



Using an integrative, Cognitive Analytical Therapy (CAT) approach to treat intimate partner violence risk

Journal:	<i>Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research</i>
Manuscript ID	JACPR-08-2016-0244.R2
Manuscript Type:	Clinical Case Study
Keywords:	Cognitive Analytic Therapy, Violence, Treatment, Offender, Risk, Intimate Partner Violence

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4 **Reviewer 1:** no recommended changes
5
6

7 **Reviewer 2:**

8
9 Comments:

10
11 **A**bstract: move the explanation of the acronym CAT to the first sentence when you
12 mention it for the first time. [Done](#)
13
14

15
16 **I**ntroduction: first line about the pro-fem theories, it'd be better to use an alternative
17 reference as you go on to discuss pence and paymar in the next sentence. [Edit made,](#)
18 [reference added.](#)
19

20
21 **I**'d recommend you move your discussion of alternative theories to before you start
22 to discuss CBT. I think these theories need integrating a little more critically into the
23 narrative I'm terms of why these approaches fit better with the work you have done
24 here with this case study. [I have moved CBT part to after the other theories but](#)
25 [before CAT.](#)
26
27

28
29 **C**lient info - remove the psychosocial background header as I don't think it's needed.
30 [Done](#)
31

32
33 **P**9 - I would just use the word weapon rather than specifying the weapon (so the veg
34 peeler) as I think it's the presence of something that could be used as a weapon
35 that's important rather than the actual object. [Done](#)
36

37
38 **D**iscussion: line one, do you mean CBT rather than DBT in that sentence? [Error](#)
39 [changed](#)
40

41
42 **P**24 - I'd remove the reference to the Duluth Model, the work you have done here
43 doesn't fit at all with that model (in a very positive way!!). Perhaps include reference
44 to the other models from your introduction? [Edited.](#)
45

46
47 **C**onclusion: I still feel this could be slightly stronger and firmer in the originality and
48 contribution but I might be being picky. [Slight edits made.](#)
49

50
51 **T**ables: could be reserved better without the horizontal lines. [I will leave table format](#)
52 [to the journal proofing process – happy for these to be reformatted to fit the journal.](#)
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 **Using an integrative, Cognitive Analytical Therapy (CAT) approach to treat**
5 **intimate partner violence risk**
6
7

8 **Abstract**

9
10 **Aims:** There is limited research on Cognitive Analytical Therapy (CAT) in forensic
11 contexts; this case study therefore significantly contributes to the knowledge base.
12 This case study presents the assessment and treatment of an adult male offender with
13 a diagnosis of schizophrenia. The client's offence involved intimate partner violence
14 and was committed at a time of acute psychiatric relapse.

15
16
17
18 **Method:** Twelve sessions of Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT) and CAT
19 informed treatment were individually designed to meet the needs of the client,
20 delivered in an in-patient setting in the UK. The client's progress was assessed using
21 psychometric, observational, and narrative/descriptive methods.
22
23

24
25 **Results:** Psychometric evidence was limited by distorted responding. However,
26 narrative/descriptive assessment indicated that progress had been made in some areas.
27 Recommendations for further treatment were made.

28
29
30 **Conclusions:** Twelve sessions did not meet all of the client's needs. The use of CAT
31 as a model that his team could use in understanding his violence was conducive to
32 risk management. Overall, insight gained through CAT based psychological
33 intervention contributed to risk reduction.
34
35

36
37 **Originality:** This case study demonstrates the applicability of CAT to forensic
38 settings.
39
40

41 **Keywords:**

42 Cognitive Analytical Therapy, Violence, Risk, Treatment, Intimate Partner Violence,
43 Offender
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)

Pro-feminist theories view IPV as a reflection of the patriarchal organisation of society as a whole, where men use violence when they feel their dominance is threatened (see Gondolf, 1998). Pence and Paymar (1993) discuss this in the context of Duluth 'power and control wheel' where power dynamics linked to socialisation are proposed to link to IPV. However, pro-feminist theory has been criticised for over-emphasising socio-cultural factors, resulting in exclusion of individual factors. For example, Dutton (1994) critically enquires how men can be held individually accountable for their IPV if it is a result of patriarchal society and Lawson (2003) questions how pro-feminist theory accounts for IPV within a same-sex relationship.

Family systems theory views the family as a dynamic organisation, with interdependent components, where the recurrence of behaviour of a family member is affected by other family members' responses. This theory promotes a family-level approach to IPV intervention (Gelles & Maynard, 1987) this approach may promote the view that the victim is to blame. Attachment theory, which places an emphasis on the reciprocity between individuals in a relationship, provides the perspective that IPV can be seen as an exaggerated response of a disorganised attachment system linked to disorganised attachment in infancy (Fonagy, 1999).

Cognitive behavioural theory puts forward that behaviour modification requires change in perception and interpretation (Beck & Weishaar, 2008) and can be used to frame IPV. Deeper held beliefs relating to male dominance remain relevant here as factors that may impact on perception and interpretation. Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT) has become a favoured approach to offender treatment (McGuire, 2003; Gilbert & Daffern, 2010) as it lends well to identifying IPV

1
2
3 intervention approaches. Despite this, group based CBT interventions have been
4
5 criticised for lacking individuality (Howells & Day, 2002) and for not being sufficient
6
7 to overcome automatic thoughts or learned behaviour (Walker & Bright, 2009),
8
9 suggesting that more is needed to address the psychological processes involved in
10
11 IPV.

12
13
14 These differing approaches, and their criticisms, demonstrate the need to go beyond
15
16 one model in the treatment of IPV.

17
18
19 Cognitive Analytic Therapy (CAT), an integrative approach underpinned by
20
21 psychoanalytic, cognitive and personal construct theory suggests that through early
22
23 care relationships, individuals develop a range of reciprocal role procedures (RRPs)
24
25 that determine how they relate to others and themselves, and some of these can be
26
27 problematic (Ryle, 1997). It is suggested that offending behaviour can be a result of
28
29 problematic RRP, and RRP focussed interventions can be useful for offenders
30
31 (Pollock, 2006).

32
33
34 Schizophrenia and psychosis have been found to be associated with general
35
36 violence, with increased risk found with substance abuse comorbidity (Fazel et al.,
37
38 2009). It has been suggested that the paranoia experienced by those with
39
40 schizophrenia is similar to the hostile attribution involved when people experience
41
42 anger or aggression (Chadwick, Birchwood & Trower, 1996). In relation to IPV,
43
44 '*recent psychotic symptoms*' is an item recognised within the Spousal Assault Risk
45
46 Assessment (SARA; Kropp, Hart, Webster & Eaves, 2008) as being associated with
47
48 poor coping skills and increased interpersonal stress, and therefore IPV. It has also
49
50 been highlighted that establishing whether violence precipitates schizophrenic
51
52 symptoms is useful in treatment planning (Howells, 1998), as treatment providers can
53
54 target psychological/psychiatric approaches accordingly. A range of factors can
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 contribute to the development and maintenance of criminal behaviour, therefore it can
4
5 be argued that an integrative approach is needed to explore and address these factors
6
7 (Krampen, 2009). This case study draws upon both CAT and CBT in the
8
9 psychological treatment of an adult male who has a history of IPV.
10
11

12 13 14 **Client introduction**

15
16 Mr A is a 25-year-old man with a diagnosis of paranoid schizophrenia and a
17
18 history of drug misuse. He is detained in a low secure mental-health hospital in the
19
20 UK. At the time of his IPV offence, there was evidence of acute psychiatric relapse.
21
22

23 Mr A, who has two brothers, described his biological father as a black
24
25 Jamaican who misused cocaine. His parents separated when he was under five years
26
27 old. There was on-going domestic violence towards Mr A's mother from her various
28
29 male partners. There is a history of criminal behaviour and psychiatric problems in
30
31 the extended family (diagnoses unclear).
32
33

34 Mr A's mother had another relationship with a man for five years during his
35
36 childhood. Mr A's father and stepfather were body builders who abused steroids. Mr
37
38 A described his childhood as "*sad*". His mother was constantly at work and there was
39
40 an atmosphere of physical violence perpetrated by his father and stepfather.
41
42 Discipline was exerted by threats of violence. Mr A denied any history of sexual
43
44 abuse.
45
46

47 Mr A has previously reported that his teachers told him that he had a 'learning
48
49 difficulty' from the age of four. Mr A said that he found it difficult to concentrate in
50
51 the classroom environment from the age of ten onwards, disrupting the environment
52
53 and being suspended. He had few school friends. His level of educational attainment
54
55 was predicted to be poor but he did pass some exams, leaving education at the age of
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sixteen. He has worked in manual jobs but was unemployed for around a year prior to
4 this hospital admission, having been made redundant. Mr A was reliant on state
5 benefits and selling drugs as his sources of income.
6
7
8

9
10 Mr A has previously been in relationships with women. Mr A did not describe
11 these relationships as being emotionally intimate. Mr A has disclosed controlling
12 behaviour and violence towards one previous partner. He was in a relationship with
13 the current victim for around one year prior to the serious offence that precipitated
14 this hospital admission. Mr A describes this relationship as being 'on and off'.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Forensic history

24
25 Mr A has prior convictions for theft, failure to surrender to custody,
26 possession of amphetamines, breach of community order, and criminal damage.
27
28

29
30 There is a documented history of suspected IPV perpetrated by Mr A against
31 his ex-partner (and current victim) during their relationship. Suspicions arose
32 following attendance of various agencies at Mr A and the victim's shared house. This
33 included Police attendance following the victim alleging she had been assaulted by
34 Mr A. Allegations included threats of weapon use and possession of a knife, where
35 Mr A's ex-partner did not wish to proceed with Police charges. In addition, during
36 routine visits, community psychiatric staff observed injuries on the victim that were
37 considered to be consistent with IPV.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47
48 Mr A has disclosed having been violent towards other males in the past,
49 including stabbing a male in the leg during an altercation. He also disclosed that he
50 sold drugs to make money. The onset of violent behaviour preceded diagnosis of
51 psychiatric illness.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In relation to this inpatient admission, Mr A pleaded guilty to offences of
4 assault, affray, and burglary. Consequently, other matters that he had originally been
5 charged with were discontinued (he was originally also charged on two counts of false
6 imprisonment). This 'plea bargaining' approach is not uncommon internationally,
7 whereby if the perpetrator admits the charges, lesser charges are filed against them.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 The index offence involved Mr A pulling his partner to the floor, banging her
15 head several times against the bath. He made threats to kill her whilst he was holding
16 a weapon. The affray offence relates to a few weeks prior to the assault, whereby Mr
17 A went to the victim's ex-husband's house with a hammer and threatened his ex-
18 partner and her ex-husband.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Method**

28 **Assessments**

29 **Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS-IV; Wechsler, 2008)**

30
31
32 Mr A's cognitive ability was assessed in order to inform treatment planning.
33
34 Mr A's general cognitive ability, as estimated by the WAIS-IV (Wechsler, 2008), was
35 found to be within in the 'extremely low' range. His general verbal comprehension
36 abilities were in the 'extremely low' range, and his general perceptual reasoning
37 abilities were in the 'borderline' range. Mr A's ability to sustain attention,
38 concentrate, and exert mental control was found to be within the 'extremely low'
39 range. His ability to process simple or routine visual material without making errors
40 was considered to be within the 'borderline' range when compared to his peers.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Spousal Assault Risk Assessment (SARA; Kropp, Hart, Webster & Eaves, 2008)

The SARA (Kropp, Hart, Webster and Eaves, 2008) is a clinical checklist of risk factors for spousal assault that can be used to help guide treatment and case prioritisation and consists of twenty factors, grouped into five content areas; *criminal history, psychosocial adjustment, spousal assault history, index offence and other considerations*. In order to collate information to inform the formulation, Mr A's case was assessed using the SARA.

