## Background

- Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) is a highly prevalent and dangerous phenomenon. IPV perpetrators are commonly placed in Batterer Intervention and Prevention Programs (BIPP) in order to prevent future violations.
- These programs are notoriously ineffective. 30-60% of IPV perpetrators drop-out of the program prior to its conclusion (Daly & Pelowski, 2000). Reoffending rates following treatment in BIPP are also high.
- The Transtheoretical Model for change was developed (Prochaska, 1979) in order to evaluate a patient’s readiness to stop smoking. This was applied to IPV and has been used in several studies as a way to test IPV perpetrator’s readiness to change (e.g., Eckhardt & Utshig, 2007).
- A new measure was created to assess IPV perpetrator’s outcome expectancies (Meiss, Murphy, & Winters, 2010).
- The current research investigated IPV perpetrator’s readiness to change as well as their outcome expectancies prior to their first BIPP meeting. The goal was to find predictors of treatment failure.

### Hypotheses

1. Participants that reoffend/drop out will have higher positive expectancy scores than those who did not reoffend/drop out.
2. Participants that reoffend/drop-out will have lower readiness scores than those who did not reoffend/drop out.

### Method

- Participants (n=62) were adult males arrested for misdemeanor charges related to domestic violence towards an intimate partner. They were sentenced to at least 26 weeks of BIPP. Their mean age was 33.95 (SD = 11.81) years old with a range of 19-66.
- Individual 60 minute interviews were conducted during the participants initial probation visit.

### Measures:

**Outcome Expectancies of Partner Abuse Scale** (Meiss, Murphy, & Winters, 2010) used to assess the participant’s outcome expectancies. The University of Rhode Island Change Assessment Inventory-Domestic Violence (Levesque et al., 2000), used to assess a participant’s readiness to change.
- In the six months following adjudication the participant’s probation records were reviewed for relevant outcome data.

### Results

#### Hypothesis 1: Participants that reoffend/drop out will have higher positive expectancy scores than those who did not reoffend/drop out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Patients that reoffend/drop out will have higher positive expectancy scores than those who did not reoffend/drop out.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Hypothesis 2: Participants that reoffend/drop-out will have lower readiness scores than those who did not reoffend/drop out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Participants that reoffended did not score significantly higher in positive expectancy scores than non-reoffenders. Participants that dropped out also did not score significantly higher in positive expectancy scores versus those that did not drop out.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Discussion

#### Drop out and Recidivism

- There was no significant relationship between positive expectancies and higher rates of program drop out or recidivism.
- There was no significant relationship between lower readiness and higher rates of program drop out or recidivism.
- Maintenance is the only variable that is a significant predictor of the number of sessions attended.

#### Limitations

- The OEPA scale is a new scale. Outside of the 130 participants testing it’s internal validity (Meiss et al., 2009) this is one of the first studies to use the scale. As a result their may be unaccounted for confounding variables within the scale.
- By using only self-report data for data collection, subjects may not have been truthful when reporting sensitive information (how many times they have been arrested, etc.). Also the interviews took place in the Marion County Department of Corrections and may have also deterred participants from answering truthfully.
- The Six month delay may not have been long enough.

#### Future Research

- Instead of meeting participants in the probation department future research should explore more neutral testing locations.
- Instead of relying solely on self-report data, future research could benefit from using other methods of data collection.
- Instead of conducting the interviews during participant’s initial probation visit, conduct the interviews closer to their initial BIPP meeting.
- The finding that high scores in maintenance is a significant predictor of program sessions attended should be explored further.