1 Title: How do parole board members in England and Wales construct decisions about

2 whether to release perpetrators of intimate partner violence from prison?

3

1. Abstract

Background

Existing research explores Parole Board decision-making, but not specifically for perpetrators

of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV), a special case due to the gendered and secretive nature of

IPV and the role of control in predicting reoffending.

Aim

To identify associations between case variables in England and Wales Parole Board decisions

regarding perpetrators of IPV and explore how these variables help construct the decision.

Methods

Logistic regressions regarding decisions in a sample of all 137 male prisoners who had

abused women and applied for release or progression to open conditions in England and

Wales from April 2018 to September 2019, developed into latent class analyses.

Thematic analyses of 6 interviews with Parole Board members about decision-making in IPV

cases.

Results

Release decisions were strongly predicted by the recommendations of Offender Managers,

Offender Supervisors and Psychologists, mediated by the Parole Board's confidence in their

ability. Decisions were also significantly associated with custodial behaviour and attendance

26   on courses, mediated by the Board's confidence in the prisoner's insight and honesty.

27   Thematic analysis was both consistent with these findings and provided a context in which

28   the associations could be understood.

29

30   **Conclusions**

31   The findings have implications for understanding the dynamic between professional decisions

32   and the Parole Board's decision; for the importance of Offender Managers demonstrating

33   their expertise and ability to manage risk; for Parole Board members' reflection and

34   development; for academic research into IPV; and for those who have experienced IPV and

35   are looking to understand parole decisions about their abuser.

36

37   **Key words**:

38   Parole Board decisions; decision-making; intimate partner violence; heuristics; systems

39   thinking

40

50

51

2. Background

How general parole decisions are made

The term 'parole' comes from the French for 'word of honour', but parole decisions today

require much more than the prisoner's word.

The Parole Board in England and Wales decides whether to: direct a prisoner's release;

recommend that they progress from 'closed' to 'open' prison (allowing them more time in the

community); or direct that they remain in prison until a further statutory review or their

remaining term, whichever is shorter. The Board must be "satisfied that it is no longer

necessary for the protection of the public that [the prisoner] be confined" (Parole Board,

2019) in order to direct release or recommend progression. They are assisted by a dossier

containing relevant reports from professionals including: the Offender Supervisor (OS) who

oversees the offender's time in prison; the Offender Manager (OM) responsible for the risk

management plan after release; Psychologists; and coordinators of relevant programmes.

Existing research has identified factors associated with general parole decisions, and how

these are constructed within a wider system of case-specific and external influences. The

factors can include prisoner characteristics such as their age and 'parole readiness' (Huebner

& Bynum, 2006), mental health (Caplan, 2010; Shingler & Needs, 2018, although Houser et

al., 2019, found minimal impact) and substance misuse (Bradford & Cowell, 2012). Other

relevant factors include the prisoner's offending: the severity of the index offence (Caplan,

2010; Huebner & Bynum, 2006; Tzeng, 2014) and patterns of offending (Caplan, 2010); and

their subsequent time in prison: their 'institutional behaviour' (Caplan, 2010; Connor, 2016;

Huebner & Bynum, 2006) including whether they have completed perpetrator programmes

(Connor, 2016). The perceived effectiveness of the risk management plan is also an important

consideration (Bradford & Cowell, 2012), reflecting Padfield's (2017) emphasis on the 'luck'

78   of having high-quality Offender Managers and a Parole Board willing to "take a chance" on

79   their plan. Decision-makers are also wary of 'impression management' among violent

80   offenders (Mills & Kroner, 2006) and sex offenders (Cochran & Comeau-Kirschner, 2016).

81   Overall, therefore, the parole decision involves an understanding of internal protections

82   against reoffending: 'habit-based compliance' and 'normative compliance' based on moral

83   values, as well as how reoffending is prevented by external incentives ('instrumental

84   compliance') and coercion ('constraint-based compliance') (Bottoms, 2001).

85   However, these factors have not been studied in the specific case of Intimate Partner

86   Violence (IPV), and more qualitative and quantitative research is needed to test these

87   associations (Padfield, 2017). The current mixed methods study explores how Parole Boards

88   in England and Wales make decisions about parole for a man imprisoned for IPV against a

89   female partner or ex-partner. These decisions warrant attention due to how the nature of IPV

90   offences predicts reoffending, and the gendered and secretive nature of most IPV.

91   This research considers the tensions decision-makers experience in these contexts: between

92   the broader legal framework and the minutiae of individual cases; and between public safety

93   and the right of the individual to fair treatment and the chance to reform (Kohler-Hausmann,

94   2019).

95

96   **The complexity of decision-making in criminal justice**

97   A decision to release is not only determined by a set of case characteristics.

98   Social psychological research on the relationship between internal and external factors

99   affecting a decision-maker (Hancock et al., 2018; Rothstein et al., 2006) includes the

100   interaction between conscious and unconscious decision-making (Greene & Dalke, 2020;

101   Soon et al., 2008), and the role of 'heuristics' or mental short-cuts (Fiedler & Sydow, 2015)

102   as applied to decisions in the courts (Dhami & Belton, 2017) and criminal justice more

103   broadly (Peer & Gamliel, 2013).

