Domestic Violence in Clinical Practice: Assessment, Intervention, and Ethical Response for Behavioral Health Providers

Domestic violence (DV) remains a pervasive public health concern with significant mental health, social, and economic implications. For behavioral health providers, a clear understanding of DV definitions, epidemiology, and impacts is essential for effective assessment, prevention, and intervention.

Defining Domestic Violence

Domestic violence is an umbrella term encompassing various forms of abuse that occur within domestic or familial contexts. It is commonly differentiated from intimate partner violence (IPV), which refers to harmful behaviors perpetrated by a current or former partner or spouse—and from family violence, which includes abuse between non-intimate family members such as parents and children or siblings. These distinctions help clinicians and policymakers tailor screening and intervention strategies while recognizing the overlapping nature of these constructs. Recent epidemiological research emphasizes this nuance; for example, Clemens et al. (2023) noted that IPV represents a major global public health issue and called for improved cross-cultural measurement and attention to both victimization and perpetration.

Subtypes of DV/IPV

DV manifests through multiple, overlapping forms of harm, including physical, sexual, psychological, financial, and digital abuse. Physical abuse involves the intentional use of physical force that can result in injury or death. Sexual abuse refers to coerced or non-consensual sexual activity, often used as a means of control. Psychological or emotional abuse encompasses behaviors such as humiliation, intimidation, and threats that erode self-esteem and autonomy (Clemens et al., 2023). Economic abuse restricts financial independence by controlling access to funds or employment opportunities, while digital abuse includes surveillance, online harassment, or technological monitoring that extends control beyond physical space (Tolmie, 2023). Recent prevalence data among pregnant women in rural settings revealed psychological violence as the most common subtype (34.2 %), followed by physical (14.1 %) and sexual (13.5 %) violence (Negash et al., 2024). Other research found that physical and psychological abuse frequently overlap, suggesting that single-subtype analyses may underestimate the full burden of DV (Rastogi et al., 2024).

Coercive Control as a Unifying Feature

A defining component uniting the subtypes of domestic violence (DV) is coercive control, a sustained pattern of domination that extends far beyond physical assault. This framework views DV not as a sequence of isolated violent incidents but as a system of entrapment that progressively erodes autonomy and safety. Coercive control encompasses behaviors such as isolation, intimidation, surveillance, economic deprivation, and micro-regulation of daily life, creating a climate of ongoing fear and dependency (Lohmann et al., 2023). These behaviors form a structure of oppression that makes it difficult for survivors to recognize abuse as it unfolds, and nearly impossible to leave without significant psychological and practical support.

Recent research reinforces the psychological toll of coercive control. Williamson et al. (2023) conducted a meta-analysis of 45 studies and found that coercive control was moderately associated with both posttraumatic stress disorder ($r = 0.32$) and depression ($r = 0.27$). These associations mirror or exceed those observed in other forms of intimate partner violence (IPV), suggesting that coercive control produces trauma responses comparable to those of physical violence. Survivors often describe the experience as "a living hostage situation," characterized by hypervigilance, emotional dysregulation, and constant anxiety about potential retaliation (Fisher et al., 2024). Unlike episodic violence, coercive control maintains an enduring state of threat that destabilizes a person's self-concept and capacity for independent decision-making.

For behavioral health providers, understanding coercive control as the central mechanism of DV has profound clinical implications. It highlights chronic fear, relational trauma, and the loss of agency as primary treatment targets rather than secondary consequences. Survivors frequently present with symptoms of complex trauma, dissociation, and attachment disturbances rooted in long-term subjugation. Therapeutic work must therefore address the survivor's reestablishment of self-efficacy, boundaries, and trust in others, while carefully avoiding interventions that could inadvertently reproduce dynamics of control. Trauma-informed care approaches that emphasize empowerment, choice, and safety are essential in promoting recovery from the insidious effects of coercive control (Williamson et al., 2023).

Additionally, researchers have emphasized the need for inclusive definitions that account for the diversity of survivors' experiences. While early frameworks were based primarily on heterosexual, cisgender couples, newer studies reveal that coercive control manifests in unique ways within LGBTQ+ and marginalized populations. Hine et al. (2024) found that identity-based abuse—such as threats of "outing," leveraging stigma, or exploiting systemic discrimination—plays a distinct role in reinforcing dependency and fear in these

relationships. These findings underscore the necessity of culturally competent and intersectional perspectives when assessing or treating survivors of coercive control.

Coercive control serves as a unifying feature across DV subtypes by reframing abuse as an enduring system of domination that restricts autonomy and perpetuates psychological harm. Its inclusion in both clinical assessment and public policy broadens the understanding of what constitutes abuse, allowing providers to move beyond visible injuries to address invisible, enduring trauma. Recognizing coercive control as a central organizing construct enables behavioral health professionals to more effectively conceptualize and treat survivors' experiences, restore autonomy, and promote long-term recovery from the pervasive impacts of relational oppression.

Epidemiology and Behavioral Health Impact

Recent global reviews confirm DV's staggering prevalence and mental-health burden. A 2024 systematic review found that nearly one in three women (31 %) experienced IPV during the COVID-19 pandemic, with higher prevalence in developing regions (33 %) than in developed regions (14 %) (Suryanarayanan et al., 2024). Lower education, early marriage, and rural residence were consistent risk factors (Aboagye et al., 2023). Moreover, IPV exposure is linked to depression, anxiety, substance use, and suicidality; a meta-review of 35 studies reported elevated rates of PTSD and depressive symptoms among survivors (Silva et al., 2024). Importantly, randomized controlled trials indicate that screening alone does not significantly reduce IPV or improve mental-health outcomes without integrated follow-up interventions (Spangaro et al., 2024).

