

## ***BETTER TOGETHER***

2018 ATSA Conference | Friday October 19 | 1:30 PM – 3:00 PM

**F-19**

### **Intimate Partner Sexual Violence: Definitions, Profile, Criminogenic Needs, and Future Directions**

Symposium Chair: Sandy Jung, PhD, RPsych  
MacEwan University

Rape in intimate partnerships is a serious and prevalent form of violence against women. Some reports indicate that at least 7% of women in the U.S. have been raped by an intimate partner, with higher estimates in marital relationships (Finkelhor & Yllo, 1985; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). A Canadian report indicated that 34% of female victims of spousal assault experienced being sexually assaulted, beaten, choked or threatened with a gun or a knife by their partners (Statistics Canada, 2016). The existing literature has used various terms to describe sexual violence within an intimate partner relationship, which include but is not limited to marital rape, date rape, forced sex in marriage, and partner sexual violence. This symposium addresses this oft-neglected area of intimate partner sexual violence (IPSV) in the field of sexual abuse prevention through four presentations. The first presentation provides a concise overview of the literature, specifically focused on defining what comprises intimate partner sexual violence. The second presentation examines the demographic characteristics of the perpetrators and the victims of IPSV and compares these cases with intimate partner violence that excludes sexual violence, and with sexually violent perpetrators who have offended against known victims and stranger victims, in order to provide an overview of the profile of IPSV in relation to similar but contrasting perpetrator groups. The third presentation investigates the risk and criminogenic needs of IPSV perpetrators when compared to men who physically but non-sexually assault their intimate partners with the hope of identifying areas of relevance that are specific to IPSV perpetrators for both evaluative and treatment consideration. The fourth presentation addresses how to translate existing evidence, along with the findings from these presentations, into recommended intervention practices.

## **BETTER TOGETHER**

2018 ATSA Conference | Friday October 19 | 1:30 PM – 3:00 PM

### **What Do We Know About Sexual Violence Against Intimate Partners?**

Sandy Jung, PhD, RPsych  
Cassandra Kleefman, BA  
MacEwan University

Sexual violence within an intimate partner relationship has received less attention than physical violence in relationships or sexual violence, in general. Yet, intimate partner sexual violence (IPSV) is prevalent in abusive relationships, and among reported instances of sexual assault in Canada, over a third were committed by an intimate partner (Rotenberg, 2017). This presentation explores the diversity of IPSV, which ranges from sexual coercive behaviors to penetrative sexual assault. The existing literature will be briefly reviewed to provide a profile of perpetrators of IPSV and a profile of their victims. An argument will be made in this first presentation that the trauma left by IPSV is a significant contributor to the development of PTSD, general stress, and disassociation (Temple et al., 2007), that there is a decreased likelihood for victims to report IPSV to the police (Felson & Pare, 2005), and that IPSV perpetrators were more likely to receive shorter sentences than other sexual offenders (McCormich et al., 1998).

#### **References**

- Felson, R., & Pare, P. P. (2005). The reporting of domestic violence and sexual assault by nonstrangers to the police. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67*, 597-610.
- McCormich, J., Maric, A., Seto, M., & Barbaree, H. (1998). Relationship to victim predicts sentence length in sexual assault cases. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 13*, 413-420.
- Rotenberg, C. (2017). *Police-reported sexual assaults in Canada, 2009 to 2014: A statistical profile* (Catalogue no. 85-002-X). Ottawa, Canada: Statistics Canada.
- Temple, J., Weston, R., Rodriguez, B., & Marshall, L. (2007). Differing effects of partner and nonpartner sexual assault on women's mental health. *Violence Against Women, 13*, 285-297.

#### **Learning Goals:**

- Participants will be able to identify the range of behaviors that comprise intimate partner sexual violence.
- Participants will recognize the differences between IPSV and other offenders in terms of the impact on victims.
- Participants will gain knowledge on the criminal justice system's response to IPSV compared to other violent and sexually violent crimes.