104   The mechanisms through which Parole Board members reach decisions are further

105   complicated by the 'risk society' (Kemshall, 2019) and 'risk colonisation' (Rothstein et al.,

106   2006). This involves the pressure to reduce organisational risk - i.e. blame for a prisoner

107   reoffending after release, such as in the Hanson or Rice cases (Harding, 2006) - being

108   conflated or confused with the aim to reduce societal risk, which includes balancing different

109   risks of societal harm.

110

111   **Special considerations regarding Intimate Partner Violence decisions**

112

113   Research on parole decisions about perpetrators of IPV is limited, and complicated by the

114   nature of IPV, which is arguably highly gendered (Anderson & Umberson, 2001; Johnson,

115   2006; Kimmel, 2002; Razera et al., 2017), occurs in private (creating greater uncertainty for

116   decision-makers), and overlaps numerous different offences. While the Government's recent

117   introduction of the offence of 'coercion and control' (Myhill & Hohl, 2016) is specific to

118   IPV, other relevant offences including murder, rape, assault and false imprisonment are not,

119   though this is partly mitigated by the creation of a statutory definition of domestic abuse in

120   the current *Domestic Abuse Bill* (Parliament, 2020).

121   Domestic Violence Perpetrator Programmes (DVPPs) seek to reduce reoffending, and have

122   been linked to an increased likelihood of a release decision (Connor, 2016). However, while

123   individual trials suggest reduced abusive behaviour following attendance (Doyle et al., 2018;

124   Kelly & Westmarland, 2015; Strang et al., 2017), wider systematic studies have not identified

125   a significant difference in reoffending between abusers who have, and have not, attended

126   courses (Babcock et al., 2004; Gondolf, 2011; Haggård et al., 2017; Vigurs et al., 2016).

127 Further understanding of the role of DVPPs in release decisions is therefore needed, given the

128 lack of evidence for their effectiveness.

129 The 'nature' of IPV can predict future offending (Goldstein et al., 2016; Kingsnorth, 2006),

130 considered in this research in terms of: the Composite Abuse Scale (Hegarty et al., 2005)

131 which identified 'Severe Combined Abuse' as more dangerous to the survivor's welfare than

132 physical, emotional, sexual abuse or harassment alone; and Johnson's (2006) typology that

133 distinguished 'Intimate Terrorism', involving an element of control over the victim, from

134 'Situational Couple Violence' which lacks unilateral control. Intimate terrorism, victim-

135 blaming and minimisation correlate with self-reported repeat offending (Lila et al., 2008;

136 Scott & Straus, 2007), while control, power, jealousy and misogyny/patriarchal beliefs are all

137 found more commonly in clinical samples than general population IPV (Love et al., 2018).

138 Within the DASH (Richards, 2009) model of risk, the following variables predicted future

139 offending: prior violent history; alcohol and drug abuse; recent separation; and a victim's

140 level of fear of their abuser (Almond et al., 2017).

141

142 This research fills gaps in two areas of the research:

143   1) which factors are most strongly associated, in England and Wales, with a Parole

144   Board decision to release a perpetrator of IPV (or progress them to open conditions),

145   and whether these factors overlap with those associated with IPV reoffending or

146   parole decisions more widely;

147   2) how these factors affect decisions: whether parole board members are conscious of all

148   the factors that influence their decisions, and why they place weight on specific

149   factors.

7

150   3. Methods

151

152   To explore associations between factors and decisions *and* the dynamics behind any

153   associations, this research includes quantitative and qualitative elements.

154   The cases include a range of crimes against a current or former intimate partner. The study

155   includes decisions about offenders on indeterminate, life and determinate sentences, either for

156   initial release or for release after recall.

157   This article reports midway findings from a project that received ethical approval from the

158   UCL Institute of Education Ethics Committee in October 2018 (no. Z6364106/2018/07/78),

159   and from the Parole Board's Research Governance Group in May 2019.

160   The lead researcher is a male PhD student, – a point for reflection given the gendered nature

161   of the topic - a former social worker and expert witness with several years' experience of IPV

162   cases in the criminal and family courts, providing background insights but also creating the

163   possibility of bias from prior assumptions about the topic.

164

165   **The Quantitative Element**

166

167   The analysis used 137 decision letters representing each eligible parole hearing from April

168   2018 to September 2019 that involved male perpetrators and female victims in open or closed

169   prisons (after excluding 5 cases involving female/transgender perpetrators and/or

170   male/transgender victims, or where the offender was in a psychiatric institution).

171

172   The variables were recoded into binary versions, allowing logistic regressions between each

173   candidate variable and the decision to release the prisoner (or progress them to open

174   conditions), and latent class analyses to identify groups of cases, before conducting further

175   logistic regressions between membership of those latent classes and the decision.

