.4%), followed by traffic/import drugs (24.4%) and robbery (19.3%). The majority (60.7%) were incarcerated, while the remainder was supervised in the community.

Risk/Need Profile: A majority of the women were identified at intake as posing a moderate risk (56.0%), showing moderate motivation (51.1%) to address the factors associated with their criminal pattern, and as having high needs related to their criminal behaviour (52.2%). The women were most commonly rated at intake as having a high reintegration potential (38.3%). As shown in Table 1, a majority of the women were assessed at intake as not having a problem in the community functioning and attitude domains. Most frequently, the women were assessed as having some /considerable difficulty with employment, associates/social interaction, marital/family background, personal/emotional orientation, and substance abuse domains. For comparison purposes, the corresponding percentages of needs at intake for federally sentenced repeat-violent² women are provided in brackets (Bell, 2004).

Table 1: Perpetrators' Intake Assessment Domains (N = 134)

Domain	Asset/ No difficulty	Some / Considerable Difficulty
Community Functioning	69.4%	30.6% (48%)
Attitude	67.9%	32.1% (35%)
Employment	26.9%	73.1% (68%)
Social Interaction	35.8%	64.2% (67%)
Marital / Family	19.4%	80.6% (74%)
Personal/ Emotional	5.2%	94.8% (93%)
Substance Abuse	11.2%	88.8% (79%)

² The population of violent women offenders would have included women perpetrators of intimate violence

Childhood Victimization: An in-depth review of the files for 58 women identified as perpetrators of intimate partner violence revealed considerable abuse during their childhood/adolescence; 76% experienced emotional abuse, and 77.2% experienced physical abuse. The abuse was most often committed by someone other than a family member (64.1%), although 50% had been abused by their mothers, 31% by their fathers, and 44.4% by another family member(s). Most (70.6%) experienced their first episode of abuse between the ages of 5 and 15 years, although about 20% were under 5 years of age when they were first assaulted. Moreover, the abuse was considered long-term or severe for 78.4% of the women.

Intimate Relationships: Most (70.8%) of the women had only been involved in heterosexual intimate relationships, while 6.9% had only been involved in same-sex relationships; almost one-quarter (22.4%) had been involved in both heterosexual and homosexual relationships. The average length of intimate relationships was more than 5 years for half of the women. Violence perpetrated by the women offenders and their partners is profiled in Table 2. Most (72.5%) of the women were violent in *some* of their intimate relationships. The largest group of women perpetrators (59.6%) were also victims in *some* of their intimate relationships; only 5.3% of the women had never experienced violence by an intimate partner. For 63% of the women, the violence was reported to be long-term or severe.

Table 2: Violence Perpetrated by the Women and by their Partners

Proportion of Intimate Relationships	Percentage of Perpetrators	Percentage of Perpetrators Who Were Also Victims
None		5.3%
Some (a minority)	72.5%	59.6%
Most (a majority)	13.7%	17.5%
All	13.7%	17.5%

Offenders' Violence: The offender's index offence was related to intimate violence for 22.4% of the women. As shown in Table 2, most of the women had been violent in *some* of their intimate relationships; although 13.7% had been violent in *most*, and another 13.7% in *all* of their intimate relationships. The victim was male for 82.5% of the cases, female for 10.5%; 7% of the women reported that they had been violent towards both women and men partners. As shown in Table 3, the violence was most often committed on an *occasional* (i.e., 2-3 episodes over period of relationship) basis.

The violence was physical in almost all cases; sexual violence (with or without physical violence) was reported for 11.1% of the women. At some time, 64.3% had used a weapon during an incident of violence. Poisoning and stalking the victim were rare; 2.8% and 2.4% of women, respectively had perpetrated these forms of abuse.