Two of the twenty SARA items were assessed as not present, seventeen of the items were assessed as present, one item was omitted and none were partially present.

Items that were used to guide risk management and reduction included *employment problems, substance misuse problems, relationship problems, suicidal/homicidal ideation, psychotic symptoms, extreme minimisation, weapon use and attitudes condoning spousal abuse*.

Pre-treatment initial case formulation and treatment approach

There is limited empirical research relating to case formulation and its impact on clinical outcomes (see Ghaderi, 2011), however one practical consideration to enhance the utility of case formulation is to draw on different models to encourage practitioner flexibility (Eells & Lombart, 2011). This case study applied functional analysis, which can be considered an important part of cognitive-behavioural case formulation (Persons, 2008) as well as a CAT informed approach to formulation. For example, the intervention involved identification of RRP's and a CAT reformulation narrative letter, which is a therapy tool that is argued to be central to CAT (Newell et

1
2
3 al., 2009) whereby clients are supported by the therapist in transforming their existing
4 understanding of their presenting problem into a more explanatory and useful form.
5
6

7 Functional analysis is an assessment approach used to establish the function of
8 a behaviour by exploring the relationship between an individual and their
9 environment, often referred to as an A:B:C analysis (Sturmev, 2008). The A:B:C in
10 functional analysis refer to *antecedents* (A), *behaviour* (B) and *consequences* (C).
11 Antecedents can be distal (historical) or proximal (current). It is important within
12 functional analysis to consider reciprocal determination, which is the concept of
13 environment, behaviour and consequences being interrelated or interactive. For
14 example, a consequence could become an antecedent for a future behaviour and
15 consequence cycle.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 A multiple sequential functional analysis (MSFA) is a series of functional
28 analyses that link together to account for complex historical behaviour chains
29 (Gresswell & Hollin, 1992). Mr A's case was formulated using the MSFA approach
30 (see Table 1), which was used to guide treatment. These MSFA hypothesise that
31 parental influence, substance misuse, and paranoid ideation contribute to IPV.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 <Insert Table 1 here >
42
43
44

45 **Intervention**

46 **Description**

47
48 The twelve one-hour session, individualised CAT and CBT informed
49 psychological intervention sessions were delivered weekly, and took place after
50 several assessment/motivation sessions.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Session 1
4

5 Mr A's relationships with significant others were explored, with a view to
6 gathering information that could be used to inform identification of RRP.
7
8 Transference and countertransference were discussed in the context of CAT and
9 RRP, in particular in the context of a potential role of
10 **pleasing/impressing**→**pleased/impressed** he had already identified.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Sessions 2-5
20

21 These sessions focussed on Mr A's relationships with others in order to further
22 explore RRP and to inform a CAT reformulation letter. Controlling / controlled,
23 impressing/impressed and humiliating /humiliated were discussed as possible
24 reciprocal roles.
25
26
27
28

29 Session 6-7
30

31 These sessions involved the therapist reading out the CAT reformulation letter
32 and discussing this. A self-exploration/self-esteem exercise was set as out of session
33 work.
34
35
36
37

38 Session 8
39

40 An exercise on identifying the emotions of others through facial expression
41 was undertaken, using pictures from magazines as a starting point. An exercise on
42 'bottling up' feelings was completed from a CBT perspective (**event** →
43 **thoughts/feelings/behaviour** → **consequence**) whereby Mr A was encouraged to
44 identify how 'The Incredible Hulk' may have felt and thought before he transformed
45 into 'The Hulk' from the man he was before, and what may have contributed to this
46 change in his behaviour. This was discussed in relation to Mr A's violence. RRP
47 recognition was also discussed.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Session 9

This session focussed on recapping/expanding on the work completed in the previous session and also covered a current feelings and behaviour cycle that was similar to previous unhelpful cycles.

Session 10

Mr A's thoughts, feelings and behaviour within the index offence and in other IPV were explored and discussed. Themes including jealousy, anger and drugs were explored. Through this a possible RRP was identified (rejecting / rejected). The victim 'no-send' letter Mr A had completed was discussed.

Session 11

This session explored a 'victim no-send' letter, and was used to review RRP's and prepare for the end of therapy. An out of session task to complete an end of therapy letter¹ was set for both patient and therapist to complete.

Session 12

Mr A had not prepared his end of therapy letter but talked through related thoughts. The therapist's end of therapy letter was read out. Mr A's progress and the future were discussed.

Results

General engagement

Mr A attended all twelve intervention sessions and completed out of session tasks. Mr A's progress in the individual sessions was considered alongside his out of session work and his behaviour outside of sessions. Direct observation of Mr A

¹ This is a CAT tool designed to facilitate ending therapy. It is recommended that when writing this the therapist considers: feelings on ending, achievements, relationship, expression of hope, warm and engaging, exits, language used, life/learning after therapy (Turpin et al., 2011).

1
2
3 outside of the therapy sessions by the therapist was not possible, although staff
4 observation were available. Pre and post-treatment psychometric assessments were
5 considered.
6
7
8
9

10 11 **Qualitative description of progress**

12
13
14 Mr A worked well in exercises that built on his strengths, for example
15 exercises using creative means. Although possessing a limited repertoire of words to
16 describe emotions, he demonstrated an ability to recognise emotions from facial
17 expression within an exercise using visual aids. Mr A also completed a self-esteem
18 exercise exploring his life and identity by creating a collage.
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Mr A developed some insight into some RRP's and behaviour cycles. For
26 example, he recognised that his tendency to give others what they want in order to
27 impress or please them can leave him feeling used, and that when this happens, he
28 does not talk to people about his feelings. This happened within his relationships with
29 partners and other people. He recognised that he still does this in hospital; however,
30 he does not feel that this is problematic, and consequently he did not develop exit
31 strategies or options to address this. Mr A recognised that fearing rejection contributes
32 to this tendency, and he explored how this may link to his early childhood experiences
33 relating to early separation from his father and his father's subsequent inconsistent
34 parenting.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Mr A talked through his offence, recognising that 'bottling up' emotions
48 contributed to his behaviour within the offence and also within other previous
49 incidents of IPV. He was able to label the feelings he had immediately preceding the
50 offence not just as anger, but also as loneliness and feeling unwanted. He recognised
51 that he feared the victim rejecting him by being unfaithful or ending the relationship.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Mr A showed awareness of what could happen if people keep their emotions inside
4 and self-isolate, linking this back to his offence.
5
6

7 Mr A explored some of the consequences of his behaviour on others. One of
8 the biggest pieces of work he completed during treatment was his 'victim no-send
9 letter'. The aims of this exercise was to explore his understanding of his relationship
10 with the victim, the offence itself, his feelings about the offence and victim, and also
11 what he thought she might feel. This was talked about during sessions, along with his
12 desire to be seen as a 'good' person by showing the victim that he had changed. This
13 was also linked back to his tendency to try to please/impress others. Risk issues were
14 addressed as part of this and strategies for managing feelings associated with not
15 being able to show the victim that he had changed were examined. The letter, and
16 discussions around it, demonstrated that he has some recognition of how the victim
17 might have felt at the time of the offence and also now, particularly if she saw Mr A
18 again. Despite this, Mr A did not demonstrate insight into the longer-term victim
19 impact.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Mr A demonstrated awareness of substances having a negative impact on his
37 mental health, and although he said he did not wish to use drugs in the future, his
38 awareness appeared inconsistent. He recognised that dysfunctional emotional coping
39 contributed to his substance misuse, for example taking amphetamines to cope with
40 feeling low about not helping his mother with the bills. He recognised that wanting to
41 have big muscles like his father, and sibling competitiveness, contributed to his
42 steroid use; however, he did not fully explore the related RRP, which he could do if
43 he engages in treatment in the future
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 **Behavioural observations**

56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Mr A's documented behaviour outside of sessions was consistent. Ward staff
4 often described his behaviour as 'settled'. He engaged well in the hospital regime and
5
6
7
8 community activities with no evidence of drug or alcohol misuse.

9
10 The single documented incident of note could be related back to his identified
11 role of pleasing others, resulting in not getting his needs met. During the course of
12 treatment, it was Mr A's birthday. He met his mother and brother on escorted leave
13 for a 'birthday meal' and said to his family that he did not want to go to a certain fast
14 food outlet because the last time he had eaten there he was sick. His brother and
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
The three of them (and the hospital escort) went to this fast food outlet and Mr A sat with
his brother and mother who eat their meals, but Mr A did not order any food as he
was afraid of being sick. He therefore did not eat at his 'birthday meal'. The person
reporting this situation felt that Mr A had not got his needs met, however Mr A's
perspective was that he had experienced a good birthday because he had seen his
mother and brother. He did not feel there were any difficulties or problems in this
situation. Although Mr A's perspective and feelings are paramount, and he did not
report any problems with the situation, enacting and maintaining this RRP involving
pleasing others and not getting his needs met appeared to link to the dysfunctional
roles that were present within the IPV. Had he recognised this role, and expressed his
view and feelings assertively, he may have got his needs met in this situation. This
does not necessarily directly link to his level of risk of violence, however this
situation demonstrated that he could benefit from developing further insight into the
way he relates to the world around him.