## ***BETTER TOGETHER***

2018 ATSA Conference | Friday October 19 | 1:30 PM – 3:00 PM

### **A Comparative Profile of Intimate Partner Sexual Violence**

Harleen Cheema, BA (Hons)  
Martina Faitakis, BA  
Sandy Jung, PhD, RPsych  
MacEwan University

Intimate partner sexual violence (IPSV) is often overlooked in both intimate partner violence (IPV) and general sexual assault literature. Furthermore, past literature contains inconsistencies in definitions and measurements on what defines IPSV (Bagwell-Gray, Messing, & Baldwin-White, 2015). From this lack of consensus, IPSV has not been assessed independent of either sexual violence, or intimate partner violence. The objective of the current study was to obtain a profile of men who sexually assault their intimate partners. This study compares incidents of IPSV to three other groups: Perpetrators who sexually assault stranger victims, perpetrators who sexually assault known (non-intimate) victims, and perpetrators who physically assault their partners. Past literature indicates that incidents of IPSV involve more severe violence compared to non-IPSV (Bergen & Bukovec, 2006; Mahoney, 1999; Stermac et al., 2006). This segment of the symposium examines cases of police-reported sexual assaults against intimate partners in order to create a snapshot of this population compared to other domestic violence and sexual violence perpetrators.

Data from the present study included police-reported occurrences of sexual and violent assaults to local law enforcement from 2010 to 2014. Only non-historical occurrences with an adult male perpetrator and a female victim 16 years and older were included (N = 580). Using the index offense, perpetrators were categorized into four groups. IPV (n= 145) and IPSV (n = 145) perpetrators included attempted or completed physical assault or sexual assault perpetrated by a current or ex intimate partner, respectively. Known (n = 145) sexual violence included all perpetrators known to the victim such as friends, coworkers, and family, but excluded intimate partners. Finally, stranger (n = 145) sexual violence included perpetrators with no previous contact above 24 hours to the victim. The four groups were compared on demographic data of perpetrators and victims, offence and police reporting features, and the criminal history and recidivism of the perpetrators. The findings revealed several significant differences. IPSV perpetrators were younger than known perpetrators but more similar in age to IPV and stranger perpetrators. Similar to IPV and stranger victims, IPSV victims were closer in age to their perpetrators, which contrasted from sexual assault victims known to their perpetrators. A greater proportion of IPV and IPSV victims were identified as Aboriginal compared to victims of known or stranger sexual assaults. Furthermore, IPSV took the longest to report to police compared to all other types of offences. Lastly, the four groups of perpetrators differed in their criminal histories and differed in their likelihood to commit any post-index offense. The present findings contribute to our limited knowledge about IPSV perpetration, and further,

## ***BETTER TOGETHER***

2018 ATSA Conference | Friday October 19 | 1:30 PM – 3:00 PM

this research highlights avenues for future exploration in the literature.

### **Learning Goals:**

- Participants will be able to identify demographic features that significantly differentiate IPSV perpetrators and victims from cases of IPV and non-intimate partner sexual violence.
- Participants will learn that IPSV constitutes as a unique subtype of sexual violence and domestic violence that warrants further research.
- Participants will learn similarities and differences regarding criminality characteristics of IPSV when compared to other sexual offence perpetrators and non-sexual intimate partner abusers.