Table 3: Frequency of Offenders' Violence (N=37)

Frequency of Violence	Percentage of Offenders
1 incident over period of relationship	18.9%
2-3 incidents over period of relationship	48.6%
4-5 incidents over the period of the relationship	29.7%

More than 5 incidents over the relationship	2.7%
---	------

Consequences of Violence: In most incidents of intimate partner violence, there was no injury to the victim. Nevertheless, 68.8% have perpetrated *at least one* violent act in which there was mild injury, 30.0% caused moderate injury (i.e., required medical attention), 18.2% caused injury requiring hospitalization, and 11.8% perpetrated at least one act which resulted in the death of their intimate partner.

Motives for the Violence: Motives for the offenders' violence are provided in Table 4. The majority of the women had a history of mutual violence/combat with their intimate partner, although 63.9% of the women were the primary perpetrators in at least one incident. Fear of further control/abuse by their partner, self defence, and especially defence of children were relatively infrequent motives. Of the six incidents that resulted in death of the partner, two were related to revenge/retaliation, two were related to instrumental violence, one was related to self-defence, and the motive was unknown for one case.

Table 4: Motives for Offenders' Relationship Violence³

	Most Incidents (n = 39)	At least One Incident
Mutual violence/combat ⁴	59.0%	81.6% (n=49)
Primary perpetration ⁵	15.4%	63.9% (n=36)
Revenge/retaliation ⁶	7.7%	37.9% (n=29)
Instrumental purposes ⁷	7.7%	31.6% (n=38)
Fear of further control/abuse by partner ⁸	5.1%	19.4% (n=31)
Self defence ⁹	5.1%	18.2% (n=33)
Defence of children ¹⁰	0%	2.4% (n=42)

Contributing Factors: Factors contributing to the offenders' perpetration of intimate partner violence in at least one incident are listed in Table 5. As shown, physical/sexual victimization and emotional abuse by the victim was evident in at least one incident of violence for the overwhelming number of offenders.

Table 5: Factors Contributing to the Offenders' Intimate Partner Violence

Contributing Factors	Percentage of Offenders
-----------------------------	--------------------------------

³ The motive for the violence could not be determined from file documentation for a number of the cases

⁴ both partners have been violent

⁵ no evidence that her intimate partner perpetrated violence towards her

⁶ offender was violent to punish partner or gain revenge for a perceived or actual wrong

⁷ violence was instrumental in achieving some other goal (e.g., insurance, desire to establish relationship with new partner, robbery)

⁸ fear not of immediate harm, but future continuation of harm

⁹ offender believed that if she did not defend herself she would become a victim of immediate harm

¹⁰ belief that if she did not defend her child(ren), they would become the victim(s) of immediate harm

Physically/sexually abused by victim	84.3% (n=51)
Emotionally abused by victim	84.3% (n=51)
Alcohol abuse	66.7% (n=39)
Drug abuse	54.3% (n=35)
Financial issues	31.4% (n=35)
Jealousy	26.9% (n=26)
Child discipline/custody	2.5% (n=40)

Indicators of Risk of Intimate Partner Violence: Results of the SARA for the sample of women offenders are presented in Table 6. For comparison purposes, data for male federal offenders of domestic violence are presented as well. Six of the 20 risk factors are evident for a majority of the women (i.e., more than two-thirds of the women). These items are: past physical assault of an intimate partner; recent substance abuse/dependence; recent employment problems; severe violence and/or sexual assault in index offence; past violation of conditional release or community supervision; and, victim of and/or witness to family violence as a child or adolescent. An additional seven indicators of risk were found to be reasonably evident for the women (i.e., between 33% and 66% of the women). In comparison, the six SARA items that were absent for a large majority of the women (i.e., less than 33% of women offenders) were related to minimization of spousal assault history; attitudes supporting spousal assault; past assault of family members; recent psychotic/manic symptoms; past sexual assault/jealousy; and violations of “no contact” orders.

The SARA summary risk rating provides an overall rating of risk for intimate partner violence. It is based on the evaluator’s consideration of the twenty risk factors. Only 6.9% of the women were classified as high risk; 29.3% were classified as moderate risk; 63.8% were classified as low risk. The corresponding percentages for male offenders with histories of domestic violence are 28.5% high, 39.9% moderate, and 31.6% low.