For behavioral health professionals, these findings underscore the need for trauma-informed, multi-sectoral responses that address safety, autonomy, and psychological recovery. Recognizing coercive control and the chronic nature of relational trauma positions clinicians to intervene more effectively and advocate for systemic change.

Prevalence and Public Health Significance

Global and National Prevalence

Recent evidence confirms that domestic violence (DV) and intimate partner violence (IPV) remain widespread across socioeconomic and cultural boundaries. Globally, IPV affects roughly one-third of women across the lifespan, with higher rates in low- and middle-income countries. For example, a 2024 meta-analysis found a pooled lifetime prevalence of IPV in women at around 31 % (White et al., 2024). Additional research reports lifetime prevalence estimates as high as 35 % in Southern Asia and 33 % in sub-Saharan Africa, underscoring geographic disparities (Frontiers Public Health, 2024). Taken together,

these figures reaffirm that IPV constitutes “a major global public health problem” rather than a confined or diminishing phenomenon (Annual Review of Public Health, 2024).

In the United States, data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC, 2024) indicate that approximately 41 % of women and 26 % of men report experiencing contact sexual violence, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner in their lifetime, and more than 60 million women and 50 million men have experienced psychological aggression by a partner (CDC, 2024). These U.S. figures highlight both the ubiquity of IPV and that it affects both genders, even if rates differ.

Underreporting and Intersectional Barriers

Despite these alarming prevalence rates, actual rates are likely underestimated. Survivors frequently avoid disclosure due to fear of retaliation, stigma, or lack of institutional trust (Wright et al., 2022). Intersectional barriers compound this problem: survivors from immigrant, LGBTQ+, disabled, or low-income backgrounds often face additional structural and cultural impediments to reporting and receiving care (Essue et al., 2025). For instance, immigrant survivors may fear deportation or cultural ostracism, while LGBTQ+ individuals may avoid seeking help due to discrimination or concerns about outing (Essue et al., 2025). Behavioral health providers should therefore approach all clients with a trauma-informed lens that assumes possible DV exposure even when not disclosed.

Health and Mental Health Impacts

Exposure to DV/IPV is associated with elevated risks for both physical and psychological morbidity. A global systematic review found strong associations between IPV and depression, psychological distress, and suicidality—with odds ratios of 2.03 for psychological IPV and 4.85 for physical IPV in relation to suicidal ideation (White et al., 2023). Moreover, coercive control and non-physical forms of abuse independently predict mental health outcomes, emphasizing that psychological abuse can be as detrimental as overt physical violence (Annual Review of Public Health, 2024). For pregnant women in particular, evidence shows higher risks of miscarriage and adverse perinatal outcomes linked to partner violence (Frontiers Public Health, 2024). Behavioral health providers thus play a critical role in early identification and intervention for trauma symptoms emerging from DV.

Public Health Framing

Viewing DV as a public health crisis allows for broader systemic responses beyond criminal justice. IPV contributes not only to acute injury and death but also to long-term disability, chronic pain, cardiovascular disease, and substance use disorders (Annual Review of Public Health, 2024). The interconnection between violence, trauma, and health

underscores the need for integrated mental-health, medical, and social services. This approach positions behavioral health clinicians not only as therapists but also as key participants in coordinated community-level responses.

Economic, Social, and Intergenerational Impact

Economic Costs

The economic burden of DV is staggering. The CDC (2024) estimates the lifetime economic cost of IPV in the United States at approximately $3.6 trillion, including direct medical care, lost productivity, and criminal justice expenditures. On an individual level, survivors face job loss, absenteeism, and barriers to education or advancement due to trauma, injuries, or controlling partners (Hilton et al., 2025). These economic restrictions perpetuate cycles of dependence and poverty, making escape from abusive environments more difficult.

Social Consequences

Domestic violence destabilizes families and communities. It undermines attachment bonds, erodes social support networks, and perpetuates fear-based relational patterns (Lohmann et al., 2023). Survivors often experience social isolation—a deliberate strategy by perpetrators—and may internalize blame or shame, complicating recovery. From a community perspective, DV contributes to homelessness, child welfare involvement, and interagency strain, emphasizing the need for cross-sector collaboration between behavioral health, medical, and legal systems.

Intergenerational Transmission of Trauma

Children exposed to domestic violence are particularly vulnerable. Clemens et al. (2023) reported that early exposure to parental IPV is associated with heightened risk for future perpetration or victimization, reflecting learned behavioral and attachment patterns. Chronic exposure alters neurodevelopmental trajectories, increasing susceptibility to anxiety, aggression, and emotional dysregulation. Behavioral health providers must recognize that DV often spans generations, reinforcing the importance of family-oriented interventions and prevention strategies.

Mental Health

Among adult survivors, depression, PTSD, and substance use disorders are prevalent, frequently co-occurring (Spencer et al., 2023). Coercive control correlates with increased severity of trauma symptoms, even when physical violence ceases (Lohmann et al., 2023). DV exposure also elevates suicide risk, particularly when accompanied by isolation or loss of autonomy. Due to these concerns, behavioral health assessment should routinely include safety inquiries, trauma screening, and suicide risk evaluation.

Role of Behavioral Health Providers

Behavioral health providers are uniquely positioned as frontline responders in addressing DV. Because survivors often seek counseling for symptoms of depression, anxiety, or relational distress without identifying abuse explicitly, clinicians play a crucial role in detection and support (Hilton et al., 2025). Incorporating DV-aware frameworks into therapy enhances both safety and treatment efficacy.

Assessment and Screening

Clinicians can integrate brief validated tools (e.g., HITS, WAST, Danger Assessment) within intake or ongoing assessments while prioritizing privacy and safety. Open-ended, non-judgmental inquiry supports disclosure and trust. Assessing coercive control, financial dependency, and digital monitoring is equally vital, as these may exist without visible injury (Tolmie, 2023).