### **Risk and Criminogenic Needs of Intimate Partner Sexual Violence Offenders**

Brandon Sparks, B.A (Hons)  
University of Saskatchewan  
Farron Wielinga, BA (Hons)  
University of Saskatchewan  
Mark Olver, PhD, RD Psych  
University of Saskatchewan  
Sandy Jung, PhD, RPsych  
MacEwan University

Intimate partner violence (IPV) is a serious societal problem that is estimated to impact more than one in every four women in the course of her lifetime (Desmarais, Reeves, Nicholls, Telford, & Fiebert, 2012). Intimate partner sexual violence (IPSV) is common in IPV, and can increase the risk of being a victim of domestic homicide seven-fold when physical violence is also present (Campbell et al., 2003). Yet, IPSV is often overlooked in clinical and research contexts, leading to important aspects of IPSV not being adequately examined. Specifically, there remains a paucity of research on differences between intimate partners who do and do not sexually offend against their partners, and thus little is known about risk factors that may be unique to IPSV perpetrators. Although intimate partner violence and sexual violence are not the same, similar underlying mechanisms are known to broadly facilitate offending. Some research on interpersonal violence has examined differences in spousal assaulters who have and have not sexually offended against their partners; however, little research has focused on how risk factors and risk levels may vary among IPSV and IPV perpetrators.

This presentation focuses on similarities and differences in risk and need factors among IPSV perpetrators and IPV perpetrators in a police-reported sample. IPSV perpetrators

## **BETTER TOGETHER**

2018 ATSA Conference | Friday October 19 | 1:30 PM – 3:00 PM

were compared in terms of risk, criminogenic need, and subsequent recidivism. Thirty-six perpetrators of IPSV (i.e., individuals whose current index offense or whose past offense involved sexual violence) were identified from a broader sample of 246 male perpetrators who were charged for offences against their intimate partners. These IPSV perpetrators were compared to an age-matched as well as a random sample of IPV perpetrators on several risk and need factors. Risk factors were organized into theoretically and clinically relevant composites based on the major predictors of criminal behaviour referred to as “central eight” risk/need factors (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). Statistical analyses revealed that meaningful differences exist between IPSV and IPV perpetrators. Specifically, IPSV perpetrators scored significantly higher on composites evaluating propensity for rule violation and problems with sexual self-regulation, which have been noted in the literature as being of central importance in predicting sexual recidivism. Other identified similarities and differences will also be discussed in relation to risk posed by IPSV perpetrators. These criminogenic needs are worth assessing and targeting in interventions for IPSV perpetrators. Relevance of these risk factors within the RNR framework will be discussed.

### **References**

- Andrews, D. A. & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Newark, NJ: LexisNexis/Matthew Bender.
- Campbell, J.C., Webster, D., Koziol-McLain, J., Block, C., Campbell, D., Curry, M. A., ... Laughon, K. (2003). Assessing risk factors for intimate partner homicides. *National Institute of Justice Journal*, 250, 15-19.
- Desmarais, S. L., Reeves, K. A., Nicholls, T. L., Telford, R. P., & Fiebert, M. S. (2012). Prevalence of physical violence in intimate relationships, part 2: Rates of male and female perpetration. *Partner Abuse*, 3, 170–198.

### **Learning Goals:**

- Participants will learn about criminogenic needs that are common to IPSV and IPV perpetrators.
- Participants will learn about how IPSV risk differs in meaningful ways from IPV risk.
- Participants will learn about recidivism risk and how it compares between IPSV and IPV perpetrators.

## ***BETTER TOGETHER***

2018 ATSA Conference | Friday October 19 | 1:30 PM – 3:00 PM

### **Translating Evidence into Recommended Intervention Practices**

N. Zoe Hilton, PhD, CPsych  
University of Toronto  
Dana L. Radatz, PhD  
Niagara University

This presentation will consider the implications of the previous three talks within the framework of the Risk, Needs, and Responsivity (RNR) principles of effective correctional services. These principles of effective intervention have not been widely adopted in the intimate partner violence (IPV) field. The development of specialized risk assessment tools for IPV came after general, violent, and sexual offending risk assessment tools, and there is a lag in validation research for IPV tools, with smaller samples available and only one published meta-analysis to date. Recently a few IPV scholars have begun drawing attention to the principle of criminogenic needs; that is, potentially changeable risk factors that are strongly correlated with criminal reoffending and, therefore, priorities for intervention. Instead, the IPV research literature has focused on attitudinal, cultural and relationship variables, and cumulating research suggests that batterer intervention programs have limited effectiveness at reducing intimate partner violence (IPV) recidivism.