Table 6: Percentage of Offenders who Demonstrated SARA Risk Factors¹¹

SARA Item	Women Offenders	Male Offenders (n=4137)
#11. Past Physical Assault against intimate partner	94.5% (n=55)	89.1%
#7. Recent Substance Abuse/Dependence	87.9% (n=58)	80.9%
#5. Recent Employment Problems	87.7% (n=57)	67.2%
#18. Severe Violence and/or Sexual Assault in Index Offence ¹²	84.6% (n=26) ¹³	
#3. Past Violations of Conditional Release/Community Supervision	75.0% (n=56)	73.6%
#6. Victim and or Witness to Family Violence as a Child or Adolescent	75.0% (n=56)	57.7%
#2. Past Assault of Strangers or Acquaintances	63.1% (n=57)	69.0%
#19. Use of Weapons or Credible Threats of Death in Index Offence ¹¹	62.5% (n=24) ¹²	

¹¹ Risk indicators coded as “present” or “somewhat present”.

¹² Items pertaining to index offence could not be coded for male offenders.

¹³ Item was not coded if there was insufficient information or the item was not applicable (i.e., index offence)

#10. Personality Disorder with Anger, Impulsivity or Behavioural Instability	46.3% (n=54)	35.6%
#13. Past Use of Weapons or Credible Threats of Death Against Partner	42.2% (n=45)	47.2%
#4. Recent Relationship Problems	40.8% (n=54)	66.4%
#8. Recent Suicidal/Homicidal Ideation or Intent	35.7% (n=56)	22.9%
#14. Recent Escalation in Frequency or Severity of Assault Against Partner	35.2% (n=54)	34.5%
#16. Extreme Minimization or Denial of Spousal Assault History	29.1% (n=55)	64.6%
#17. Attitudes that Support or Condone Spousal Assault	27.6% (n=58)	57.1%
#1. Past Assault of Family Members	26.9% (n=52)	42.9%
#9. Recent Psychotic/Manic Symptoms	21.6% (n=51)	8.7%
#12. Past Sexual Assault/Jealousy against intimate partner	19.1% (n=47)	29.2%
#20. Violation of a “No Contact” Order in Index Offence ¹¹	6.9% (n=29) ¹²	
#15. Past Violations of “No Contact” Orders	5.7% (n=53)	30.2%

Typology of Women Offenders: Evidence of either Past Assault of family members (SARA item #1) or Past Assault of Strangers or acquaintances (SARA item #2) was present for 66.7% of the women. These women were coded as *Generally Violent*. In comparison, 33.3% of the sample were identified as *Partner Only* (i.e., no evidence of either SARA items 1 or 2). The two groups were compared on variables of interest, and while trends were observed showing more serious violence for *Generally Violent* women, small sample sizes limited the number of analyses that could be performed. The results suggested that *Generally Violent* women (86.5%) were more likely than the *Partner-Only* (50.0%) to have past violations of conditional release or community supervision, $\chi(1)=8.5, p<.01$ ¹⁴. Further, *Generally violent* women (58.6%) were more likely than *Partner-Only* women (13.3%) to have used weapons or made credible threats of death against their intimate partner during past incidents $\chi(1)=8.26, p<.01$.

Discussion

Incidence: At least 15% of federally sentenced women offenders have perpetrated intimate partner violence. While this rate is roughly consistent with large scale surveys of Canadian (Johnson & Hotton, 2001) and American (Straus & Gelles, 1986) populations, it may well be an underestimate of the magnitude of intimate partner violence among federally sentenced women. The study employed a file review methodology, and relied on a few existing indicators to identify perpetrators of intimate partner violence. An alternative methodology, such as a confidential survey or even the inclusion of additional indicators (e.g., victimization of domestic violence), may have identified a greater proportion of women who perpetrated violence towards their intimate partners.