Psychometric assessment

1
2
3 Mr A was assessed using a variety of psychometric measures (see Table 2).
4
5 Where the required information was present in relation to each scale, *clinically*
6
7 *significant change* and *reliable change* were assessed according to Jacobson, Follette
8
9 and Revenstorf's (1984) methodology. According to this methodology, *clinically*
10
11 *significant change* can be considered as change that has taken the individual from a
12
13 problematic, dysfunctional, patient, client or user group to a score typical of the
14
15 'normal' population. *Reliable change* relates to whether an individual changed to an
16
17 extent that is unlikely to be due to simple measurement unreliability.
18
19

20
21 < Insert table 2 about here >
22

23
24 It is of note that for the majority of the scales, Mr A scored in the 'non-
25
26 dysfunctional' or 'non-clinical' range pre-treatment as well as post-treatment, and
27
28 post-treatment his scores on some scales changed *against* the desired direction of
29
30 change. The impression management scale of the Paulhus Deception Scales (1999)
31
32 indicated the possibility of '*faking good*' both pre and post-treatment. Mr A's pre-
33
34 treatment score pattern on the Paulhus sub-scales indicates that he might be aware of
35
36 his shortcomings yet wants to be seen in a positive light, resulting in self-report being
37
38 overly positive. This fits with the psychological treatment itself highlighting that
39
40 *pleasing or impressing others* is a behavioural tendency for Mr A, showing a link
41
42 between psychometric findings and behavioural evidence. Given that his responses
43
44 may have been distorted, despite the comprehensive test battery used, little weight
45
46 was placed on the psychometric findings in assessing outcomes.
47
48

49
50 Given the clinical issues in Mr A's case, one particular score is of particular
51
52 interest. This is the Anger Control-Out (AC-O) subscale of the STAXI-2 (Spielberger,
53
54 1999). On this scale, higher scores are typically desirable (controlling outward
55
56 manifestations of anger), and Mr A scored in the 'high' range. On the surface, this
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 means that pre-treatment he was already scoring in a functional range on this subscale
4
5 and that post-treatment he had changed against the desired direction of change.
6
7 However, a high score could also be considered problematic for some clients because
8
9 over-control can lead to passivity, depression, and withdrawal. Consequently,
10
11 depending on the client, a reduction in score is desirable and given Mr A's tendency
12
13 to hold his feelings of anger in, resulting in a later outburst, it could be considered that
14
15 his pre-treatment high score on this scale is not desirable. As a result, Mr A's post-
16
17 treatment clinically significant (but not reliably) lowered score could be considered as
18
19 movement in the desired direction. This hypothesis should be considered with
20
21 caution, due to Mr A's possible distorted responding as per the Paulhus scale findings.
22
23
24

25 In summary, psychometric assessment did not reveal particularly problematic
26
27 areas of functioning within the constructs assessed by the scales both pre-and post-
28
29 treatment for Mr A. There was some movement against the desired direction of
30
31 change on some psychometric sub-scales, however where this did occur Mr A's score
32
33 remained in a non-problematic range. The Paulhus scale revealed the possibility of
34
35 overly positive self-report and so it is possible that his pattern of responding to the
36
37 questions within the psychometrics was distorted. In light of this finding, and clinical
38
39 evidence supporting this tendency to try to please others, psychometric assessments
40
41 were considered with caution.
42
43
44

45 The therapist recommended that some future intervention focussing on the
46
47 importance of assertiveness may assist Mr A in getting his needs met. It was
48
49 considered that if he was willing, future psychological treatment focussing even more
50
51 on his RRP (particularly on *revising* RRP), exploring emotion recognition and
52
53 expression, and working on developing intimacy skills may also facilitate positive
54
55 well-being and risk management.
56
57
58
59
60

Discussion

Integrative CAT and CBT approach to offender treatment

This case study used an integrative CAT and CBT approach to the treatment of an adult male with schizophrenia who had perpetrated IPV. Pollock (2006) puts forward that CAT can be a useful form of psychotherapy in a forensic setting because one of its objectives is *'to scaffold the offender's acquisition of the psychological tools to promote self-knowledge, insight and the ability to self-reflect, developing a mental model of the connection between both personality and crime... the meaning of the offence and its predictable recurrence are overt features of the therapy'* (pp324-325). This case study has demonstrated that this worked well in practice, because although through twelve sessions Mr A did not revise all of the RRP's identified, he developed some insight into his relationships and behaviour within these. CAT was a useful framework that facilitated identification of dysfunctional behaviour patterns. Some of the CAT tools were easier than others to adapt to meet Mr A's learning needs, and a slow pace of therapy was needed to facilitate Mr A's understanding of key CAT concepts such as RRP's. Mr A responded well to CBT informed exercises that explored thoughts and feelings linking to behaviour in given situations, however this approach did not necessarily address the causes of his high risk thoughts and feelings. More than twelve sessions would have better met Mr A's needs, however hospital resources did not allow for this. Consequently, clear recommendations for follow-up intervention were made. Follow-up intervention may be particularly important for Mr A given that risk of violence may be higher for those who experience schizophrenia and comorbid substance-misuse (e.g. Fazel et al., 2009).

1
2
3 Transference and counter-transference can be understood within CAT in terms
4 of enactments of RRP, with transference being awareness of the client inducting the
5 therapist into a particular role and counter transference being the therapist's
6 awareness of pressure to enact the role into which they have been inducted (Pollock &
7 Stowell-Smith, 2006). This was particularly relevant in Mr A's treatment in relation to
8 his 'impressing' role, whereby it would be easy as a therapist to be induced into the
9 'impressed/pleased' role. As Ryle (1997) highlights, such collusion could reinforce
10 the maladaptive RRP and result in maintaining the fragmented structure of the client's
11 personality. In this case, this could have reinforced the benefits of Mr A holding in or
12 'bottling up' his true feelings, behaving in a way designed to impress others,
13 ultimately maintaining the cycle of not getting his needs met. Supervision aided the
14 author in identifying and managing the potential for the client to 'pull' the therapist
15 towards colluding with these patterns.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Within this case study, outcome was difficult to assess. Firstly, impression
33 management limited psychometric assessment. Secondly, the in-patient environment
34 is restricted, adding to the inherent difficulties of assessing a patient who generally
35 holds in their feelings. Consequently, assessment of progress is largely subjective.
36 This highlights the importance of a multi-disciplinary approach to risk management.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Twelve sessions did not fully address Mr A's areas of need. As this case study
44 has highlighted, treatment applying approaches such as CAT may be difficult to adapt
45 for clients with lower intellectual functioning, and adapted treatment may take longer
46 to deliver than treatment designed for a client without additional learning needs.
47 However, in services where time and resources are finite, lengthier intervention could
48 be difficult to achieve. Despite this, given that that the aim of treatment was to
49 develop Mr A's insight into his index offence and to understand the development of
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 dysfunctional roles or patterns of behaviour for him, in order to reduce or help
4 manage associated risks, this could be considered a successful treatment. Taking this
5 forward with another patient it is therefore recommended that a CAT informed
6 intervention involves more than twelve sessions, and that consideration is given to
7 how other models and influences can be incorporated into the treatment, such as the
8 theories based on attachment (Fonagy, 1999).
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Conclusions

20
21 This case study has demonstrated CAT informed treatment in practice. Mr A
22 exhibited behaviours in treatment that suggested insight and reduced risk. There is
23 limited research available on the effectiveness of CAT with forensic clients and this
24 case study is encouraging with regard to this vulnerable client group. Pollock (2006)
25 puts forward that CAT is conducive to risk, need, and responsivity principles (see
26 McGuire, 1995) with respect to 'what works' with offenders, and that CAT shows
27 many of the components of a valid forensic psychotherapy. Future research will
28 further inform the position, and in an economic climate where services strive to gain
29 value for money by providing treatment that is deemed to be effective, the importance
30 of research to inform evidence based practice is further emphasised.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 References