Trauma-informed and Empowerment-based Interventions

Therapeutic approaches should emphasize empowerment, autonomy, and safety planning rather than confrontation with the perpetrator. Modalities such as trauma-focused cognitive behavioral therapy (TF-CBT), dialectical behavior therapy (DBT), and acceptance and commitment therapy (ACT) have demonstrated effectiveness in treating post-DV trauma (Lohmann et al., 2023). Collaboration with shelters, advocacy groups, and legal services expands client safety and support networks.

Prevention and Systems Collaboration

Behavioral health professionals can contribute to prevention by educating clients and communities about healthy relationships, early warning signs, and resources. They are essential members of multidisciplinary teams that coordinate medical, legal, and social service responses (CDC, 2024). In supervision and organizational contexts, integrating DV-informed protocols reduces clinician burnout and ensures consistent ethical practice.

Professional Education and Lifelong Learning

Ongoing education enables clinicians to stay updated on evolving research, trauma science, and cultural competence related to DV/IPV. Training in coercive control dynamics, technology-facilitated abuse, and intersectional identities improves provider sensitivity and efficacy. Embedding DV awareness in behavioral health education fosters a workforce equipped to mitigate this pervasive societal issue.

Domestic violence is not merely an interpersonal or legal issue but a complex biopsychosocial phenomenon with profound individual and societal costs. Recent evidence from global and national studies underscores its persistence, multifaceted nature, and devastating mental health consequences. Behavioral health providers—

through trauma-informed assessment, advocacy, and interdisciplinary collaboration—are indispensable in addressing DV's mental health burden and preventing its intergenerational continuation. Recognizing DV as a core domain of behavioral healthcare transforms providers into pivotal agents of safety, recovery, and systemic change.

Theoretical Foundations and Typologies

Psychological and Sociological Models

Understanding domestic violence (DV) through theoretical frameworks allows behavioral health providers to conceptualize the dynamics behind abuse, inform assessment, and guide intervention. Three major conceptual models are particularly relevant: the power & control/feminist model (e.g., Michael P. Johnson's typology), social-learning theory, and ecological systems theory.

Power & Control Wheel / Feminist Theory Origins

The origins of the "Power & Control Wheel," developed as part of the Duluth Model, are rooted firmly in feminist theory, framing intimate partner violence (IPV) as an outcome of systemic, gender-based power differentials. According to the model, abusive partners, predominantly men in heterosexual relationships, utilize a repertoire of tactics such as intimidation, isolation, economic abuse, emotional manipulation, and the enforcement of male privilege in order to maintain dominance over their intimate partner (The Duluth Model, n.d.; Pence & Paymar, 1993). The wheel visually organizes these tactics in spokes that radiate from a center of power and control: for example, using isolation, threats and coercion, emotional abuse, and male privilege are identified as mechanisms through which abusers maintain control long-term (The Duluth Model, n.d.).

Complementing this model is the typology proposed by Michael P. Johnson, which makes a critical distinction between two dominant forms of IPV: intimate terrorism (also termed coercive controlling violence) and situational couple violence. Intimate terrorism is characterized by a general pattern of coercive control embedded in the relationship, whereas situational couple violence does not stem from a broader campaign of control but rather occurs in the context of conflict escalation or reactive aggression (Johnson, 2014; Johnson, 2011). Johnson's work thus aligns with feminist frameworks by underscoring that for many cases of IPV, the primary issue is not isolated physical acts, but a pervasive pattern of dominance and entrapment (Johnson, 2014; Meier, 2015).

For clinicians and behavioral health providers, this paired theoretical foundation signals the importance of looking beyond discrete violent incidents and instead assessing for ongoing patterns of power and control. Interventions informed by the Duluth model and Johnson's typology demand a focus on the broader relational system: practitioners are

encouraged to identify not only injuries and immediate threats but also the underlying mechanisms—economic control, social isolation, threat-use, and diminished agency—that sustain violence over time (Johnson, 2014). In doing so, they shift the lens from solely acute crisis response toward longer-term recovery of autonomy, safety, and agency for survivors.

Social Learning Theory

The theory of social learning provides an important framework for understanding how patterns of domestic violence (DV) can be passed across generations. At its core, social learning theory posits that aggressive, controlling behavior is learned through observation, modelling, and reinforcement, as individuals witness actions, internalize scripts, and come to view certain responses as acceptable or effective. In the context of intimate partner violence (IPV), children who witness partner violence may absorb relational dynamics of conflict, power, and control—thus increasing their risk not only for victimization but also for perpetration in later life (Liu & Xu, 2023). A recent theoretical analysis argues that while social learning remains a useful explanatory lens, it must be integrated with relational and contextual nuance—rather than treated as the sole causal mechanism of DV transmission (Theoretical Analysis of the Cycle of Intimate Partner Violence, 2024). In other words, exposure to violence may equip a young person with a behavioral script for power-and-control, but whether they enact or experience violence depends on broader relational dynamics, socio-cultural context, and individual factors such as attachment, emotion regulation, and opportunity.

From a clinical perspective, this means behavioral-health providers should move beyond assessing only the current abusive behavior or trauma symptoms. Instead, they should attend to the client's family-of-origin experiences: the presence of partner violence in their childhood home, the ways conflict and control were modelled, and the relational scripts about dominance, submission and interpersonal conflict they internalized. This model suggests that therapeutic work should explore how clients learned to cope with power and aggression, how those scripts continue to shape their relational patterns, and how they can develop new, healthier models of conflict resolution and autonomy. By doing so, clinicians can help clients interrupt learned patterns, rebuild relational agency, and cultivate more adaptive interpersonal scripts—thereby addressing not just the present violence, but the intergenerational footprint of violence-learning.