176

The Qualitative Element

178

179 Interviews were conducted from August to November 2019, with 20 Parole Board members

180 recruited through an appeal via the Parole Board Policy and Research Lead. This self-

181 selecting convenience sample (from the population of 246 members), comprised 8 former

182 probation officers, 3 members with backgrounds working with IPV cases, 4 psychologists, 2

183 judges and 3 lay members. Interviewees received a consent form, information sheet and the

184 topic guide in advance.

185 Six interview transcripts were selected at random for analysis, and double-coded by authors

186 independently as the first stage of an inductive-deductive-recursive cycle (Rubin & Rubin,

187 2011) in which data were recoded as themes emerged (including the quantitative analysis

188 themes).

189 4. Results
190

Quantitative Data: Logistic Regressions

192

Logistic regressions identified 17 factors (see Table 1) significantly associated ($p<0.05$) with

a decision to release an offender or progress them to open conditions. Of particular note were

the associations between professional recommendations and decisions: prisoners were much

more likely to be released if their Offender Supervisor, Psychologist and/or Offender

Manager recommended it. Other factors strongly associated with a decision to release or

progress a prisoner included the Parole Board's impression of personal factors such as the

prisoner's honesty, insight, positive attendance on DVPPs, and working relationships with

professionals. There were also statistically significant associations between a

release/progression decision and 'structural' factors such as the effectiveness of the risk

management plan, the imminence of risk (more so than the level of risk) and the offender's

links in the community.

204

[table 1 here]

206

Collinearity testing identified no redundancy: no two variables had a Variance Inflation

Factor (VIF) greater than 7.5, short of the suggested cut-off for redundancy of 10 (O'Brien,

2007).

210

Quantitative data: latent class analyses of significant factors

212

213 Latent class analysis of the 'professional input' categories (see Table 2) showed a significant

214 association between the recommendations of the OM, OS and psychologist, and the Board's

215 decision.

216

217 [table 2 here]

218

219 Only 1 of 45 prisoners were released/progressed where professional opinion opposed it,

220 compared to 77 out of 90 prisoners where professionals mostly supported release –

221 professional recommendations therefore seemed to be a necessary condition for release,

222 although not always sufficient. This was made clearer in a three-class model, which split the

223 latter class into two: one where 64 of 65 were released, and another intermediate class where

224 only about half (13 of 25) were released. This smaller category was distinguished by higher

225 levels of perceived risk and by lower confidence in the effectiveness of the risk management

226 plan, despite professional support for release.

227 In other words, Parole Boards were inclined to release/progress prisoners on the

228 recommendation of professionals, provided they had confidence in those professionals'

229 expertise and their ability to manage the risk.

230 Further latent class analyses identified best-fit models for those factors associated with the

231 prisoner's 'journey' from offending to the hearing (Table 3) and with the prisoner's life after

232 release (Table 4). Both sets of categories were significantly associated with different

233 likelihoods of release, though accounting for less variance in outcome than the 'professional

234 input' model (Table 2).

235

236 [table 3 here]

237

238   [table 4 here]

239

240   **Qualitative data: thematic analysis of interviews**

241

242   Initial coding from 6 transcripts produced 5 overarching themes as follows:

243

244   1. **The Parole Board member within the decision**

245   Interviewees reflected on how their decision-making was influenced (consciously and

246   subconsciously) by their backgrounds - *"we see the world through the prisms of our past*

247   *experiences"* (Interviewee #02) - and by the tensions between personal feelings, their

248   theoretical knowledge, and the legal tests: *"occasionally something just gets under your skin,*

249   *and you can't legislate for it happening"* (Interviewee #03)

250

251   2. **Offender journey**

252   Interviewees discussed how they considered the path the offender has followed: from

253   previous patterns of offending and the index offence, through their experience of prison, and

254   the evidence for change. This included exploring the role of controlling behaviour in previous

255   offences, and the degree to which the offender showed remorse and took responsibility for

256   their actions.

257   They considered the tension between real and apparent change: "*whether they've taken*

258   *responsibility of their offending... tangible evidence that they've shifted in attitudes*"

259   (Interviewee #04) or "*whether he just paid lip service*" (Interviewee #01).

260   Interviewees were not impressed by attendance on courses (DVPPs), but by its effects, e.g.

261   *"whether you can see evidence that the* [DVPP]*'s made any difference to how the person*

262   *talks about things*" (Interviewee #03).

263

3. Looking ahead to life after release

All the interviewees said they considered the quality of risk management plans post-release

and the prisoner's overall circumstances, i.e. "*what are they coming out to?*" (Interviewee

#01). They considered the offender's age; social/community resources; behaviour in the

community, how much time has elapsed; and their relationships with their community and

potential partners.