- 46
47 Beck, A. T., & Weishaar, M. (2008). Cognitive therapy. In R. J. Corsini & D. Wedding (Eds.), *Current*
48 *psychotherapies*. 8th Ed. pp 263-294 Belmont, CA: Thomsons.
49
50
51
52 Buss, A. H. & Warren, W. L. (2000) *Aggression Questionnaire*. Los Angeles: Western Psychological
53 Services.
54
55
56 Butler, R.J. & Gasson, S.L. (2004). *The Self Image Profile for Adults*. London: Pearson Assessment
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Christensen, L. & Mendoza, J. L. (1986). A method of assessing change in a single subject: an
4 alteration of the RC index. *Behavior Therapy*, 17, 305-308.
5
6
7 CORE System Group (1998). *CORE System User Manual*. Leeds: CORE System Group
8
9
10 Dutton D. (1994) Patriarchy and Wife Assault: The Ecological Fallacy. *Violence and Victims*, 9(2)
11 167-182.
12
13
14 Eells, T. D., & Lombart, K. G. (2004). Case formulation: Determining the focus in brief dynamic
15 psychotherapy. In D. P. Chapman (ed.), *Core processes in Brief Psychodynamic Psychotherapy*
16 (pp. 119-144). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
17
18
19
20 Evans, C., Margison, F. & Barkham, M. (1998). The contribution of reliable and clinically significant
21 change methods to evidence-based mental health. *Evidence Based Mental Health*, 1,70-72
22
23
24 Evans, C., Mellor-Clark, J., Margison, F., Barkham, M., McGrath, G., Connell, J., & Audin, K. (2000).
25 Clinical Outcomes in Routine Evaluation: The CORE-OM. *Journal of Mental Health*, 9, 247-
26 255.
27
28
29
30 Fairbairn, W. R. D. (1952). *An Object Relations Theory of the Personality*. London: Tavistock.
31
32
33 Fazel, S., Gulati, G., Linsell, L., Geddes, J.R. & Grann, M. (2009). Schizophrenia and Violence:
34 Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses. *PLoS Medicine* 6(8): e1000120.
35
36
37 Fonagy, P. (1999). Male perpetrators of violence against women: An attachment perspective. *Journal*
38 *of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies*, 1(1), 7-27.
39
40
41 Gelles, R. J., & Maynard, P. E. (1987). A structural family systems approach to intervention in cases of
42 family violence. *Family Relations*, 36(3), 270-275.
43
44
45 Ghaderi, A. (2011). Does case formulation make a difference to treatment outcome? In P. Sturmey &
46 M. McMurrin, *Forensic Case Formulation* (pp. 83-106). Chichester, UK: Wiley & Sons.
47
48
49 Gilbert, F. & Daffern, M. (2010). Integrating contemporary aggression theory with violent offender
50 treatment: How thoroughly do interventions target violent behaviour? *Aggression and Violent*
51 *Behaviour*, 15, 167-180.
52
53
54 Gondolf, E. W. (1988) *Battered Women as Survivors: An Alternative to Treating Learned*
55 *Helplessness*. Massachusetts, USA: Lexington Books.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Gresswell, D. M. & Hollin, C. R. (1992). Towards a new methodology of making sense of case
5 material: an illustrative case involving attempted multiple murder. *Criminal Behaviour and*
6 *Mental Health*, 2, 329-41
7
8
9
10 Howells, K. (1998). Cognitive Behavioural Interventions for Anger, Aggression and Violence. In N.
11 Tarrrier, A. Wells & G. Haddock, *Treating Complex Cases; the cognitive behavioural therapy*
12 *approach*. Chichester, UK: Wiley & Sons.
13
14
15 Howells, K. & Day, A. (2002). Grasping the Nettle: Treating and rehabilitating the violent offender.
16 *Australian Psychologist*, 37, 222-228.
17
18
19 Jacobson, N. S., Follette, W. C. & Revenstorf, D. (1984). Psychotherapy and outcome research:
20 Methods for reporting variability and evaluating clinical significance. *Behavior Therapy*, 15,
21 336-352
22
23
24 Jacobson, N. S. & Truax, P. (1991). Clinical significance: A statistical approach to defining meaningful
25 change in psychotherapy research. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 59(1), 12-19
26
27
28 Krampen, G. (2009). Psychotherapeutic Processes and Outcomes in Outpatient Treatment of Antisocial
29 Behaviour: An integrative Psychotherapy Approach. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*, 19
30 (3), 213-230.
31
32
33
34 Kropp, P. R., Hart, S. D., Webster, C. D. & Eaves, D. (2008). Manual for the Spousal Assault Risk
35 Assessment Guide (2nd Ed.). Vancouver, Canada: ProActive ReSolutions Inc.
36
37
38 McGuire, J. (Ed). (1995) *What Works: Reducing reoffending*. Chichester: Wiley.
39
40
41 McGuire, J. (2003). *Offender rehabilitation and treatment: Effective programs and policies to reduce*
42 *re-offending*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
43
44
45
46 Newell, A., Garrihy, A., Morgan, K., Raymond, C., & Gamble, H. (2009). Receiving a CAT
47 Reformulation Letter: What Makes a Good Experience? *Reformulation*, 29.
48
49
50 Paulhus, D. L. (1998). *Paulhus Deception Scales (PDS): The Balanced Inventory of Desirable*
51 *Responding-7*. North Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems inc.
52
53
54 Patton, J. H., Stanford, M. S., & Barratt, E. S. (1995). Factor structure of the Barratt Impulsiveness
55 Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 51, 768-774
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Pence, E., & Paymar, M. (1993). *Education groups for men who batter: The Duluth model*. New York:
4 Springer.
5
6
7 Persons, J. B. (2008). *The Case Formulation Approach to Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*. New York,
8 NY: Guildford.
9
10
11 Pollock, P. H. & Belshaw, T. (1998). Cognitive analytic therapy for offenders. *The Journal of Forensic*
12 *Psychiatry*, 9 (3), 629-642.
13
14
15 Pollock, P. H., (2006) Final thoughts: The way forward for cognitive analytic therapy in forensic
16 settings. In P. H. Pollock, M. Stowell-Smith, & M. Gopfert (Eds). *Cognitive Analytic Therapy*
17 *for offenders: A new approach to forensic psychotherapy*. Hove; Routledge. pp 323-326
18
19
20
21 Pollock, P. H., & Stowell-Smith, M. (2006). Cognitive Analytic Therapy applied to offending. In P. H.
22 Pollock, M. Stowell-Smith and M. Gopfert (Eds.), *Cognitive Analytic Therapy for Offenders: A*
23 *new approach to forensic psychotherapy*. (pp. 1-43). London: Routledge.
24
25
26
27 Ryle, A. (1997). The structure and development of borderline personality disorder: A proposed model.
28 *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 170, 82-87.
29
30
31 Spielberg, C.D. (1999). *State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory*. Florida, USA: PAR Inc.
32
33
34 Sturmey, P. (2008). *Behavioural Case Formulation and Intervention: A Functional Analytic Approach*.
35 Chichester: Wiley.
36
37
38 Turpin, C., Adu-White, D., Barnes, P., Chalmers-Woods, R., Delisser, C., Dudley, J. and Mesbahi, M.,
39 (2011). What are the important ingredients of a CAT goodbye letter? *Reformulation*, 30-31.
40
41
42 Walker, J. S., & Bright, J. A. (2009). Cognitive therapy for violence: Reaching the parts that anger
43 management doesn't reach. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology*, 20, 174-201.
44
45
46 Wechsler, D. (2008). *Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, 4th Edition (WAIS-IV)*. San Antonio, TX:
47 Pearson.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Using an integrative, Cognitive Analytical Therapy (CAT) approach to treat intimate partner violence risk

Abstract

Aims: There is limited research on [Cognitive Analytic Therapy \(CAT\)](#) in forensic contexts; this case study therefore significantly contributes to the knowledge base. This case study presents the assessment and treatment of an adult male offender with a diagnosis of schizophrenia. The client's offence involved intimate partner violence and was committed at a time of acute psychiatric relapse.

Method: Twelve sessions of Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT) and [Cognitive Analytical Therapy \(CAT\)](#) informed treatment were individually designed to meet the needs of the client, delivered in an in-patient setting in the UK. The client's progress was assessed using psychometric, observational, and narrative/descriptive methods.

Results: Psychometric evidence was limited by distorted responding. However, narrative/descriptive assessment indicated that progress had been made in some areas. Recommendations for further treatment were made.

Conclusions: Twelve sessions did not meet all of the client's needs. The use of CAT as a model that his team could use in understanding his violence was conducive to risk management. Overall, insight gained through CAT based psychological intervention contributed to risk reduction.

Originality: This case study demonstrates the applicability of CAT to forensic settings.

Keywords:

Cognitive Analytic Therapy, Violence, Risk, Treatment, Intimate Partner Violence, Offender

Introduction

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)

Pro-feminist theories view IPV as a reflection of the patriarchal organisation of society as a whole, where men use violence when they feel their dominance is threatened (see Gondolf, 1998). Pence and Paymar (1993) discuss this in the context of Duluth 'power and control wheel' where power dynamics linked to socialisation are proposed to link to IPV. However, pro-feminist theory has been criticised for over-emphasising socio-cultural factors, resulting in exclusion of individual factors. For example, Dutton (1994) critically enquires how men can be held individually accountable for their IPV if it is a result of patriarchal society and Lawson (2003) questions how pro-feminist theory accounts for IPV within a same-sex relationship.

~~Cognitive behavioural theory puts forward that behaviour modification requires change in perception and interpretation (Beck & Weishaar, 2008) and can be used to frame IPV. Deeper held beliefs relating to male dominance remain relevant here as factors that may impact on perception and interpretation. Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT) has become a favoured approach to offender treatment (McGuire, 2003; Gilbert & Daffern, 2010) as it lends well to identifying IPV intervention approaches. Despite this, group based CBT interventions have been criticised for lacking individuality (Howells & Day, 2002) and for not being sufficient to overcome automatic thoughts or learned behaviour (Walker & Bright, 2009), suggesting that more is needed to address the psychological processes involved in IPV.~~

Family systems theory views the family as a dynamic organisation, with interdependent components, where the recurrence of behaviour of a family member is

1
2
3
4
5
6 affected by other family members' responses. This theory promotes a family-level
7
8 approach to IPV intervention (Gelles & Maynard, 1987) this approach may promote
9
10 the view that the victim is to blame. Attachment theory, which places an emphasis on
11
12 the reciprocity between individuals in a relationship, provides the perspective that
13
14 IPV can be seen as an exaggerated response of a disorganised attachment system
15
16 linked to disorganised attachment in infancy (Fonagy, 1999).

17
18 Cognitive behavioural theory puts forward that behaviour modification
19
20 requires change in perception and interpretation (Beck & Weishaar, 2008) and can be
21
22 used to frame IPV. Deeper held beliefs relating to male dominance remain relevant
23
24 here as factors that may impact on perception and interpretation. Cognitive
25
26 Behavioural Therapy (CBT) has become a favoured approach to offender treatment
27
28 (McGuire, 2003; Gilbert & Daffern, 2010) as it lends well to identifying IPV
29
30 intervention approaches. Despite this, group based CBT interventions have been
31
32 criticised for lacking individuality (Howells & Day, 2002) and for not being sufficient
33
34 to overcome automatic thoughts or learned behaviour (Walker & Bright, 2009),
35
36 suggesting that more is needed to address the psychological processes involved in
37
38 IPV.

39
40 -These differing approaches, and their criticisms, demonstrate the need to go beyond
41
42 one model in the treatment of IPV.

43
44 Cognitive Analytic Therapy (CAT), an integrative approach underpinned by
45
46 psychoanalytic, cognitive and personal construct theory suggests that through early
47
48 care relationships, individuals develop a range of reciprocal role procedures (RRPs)
49
50 that determine how they relate to others and themselves, and some of these can be
51
52 problematic (Ryle, 1997). It is suggested that offending behaviour can be a result of
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

1
2
3
4
5
6 problematic RRP, and RRP focussed interventions can be useful for offenders
7
8 (Pollock, 2006).
9

10 Schizophrenia and psychosis have been found to be associated with general
11 violence, with increased risk found with substance abuse comorbidity (Fazel et al.,
12 2009). It has been suggested that the paranoia experienced by those with
13 schizophrenia is similar to the hostile attribution involved when people experience
14 anger or aggression (Chadwick, Birchwood & Trower, 1996). In relation to IPV,
15 'recent psychotic symptoms' is an item recognised within the Spousal Assault Risk
16 Assessment (SARA; Kropp, Hart, Webster & Eaves, 2008) as being associated with
17 poor coping skills and increased interpersonal stress, and therefore IPV. It has also
18 been highlighted that establishing whether violence precipitates schizophrenic
19 symptoms is useful in treatment planning (Howells, 1998), as treatment providers can
20 target psychological/psychiatric approaches accordingly. A range of factors can
21 contribute to the development and maintenance of criminal behaviour, therefore it can
22 be argued that an integrative approach is needed to explore and address these factors
23 (Krampen, 2009). This case study draws upon both CAT and CBT in the
24 psychological treatment of an adult male who has a history of IPV.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Client introduction**

42
43 Mr A is a 25-year-old man with a diagnosis of paranoid schizophrenia and a
44 history of drug misuse. He is detained in a low secure mental-health hospital in the
45 UK. At the time of his IPV offence, there was evidence of acute psychiatric relapse.
46
47
48
49

50 **Psychosocial background of client**

51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Formatted: None, Tab stops: 0.5", Left