Ecological Systems Theory

The ecological model, originally developed by Bronfenbrenner, provides a multilevel framework for understanding intimate partner violence (IPV) as embedded within

interconnected systems of influence, individual, dyadic, community, and societal. Within this model, IPV is viewed not solely as an interpersonal issue but as a product of overlapping environmental and structural conditions that either exacerbate or buffer against violence. A recent systematic ecological review found that factors such as emotional dependence, limited education, substance use, and histories of childhood abuse (microsystem); relationship conflict and poor communication (mesosystem); neighborhood poverty, unemployment, and social isolation (exosystem); and broader cultural norms supporting male dominance and violence (macrosystem) all contribute to women's risk for IPV (Jiménez & Rodríguez Ávila, 2024).

Contemporary studies reaffirm that ecological determinants strongly shape IPV prevalence and outcomes. For instance, community-level disadvantages, such as economic hardship, weak social cohesion, and tolerance for violence, have been found to significantly predict higher rates of IPV perpetration and victimization (Lyons et al., 2023). Similarly, Meyer (2023) emphasizes that societal attitudes reinforcing gender inequity and traditional masculinity norms perpetuate structural conditions under which violence against women becomes normalized. In addition, new research highlights how institutional responses, such as the accessibility of police protection, housing services, and community advocacy—mediate survivors' ability to seek safety and sustain recovery (Williams et al., 2025).

For behavioral health providers, this ecological understanding underscores that assessment must extend beyond the individual or couple to include contextual domains such as economic resources, community support, and systemic oppression. Effective intervention may combine trauma-informed psychotherapy with community linkage, social service collaboration, and advocacy for structural change. By working at multiple ecological levels, clinicians can address both the psychological effects of IPV and the social conditions that allow coercive control and violence to persist.

Combining these frameworks produces a layered conceptualization: power and control emphasize relational dominance; social learning explains how violence is transmitted; ecological theory contextualizes the broader system. Behavioral health clinicians benefit from integrating these lenses rather than relying on a single model.

Attachment and Relational Dynamics

Attachment theory and relational dynamics provide additional depth to the conceptual map of DV, especially in the dyadic, interpersonal context.

Application of Attachment Theory

Adult attachment theory posits that early caregiver bonds shape internal working models of self and others, influencing adult romantic relationships. Almeida et al. (2023) found that insecure adult attachment (anxious or avoidant) significantly correlates with IPV perpetration and victimization. Attachment insecurity increases emotional dysregulation and maladaptive relational scripts, thereby contributing to DV dynamics.

Insecure-Anxious and Avoidant Dyads: Pursuer–Distancer Pattern

A dyadic dynamic frequently observed in abusive relationships is the pursuer–distancer (or demand–withdraw) pattern, in which one partner, often anxiously attached—pursues closeness, reassurance, or control, while the other, commonly avoidantly attached—withdraws emotionally. This interactional loop fuels escalating anxiety, conflict, and control behaviors. The pursuer's intensified efforts to connect often heighten the distancer's avoidance, creating an ongoing cycle of pursuit, withdrawal, and resentment that can evolve into coercive or aggressive exchanges. Recent empirical evidence demonstrates that such relational dynamics are not merely frustrating communication patterns but significant predictors of intimate partner violence (IPV) risk (Morales-Sanhueza et al., 2024).

In a large help-seeking sample, Arseneault et al. (2023) found that attachment anxiety was directly associated with coercive control perpetration and indirectly associated with physical, psychological, and sexual IPV through demand–withdraw and demand–demand communication. Similarly, Douadi et al. (2024) reported that attachment insecurities predicted IPV perpetration via affect dysregulation and hostile relational schemas, supporting the notion that maladaptive emotion regulation within insecurely attached dyads fosters abusive cycles. Seedall and McCourt (2024) further observed that when anxiously attached individuals pursued conflict resolution, their avoidant partners were more likely to withdraw, confirming that the demand–withdraw dynamic reinforces distress and entrapment, particularly under emotional threat. Collectively, these studies underscore that attachment insecurities and communication rigidity jointly sustain the relational conditions under which control and violence emerge.

For behavioral health providers, recognizing this dyadic choreography is essential for assessment and intervention. Therapy should target relational regulation, helping partners identify and interrupt the demand–withdraw loop through mindfulness, emotional pacing, and structured communication. Boundary setting allows the pursuer to tolerate distance without resorting to control while helping the distancer remain engaged rather than defensive or avoidant. Attachment repair strategies, such as emotionally focused therapy or schema-based interventions, can reduce mutual reactivity and promote secure relating. In cases involving abuse, clinicians must emphasize individual safety and autonomy while

reframing violence as the outcome of entrenched attachment and regulation failures. Understanding the pursuer–distancer pattern thus enables clinicians to move beyond symptom management toward addressing the relational choreography of coercion, fear, and attachment injury that often sustains IPV.

Disorganized Attachment and Trauma-Reenactment Cycles

Disorganized attachment, characterized by contradictory or fearful behaviors toward attachment figures, often develops in the aftermath of childhood maltreatment and unresolved trauma. Individuals with this attachment pattern experience deep ambivalence—seeking closeness while simultaneously fearing it—which disrupts emotional regulation and relational stability. In adult intimate relationships, such attachment disorganization can predispose individuals to both victimization and perpetration of intimate partner violence (IPV) through maladaptive coping mechanisms rooted in fear and control (Krause-Utz et al., 2023). These individuals may oscillate between dependency and withdrawal, or between nurturing and aggression, leading to chaotic, enmeshed, and sometimes violent relational cycles.

A recent meta-analysis by Wong and Denson (2025) conceptualizes IPV as, in part, a maladaptive stress response among individuals with insecure or disorganized attachment. The authors found that emotion dysregulation, dominance motives, and poor conflict management significantly mediated the relationship between insecure attachment and IPV perpetration. Similarly, a 2024 study by Morales-Sanhueza et al. demonstrated that attachment fear and inconsistent caregiving histories were associated with greater relational volatility and coercive control behaviors, particularly under conditions of emotional stress. These findings align with contemporary trauma frameworks suggesting that disorganized attachment reflects an internalized pattern of approach–avoidance behavior, activated by threat cues reminiscent of early relational trauma (Krause-Utz et al., 2023; Wong & Denson, 2025).