They were not only concerned with the presence of a factor but the nuanced role it played: for

example, whether their close-knit family could be said to be "*protective*" or just "*supportive*"

(Interviewee #05); or whether a close relationship with professionals suggested an

encouraging degree of compliance, or a concerning degree of dependence that lacked what

Bottoms (2001) called 'habit-based' or 'normative' compliance. They emphasised the

manageability and "*imminence of risk*" (Interviewee #01): whether the risk is easily

identified in advance and whether the offender can self-manage or be trusted to disclose

problems. For example: "*you're more likely to take a punt on release if you're confident that*

the risk management plan is 'on it' and ready to recall if necessary" (Interviewee #04).

4. Confidence in other professionals

Interviewees described shifting levels of confidence, scepticism and trust in experts such as

psychologists and OMs and how their evidence stands up to scrutiny. For example, there

were cases where "*a panel wonders whether the OM would be strong enough when being*

challenged" (Interview #4). Further, there appeared to be a wariness of release

recommendations where professionals place more weight on an offender's custodial

compliance than future risk, e.g. "[they're] *well behaved in prison, very compliant, so you'll*

get the OM and OS saying 'release them' because they're looking at current behaviour"

288 (Interviewee #5). They also described the need for confidence in probation officer's ability to

289 create and implement an effective risk management plan, and the tension between

290 consistency and integrity – they found similar conclusions encouraging *unless* one expert's

291 conclusions were simply adopted uncritically by others. In this sense, interviewees

292 consistently perceived that the psychologist tended to be given *"an exalted role of*

293 *importance"* (Interviewee #1)

294

295 **5. Environmental pressures in the hearing and beyond**

296 The hearing structure itself plays a role, with interviewees usually feeling less risk-averse

297 when meeting an offender than when reading the relevant information. For example:

298 "*I'd never accept releasing on the papers… there have been many, many times when I've*

299 *changed my mind after hearing from the prisoner*" (Interviewee #01)

300 "*more often than not* [the prisoner's presence] *makes release a bit more likely*" (Interviewee

301 #04).

302 Interviewees also acknowledged external influences: pressures to release (especially for IPPs)

303 but also pressure from media/public against release (particularly after high-profile cases such

304 as Worboys). They argued: "*it's really nuanced decision-making, which can be hard to*

305 *convey and explain*" outside the hearing (Interviewee #04).

306 They identified dissonance between the legal and substantive impacts of information where

307 they were legally prohibited from including something in their deliberations but were still

308 aware of it, e.g. the inclusion of a victim impact statement – "*if I'm hearing that, you can't*

309 *not be affected*" (Interviewee #04) or the involvement of children: "*it shouldn't legally make*

310 *any difference to our job*" (Interviewee #02) yet "*you can't 'un-know' things that are in a*

311 *dossier*" (Interviewee 04).

312

313   These five overarching themes converged with the quantitative associations, as explored

314   further in the next section.

315   5. Discussion

316

317

318 This study helps to identify factors associated with a decision to release IPV perpetrators, and

319 to shed some light on the mechanisms by which these factors lead to a decision. The

320 recommendations of the OS, OM and psychologist were the strongest predictors, especially

321 when the recommendation was *against* release/progression.

322 The association between recommendations and decisions could also reflect a tendency for

323 decision-makers to absorb assumptions from previous decision-makers (Peer & Gamliel,

324 2013), or even the "chumminess" bemoaned by Padfield (2017). There was the risk that the

325 psychologist's report may become reified, and unduly influence the OM and OS (who read

326 the report before giving their own recommendations) – a perception shared by prisoners

327 (Shingler & Needs, 2018). Alternatively, the association may reflect that the OM, OS and

328 psychologist are influenced by the same factors as the Parole Board.

329

330 Our finding that prisoners who had completed DVPPs with 'positive' or 'neutral' feedback

331 were 5.3 times more likely to be released (see Table 1) than those who had not (either

332 through non-attendance or unsatisfactory attendance) was consistent with prior research

333 (Connor, 2016). However, both the latent class analysis and thematic analysis suggested that

334 offenders with good custodial behaviour and attendance on courses were much less likely to

335 be released if they did not also impress the Board with their insight and honesty.

336

337 The results were also consistent with previous findings (Caplan, 2010; Huebner & Bynum,

338 2006; Tzeng, 2014) identifying associations between the nature and severity of the offence(s)

339 and the Parole Board's decision. However, this association did not relate to the type of

340 offence but to the nature of IPV involved, using Johnson's (2006) distinction between

341   offenders who exert control over their victims ('intimate terrorism') and those whose

342   behaviour is chaotic and not involving control ('situational couple violence'). The latter

343   group were over 6 times more likely to be released than the former (see Table 1). This

344   reflects interviewees' perceptions that someone whose violence is linked to visible risk

345   factors (e.g. alcohol and drug misuse, unstable mental health, disengagement from networks)

346   can be more easily recalled before becoming violent, compared to someone with a controlling

347   personality.

348

349   However, the quantitative data did not reflect the consistent emphasis by interviewees, or the

350   findings of previous research (Almond et al., 2017; Caplan, 2010) on previous IPV offending

351   or substance abuse. While offenders with no prior offending or substance misuse were more

352   likely to be released, the difference was not statistically significant for the current sample

353   size.