1
2
3
4
5
6 Mr A, who has two brothers, described his biological father as a black
7 Jamaican who misused cocaine. His parents separated when he was under five years
8 old. There was on-going domestic violence towards Mr A's mother from her various
9 male partners. There is a history of criminal behaviour and psychiatric problems in
10 the extended family (diagnoses unclear).
11
12
13
14
15

16 Mr A's mother had another relationship with a man for five years during his
17 childhood. Mr A's father and stepfather were body builders who abused steroids. Mr
18 A described his childhood as "*sad*". His mother was constantly at work and there was
19 an atmosphere of physical violence perpetrated by his father and stepfather.
20 Discipline was exerted by threats of violence. Mr A denied any history of sexual
21 abuse.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Mr A has previously reported that his teachers told him that he had a 'learning
29 difficulty' from the age of four. Mr A said that he found it difficult to concentrate in
30 the classroom environment from the age of ten onwards, disrupting the environment
31 and being suspended. He had few school friends. His level of educational attainment
32 was predicted to be poor but he did pass some exams, leaving education at the age of
33 sixteen. He has worked in manual jobs but was unemployed for around a year prior to
34 this hospital admission, having been made redundant. Mr A was reliant on state
35 benefits and selling drugs as his sources of income.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Mr A has previously been in relationships with women. Mr A did not describe
44 these relationships as being emotionally intimate. Mr A has disclosed controlling
45 behaviour and violence towards one previous partner. He was in a relationship with
46 the current victim for around one year prior to the serious offence that precipitated
47 this hospital admission. Mr A describes this relationship as being 'on and off'.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Forensic history

Mr A has prior convictions for theft, failure to surrender to custody, possession of amphetamines, breach of community order, and criminal damage.

There is a documented history of suspected IPV perpetrated by Mr A against his ex-partner (and current victim) during their relationship. Suspicions arose following attendance of various agencies at Mr A and the victim's shared house. This included Police attendance following the victim alleging she had been assaulted by Mr A. Allegations included threats of weapon use and possession of a knife, where Mr A's ex-partner did not wish to proceed with Police charges. In addition, during routine visits, community psychiatric staff observed injuries on the victim that were considered to be consistent with IPV.

Mr A has disclosed having been violent towards other males in the past, including stabbing a male in the leg during an altercation. He also disclosed that he sold drugs to make money. The onset of violent behaviour preceded diagnosis of psychiatric illness.

In relation to this inpatient admission, Mr A pleaded guilty to offences of assault, affray, and burglary. Consequently, other matters that he had originally been charged with were discontinued (he was originally also charged on two counts of false imprisonment). This 'plea bargaining' approach is not uncommon internationally, whereby if the perpetrator admits the charges, lesser charges are filed against them.

The index offence involved Mr A pulling his partner to the floor, banging her head several times against the bath. He made threats to kill her whilst he was holding a ~~sharpened vegetable peeler~~weapon. The affray offence relates to a few weeks prior to the assault, whereby Mr A went to the victim's ex-husband's house with a hammer and threatened his ex-partner and her ex-husband.

Method

Assessments

Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS-IV; Wechsler, 2008)

Mr A's cognitive ability was assessed in order to inform treatment planning. Mr A's general cognitive ability, as estimated by the WAIS-IV (Wechsler, 2008), was found to be within in the 'extremely low' range. His general verbal comprehension abilities were in the 'extremely low' range, and his general perceptual reasoning abilities were in the 'borderline' range. Mr A's ability to sustain attention, concentrate, and exert mental control was found to be within the 'extremely low' range. His ability to process simple or routine visual material without making errors was considered to be within the 'borderline' range when compared to his peers. Assessment of cognitive ability was completed to ensure that the intervention was designed to meet Mr A's learning needs and also to work with his clinical team to ensure that his cognitive functioning was supported on a day-to-day basis.

Spousal Assault Risk Assessment (SARA; Kropp, Hart, Webster & Eaves, 2008)

The SARA (Kropp, Hart, Webster and Eaves, 2008) is a clinical checklist of risk factors for spousal assault that can be used to help guide treatment and case prioritisation and consists of twenty factors, grouped into five content areas; *criminal history, psychosocial adjustment, spousal assault history, index offence and other considerations*. In order to collate information to inform the formulation, Mr A's case was assessed using the SARA.

Two of the twenty SARA items were assessed as not present, seventeen of the items were assessed as present, one item was omitted and none were partially present.

1
2
3
4
5
6 Items that were used to guide risk management and reduction included
7
8 *employment problems, substance misuse problems, relationship problems,*
9
10 *suicidal/homicidal ideation, psychotic symptoms, extreme minimisation, weapon use*
11
12 *and attitudes condoning spousal abuse.*
13

14 15 16 **Pre-treatment initial case formulation and treatment approach** 17

18 There is limited empirical research relating to case formulation and its impact
19
20 on clinical outcomes (see Ghaderi, 2011), however one practical consideration to
21
22 enhance the utility of case formulation is to draw on different models to encourage
23
24 practitioner flexibility (Eells & Lombart, 2011). This case study applied functional
25
26 analysis, which can be considered an important part of cognitive-behavioural case
27
28 formulation (Persons, 2008) as well as a CAT informed approach to formulation. For
29
30 example, the intervention involved identification of RRP's and a CAT reformulation
31
32 narrative letter, which is a therapy tool that is argued to be central to CAT (Newell et
33
34 al., 2009) whereby clients are supported by the therapist in transforming their existing
35
36 understanding of their presenting problem into a more explanatory and useful form.
37

38 Functional analysis is an assessment approach used to establish the function of
39
40 a behaviour by exploring the relationship between an individual and their
41
42 environment, often referred to as an A:B:C analysis (Sturmey, 2008). The A:B:C in
43
44 functional analysis refer to *antecedents* (A), *behaviour* (B) and *consequences* (C).
45
46 Antecedents can be distal (historical) or proximal (current). It is important within
47
48 functional analysis to consider reciprocal determination, which is the concept of
49
50 environment, behaviour and consequences being interrelated or interactive. For
51
52 example, a consequence could become an antecedent for a future behaviour and
53
54 consequence cycle.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 A multiple sequential functional analysis (MSFA) is a series of functional
7 analyses that link together to account for complex historical behaviour chains
8 (Gresswell & Hollin, 1992). Mr A's case was formulated using the MSFA approach
9 (see Table 1), which was used to guide treatment. These MSFA hypothesise that
10 parental influence, substance misuse, and paranoid ideation contribute to IPV.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 <Insert Table 1 here >
19
20
21

22 Intervention

23 Description

24
25 The twelve one-hour session, individualised CAT and CBT informed
26 psychological intervention sessions were delivered weekly, and took place after
27 several assessment/motivation sessions.
28
29
30
31
32

33 Session 1

34
35 Mr A's relationships with significant others were explored, with a view to
36 gathering information that could be used to inform identification of RRP.
37 Transference and countertransference were discussed in the context of CAT and
38 RRP, in particular in the context of a potential role of
39 **pleasing/impressing**→**pleased/impressed** he had already identified.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Sessions 2-5

48
49 These sessions focussed on Mr A's relationships with others in order to further
50 explore RRP and to inform a CAT reformulation letter. Controlling / controlled,
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

impressing/impressed and humiliating /humiliated were discussed as possible reciprocal roles.

Session 6-7

These sessions involved the therapist reading out the CAT reformulation letter and discussing this. A self-exploration/self-esteem exercise was set as out of session work.

Session 8

An exercise on identifying the emotions of others through facial expression was undertaken, using pictures from magazines as a starting point. An exercise on 'bottling up' feelings was completed from a CBT perspective (**event → thoughts/feelings/behaviour → consequence**) whereby Mr A was encouraged to identify how 'The Incredible Hulk' may have felt and thought before he transformed into 'The Hulk' from the man he was before, and what may have contributed to this change in his behaviour. This was discussed in relation to Mr A's violence. RRP recognition was also discussed.

Session 9

This session focussed on recapping/expanding on the work completed in the previous session and also covered a current feelings and behaviour cycle that was similar to previous unhelpful cycles.

Session 10

Mr A's thoughts, feelings and behaviour within the index offence and in other IPV were explored and discussed. Themes including jealousy, anger and drugs were explored. Through this a possible RRP was identified (rejecting / rejected). The victim 'no-send' letter Mr A had completed was discussed.

Session 11

1
2
3
4
5
6 This session explored a ‘victim no-send’ letter, and was used to review RRP
7 and prepare for the end of therapy. An out of session task to complete an end of
8 therapy letter¹ was set for both patient and therapist to complete.
9

10 11 12 Session 12

13
14 Mr A had not prepared his end of therapy letter but talked through related
15 thoughts. The therapist’s end of therapy letter was read out. Mr A’s progress and the
16 future were discussed.
17
18
19

20 21 22 **Results**

23 24 **General engagement**

25
26 Mr A attended all twelve intervention sessions and completed out of session
27 tasks. Mr A’s progress in the individual sessions was considered alongside his out of
28 session work and his behaviour outside of sessions. Direct observation of Mr A
29 outside of the therapy sessions by the therapist was not possible, although staff
30 observation were available. Pre and post-treatment psychometric assessments were
31 considered.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 41 **Qualitative description of progress**

42
43 Mr A worked well in exercises that built on his strengths, for example
44 exercises using creative means. Although possessing a limited repertoire of words to
45 describe emotions, he demonstrated an ability to recognise emotions from facial
46 expression within an exercise using visual aids. Mr A also completed a self-esteem
47 exercise exploring his life and identity by creating a collage.
48
49
50

51
52
53
54 ¹ This is a CAT tool designed to facilitate ending therapy. It is recommended that when writing this
55 the therapist considers: feelings on ending, achievements, relationship, expression of hope, warm and
56 engaging, exits, language used, life/learning after therapy (Turpin et al., 2011).
57

1
2
3
4
5
6 Mr A developed some insight into some RRP's and behaviour cycles. For
7
8 example, he recognised that his tendency to give others what they want in order to
9
10 impress or please them can leave him feeling used, and that when this happens, he
11
12 does not talk to people about his feelings. This happened within his relationships with
13
14 partners and other people. He recognised that he still does this in hospital; however,
15
16 he does not feel that this is problematic, and consequently he did not develop exit
17
18 strategies or options to address this. Mr A recognised that fearing rejection contributes
19
20 to this tendency, and he explored how this may link to his early childhood experiences
21
22 relating to early separation from his father and his father's subsequent inconsistent
23
24 parenting.