For behavioral health providers, recognizing disorganized attachment dynamics is crucial for case formulation and treatment planning. When clients present with dissociation, self-blame, or chaotic relationships, clinicians should consider how unresolved attachment trauma may shape their current relational functioning. Trauma-informed interventions that emphasize emotional regulation, safety, and the repair of relational trust, such as attachment-focused psychotherapy or somatic trauma treatments, can support recovery. By addressing the underlying attachment disorganization rather than focusing solely on surface behaviors, clinicians can better facilitate healing, agency, and resilience among survivors and perpetrators alike.

Implications For Treatment and Client Conceptualization

From a clinical perspective, integrating attachment theory means assessing clients' attachment styles (secure, anxious, avoidant, disorganized), exploring how these styles shape relational dynamics, and tailoring interventions accordingly. An anxiously attached survivor might benefit from work on self-soothing, relational autonomy and boundary formation; an avoidantly attached perpetrator may require help recognizing emotional suppression and developing non-violent relational strategies. Couples' work may proceed only when safety and control dynamics are clarified; an attachment lens adds relational nuance beyond behavioral symptoms.

Trauma Bonding and Dependency

In long-standing abusive relationships, mechanisms of trauma bonding, learned helplessness and psychological entrapment perpetuate the pattern of abuse and complicate intervention.

Neurochemical Underpinnings of Trauma Bonding

Trauma bonding describes the emotionally paradoxical attachment victims develop toward their abusers, reinforced through cycles of abuse and intermittent positive reinforcement. Although empirical neurochemical research is nascent, clinical literature suggests that oxytocin and cortisol dynamics play a role: threat-relief cycles may condition bonding even in harmful relationships (Jones & Smith, 2023). Recognizing this helps providers move beyond simplistic "why don't they leave?" judgments toward a neuro-relational model of entrapment.

Learned Helplessness and Intermittent Reinforcement

Seligman's learned helplessness model applies to DV in that victims may learn that protest or escape triggers more harm rather than relief, causing resignation to abuse. Concurrently, intermittently rewarded kindness from the perpetrator functions like a conditioning loop, "precious relief" following violence deepens emotional dependence. Clinicians should support survivors by disrupting these cycles through empowerment, autonomy-building, and relapse prevention.

Psychological Entrapment and Self-Blame

Trauma bonding is reinforced by psychological entrapment: victims often believe leaving is impossible due to emotional dependence, fear of retaliation, economic constraints, or internalized shame ("I caused this"). Coercive control further reduces options by isolating the victim, limiting autonomy and resources. For behavioral health providers, assessment should include exploration of entrapment, self-blame, and relational dependency;

intervention should include empowerment, external resource linkage, and psychoeducation about bonding dynamics.

Typologies of Perpetrators and Survivors

Utilizing typologies helps clinicians differentiate patterns of violence, risk severity, and tailor response strategies. One of the most influential frameworks is Johnson's typology of IPV.

Johnson's Typology: Coercive Controlling Vs. Situational Violence

Johnson (2023) describes *intimate terrorism* (coercive-controlling violence) and *situational couple violence*. Intimate terrorism involves systematic dominance, while situational violence arises from conflict escalation without underlying control. A scoping review affirmed the typology's relevance but noted the need for context and gender-sensitive nuance (Cares et al., 2023). Clinicians should assess whether a client's relationship involves control and entrapment (higher risk) or situational violence (may allow for conjoint or relational work).

Personality, Attachment and Cognitive Distortions Among Perpetrators

Perpetrator profiles often combine insecure attachment, personality traits (e.g., antisocial, narcissistic), and cognitive distortions (e.g., entitlement, minimization of violence). A 2024 Turkish study found that insecure attachments and early maladaptive schemas significantly predicted perpetration of IPV (Kara et al., 2024). Clinical intervention must include cognitive-behavioral work addressing schemas ("I must control my partner") and relational repair alongside accountability frameworks.

Survivor Typologies: Resilient, Dependent, Ambivalent, Avoidant Responders.

Emerging frameworks categorize survivors into typologies: *resilient* (strong resources, active change), *dependent* (high relational/financial dependency), *ambivalent* (oscillation between staying and leaving), and *avoidant* (minimization or denial of harm). While empirical research is still developing, conceptualizing survivors this way enables more tailored support: dependent survivors may need autonomy/advocacy work; ambivalent survivors may need motivational interviewing focusing on readiness.

Tailoring Intervention Strategies to Typology

Effective interventions must align with typology. Coercive-control (intimate terrorism) cases demand safety-first, individual survivor work, perpetrator accountability, and no conjoint therapy until control is eliminated. Situational couple violence might allow for couple-based interventions with robust screening and safety protocols. Perpetrators with

antisocial traits require structured CBT, anger management, and monitoring; low-severity situational perpetrators might benefit from motivational interviewing and relapse prevention. Survivor interventions likewise vary by typology: resilient survivors may engage in trauma processing immediately; dependent survivors may require phased empowerment; ambivalent survivors may benefit from readiness work; avoidant survivors may need engagement and emotional activation.

Using typological distinctions supports differential diagnosis of violence, risk stratification, and tailoring of treatment pathways. For behavioral health providers, embedding typology into assessment and case conceptualization enhances precision of care and safety.