The present results suggest that the incidence of intimate partner violence among federally sentenced women offenders is about half that for male offenders. Earlier research within the Correctional Service of Canada using a similar file review methodology determined that 29% of male offenders had been violent toward a female partner (Robinson & Taylor, 1995). While survey research has consistently found

¹⁴ One cell with expected count less than 5

relatively gender balanced rates of intimate partner violence, research with shelter and criminal justice populations has identified a distinct form of partner violence, termed patriarchal terrorism, which is primarily perpetrated by men (Johnson, 1995). Given the risk profiles of offenders who receive federal sentences (i.e., minimum of two year term of imprisonment), it is likely that their violence is characterized as the more serious form.

Demographic and Personal Characteristics: The present results suggest that perpetration of violence against intimate partners is a particularly serious problem for Aboriginal women. Aboriginal people comprise less than three percent of the Canadian population and they represent over 22% of women inmates (Fortin, 2004). In the present study, over 40% of the women identified as perpetrators of intimate violence were Aboriginal. Rates of men's violence against women, including lethality, are particularly high in Aboriginal communities (Four Worlds Centre for Development Learning, 2003). The absence of literature examining the issue of Aboriginal women's violence is perhaps not surprising given the relative magnitude of the problem of violence against Aboriginal women.

Factors such as financial issues, jealousy, and in particular, substance abuse contribute to the intimate partner violence by female offenders currently serving a federal sentence in Canada. About 88% of the women were assessed at intake as having some/considerable difficulty with substance abuse, and alcohol and drug abuse were identified as contributing factors to their violence for two-thirds and one-half of the women, respectively. This rate is even higher than that reported for federally sentenced women with any kind of violent histories. Bell (2004) found that 79% of violent women had some to considerable need in the substance abuse domain¹⁵. The association between substance abuse and the perpetration of partner abuse generally, and lethality, specifically, has been reported in the literature for female-to-male violence (Kruttschnitt, 2002) and female-to-female violence (Renzetti, 1992).

Using the framework provided by the SARA, the following three risk factors were most common among federally sentenced women perpetrators of domestic violence: past physical assault against an intimate partner (94.5%), recent substance abuse (87.9%), and recent employment problems (87.7%). In comparison to a recent, large scale study, the percentage of women meeting the criteria for each of these factors in the present study is very high. Henning and Feder (2004) found that only 14.5% of the women arrested for domestic violence had a prior arrest for domestic violence, 28.3% had problems with alcohol/drugs, and 42.6% were currently unemployed. Therefore, while the risk factors for the federally sentenced women offenders appear similar to those arrested for domestic violence, the federally sentenced women clearly demonstrate heightened risk and criminogenic need profiles.

A majority of the women in the present study were also assessed as having considerable marital/family problems and personal/emotional deficits. Interestingly, only 41% reported having substantial conflict or separation in the year preceding the violence. Henning, Jones & Holdford (2003) speculate that for some violent women (i.e., those who are primarily victims) their dissatisfaction/distress may be largely influenced by their partners' abusive behaviour. In comparison to the other factors studied, child discipline/custody issues were documented as a contributing factor in only one case.

¹⁵ the population of violent women offenders would have included women perpetrators of intimate violence

Also, the majority of women had no difficulty in the community functioning and attitude domains. Only 27.6% of the women perpetrators of intimate violence in the current study demonstrated attitudes that support or condone domestic violence, even though many of the women were exposed to abusive models while growing up.

Past Victimization: The current findings indicate shockingly high rates of past victimization for women offenders who have been violent against intimate partners; over three-quarters of the women in the present study had been a victim of family violence as a child or adolescent, most often by individuals other than family members, but also commonly by their mothers, fathers, and step-parents. The extent of victimization is substantial; for about three-quarters of the women the abuse was long-term or severe, including multiple perpetrators or serious injuries requiring medical attention. While the large majority of the women in the sample experienced their first episode of abuse between the ages of five and fifteen, there was still a significant minority that experienced their first episode under age five. Exposure to parental domestic violence was also considerable for the CSC women. Rates of victimization in their adult intimate relationships is also extensive for these women; only three (5.3%) of the women had never experienced violence by a past or present intimate partner. The largest group of women (60%) had experienced abuse in some of their intimate relationships, although about a third were abused in most or all of their relationships. For 63% of the women, the violence was reported to be long-term or severe abuse. The largest group of women (59.6%) was victims in some of their intimate relationships; only 5.3% of the women had never experienced violence by an intimate partner. For 63% of the women, the violence was reported to be long-term or severe.