25
26 Mr A talked through his offence, recognising that 'bottling up' emotions
27
28 contributed to his behaviour within the offence and also within other previous
29
30 incidents of IPV. He was able to label the feelings he had immediately preceding the
31
32 offence not just as anger, but also as loneliness and feeling unwanted. He recognised
33
34 that he feared the victim rejecting him by being unfaithful or ending the relationship.
35
36 Mr A showed awareness of what could happen if people keep their emotions inside
37
38 and self-isolate, linking this back to his offence.

39
40 Mr A explored some of the consequences of his behaviour on others. One of
41
42 the biggest pieces of work he completed during treatment was his 'victim no-send
43
44 letter'. The aims of this exercise was to explore his understanding of his relationship
45
46 with the victim, the offence itself, his feelings about the offence and victim, and also
47
48 what he thought she might feel. This was talked about during sessions, along with his
49
50 desire to be seen as a 'good' person by showing the victim that he had changed. This
51
52 was also linked back to his tendency to try to please/impress others. Risk issues were
53
54 addressed as part of this and strategies for managing feelings associated with not
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 being able to show the victim that he had changed were examined. The letter, and
7
8 discussions around it, demonstrated that he has some recognition of how the victim
9
10 might have felt at the time of the offence and also now, particularly if she saw Mr A
11
12 again. Despite this, Mr A did not demonstrate insight into the longer-term victim
13
14 impact.

15
16 Mr A demonstrated awareness of substances having a negative impact on his
17
18 mental health, and although he said he did not wish to use drugs in the future, his
19
20 awareness appeared inconsistent. He recognised that dysfunctional emotional coping
21
22 contributed to his substance misuse, for example taking amphetamines to cope with
23
24 feeling low about not helping his mother with the bills. He recognised that wanting to
25
26 have big muscles like his father, and sibling competitiveness, contributed to his
27
28 steroid use; however, he did not fully explore the related RRP, which he could do if
29
30 he engages in treatment in the future
31

32 33 **Behavioural observations**

34
35 Mr A's documented behaviour outside of sessions was consistent. Ward staff
36
37 often described his behaviour as 'settled'. He engaged well in the hospital regime and
38
39 community activities with no evidence of drug or alcohol misuse.
40

41
42 The single documented incident of note could be related back to his identified
43
44 role of pleasing others, resulting in not getting his needs met. During the course of
45
46 treatment, it was Mr A's birthday. He met his mother and brother on escorted leave
47
48 for a 'birthday meal' and said to his family that he did not want to go to a certain fast
49
50 food outlet because the last time he had eaten there he was sick. His brother and
51
52 mother asserted that this was where they should go, and so Mr A agreed to go. The
53
54 three of them (and the hospital escort) went to this fast food outlet and Mr A sat with
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 his brother and mother who eat their meals, but Mr A did not order any food as he
7 was afraid of being sick. He therefore did not eat at his 'birthday meal'. The person
8 reporting this situation felt that Mr A had not got his needs met, however Mr A's
9 perspective was that he had experienced a good birthday because he had seen his
10 mother and brother. He did not feel there were any difficulties or problems in this
11 situation. Although Mr A's perspective and feelings are paramount, and he did not
12 report any problems with the situation, enacting and maintaining this RRP involving
13 pleasing others and not getting his needs met appeared to link to the dysfunctional
14 roles that were present within the IPV. Had he recognised this role, and expressed his
15 view and feelings assertively, he may have got his needs met in this situation. This
16 does not necessarily directly link to his level of risk of violence, however this
17 situation demonstrated that he could benefit from developing further insight into the
18 way he relates to the world around him.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Psychometric assessment**

35 Mr A was assessed using a variety of psychometric measures (see Table 2).
36 Where the required information was present in relation to each scale, *clinically*
37 *significant change* and *reliable change* were assessed according to Jacobson, Follette
38 and Revenstorf's (1984) methodology. According to this methodology, *clinically*
39 *significant change* can be considered as change that has taken the individual from a
40 problematic, dysfunctional, patient, client or user group to a score typical of the
41 'normal' population. *Reliable change* relates to whether an individual changed to an
42 extent that is unlikely to be due to simple measurement unreliability.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 < Insert table 2 about here >
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 It is of note that for the majority of the scales, Mr A scored in the 'non-
7 dysfunctional' or 'non-clinical' range pre-treatment as well as post-treatment, and
8 post-treatment his scores on some scales changed *against* the desired direction of
9 change. The impression management scale of the Paulhus Deception Scales (1999)
10 indicated the possibility of '*faking good*' both pre and post-treatment. Mr A's pre-
11 treatment score pattern on the Paulhus sub-scales indicates that he might be aware of
12 his shortcomings yet wants to be seen in a positive light, resulting in self-report being
13 overly positive. This fits with the psychological treatment itself highlighting that
14 *pleasing or impressing others* is a behavioural tendency for Mr A, showing a link
15 between psychometric findings and behavioural evidence. Given that his responses
16 may have been distorted, despite the comprehensive test battery used, little weight
17 was placed on the psychometric findings in assessing outcomes.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Given the clinical issues in Mr A's case, one particular score is of particular
31 interest. This is the Anger Control-Out (AC-O) subscale of the STAXI-2 (Spielberger,
32 1999). On this scale, higher scores are typically desirable (controlling outward
33 manifestations of anger), and Mr A scored in the 'high' range. On the surface, this
34 means that pre-treatment he was already scoring in a functional range on this subscale
35 and that post-treatment he had changed against the desired direction of change.
36 However, a high score could also be considered problematic for some clients because
37 over-control can lead to passivity, depression, and withdrawal. Consequently,
38 depending on the client, a reduction in score is desirable and given Mr A's tendency
39 to hold his feelings of anger in, resulting in a later outburst, it could be considered that
40 his pre-treatment high score on this scale is not desirable. As a result, Mr A's post-
41 treatment clinically significant (but not reliably) lowered score could be considered as
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 movement in the desired direction. This hypothesis should be considered with
7 caution, due to Mr A's possible distorted responding as per the Paulhus scale findings.
8
9

10 In summary, psychometric assessment did not reveal particularly problematic
11 areas of functioning within the constructs assessed by the scales both pre-and post-
12 treatment for Mr A. There was some movement against the desired direction of
13 change on some psychometric sub-scales, however where this did occur Mr A's score
14 remained in a non-problematic range. The Paulhus scale revealed the possibility of
15 overly positive self-report and so it is possible that his pattern of responding to the
16 questions within the psychometrics was distorted. In light of this finding, and clinical
17 evidence supporting this tendency to try to please others, psychometric assessments
18 were considered with caution.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 The therapist recommended that some future intervention focussing on the
28 importance of assertiveness may assist Mr A in getting his needs met. It was
29 considered that if he was willing, future psychological treatment focussing even more
30 on his RRP's (particularly on *revising* RRP's), exploring emotion recognition and
31 expression, and working on developing intimacy skills may also facilitate positive
32 well-being and risk management.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Discussion**

42 **Integrative CAT and CBT approach to offender treatment**

43
44 This case study used an integrative CAT and CDBT approach to the treatment
45 of an adult male with schizophrenia who had perpetrated IPV. Pollock (2006) puts
46 forward that CAT can be a useful form of psychotherapy in a forensic setting because
47 one of its objectives is *'to scaffold the offender's acquisition of the psychological*
48 *tools to promote self-knowledge, insight and the ability to self-reflect, developing a*
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 *mental model of the connection between both personality and crime... the meaning of*
7 *the offence and its predictable recurrence are overt features of the therapy'* (pp324-
8
9
10 325). This case study has demonstrated that this worked well in practice, because
11
12 although through twelve sessions Mr A did not revise all of the RRP's identified, he
13
14 developed some insight into his relationships and behaviour within these. CAT was a
15
16 useful framework that facilitated identification of dysfunctional behaviour patterns.
17
18 Some of the CAT tools were easier than others to adapt to meet Mr A's learning
19
20 needs, and a slow pace of therapy was needed to facilitate Mr A's understanding of
21
22 key CAT concepts such as RRP's. Mr A responded well to CBT informed exercises
23
24 that explored thoughts and feelings linking to behaviour in given situations, however
25
26 this approach did not necessarily address the causes of his high risk thoughts and
27
28 feelings. More than twelve sessions would have better met Mr A's needs, however
29
30 hospital resources did not allow for this. Consequently, clear recommendations for
31
32 follow-up intervention were made. Follow-up intervention may be particularly
33
34 important for Mr A given that risk of violence may be higher for those who
35
36 experience schizophrenia and comorbid substance-misuse (e.g. Fazel et al., 2009).

37
38 Transference and counter-transference can be understood within CAT in terms
39
40 of enactments of RRP's, with transference being awareness of the client inducting the
41
42 therapist into a particular role and counter transference being the therapist's
43
44 awareness of pressure to enact the role into which they have been inducted (Pollock &
45
46 Stowell-Smith, 2006). This was particularly relevant in Mr A's treatment in relation to
47
48 his 'impressing' role, whereby it would be easy as a therapist to be induced into the
49
50 'impressed/pleased' role. As Ryle (1997) highlights, such collusion could reinforce
51
52 the maladaptive RRP and result in maintaining the fragmented structure of the client's
53
54 personality. In this case, this could have reinforced the benefits of Mr A holding in or
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 'bottling up' his true feelings, behaving in a way designed to impress others,
7 ultimately maintaining the cycle of not getting his needs met. Supervision aided the
8 author in identifying and managing the potential for the client to 'pull' the therapist
9 towards colluding with these patterns.
10
11
12

13
14 Within this case study, outcome was difficult to assess. Firstly, impression
15 management limited psychometric assessment. Secondly, the in-patient environment
16 is restricted, adding to the inherent difficulties of assessing a patient who generally
17 holds in their feelings. Consequently, assessment of progress is largely subjective.
18
19
20
21 This highlights the importance of a multi-disciplinary approach to risk management.
22
23

24 Twelve sessions did not fully address Mr A's areas of need. As this case study
25 has highlighted, treatment applying approaches such as CAT may be difficult to adapt
26 for clients with lower intellectual functioning, and adapted treatment may take longer
27 to deliver than treatment designed for a client without additional learning needs.
28
29
30
31 However, in services where time and resources are finite, lengthier intervention could
32 be difficult to achieve. Despite this, given that that the aim of treatment was to
33 develop Mr A's insight into his index offence and to understand the development of
34 dysfunctional roles or patterns of behaviour for him, in order to reduce or help
35 manage associated risks, this could be considered a successful treatment. Taking this
36 forward with another patient it is therefore recommended that a CAT informed
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 intervention involves more than twelve sessions, and that consideration is given to
45
46
47 how other models and influences can be incorporated into the treatment, such as the
48 ~~Duluth model~~ [theories based on attachment \(Fonagy, 1999\). Pence & Paymar, 1993\).](#)
49
50