354

355   Offenders were much more likely to be released if they were serving indeterminate or life

356   sentences and had served a longer sentence, but the latent class with the highest chances of

357   release were those who also had robust risk management plans, a good record of behaviour in

358   the community and broadly positive community networks in place. The interviewees

359   consistently emphasised risk manageability rather than risk level, consistent with the relative

360   effect sizes of these factors (and the significance of the quality of risk management plans) in

361   the logistic analyses.

362   This is not only consistent with broader findings around the importance of 'parole readiness'

363   (Huebner & Bynum, 2006) and the risk management plan (Bradford & Cowell, 2012) but

364   resembles the 'willingness to take a chance' identified as a more random variable by Padfield

365   (2017). These findings suggest that what seems like a 'punt' based on the offender's

366   characteristics may be driven by the reassurance provided by the quality of the OM's plan.

367

368   **Strengths and Limitations of the research**

369   The analysis, like the research itself, is provisional: the finished project will involve a larger

370   quantitative dataset (by extending the timeframe earlier than April 2018) where these

371   conclusions can be tested, and further rounds of thematic coding and analysis across all 20

372   interview transcripts. There are gaps in the research: it does not allow firm conclusions about

373   the causal direction underpinning these associations since it only considers each case as a

374   'snapshot' after the hearing has concluded; and it does not analyse the significance of the

375   prisoner's ethnicity or whether they have children (neither of which were routinely included

376   in the decision letters).

377   Further research could use a longitudinal approach to unpick the causal direction of some of

378   these associations, exploring in more depth whether individual views form in parallel, one-

379   after-the-other, or through their interaction in the hearing.

380   However, the research demonstrates the feasibility of a mixed-methods design for a subset of

381   parole decisions, while producing statistically significant results despite the smaller sample. It

382   also allows discussion of convergent themes across different types of data (we found no

383   divergences) and the focus on decisions about male perpetrators of IPV in England and Wales

384   is novel.

385   Ultimately, the research contributes to the field by demonstrating significant correlations

386   between key aspects of a case (most significantly, the recommendations of other

387   professionals) and the Parole Board's decision, at the same time as providing a qualitative

388   context in which these associations can be better understood.

6. Implications for policy and practice

This research extends the study of parole decision-making to the special case of IPV offenders. The findings support previous research around the influence of professionals on a decision-making process, and overlap with research on parole decisions across all offenders (custodial behaviour, attending programmes, honesty) and with research on factors that predict IPV: the prisoner's insight and the absence of controlling behaviour.

The findings have implications for the recommendations of the Offender Manager, Offender Supervisor and especially the Psychologist, and whether these exercise a de facto 'veto' over a prisoner's release: while Parole Boards can release a prisoner over professional objections, in practice they very rarely do. Arguably this could amount to an informal dynamic where, effectively, prisoners must first secure professional recommendations for release/progression before seeking the Parole Board's final approval.

The findings have implications for Offender Managers: whether the Board accepts their recommendations is closely linked to their perceived expertise and ability to manage the offender's risk.

The findings are useful for academic research into IPV offenders, for the future training of criminal justice professionals, and for Parole Board members' reflection and development. They also have implications for people who have experienced IPV who seek deeper understanding of why a perpetrator was, or was not, released: for example, how perpetrators of intimate terrorism are less likely to be released, and how attendance on programmes and other 'lip service' is insufficient to secure release.

414   7. References
415

416   Almond, L., McManus, M., Brian, D., & Merrington, D. P. (2017). Exploration of the risk

417   factors contained within the UK's existing domestic abuse risk assessment tool

418   (DASH): Do these risk factors have individual predictive validity regarding

419   recidivism? *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, *9*(1), 58–68.

420   https://doi.org/10.1108/JACPR-01-2016-0211

421   Anderson, K. L., & Umberson, D. (2001). Gendering violence: Masculinity and power in

422   men's accounts of domestic violence. *Gender & Society*, *15*(3), 358–380.

423   Bottoms, A. (2001). *Community Penalties: Change and Challenges*. Taylor & Francis.

424   Bradford, S., & Cowell, P. (2012). *The decision-making process at parole reviews*

425   *(indeterminate imprisonment for public protection sentences)*. 10.