These findings are consistent with research that highlights the multi-abuse experiences in the lives of women who perpetrate domestic violence, both while they were growing up and in their adult intimate relationships (Hamberger & Polente, 1994; Henning, Jones & Holdford, 2003). It is likely that women who have suffered serious trauma and victimization experience a heightened response to threat and react with heightened levels of aggression when faced with a threat (Hammock and O'Hearn, 2002). The occurrence of family of origin violence as well as past abuse by a male has also been established as a correlate for lesbian perpetrators (Renzetti, 1992). This level of abuse from an early age and in adult relationships points to a need to look at the impact on the children of these women and has implications for treatment targets that will be discussed below.

Women's Violence: Context, Dynamics and Motives: Most (72.5%) of the women had been violent in *some (a minority)* of their intimate relationships; although about a quarter of the sample had been violent in *most* or *all* of their intimate relationships. About half of the women were occasionally violent (i.e., 1-3 incidents of violence throughout the relationship), although about a third of the women were violent on a much more frequent basis. The violence was mostly directed at male partners, although about 10% of the women reported that they had been violent against females and 7% had been violent towards both women and men partners.

The women's violence was physical in almost all cases. In comparison to high rates of sexual violence for male perpetrators, sexual violence was reported for only

11.8% of the women. Over 60% had used a weapon during at least one incident of violence. Poisoning and stalking the victim were rare. In most incidents of violence, there was no injury to the victim. Nevertheless, most of the women had caused injury during at least one violent act, with 18% causing injury that required hospitalization, and 12% killing their intimate partner. Canadian research has shown that knives are most often used in spousal homicides by women, although this was not assessed in the present study (Dawson, 2001). The majority of the women were not currently serving time for domestic violence; only 22.4% of the women's index offences were related to domestic violence.

Using the typology identified for abusive women in previous research (Babcock, Miller & Siard, 2003), 66.7% of the women in the current study were classified as *Generally Violent* while 33.3% of the sample were classified as *Partner-only*. In comparison, in the Babcock study 50% of women arrested for domestic violence but living in the community were classified as *Generally Violent* and 50% were classified as *Partner-only*. The current study provides support for differences between women who are exclusively violent toward an intimate partner and women who are also violent toward others. In comparison to *Partner-only* women, *Generally Violent* women were more likely to be the primary aggressor, to have past violations of conditional release or community supervision, to have used weapons or made credible threats of death against their intimate partner during past incidents. The finding that a high percentage of both *Generally Violent* and *Partner Only* women were victims or witnessed family violence as a child or adolescent is consistent with past research findings.

Results of the current study found that female violence in intimate relationships was rarely motivated by a principle need for protection from either immediate harm (i.e., self defence) or fear of further control or abuse. This is in contrast to the studies indicating that many, if not most of the women arrested for intimate partner violence are victims who may have been acting in self-defence (Hamberger & Polente, 1994; Saunders, 1986). In the majority of cases, CSC women offenders were violent in the context of mutual violence/ combat. In this form of violence, both of the partners support and use violence as a normative response to conflicts experienced in their relationship. Although only about 15% of the women were primary perpetrators during most of the violent incidents, file material indicated that over 60% were primary perpetrators during at least one incident. Nevertheless, this may not portray the violence accurately, as coercive control was not determined in the present study, and there is evidence to suggest that even when women initiate and use violence, they do not control the dynamics of the relationship (Hamberger & Guse, 2002). About a third of the women had been motivated by revenge/retaliation and for instrumental purposes during at least one incident. Of the incidents that resulted in the death of the partner, two were related to revenge/retaliation, two were instrumental violence, and one was self-defence.