For behavioral health providers, several overarching implications emerge from the integrated understanding of domestic violence (DV) and intimate partner violence (IPV). Effective clinical practice requires a multi-lens conceptualization that synthesizes power and control frameworks, social learning theory, ecological systems, and attachment-based perspectives rather than relying on any single explanatory model. This integrative view allows clinicians to assess how structural inequalities, learned behaviors, and attachment insecurities converge to sustain cycles of violence. Within individual and couple assessments, special attention should be given to relational dynamics, including attachment styles—anxious, avoidant, or disorganized—the pursuer–distancer pattern, and trauma-bonding mechanisms that maintain entrapment. Trauma-specific care must also address neuro-relational adaptations such as learned helplessness, chronic fear, and self-blame, which often accompany prolonged exposure to coercive control.

Clinicians are further encouraged to employ typology-guided interventions that differentiate between forms of IPV—such as intimate terrorism versus situational couple violence—as well as between perpetrator and survivor profiles to ensure interventions align with each client's level of risk, readiness, and safety needs. Above all, safety and autonomy should remain paramount; in cases involving coercive control or severe power imbalance, safety planning must precede any relational or conjoint interventions. Finally, systemic thinking is essential: practitioners should evaluate and engage the broader ecological context by linking clients to community resources, advocating for social and economic supports, and recognizing the influence of cultural, gender, and policy-level factors on both risk and recovery. By combining these frameworks into assessment and intervention planning, behavioral health providers can respond more effectively to the complexity, relational depth, and heterogeneity inherent in DV cases, ultimately enhancing safety, recovery and relational health outcomes.

Clinical Indicators and Assessment

Recognizing Warning Signs

Behavioral health providers must maintain a high index of suspicion for domestic violence (DV) and intimate partner violence (IPV) given the often subtle and hidden nature of coercive, relational, or non-physical abuse. Warning signs may present in behavioral, emotional, cognitive, somatic, relational, or contextual form.

Behavioral and Emotional Cues

Survivors may present with symptoms that appear as depression, anxiety, hypervigilance, sleep disruption, unexplained injuries, somatic complaints or relational complaints (e.g., "my partner controls my life," "I can't leave"). Providers should note indicators such as frequent missed therapy sessions, cancellations, partner attending visits or refusing to allow time alone, and repeated crises. Because coercive control may not involve visible injury, emotional indicators (fear of partner, isolation, lack of autonomy, diminished self-esteem) are equally important.

Somatic and Psychosomatic Presentations

Clients may present with chronic pain, gastrointestinal complaints, headaches, sexual dysfunction, or other medically unexplained symptoms resulting from ongoing stress, trauma, or physical assault. In many cases, the presenting problem is not labelled as DV; for example, a client may seek treatment for substance use, insomnia, relationship difficulties or trauma symptoms, and the underlying DV history remains unspoken. A systematic review found that survivors of coercive control present with PTSD and depression at levels comparable to those experiencing overt physical violence ($r \approx .27$-$.33$) (Stark et al., 2023).

Red Flag Partner/Relationship Behaviors

Assessment should include relational context: partner insisting on being present in sessions, controlling finances, monitoring communications, isolating the client from family/friends, threatening children or pets, frequent "accidents," or minimizing the client's experiences. These relational control tactics often precede or accompany physical violence and may even persist after the violence ceases.

Screening Protocols

Screening is the first step in detection, but must be conducted thoughtfully, safely and with trauma-informed awareness. Behavioral health providers should integrate validated tools and embed screening into intake and periodic monitoring.

Validated Instruments

Several screening tools are available, including the Hurt, Insult, Threaten, Scream (HITS) tool, the Women Abuse Screening Tool (WAST), the Abuse Assessment Screen (AAS), and newer iterations such as the Extended-HITS (E-HITS) and Relationship Violence Use and Experience Screener (RVUES). A 2023 COSMIN-based protocol review emphasized the need to evaluate measurement properties of IPV tools and highlighted that many tools remain under-tested in diverse populations (Li et al., 2023). Another recent practical review lists the HITS and WAST among recommended tools for initial screening in adult care settings (Jones & Smith, 2023).

Implementation Considerations

Screening must take place in private, safe settings without the partner present or nearby, and clinicians should explain confidentiality and limitations (including mandatory reporting) before asking questions. A 2024 study of electronic health-record (EHR)-based screening found that using non-interruptive alerts and high-privacy computer-based methods increased screening rates from 45% to 65% and detection from 0.1% to 1.5% (Green et al., 2024). Screening alone is insufficient without follow-up, referral pathways, and the capacity to act on disclosures.

Limitations And Challenges

Screening is subject to barriers: clients may feel shame, fear retaliation, minimize the abuse, or not view it as “domestic violence.” Providers may avoid screening due to time constraints, discomfort, lack of training or absence of referral resources. A recent review classified these barriers into three categories: provider/health-service, client/cultural and organizational (Adekunle et al., 2023). Behavioral health providers should therefore ensure screening is supported by supervisory discussion, training, workflow integration and referral processes.

Risk and Lethality Assessment

Beyond initial screening, clinicians must assess risk and lethality potential, especially in relationships characterized by coercive control, repeated violence, strangulation, weapon access, children’s exposure, suicidal threats or victim’s attempt to leave.

High-Risk Indicators

Research from a JAMA systematic review reports individual factors consistently associated with IPV risk: prior non-partner violence, partner alcohol use or misuse, partner mental health disorders (e.g., PTSD, borderline personality), pregnancy (especially unintended), low education, young age, and prior victimization (Mason et al., 2024). Features associated with escalation include strangulation history, threats with weapon,

forced sex, isolation, controlling finances, abuse during pregnancy, and child exposure. Clinicians should integrate these risk indicators into case conceptualization and safety planning.

Lethality Tools and Use

While screening tools identify abuse, risk instruments (e.g., Danger Assessment, DA-I) are used to estimate lethality or severe injury potential. A 2024 methods review identified the DA-I as having strong predictive validity for immigrant women for severe violence and re-assault (Munoz et al., 2024). Behavioral health providers may not administer full law-enforcement checklists but must incorporate clinical risk assessment: Has the partner ever strangled the client? Access to guns? Threats to kill? Escalation? Children in home? These questions guide referral to specialty DV services and crisis intervention.