426   Caplan, J. M. (2010). Parole Release Decisions: Impact of Positive and Negative Victim and

427   Nonvictim Input on a Representative Sample of Parole-Eligible Inmates. *Violence and*

428   *Victims*, *25*(2), 224–242. https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.25.2.224

429   Cochran, E. P., & Comeau-Kirschner, C. (2016). The language of parole: Sex offenders'

430   discourse strategy use in Indeterminate Sentence Review Board hearings. *WORD*,

431   *62*(4), 244–267. https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.2016.1248669

432   Connor, D. P. (2016). How to Get Out of Prison: Views from Parole Board Members.

433   *Corrections*, *1*(2), 107–126. https://doi.org/10.1080/23774657.2015.1125767

434   Dhami, M. K., & Belton, I. K. (2017). On getting inside the judge's mind. *Translational*

435   *Issues in Psychological Science*, *3*(2), 214–226. https://doi.org/10.1037/tps0000115

436   Doyle, K., Levtov, R. G., Barker, G., Bastian, G. G., Bingenheimer, J. B., Kazimbaya, S.,

437   Nzabonimpa, A., Pulerwitz, J., Sayinzoga, F., Sharma, V., & Shattuck, D. (2018).

438   Gender-transformative Bandebereho couples' intervention to promote male

439   engagement in reproductive and maternal health and violence prevention in Rwanda:

20

Findings from a randomized controlled trial. *PLOS ONE*, *13*(4), e0192756.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0192756

Fiedler, K., & Sydow, M. von. (2015). *Heuristics and biases: Beyond Tversky and Kahneman*

's (1974) judgment under uncertainty.

Goldstein, D. A., Cantos, A. L., Brenner, L. H., Verborg, R. J., & Kosson, D. S. (2016).

Perpetrator Type Moderates the Relationship Between Severity of Intimate Partner

Violence and Recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *43*(7), 879–898.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854815616841

Greene, J., & Dalke, I. (2020). "You're still an angry man": Parole boards and logics of

criminalized masculinity. *Theoretical Criminology*, 1362480620910222.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480620910222

Hancock, K., Brown, P., Hadgis, A., Hollander, M., & Shrider, M. (2018). Parole Board

Personality and Decision Making Using Bias-Based Reasoning. In D. D. Schmorrow

& C. M. Fidopiastis (Eds.), *Augmented Cognition: Users and Contexts* (pp. 255–272).

Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-91467-1_21

Harding, J. (2006). Some reflections on risk assessment, parole and recall. *Probation Journal*,

53(4), 389–396. https://doi.org/10.1177/0264550506069363

Hegarty, K., Bush, R., & Sheehan, M. (2005). The Composite Abuse Scale: Further

Development and Assessment of Reliability and Validity of a Multidimensional

Partner Abuse Measure in Clinical Settings. *Violence and Victims; New York*, *20*(5),

529–547. http://dx.doi.org/10.1891/088667005780927548

Houser, K. A., Vîlcică, E. R., Saum, C. A., & Hiller, M. L. (2019). Mental Health Risk

Factors and Parole Decisions: Does Inmate Mental Health Status Affect Who Gets

Released. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*,

16(16), 2950. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16162950

21

465   Huebner, B. M., & Bynum, T. S. (2006). An Analysis of Parole Decision Making Using a

466   Sample of Sex Offenders: A Focal Concerns Perspective*. *Criminology*, *44*(4), 961–

467   991. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2006.00069.x

468   Johnson, M. P. (2006). Conflict and control: Gender symmetry and asymmetry in domestic

469   violence. *Violence against Women*, *12*(11), 1003–1018.

470   Kelly, L., & Westmarland, N. (2015). *Domestic violence perpetrator programmes: Steps*

471   *towards change. Project Mirabal final report*.

472   Kemshall, H. (2019). *Risk in Probation Practice*. Routledge.

473   Kimmel, M. S. (2002). "Gender Symmetry" in Domestic Violence: A Substantive and

474   Methodological Research Review. *Violence Against Women*, *8*(11), 1332–1363.

475   https://doi.org/10.1177/107780102237407

476   Kingsnorth, R. (2006). Intimate Partner Violence: Predictors of Recidivism in a Sample of

477   Arrestees. *Violence Against Women*, *12*(10), 917–935.

478   https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801206293081

479   Kohler-Hausmann, I. (2019). *Malcolm Feeley's Concept of Law* (pp. 36–54).

480   https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108234979.003

481   Lila, M., Herrero, J., & Gracia, E. (2008). Evaluating Attribution of Responsibility and

482   Minimization by Male Batterers: Implications for Batterer Programs. *The Open*

483   *Criminology Journal*, *1*(1). https://benthamopen.com/ABSTRACT/TOCRIJ-1-4

484   Love, H. A., Spencer, C. M., May, S. A., Mendez, M., & Stith, S. M. (2018). Perpetrator Risk

485   Markers for Intimate Terrorism and Situational Couple Violence: A Meta-Analysis.

486   *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 1524838018801331.

487   https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838018801331

488 Mills, J. F., & Kroner, D. G. (2006). Impression Management and Self-Report Among

489   Violent Offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *21*(2), 178–192.

490   https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260505282288

491 Myhill, A., & Hohl, K. (2016). The "Golden Thread": Coercive Control and Risk Assessment

492   for Domestic Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 0886260516675464.

493   https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516675464

494 O'brien, R. M. (2007). A Caution Regarding Rules of Thumb for Variance Inflation Factors.

495   *Quality & Quantity*, *41*(5), 673–690. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-006-9018-6

496 Padfield, N. (2017). *Parole Board Oral Hearings 2016-2017 - Exploring the Barriers to*

497   *Release: Stage Two of an Exploratory Study* (SSRN Scholarly Paper ID 3081039).