Risk: According to the current results, the majority of the women represent a moderate to high risk to re-offend generally, and almost all of the women were assessed at intake as having moderate to high criminogenic needs. However, their specific risk for future intimate partner violence appears substantially lower than their general risk. According to the SARA, 64% of women perpetrators of domestic violence represent a low risk to be violent towards an intimate partner, 29% of the women are moderate risk, and only 7%

are high risk. This profile is considerably different from that obtained for federally sentenced male perpetrators of domestic violence where only 32% represent a low risk, 40% are moderate risk and 28% are high risk for intimate partner violence. According to the risk principle of effective correctional intervention (Andrew and Bonta, 1994) and the risk factors established by Kropp et al (1995), 36% of the federally sentenced women perpetrators of intimate violence should receive either moderate or high intensity intervention to target and reduce their risk for intimate partner violence. Nevertheless, it is important to keep in mind that the SARA has not been validated for women offenders, and as the literature as well as the present study suggests, some of the SARA risk indicators such as *violation of a "no contact" order* may not be relevant for women offenders, and would lead to an underestimate of risk.

Treatment Targets: Development of domestic violence interventions for women offenders should be guided by theoretical and treatment models identifying factors that are specifically relevant for the women. Dutton's (1994) Nested Ecological Model of relationship violence provides a broad framework for understanding the factors, and the interactions between the factors that contribute to intimate violence although the model has yet to be fully developed for women's intimate violence. Factors associated with women's intimate violence that were identified in the present study fit well within the model at either the macrosystem (i.e., broader culture, including societal attitudes and beliefs regarding domestic violence), the exosystem (i.e., the social structures that influence the violence), the microsystem (i.e., the couple's relationship) and/or the perpetrator's individual history and characteristics. Table 8 below provides a broad outline of proposed components of treatment approaches that could address factors associated with patterns of women's relationship violence.

Interventions need to take into account the pattern and contextual factors of the violence and be tailored according to whether the woman is primarily a victim, an aggressor or involved in a relationship where she is both a victim and a perpetrator. The literature suggests that coercive control is a critical component that is often overlooked (Swan and Snow, 2002); accordingly, this should be assessed and considered within the intervention. Differences between women who are violent exclusively within intimate relationships and those who are more generally violent both within and outside of intimate relationships should be used to modify programming. The violence and emotional abuse of *Generally Violent* women may be more instrumental and related to power and control issues than *Partner-only* violence.

It should be noted that more than half the women in this sample were non Caucasian; most of these were Aboriginal. CSC is required by law to provide culturally appropriate programming for Aboriginal offenders. The treatment needs of these women should consider the cultural specific adaptations and the unique context of communities the Aboriginal women return to on release.

The characteristics of women in abusive lesbian relationships and the context of lesbian women's violence are understudied in the literature. At this stage, there is little empirical evidence to guide the development of interventions for lesbian women, although some clinicians have offered general treatment guidelines (e.g., Margolies & Leeder, 1995). Unfortunately, the small number of women who were violent towards

female partners in the current study did not allow for a close examination of these women.

Table 8: Treatment Targets and Treatment Options

Factors Associated with Relationship Violence (Treatment Targets)	Possible Treatment Options
Violence in the family of origin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Develop an understanding of the role of early modeling in establishing adult relationship patterns ➤ Parenting without abuse
Victim of violence in intimate relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Safety planning; ➤ Training in problem solving to develop a sense of self control rather than external control ➤ Positive goal setting, including alternatives to remaining in, or continuing to contribute to violence in relationships ➤ Understanding of how previous victimisation can heighten the response to threats
Relationship distress/marital discord	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Interpersonal skills (Communication skills; negotiation; assertion) ➤ Establishing networks of support
Mutual conflict/general aggression	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Self monitoring and other arousal reduction techniques; Training to anticipate consequences of aggressive acts on self, partner and others (children in particular) ➤ Using verbal self regulation and other cognitive techniques to replace thinking related to violence and aggression ➤ Development of behavioural rules or strategies to approach interpersonal problems ➤ Identifying the "behavioural chains" so that the sequence involved in the output behaviour is clarified (identify, avoid or manage high risk situations for assault)
Power and control issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Education and awareness regarding the range of controlling and abusive behaviour and training in prosocial alternatives ➤ Cultural exploration and identification of systemic forms of violence
Problems in emotional self control (depression, anxiety)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Training in cognitive techniques to manage thinking related to emotional mismanagement ➤ Training in behavioural techniques to manage distress
Substance abuse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Substance abuse should be addressed for women whose relationship violence is related to misuse of drugs and alcohol