51 Conclusions

52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 This case study has demonstrated CAT informed treatment in practice. ~~and~~
7 ~~through this~~ Mr A exhibited behaviours in treatment that suggested insight and
8 reduced risk. ~~However, there~~ is limited research available on the effectiveness of
9 CAT with forensic clients and this case study is encouraging with regard to this
10 vulnerable client group. Pollock (2006) puts forward that CAT is conducive to risk,
11 need, and responsivity principles (see McGuire, 1995) with respect to 'what works'
12 with offenders, and that CAT shows many of the components of a valid forensic
13 psychotherapy. Future research will further inform the position, and in an economic
14 climate where services strive to gain value for money by providing treatment that is
15 deemed to be effective, the importance of research to inform evidence based practice
16 is further emphasised.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 References

- 31
32 Beck, A. T., & Weishaar, M. (2008). Cognitive therapy. In R. J. Corsini & D. Wedding (Eds.), *Current*
33 *psychotherapies*. 8th Ed. pp 263-294 Belmont, CA: Thomsons.
34
35 Buss, A. H. & Warren, W. L. (2000) *Aggression Questionnaire*. Los Angeles: Western Psychological
36 Services.
37
38 Butler, R.J. & Gasson, S.L. (2004). *The Self Image Profile for Adults*. London: Pearson Assessment
39
40 Christensen, L. & Mendoza, J. L. (1986). A method of assessing change in a single subject: an
41 alteration of the RC index. *Behavior Therapy*, 17, 305-308.
42
43 CORE System Group (1998). *CORE System User Manual*. Leeds: CORE System Group
44
45 Dutton D. (1994) Patriarchy and Wife Assault: The Ecological Fallacy. *Violence and Victims*, 9(2)
46 167-182.
47
48 Eells, T. D., & Lombart, K. G. (2004). Case formulation: Determining the focus in brief dynamic
49 psychotherapy. In D. P. Chapman (ed.), *Core processes in Brief Psychodynamic Psychotherapy*
50 (pp. 119-144). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Evans, C., Margison, F. & Barkham, M. (1998). The contribution of reliable and clinically significant
8 change methods to evidence-based mental health. *Evidence Based Mental Health*, 1,70-72
9
- 10
11 Evans, C., Mellor-Clark, J., Margison, F., Barkham, M., McGrath, G., Connell, J., & Audin, K. (2000).
12 Clinical Outcomes in Routine Evaluation: The CORE-OM. *Journal of Mental Health*, 9, 247-
13 255.
14
- 15
16 Fairbairn, W. R. D. (1952). *An Object Relations Theory of the Personality*. London: Tavistock.
17
- 18
19 Fazel, S., Gulati, G., Linsell, L., Geddes, J.R. & Grann, M. (2009). Schizophrenia and Violence:
20 Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses. *PLoS Medicine* 6(8): e1000120.
21
- 22
23 Fonagy, P. (1999). Male perpetrators of violence against women: An attachment perspective. *Journal*
24 *of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies*, 1(1), 7-27.
25
- 26
27 Gelles, R. J., & Maynard, P. E. (1987). A structural family systems approach to intervention in cases of
28 family violence. *Family Relations*, 36(3), 270-275.
29
- 30
31 Ghaderi, A. (2011). Does case formulation make a difference to treatment outcome? In P. Sturmey &
32 M. McMurran, *Forensic Case Formulation* (pp. 83-106). Chichester, UK: Wiley & Sons.
33
- 34
35 Gilbert, F. & Daffern, M. (2010). Integrating contemporary aggression theory with violent offender
36 treatment: How thoroughly do interventions target violent behaviour? *Aggression and Violent*
37 *Behaviour*, 15, 167-180.
- 38 Gondolf, E. W. (1988) *Battered Women as Survivors: An Alternative to Treating Learned*
39 *Helplessness*. Massachusetts, USA: Lexington Books.
- 40
41
42
43
- 44
45 Gresswell, D. M. & Hollin, C. R. (1992). Towards a new methodology of making sense of case
46 material: an illustrative case involving attempted multiple murder. *Criminal Behaviour and*
47 *Mental Health*, 2, 329-41
48
- 49
50 Howells, K. (1998). Cognitive Behavioural Interventions for Anger, Aggression and Violence. In N.
51 Tarrier, A. Wells & G. Haddock, *Treating Complex Cases; the cognitive behavioural therapy*
52 *approach*. Chichester, UK: Wiley & Sons.
53
- 54
55 Howells, K. & Day, A. (2002). Grasping the Nettle: Treating and rehabilitating the violent offender.
56 *Australian Psychologist*, 37, 222–228.
57
58
59
60

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, 10 pt

Formatted: Line spacing: 1.5 lines

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, 10 pt, Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Jacobson, N. S., Follette, W. C. & Revenstorf, D. (1984). Psychotherapy and outcome research:
8 Methods for reporting variability and evaluating clinical significance. *Behavior Therapy*, 15,
9 336-352
10
11
12 Jacobson, N. S. & Truax, P. (1991). Clinical significance: A statistical approach to defining meaningful
13 change in psychotherapy research. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 59(1), 12-19
14
15
16 Krampen, G. (2009). Psychotherapeutic Processes and Outcomes in Outpatient Treatment of Antisocial
17 Behaviour: An integrative Psychotherapy Approach. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*, 19
18 (3), 213-230.
19
20
21 Kropp, P. R., Hart, S. D., Webster, C. D. & Eaves, D. (2008). Manual for the Spousal Assault Risk
22 Assessment Guide (2nd Ed.). Vancouver, Canada: ProActive ReSolutions Inc.
23
24
25 McGuire, J. (Ed). (1995) *What Works: Reducing reoffending*. Chichester: Wiley.
26
27 McGuire, J. (2003). *Offender rehabilitation and treatment: Effective programs and policies to reduce*
28 *re-offending*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
29
30
31 Newell, A., Garrihy, A., Morgan, K., Raymond, C., & Gamble, H. (2009). Receiving a CAT
32 Reformulation Letter: What Makes a Good Experience? *Reformulation*, 29.
33
34
35 Paulhus, D. L. (1998). *Paulhus Deception Scales (PDS): The Balanced Inventory of Desirable*
36 *Responding-7*. North Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems inc.
37
38
39 Patton, J. H., Stanford, M. S., & Barratt, E. S. (1995). Factor structure of the Barratt Impulsiveness
40 Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 51, 768-774
41
42 Pence, E., & Paymar, M. (1993). *Education groups for men who batter: The Duluth model*. New York:
43 Springer.
44
45
46 Persons, J. B. (2008). *The Case Formulation Approach to Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*. New York,
47 NY: Guildford.
48
49
50 Pollock, P. H. & Belshaw, T. (1998). Cognitive analytic therapy for offenders. *The Journal of Forensic*
51 *Psychiatry*, 9 (3), 629-642.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Pollock, P. H., (2006) Final thoughts: The way forward for cognitive analytic therapy in forensic
7 settings. In P. H. Pollock, M. Stowell-Smith, & M. Gopfert (Eds). *Cognitive Analytic Therapy*
8 *for offenders: A new approach to forensic psychotherapy*. Hove; Routledge. pp 323-326
9
10
11 Pollock, P. H., & Stowell-Smith, M. (2006). Cognitive Analytic Therapy applied to offending. In P. H.
12 Pollock, M. Stowell-Smith and M. Gopfert (Eds.), *Cognitive Analytic Therapy for Offenders: A*
13 *new approach to forensic psychotherapy*. (pp. 1-43). London: Routledge.
14
15
16 Ryle, A. (1997). The structure and development of borderline personality disorder: A proposed model.
17 *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 170, 82-87.
18
19
20 Spielberger, C.D. (1999). *State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory*. Florida, USA: PAR Inc.
21
22 Sturme, P. (2008). *Behavioural Case Formulation and Intervention: A Functional Analytic Approach*.
23 Chichester: Wiley.
24
25
26 Turpin, C., Adu-White, D., Barnes, P., Chalmers-Woods, R., Delisser, C., Dudley, J. and Mesbahi, M.,
27 (2011). What are the important ingredients of a CAT goodbye letter? *Reformulation*, 30-31.
28
29
30 Walker, J. S., & Bright, J. A. (2009). Cognitive therapy for violence: Reaching the parts that anger
31 management doesn't reach. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology*, 20, 174-201.
32
33 Wechsler, D. (2008). *Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, 4th Edition (WAIS-IV)*. San Antonio, TX:
34 Pearson.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 1: MSFA of early development, origins of offending, and current IPV offence sequence

Functional analysis: Early development	Functional analysis: Origins of offending behaviour	Functional analysis: Current offence sequence
<p>A: Separation from father, inconsistent visits from father Mother out working a lot Violence within the family home (witness/possible victim) Family do not discuss feelings Father and stepfather bodybuilding/karate Father misusing drugs</p> <p>B: Behavioural difficulties at school Early substance misuse Idolised father Rejection</p> <p>C: Wanted to be like his father – bodybuilding/fighting Violence within the home and to achieve status became normalised No emotional outlet/support – does not talk about feelings Few friends</p>	<p>A: Experiences from sequence (1) Left school with few qualifications Unstable employment Unsuccessful intimate relationships Unsuccessful at fighting/bodybuilding Idolising father On-going violence in the home from stepfather Onset of psychotic illness</p> <p>B: Feeling rejected, angry, low self esteem More body building Substance misuse (to body-build and for self esteem) Selling drugs to fund substance misuse/lifestyle Suspicious of people Violence during conflict with others Try to impress others with material things</p> <p>C: Status among peers Addiction Relationships without emotional intimacy Owe others money (for drugs) Fear rejection in intimate relationships and in general General violence in life linked to drug dealing No emotional support/outlet</p>	<p>A: Experiences from sequences (1) and (2) Relapse of psychotic symptoms Partner left for several days Partner stealing from him (drugs and money)</p> <p>B: Worry about rejection, increased anger about rejection Thinks that partner has had sex with her ex-husband Feeling angry at being used Violence against partner</p> <p>C: Prison/hospitalisation</p>
<u>Key Learning Outcomes:</u>	<u>Key Learning Outcomes:</u>	<u>Key Learning Outcomes:</u>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Violence normal within the home 2. Development of using maladaptive coping strategies (drugs, behavioural) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Learned that drugs and bodybuilding help his self-esteem. 2. Learned that he can impress others/avoid rejection 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Learned that he continues to be rejected despite providing material things. Experienced increased anger due to

difficulties at school).	if he has material possessions/money.	perception that partner had been having sex with her ex-husband. 2. Being violent was a way of expressing emotions and trying to avoid rejection.
<u>Hypothesis:</u> The behaviour that was linked to parental separation and feelings of rejection led to circumstances that reinforced the feeling of rejection (behavioural difficulties at school, few friends). Violence as a means of discipline/control within the home and within an intimate relationship became normalised, as did substance misuse. He looked up to his father (including father's physique, material possessions) but feared the rejection he experienced when father visited only occasionally.	<u>Hypothesis:</u> Mr X's offending behaviour progressed into selling substances, which in part was to fund his lifestyle. The lifestyle itself involved violence relating to drug dealing. He learned to avoid rejection by impressing others with money/possessions and this helped him achieve several girlfriends although these relationships lacked intimacy. Mr X was suspicious of others because of his lifestyle (he owed people money), because he feared rejection (in any relationship) and because of his schizophrenic illness.	<u>Hypothesis:</u> From this sequence it can be hypothesised that Mr X's offences against his partner were driven by build-up of emotions due to fear of, and perception of, being rejected and used. This build up of emotions was also fuelled by psychotic symptoms.