498   Social Science Research Network. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3081039

499 Domestic Abuse Bill 2020, HL Bill 124, Parliament, House of Commons, 2019–2020 (2020).

500   https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/lbill/58-01/124/5801124_en_1.html

501 Parole Board. (2019). *The Parole Board Decision-Making Framework*. 28.

502 Peer, E., & Gamliel, E. (2013). Heuristics and Biases in Judicial Decisions. *Court Review*, *49*,

503   114–119.

504 Razera, J., Gaspodini, I. B., Falcke, D., Razera, J., Gaspodini, I. B., & Falcke, D. (2017).

505   Intimate Partner Violence and Gender A/Symmetry: An Integrative Literature

506   Review. *Psico-USF*, *22*(3), 401–412. https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-82712017220302

507 Richards, L. (2009). *Domestic abuse, stalking and harassment and honour based violence*

508   *(DASH, 2009) risk identification and assessment and management model*.

509 Rothstein, H., Huber, M., & Gaskell, G. (2006). A theory of risk colonization: The spiralling

510   regulatory logics of societal and institutional risk. *Economy and Society*, *35*(1), 91–

511   112.

512 Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2011). *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*.

513   SAGE.

514 Scott, K., & Straus, M. (2007). Denial, Minimization, Partner Blaming, and Intimate

515   Aggression in Dating Partners. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *22*(7), 851–871.

516   https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260507301227

517 Shingler, J., & Needs, A. (2018). The role of psychological risk assessment in Parole Board

518   decision making: An exploration of the perspectives of psychologists, indeterminate

519   sentenced prisoners and Parole Board members. *Prison Service Journal*, *237*, 36–40.

520 Soon, C. S., Brass, M., Heinze, H.-J., & Haynes, J.-D. (2008). Unconscious determinants of

521   free decisions in the human brain. *Nature Neuroscience*, *11*(5), 543–545.

522   https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.2112

523 Strang, H., Sherman, L., Ariel, B., Chilton, S., Braddock, R., Rowlinson, T., Cornelius, N.,

524   Jarman, R., & Weinborn, C. (2017). Reducing the harm of intimate partner violence:

525   Randomized controlled trial of the Hampshire Constabulary CARA Experiment.

526   *Cambridge Journal of Evidence-Based Policing*, *1*(2–3), 160–173.

527 Tzeng, S. (2014). Applying DEMATEL to Investigate the Relationship Between Factors

528   Affecting Parole Boards' Decision-Making in Taiwan. *The Prison Journal*, *94*(1),

529   118–136. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885513512096

530 Weiss, B. A., & Dardick, W. (2016). An Entropy-Based Measure for Assessing Fuzziness in

531   Logistic Regression. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *76*(6), 986–1004.

532   https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164415623820

533

534

535   8. Tables
536

537   Table 1: Factors associated with a decision to release or progress an offender

Factor	Released / progressed when present	Released / progressed when absent	Odds ratio	p	Nagelkerke R^2 (highest first)
Offender Supervisor supports release/progression	71 of 81	1 of 37	255.5	<0.001	0.713
Psychologist supports release/progression	32 of 40	0 of 20	n/a	n/a	0.682
Offender Manager supports release/progression	71 of 82	3 of 47	94.6	<0.001	0.670
Positive honesty/openness	27 of 28	17 of 53	57.2	<0.001	0.485
'Robust, effective' risk management plan (compared to cases with concerns about the plan) *	65 of 71	6 of 21	27.1	<0.001	0.453
Positive insight/remorse into offence (compared to 'lack of insight/remorse')	31 of 34	8 of 35	34.5	<0.001	0.426
Positive insight/remorse into offences and behaviour (compared to 'mixed' insight/remorse)	31 of 34	14 of 26	8.8	0.003	0.426
Good working relationship with professionals	56 of 79	3 of 26	18.7	<0.001	0.334
'Medium' or 'low' imminence of harm**	65 of 90	8 of 37	9.4	<0.001	0.268
'Protective' social and community links (compared to 'mixed' or 'concerning' links)	22 of 26	17 of 41	7.8	0.001	0.239
Indeterminate / life sentence (rather than determinate sentence)	58 of 80	17 of 56	6.0	<0.001	0.218
Completed perpetrator programme with positive or neutral feedback	49 of 65	26 of 71	5.3	<0.001	0.194
Coded as Situational Couple Violence (rather than Intimate Terrorism)	28 of 33	45 of 100	6.8	<0.001	0.164
Positive or mixed reports from community releases (rather than serious	30 of 39	20 of 48	4.7	0.01	0.164