Limitations/Future Directions: The present study has several limitations. Information from OMS reports may be unreliable due to offender self-reporting and bias by those documenting offender information. In addition, in many cases there was incomplete information within OMS that resulted coding many variables as “unknown”.

The present study provides insight into the characteristics of women perpetrators and the dynamics of their intimate violence; however, the profile of women perpetrators of intimate partner violence serving a federal sentence may be unrepresentative of women arrested for partner assault and especially women sampled outside the criminal justice system. Further research on the treatment needs and associated interventions for females perpetrators of intimate partner violence is clearly needed, particularly those women offenders in lesbian relationships.

References

- Andrews, D., Bonta, J. (1994). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Press.
- Archer, J. (2000). Sex Differences in Aggression Between Heterosexual Partners: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 5, 651-680.
- Babcock, J.C., Miller, S.A., Siard, C. (2003). Towards a Typology of Abusive Women: Differences Between Partner-only and Generally Violent Women in the Use of Violence. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 27, 153-161.
- Bell, A. (2004). Women with violent offence histories: A comparison. *Forum on Correctional Research*. 16, 21-23.
- Currie, D.H. (1998). *Violent Men or Violent Women? Whose definition counts?* in Issues in intimate violence, R. Kennedy Bergen, Sage Publications Inc, Thousand Oaks CA, 97-111
- Dawson, M. (2001). *Examination of Declining Intimate Partner Homicide Rates: A Literature Review*. Department of Justice.
- Dobash, R.E. & Dobash, R.P. (2000). Evaluating criminal justice intervention for domestic violence. *Crime and Delinquency*, 46(2), 252-270.
- Dutton, D.G. (1994). Patriarchy and Wife Assault: The Ecological Fallacy. *Violence and Victims*, 9, 167-182.
- Fortin, Doris. (2004). *Program Strategy for women offenders*. Correctional Service Canada, page 25
- Four Worlds Centre for Development Learning. (2003). *Aboriginal Domestic Violence in Canada*, Aboriginal Healing Foundation.
- Gelles, R.J. (1974). *The Violent Home: A Study of Physical Aggression between Husbands and Wives*. Beverley Hills, CA, Sage.
- Glass, N., Koziol-McLain, J., Campbell, J., Rebecca Block, C. (2004). Female-Perpetrated Femicide and Attempted Femicide. *Violence Against Women*, 10, 6, 606-625
- Hamberger, L.K. & Polente, T. (1994). Counseling heterosexual women arrested for domestic violence: Implications for theory and practice. *Violence and Victims*, 9, 2, 125-137.