Documentation and Clinical Records

Accurate documentation is a critical—but often neglected—aspect of DV work. Behavioral health providers must document disclosures, safety decisions, partner behaviors, client's own assessment of risk, and referrals. Documentation may become forensic evidence or support inter-agency collaboration.

Best Practice for Documentation

Providers should use objective, non-judgmental language (e.g., "Client reports partner slapped her across the face yesterday…" rather than "Client was beaten by her abusive partner"). Note date, time, location, witness if any, presence of children, severity and frequency of abuse, injuries (with photographs if appropriate and permitted), partner's statements, client's feelings of fear, self-harm/suicidality risk, substance use, and safety planning steps. A recent clinical update emphasizes the importance of documenting treatment refusal, concealed injuries, and partner's presence at session as relational red flags (Jones & Smith, 2023).

Confidentiality and Forensic Considerations

Clinicians must explain limits of confidentiality, including mandatory reporting of child/elder abuse and imminent harm. Some jurisdictions require joint therapy refusal if partner is the perpetrator and abuse is ongoing. Review of documentation in court adversarial proceedings requires clear, professional record-keeping. Providers must also plan for data security—be aware of digital abuse, partner monitoring of records, shared devices, and safe documentation practices.

Assessment Protocols for Perpetrators and Couples

Behavioral health providers increasingly encounter complex cases where data involve perpetration, mutual violence, or couple therapy requests. Recognizing when conjoint treatment is contraindicated and conducting appropriate individual assessment is key.

Perpetrator Assessment

Assessment of perpetrators involves exploring attitudes toward violence, ownership/control beliefs, previous use of violence, substance misuse, personality disorder indicators, readiness to change, and accountability capacity. Treatment planning must integrate assessment findings: denial, minimization, externalization of blame, entitlement beliefs, rigid gender norms and lack of empathy are indicators of higher risk and poor treatment prognosis (Kara et al., 2024).

Couple and Family Assessment

A careful screening must determine whether it is safe to involve the partner or children. If coercive control, active violence or high lethality risk is present, conjoint therapy may be contraindicated. A negotiated safety or structured couples intervention model should only be considered when violence is assessed as situational rather than coercive-controlling. Behaviorally oriented providers must assess power differentials, partner readiness, children's exposure, and external supports before engaging couples work. Failing to do so may increase risk for the victim.

Safety and Confidentiality in Assessment Settings

Ensuring a safe assessment environment is non-negotiable. Providers must assume an abuse history may be present even if un-disclosed and design the assessment accordingly.

Privacy and Safety Planning

Begin by ensuring the partner is not present or cannot overhear. Use safe exit cues. Ask permission to discuss domestic violence and explain options, resources, confidentiality limits, and safety planning. If digital abuse is suspected, consider alternative communication channels (safe phone, other devices), and avoid documenting sensitive details in shared records without safeguards. A recent EHR-based screening study highlights how even provider prompts can increase disclosure if confidentiality is clearly maintained (Green et al., 2024).

Referral And Advocacy Linkages

Clinicians should develop a protocol for referral including legal advocacy, shelters, DV specialists, medical evaluation of injuries and crisis hotline information. Screening without referral options is ethically insufficient. Behavioral health providers should integrate

discussion of safety planning, including exit strategies, children's supervision, financial/legal resources, and coordinate with community agencies.

By applying these best-practice assessment protocols, behavioral health providers enhance their ability to identify, conceptualize and respond effectively to DV/IPV, improving safety, treatment outcomes and relational health for the clients they serve.

Trauma and Neurobiological Mechanisms

Trauma and the Nervous System

Exposure to domestic violence (DV) or intimate partner violence (IPV) frequently constitutes a trauma-inducing event that activates survival neuro-systems and alters nervous-system functioning. Understanding these mechanisms enables behavioral-health providers to conceptualize symptoms (e.g., hyperarousal, dissociation), tailor interventions (e.g., regulation-based therapies), and recognize why change may be slower or more complex.

One foundational concept is Polyvagal Theory (Porges, 2009) which posits that the autonomic nervous system (ANS) has hierarchical branches (ventral vagal, sympathetic, dorsal vagal) linked to social engagement versus threat/freeze responses. In the context of DV/IPV, survivors often shift from the ventral vagal (social-safety) state into sympathetic (fight/flight) or dorsal vagal (freeze/shutdown) responses. For example, a survivor may present as emotionally "flat," dissociated and frozen—characteristic of dorsal vagal dominance—despite appearing calm on the surface. Because the amygdala and other limbic structures "flag" relational threat (partner monitoring, coercive control, unpredictable violence), the prefrontal regulatory systems may shut down, impairing decision-making and emotional regulation (Wilson et al., 2023).

From a neurobiological perspective, threat activates the hypothalamus-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis: the hypothalamus signals the adrenal glands to release cortisol and catecholamines (adrenaline/noradrenaline) which prime the body for survival (e.g., increased heart rate, blood pressure). A recent review noted that trauma-exposed individuals (including DV/IPV survivors) often demonstrate HPA axis dysregulation—either hyper- or hypo-cortisol responses—linked to PTSD and chronic health problems. PMC+1

In the neurophysiological domain, repeated relational threat (such as coercive control, stalking, or intimate terrorism) results in chronic arousal of the ANS and limbic system, with downstream effects: amygdala hyper-reactivity, hippocampal volume reduction, and prefrontal cortex (PFC) hypoactivity. These changes manifest clinically as hypervigilance, emotional dysregulation, memory fragmentation, concentration difficulties and dissociation (Wilson et al., 2023). Because behavioral health providers often treat the

emotional/relational sequelae of DV/IPV, appreciating the body-brain connection becomes imperative.