Table 2: Pre and post treatment psychometric assessments including assessment of reliable and clinically significant change

Psychometric	Subscale and desired direction of change ¹	Mr X's scores				Norms		Change ²		Clinically significant change criterion	Clinically significant change?
		Pre-treatment		Post-treatment		Functional mean (SD) ³	Dysfunctional mean (SD)	Reliable change criterion	Reliable change?		
		Score	Range ⁴	Score	Range						
Aggression Questionnaire (AQ; Buss & Warren, 2000) ⁵	AQ total ↓	47 (38T)	Low	67 (49T)	Average	73.3 (24.9)	76.9 (25.0)	16.91	NO	75.10	NO
	Physical aggression (PHY) ↓	13 (47T)	Average	18 (52T)	Average	15.8 (7.7)	17.3 (7.0)	7.39	NO	16.59	YES
	Verbal aggression (VER) ↓	6 (34T)	Low	14 (54T)	Average	11.8 (4.3)	12.7 (4.7)	5.84	YES	12.23	YES
	Anger (ANG) ↓	9 (40T)	Low-average	11 (46T)	Average	15.1 (5.7)	14.8 (5.8)	7.41	NO	N/A	N/A
	Hostility (HOS) ↓	13 (47T)	Average	15 (51T)	Average	17.1 (6.6)	19.6 (7.0)	7.76	NO	18.31	NO
	Indirect aggression (IND) ↓	6 (28T)	Very low	9 (42T)	Low average	13.5 (4.8)	12.4 (5.4)	7.16	NO	N/A	N/A
	Inconsistent responding (INC) ↓	1	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI-	State Anger (S-Ang) ↓	15	Low-moderate	15	Low-moderate	19.3 (6.9)	22.7 (8.5)	5.76	NO	20.82	NO

¹ Arrows indicate the desired direction of change, however for some scales/subscales, totals in the high or low extreme can be indicative of problems in that area.
² *Reliable change criterion* for each scale calculated according to methods originating in Jacobson, Follette and Revenstorf (1984), amended by Christensen and Mendoza (1986) and later described in Jacobson and Truax (1991) and Evans, Margison and Barkham (1998). *Clinically significant change criterion* for each scale calculated according to methods originating in Jacobson, Follette and Revenstorf (1984). Change in the desired direction is listed in **bold (YES)**, change against the desired direction in *italics (YES)* in the 'change' columns.
³ SD = Standard Deviation
⁴ Range as specified in psychometric manual
⁵ Internal consistency (alpha coefficient) values were only available for the AQ non-dysfunctional sample, therefore reliable and clinically significant change values based on functional sample. Dysfunctional mean lower than functional mean on ANG and IND subscales, as desired direction of change is down this results in inability to calculate clinically significant change criterion for these subscales.

2, Spielberger, 1999) ⁶											
S-Ang/Feeling anger (S-Ang/F) ↓	5	Low-moderate	5	Low-moderate	7.1 (2.8)	9.2 (4.0)	3.30	NO	7.97	NO	
S-Ang/Feel like expressing anger verbally (S-Ang/V) ↓	5	Low-moderate	5	Low-moderate	6.4 (2.7)	7.7 (3.6)	3.11	NO	6.96	NO	
S-Ang/Feel like expressing anger physically (S-Ang/P) ↓	5	Low-moderate	5	Low-moderate	5.8 (2.1)	6.0 (2.1)	2.17	NO	5.90	NO	
Trait Anger (T-Ang) ↓	16	Moderate	12	Low	18.4 (5.4)	20.1 (5.9)	5.86	NO	19.21	NO	
T-Ang/Angry temperament (T-Ang/T) ↓	6	Moderate	5	Moderate	6.4 (2.5)	6.9 (2.9)	2.56	NO	6.63	NO	
T-Ang/Angry reaction (T-Ang-R) ↓	5	Low	4	Low	8.7 (2.6)	9.6 (3.2)	3.51	NO	9.10	NO	
Anger Expression- Out (AX-O) ↓	11	Low	10	Low	15.4 (3.7)	15.7 (4.1)	5.16	NO	15.54	NO	
Anger Expression- In (AX-I) ↓	10	Low	11	Low	16.4 (4.0)	18.3 (4.7)	5.80	NO	17.27	NO	
Anger Control-Out (AC-O) ↑	29	High	27	Moderate	23.5 (5.0)	21.1 (0.2)	0.23	YES	21.19	NO	
Anger Control-In (AC-I) ↑	26	Moderate	21	Moderate	22.6 (5.8)	21.4 (6.1)	5.10	NO	22.02	YES	
Anger Expression Index (AX Index) ↓	14	Low	21	Low	33.7 (13.1)	39.6 (14.0)	16.42	NO	36.55	NO	
Barratt Impulsivity Scale (BIS-11; Patton, Stanford & Barratt, 1995)	Motor ↓	14	N/A	17	N/A	15.0 (4.2)	18.0 (7.0)	N/A	N/A	16.13	YES
	Cognitive/Attention ↓	19	N/A	22	N/A	16.3 (5.3)	19.0 (7.0)	N/A	N/A	17.46	NO
	Non-planning ↓	25	N/A	24	N/A	17.8 (4.9)	22.0 (9.0)	N/A	N/A	19.28	NO

⁶ Higher scores on the AC-O subscale of the STAXI-2 are typically desirable (controlling outward manifestations of anger) however a high score can be considered problematic for some clients as over-control can lead to passivity, depression and withdrawal. Consequently, depending on the client, a reduction in score is desirable.

	Total Score ↓	58	N/A	63	N/A	64.9 (10.2)	69.7 (11.5)	13.19	NO	67.16	NO
Clinical Outcomes in Routine Evaluation – Outcome Measure (CORE-OM; Core Systems Group, 1998; Evans et al., 2000) ⁷	Well-being ↓	1.00	N/A	0.00	N/A	0.91 (0.83)	2.37 (0.96)	N/A	N/A	1.59	NO
	Problems/symptoms ↓	0.50	N/A	0.83	N/A	0.90 (0.72)	2.31 (0.88)	N/A	N/A	1.53	NO
	Functioning ↓	0.75	N/A	0.58	N/A	0.85 (0.65)	1.86 (0.84)	N/A	N/A	1.29	NO
	Risk ↓	0.00	N/A	0.00	N/A	0.20 (0.45)	0.63 (0.75)	N/A	N/A	0.36	NO
	Total (all items) ↓	0.56	N/A	0.50	N/A	0.76 (0.59)	1.86 (0.75)	N/A	N/A	1.24	NO
	Total (all non-risk items) ↓	0.68	N/A	0.61	N/A	0.88 (0.66)	2.12 (0.81)	N/A	N/A	1.44	NO
	Paulhus Deception Scales (PDS BIDR Version 7; Paulhus, 1998) ⁸	Impression Management (IM) ↓	12 (69T)	Much above average, may be invalid (faking good)	11 (66T)	Much above average, may be invalid (faking good)	6.7 (4.0)	5.3 (3.6)	3.99	NO	N/A
	Self-Deceptive Enhancement (SDE) ↓	4 (57T)	Slightly above average	8 (71T)	Very much above average	2.2 (2.3)	2.2 (2.7)	3.96	YES	N/A	N/A
	PDS Total ↓	16 (74T)	Very much above average	19 (83T)	Very much above average	8.9 (3.7)	7.5 (3.5)	3.63	NO	N/A	N/A
The Self image Profile for Adults (SIP-AD; Butler & Gasson, 1994) ⁹	Self-image (SI) ↑	102	Not below cut-off	118	Not below cut-off	127.2 (17.5)	Not normed	15.49	YES	N/A	N/A
	Self-esteem (SE) ↓	56	Not above cut-off	65	Not above cut-off	35.2 (15.4)	Not normed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Self-satisfaction	11	N/A	7	N/A	8.4 (6.7)	Not normed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

⁷ Reliability figures not available for CORE-OM therefore reliable change could not be calculated using the methods originating in Jacobson, Follette and Revenstorf (1984), although cut off scores were available in the CORE-OM manual, which indicated that the client was in non-clinical range both pre and post intervention.

⁸ Dysfunctional mean lower than functional mean on IM subscale and PDS total, as desired direction of change is down this results in inability to calculate clinically significant change criterion for these scales. SDE subscale: functional and dysfunctional means are the same for SDE subscale therefore clinically significant change criterion cannot be calculated.

⁹ Dysfunctional norms were not available for the SIP-AD therefore reliable change is based on a functional sample and the clinically significant change criterion cannot be calculated. Internal consistency value was only available for the SI subscale.

	(SS) ↑										
	Self-certainty negative (SCert- ve) ↓	4	N/A	1	N/A	0.1 (0.6)	Not normed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Self-certainty positive (SCert+ve) ↑	7	N/A	7	N/A	3.6 (4.0)	Not normed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Outlook (O) ↑	4.5	N/A	4.0	N/A	4.1 (0.9)	Not normed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Consideration (Con) ↑	3.9	N/A	4.6	N/A	4.3 (0.8)	Not normed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Social (S) ↑	3.4	N/A	4.2	N/A	4.4 (0.8)	Not normed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Physical (P) ↑	0.7	N/A	1.3	N/A	4.4 (1.2)	Not normed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Competence (Com) ↑	3.4	N/A	3.0	N/A	3.8 (0.8)	Not normed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Moral (M) ↑	3.6	N/A	1.0	N/A	4.5 (0.8)	Not normed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A