- Hamberger, L.K., Guse, C.E. (2002). Men's and Women's Use of Intimate Partner Violence in Clinical Samples. *Violence Against Women*, 8, 11, 1301-1331.
- Hammock, G. & O'Hearn R. (2002). Psychological Aggression in Dating Relationships: Predictive Models for Males and Females. *Violence and Victims*, Vol. 17, 5, 525-540.
- Harned, M.S. (2001) Abused Women or Abused Men? An Examination of the Context and Outcomes of dating Violence. *Violence and Victims*, 16, 3, 269-285.
- Henning, K. & Feder, L. (2004). A Comparison of Men and Women Arrested for Domestic Violence: Who Presents the Greater Threat? *Journal of Family Violence*, 19, 2, 69-80.
- Henning, K., Jones, A., Holdford R. (2003). Treatment Needs of Women Arrested for Domestic Violence a Comparison with Male Offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18, 8, 839-856.
- Holtzworth, Monroe, Stuart. (1994). Typologies of male batterers: Three subtypes and the differences among them. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116, 476-497.
- Johnson, H. & Hotton, T. (2001). *Spousal violence*. In C. Trainor & K. Milorean (Eds.) *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile 2001* (pp. 26 - 43). Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Johnson, M.P. (1995). Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: Two forms of violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57, 283-294.
- Johnson, M.P. (2000, November). *Conflict and control: Images of symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Institute of Justice's Gender Symmetry Workshop, Washington, DC.
- Koonin, Michele., Cabarcas, Araceli., Gefner R. (2002). *Treatment of Women Arrested for Domestic Violence: Women Ending Abusive/Violent Episodes Respectfully* (Weaver) Manual. Family Violence & Sexual Assault Institute, San Diego.
- 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, Randall P., Hart, Stephen D., Webster, Christopher D., Eaves, D. (1995). *Manual for the Spousal Assault Risk Assessment Guide 2nd Edition*. The British Columbia Institute of Family Violence.
- Kruttschnitt, C., Gartner, R., Ferraro, K. (2002). Women's involvement in serious interpersonal violence. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour* Vol. 7, 529-565.

- Magdol, L. et al. (1997). Gender Differences in Partner Violence in a Birth Cohort of 21-Year-Olds: Bridging the Gap Between Clinical and Epidemiological Approaches. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 65(1), 68-78.
- Margolies, L. & Leeder, E. (1995). Violence at the door: Treatment of lesbian batterers. *Violence Against Women*, 139-157.
- Markowitz, F. E. (2001). Attitudes and Family Violence: Linking Intergenerational and Cultural Theories. *Journal of Family Violence*, Vol. 16, 2, 205-218.
- Mills, L.G. (2003). *Insult to Injury: Rethinking our Response to Intimate Abuse*. Princeton University Press, Princeton Oxford New Jersey, 19-100.
- Morse, B.J. (1995). Beyond the Conflict Tactics Scale: Assessing Gender Differences in Partner Violence. *Violence and Victims*, 10, 4, 251-272.
- Pagelow, M.D. (1992). Adult victims of domestic violence: Battered women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 7, 87-120.
- Renzetti, C.M. (1992). *Violent betrayal: Partner abuse in lesbian relationships*. Newbury Park, CA, Sage Publications.
- Robinson, D. & Taylor, J. (1995). *The Incidence of Family Violence Perpetrated by Federal Offenders: A File Review Study. Research Report FV-03*. Research Division Correctional Service of Canada.
- Saunders, D.G. (1986). When battered women use violence: Husband-abuse or self defence? *Violence and Victims*, 1, 1, 47-60.
- Smith-Acuna, S., Henderson Metzger, L., Watson, M. (2004). The Paradox of the Female Batterer: Exploring the Link Between Gender, Personality, and Intimate Violence. *FVSAB*, 20, 1, 5-10. CHECK
- Statistics Canada: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. (2002) *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile 2002*. Cat. no. 85-224-XIE. Ottawa: Minister of Industry.
- Stets, J.E. & Straus, M.A. (1995). *The marriage Licence as a Hitting Licence: A Comparison of Assaults in Dating, Cohabiting, and Married Couples, in Physical Violence in American Families, Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence*. by Straus, M.A., Gelles, R.J., Transaction Publishers, 227-244.
- Straus, M.A. & Gelles, R.J. (1986). Societal change and change in family violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 465-479.

- Straus, M.A. (1999). *The Controversy Over Domestic Violence By women, A Methodological, Theoretical, and Sociology of Science Analysis, Violence in Intimate relationships*. ed. Ximena Ariaga and Stuart Oskamp, Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications, 17-44.
- Straus, M.A., Gelles, R.J., Steinmetz, S.K. (1980). *Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Anchor Press.
- Swan, S.C., Snow, D.L. (). A Typology of Women's Use of Violence in Intimate Relationships, *Violence Against Women*, 8, 3, 286-319.
- Worcester, N. (2002). Women's Use of Force Complexities and Challenges of Taking the Issue Seriously. *Violence Against Women*, 8, 11, 1390-1