concerns about community behaviour)					
'Model prisoner' or only minor arbitrations in custody	60 of 87	11 of 36	5.1	<0.001	0.159
Each year elapsed since offence	n/a	n/a	1.1	0.01	0.125
'Medium' or 'low' risk of harm to future partner**	20 of 25	54 of 105	3.8	0.013	0.073
Open prison (rather than closed estate)	13 of 15	57 of 105	5.5	0.030	0.070
Non-significant factors:					
Lacking problematic or addictive substance use	*6 of 7*	*45 of 84*	*5.2*	*0.135*	*0.044*
Offender did not kill victim	*53 of 104*	*22 of 32*	*0.5*	*0.080*	*0.031*
No prior IPV convictions	*40 of 64*	*35 of 71*	*1.7*	*0.124*	*0.023*
Not coded as Severe Combined Abuse (Hegarty)	*35 of 56*	*40 of 80*	*1.7*	*0.150*	*0.020*
Victim statement provided	*17 of 25*	*58 of 111*	*1.9*	*0.157*	*0.020*
Decision made on papers	*0 of 14*	*50 of 86*	*n/a*	*n/a*	*0.020*
*3-person panel****	*31 of 50*	*18 of 36*	*1.6*	*0.269*	*0.019*
Offender did not sexually abuse victim	*61 of 106*	*14 of 30*	*1.5*	*0.292*	*0.011*
No prior violent convictions	*11 of 24*	*64 of 111*	*0.6*	*0.293*	*0.011*
Each additional year of age	*n/a*	*n/a*	*1.0*	*0.440*	*0.011*
Each year remaining on sentence	*n/a*	*n/a*	*1.1*	*0.580*	*0.008*
*Psychologist on the panel****	*18 of 35*	*57 of 101*	*1.2*	*0.231*	*0.000*
*Judge on the panel****	*9 of 15*	*66 of 121*	*1.2*	*0.231*	*0.000*
Acknowledging offence (rather than denial)	*74 of 122*	*6 of 20*	*1.3*	*0.132*	*0.000*
No concerns re: suspected manipulation	*73 of 121*	*7 of 21*	*1.3*	*0.132*	*0.000*

538 *excluding cases where the Board felt the offender could not be managed under any plan
539 **: various measures used
540 ***: where known
541

542

543 Table 2: latent classes based on professional input

Latent Class		"Recommended for Release"		"Opposed to Release"
		"Highly Recommended"	"Risky but Recommended"	
Effective risk management plan		94.9%	68%	38.3%
Offender Manager recommended release/progression		100%	82.6%	4.9%
Offender Supervisor recommended release/progression		100%	100%	0%
Psychologist recommended release/progression		100%	100%	4.8%
Medium/Low level of harm*		40.5%	0%	9.8%
Medium/Low imminence of harm*		95.8%	63.9%	46.5%
3-class model	Released / progressed	64 of 65	13 of 25	1 of 45
	Odds ratio of release/progression relative to "Opposed" group (R^2=0.774)	894.7 p<0.001	47.6 p<0.001	n/a
2-class	Released / progressed	77 of 90		1 of 45
	Odds ratio of release/progression relative to "Opposed" group (R^2=0.673)	217.1 p<0.001		n/a

544 3-class model: Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) =655; Entropy=0.775 'moderate'
545 (Weiss & Dardick, 2016)
546 2-class model: BIC=644; Entropy=0.94, 'high'
547 *: various measures used

548

549   Table 3: latent classes based on the prisoner's 'journey' and reflections on offending

Class	'Resistant'	'Lip Service'	'Engaging'
'Situational Couple Violence' rather than 'Intimate Terrorism' (Johnson 2006)	0%	23.1%	38.6%
Completed perpetrator programme satisfactorily	8.9%	38.7%	75.8%
'Model prisoner' or only minor arbitrations in custody	24.9%	61.8%	96.8%
Working well with professionals	0%	85.3%	100%
Positive honesty/openness	7%	0%	83.3%
Positive insight/remorse	0% good 0% mixed 100% problematic	0% good 52.2% mixed 47.8% problematic	86.7% good 13.3% mixed 0% problematic
Released / progressed	2 of 25	30 of 65	43 of 49
Odds ratio of release/progression relative to 'Resistant' offenders ($R^2 =0.423$)	n/a	10 p<0.001	90.9 P<0.001

550   BIC=891; Entropy=0.785 ('moderate')
551

552

553   Table 4: latent classes for 'looking ahead' to the offender's life after release

Class	'Recent unstable'	'Unstable'	'Historic, settling'	'Stable'
Years elapsed since index offence (mean)	4.2	11.3	21.8	13.6
Indeterminate or life sentences (rather than determinate)	13.2%	82.3%	100%	100%
Good or mixed behaviour on community releases (rather than problematic)	31.2%	24%	49.7%	100%
Effective risk management plan	66.7%	59.1%	100%	100%
Protective social and community resources	31.2%	14.5%	42.4%	74.6%
Released / progressed	20 of 58	20 of 36	8 of 13	27 of 29
Odds ratio of release/progression relative to 'Recent Unstable' offenders ($R^2 = 0.273$)	n/a	2.4 p=0.047	*3.0 p=0.079*	25.6 p<0.001

554   BIC=1398; Entropy=0.829 ('high')