In her presentation, Cassandra Kleefman shows the severity of offending among IPSV offenders that compels us to pay attention to identifying and intervening with this offender group. The current presentation will consider the implications for formal risk assessment using approaches developed in the sex offender and IPV offender literatures. In his presentation, Brandon Sparks identifies differences between IPSV and non-sexual IPV offenders on the major predictors of criminal behaviour referred to as the central eight risk/need factors. The current presentation will set these findings in the context of recent work comparing general violent offenders and non-sexual IPV offenders on criminogenic needs, and highlight criminogenic needs that may be of particular concern among IPSV offenders. In their presentation, Harleen Cheema and Martina Faitakis provide additional evidence about IPSV offender risk, and identify a number of potential responsivity factors that are relatively common to this offender group that might distinguish them from either general sex offenders or non-sexual IPV offenders. The current presentation will identify the extent to which these factors are addressed or overlooked in existing IPV treatment and, drawing on recent work calling for RNR principles to be addressed in interventions for men who offend against their intimate partners, will suggest directions for change.

#### **Learning Goals:**

- Participants will learn about the challenges in drawing attention to IPV-specific criminogenic needs.
- Participants will strengthen their knowledge about criminogenic needs among men who sexually offend against their intimate partners.

## **BETTER TOGETHER**

2018 ATSA Conference | Friday October 19 | 1:30 PM – 3:00 PM

- Participants will be able to describe intervention strategies that may be recommended for IPSV offenders.

**Sandy Jung, PhD, RPsych** is an Associate Professor of Psychology at MacEwan University. She conducts research on the prevention of sexual assault and intimate partner violence and is a practicing forensic psychologist. She serves on the Board of Directors of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers and on the Editorial Board for *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*.

**Cassandra Kleefman, BA**, is a recent graduate of MacEwan University, where she majored in psychology. During her undergraduate, she completed research on sexual offending and developed a passion for forensic psychology. She currently works at the Integrated Threat and Risk Assessment Centre (I-TRAC), where she helps conduct research on offenders of intimate partner violence. Cassandra plans on attending graduate studies, where her passion for forensic research and forensic practice can be further developed.

**Harleen Cheema, BA (Hons)**, is a fourth year psychology honours student at MacEwan University and is completing her thesis research, which examines the influence of person-first language on perceptions of individuals who sexually offend. Following the completion of her undergraduate degree, Harleen hopes to attend a graduate program specializing in clinical psychology.

**Martina Faitakis, BA**, completed her undergraduate degree in psychology with a minor in business studies at MacEwan University. She is currently a research assistant on a large-scale research project that is examining intimate partner violence risk assessment at the Integrated Threat and Risk Assessment Centre (ITRAC) in Edmonton, AB.

**Brandon Sparks, BA (Hons)**, is a graduate student in Applied Social Psychology at the University of Saskatchewan, Canada. His research interests include both juvenile and adult sexual offenders and the legislations that affect them. He is also a member of ATSA's Public Policy Committee.

**N. Zoe Hilton, PhD, CPsych**, is associate professor of psychiatry at the University of Toronto, senior research scientist at the Waypoint Research Institute, Waypoint Centre for Mental Health Care, and a registered psychologist. Her research publications primarily concern interpersonal violence, risk assessment, risk communication, and the Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment (ODARA).

### **Financial Interest Disclosure:**

Chair and co-author of symposiums 1, 2, and 3, S.Jung: Remuneration is received from the sale of her published book (2017), *RNR Principles in Practice in the Management and Treatment of Sexual Abusers*, published by Safer Society Press.

4<sup>th</sup> symposium presenter, Z.Hilton: Remuneration is received from the sale of her published book (2010), *Risk Assessment for Domestically Violent Men*, published by American Psychological Association.