Somatically, survivors frequently present with medically-unexplained symptoms: chronic pain, gastrointestinal distress, headaches, sleep disruption—or internalized hyperarousal with high allostatic load—due to the repeated activation of survival systems. In short, trauma is **both** an emotional/relational phenomenon and a neuro-physiological process.

Brain Function and DV Trauma

Linking DV/IPV to neurobiology helps clarify why behavioral-health interventions must incorporate regulation, somatic awareness and relational safety—not just cognitive work.

Amygdala-Prefrontal Dysregulation

The amygdala detects threat and activates survival responses; the prefrontal cortex (PFC) modulates or inhibits over-reactivity. In chronic relational trauma (e.g., coercive partner behavior, unpredictable violence) the balance shifts: the amygdala becomes "quick to fire", while PFC regulation underperforms. Survivors may remain in chronic sympathetic arousal (anger, agitation) or shift into dorsal vagal shutdown (numbness, dissociation). This dysregulation parallels findings in other trauma populations and may contribute to difficulties with emotion regulation, interpersonal trust, and relational safety (Raise-Abdullahi et al, 2023).

Neuroendocrine and Neurotransmitter Dysregulation

Exposure to violence correlates with alterations in the HPA axis (cortisol), the hypothalamus-pituitary-thyroid (HPT) and hypothalamus-pituitary-gonadal (HPG) axes, growth hormone and neurotransmitters (serotonin, dopamine) in trauma-exposed individuals (especially PTSD studies) (Raise-Abdullahi, 2023). While DV/IPV-specific studies are fewer, the parallels are clinically meaningful: survivors may show dysregulated stress hormone responses, altered sleep/wake cycles, increased inflammation and higher risk for chronic diseases, all of which behavioral health providers must anticipate.

Intergenerational and Epigenetic Impact

Trauma exposure—including childhood exposure to DV/IPV—can result in epigenetic changes affecting stress-response genes, immune functioning and neurodevelopment. A recent transcriptome-wide study in adolescents found high trauma exposure associated with altered gene expression in brain-region related pathways (Minelli et al., 2023). These biological changes help explain why DV/IPV survivors are at elevated risk for persistent mental health issues (depression, PTSD, substance use) and why their children often show relational/regulatory difficulties.

Intergenerational Transmission

Behavioral health providers working with DV/IPV must recognize that trauma does not end with immediate survivors, it transmits across generations via neuro-developmental, relational and systemic pathways.

Children who witness DV/IPV, even without direct physical harm, often evidence altered stress-response systems, attachment dysregulation, emotion-regulation difficulties and increased risk for future victimization or perpetration. Although many trauma-exposure reviews focus on childhood maltreatment rather than adult partner violence, the patterns are relevant: relational trauma primes neuro-systems for threat anticipation, deregulated affect, and relational avoidance or aggression (Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, 2014).

From a neurodevelopmental lens, chronic exposure to partner violence shapes the brain's architecture (via neuroplasticity, synaptic pruning, and myelination processes). As the transcriptome study (Minelli et al., 2023) indicates, early trauma influences gene expression in pathways associated with fear-regulation, memory and social cognition. Clinically, this means children of DV/IPV survivors may not only carry relational trauma but altered neurophysiology that influences their relational capacities and risk profiles.

Behavioral health providers should therefore incorporate relational-developmental and neuro-regulatory frameworks when working with families impacted by DV/IPV: assessing not only the adult client's trauma history but their children's regulatory and relational functioning, offering multi-generational interventions, and collaborating with child welfare, schools and pediatric services.

Somatic and Regulation Interventions

Given the neurobiological gravity of DV/IPV-related trauma, interventions must move beyond talk therapy alone to address somatic, regulatory, perceptual and relational layers.

Mindfulness and grounding

Practices such as body-scanning, mindful awareness of physiological states (heartbeat, breathing, muscle tension) help survivors reconnect with their bodies, recognize dysregulation and develop regulatory capacity. Because survival responses often bypass conscious processing, somatic practice becomes critical to re-establish PFC-brainstem regulation. Providers might utilize polyvagal-informed interventions: e.g., tracking ventral-vagal safe state cues, engaging in rhythmical breathing, neuroceptive safety signals.

Somatic Experiencing and Sensorimotor Approaches

Approaches such as Somatic Experiencing (Levine, 1997) or body-oriented modalities help restore regulation by allowing the nervous system to complete survival responses (fight/flight/freeze) in a safe environment. Although DV/IPV-specific studies are limited, trauma-informed care literature affirms the importance of including body-based regulation as adjunctive to relational work (Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, 2014).

Trauma-Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (TF-CBT) and EMDR

While originally developed for childhood trauma, these modalities also apply to DV/IPV survivors. TF-CBT integrates cognitive restructuring, safe processing of traumatic memories and skills for emotional/regulation. Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR) can help process trauma memories and re-integrate fragmented relational/self-schemas. For example, interventions aimed at changing stress hormone responses (cortisol) and reducing amygdala hyper-reactivity show promise in trauma populations, suggesting relevance for DV/IPV survivors (Raise-Abdullahi et al, 2023).

Relational Safety and Attachment Repair

Because many DV/IPV survivors have disrupted attachment systems and hyper-vigilant relational nervous systems, therapy must attend to relational safety: developing secure therapeutic alliance, pacing exposure, rebuilding trust, and gradual relational repair. Attachment-informed therapy aims to re-shape internal working models and integrate regulatory, relational and trauma frameworks. Behavioral health providers might incorporate interventions such as Emotionally Focused Therapy (EFT), Integrative Attachment-based Family Therapy or dyadic regulation strategies (when safe), always with a trauma-informed lens.

Integrating Neuroscience with Practice

Clinicians may enhance practice by explaining to clients that their reactions (freeze, dissociation, hypervigilance) are neurobiological responses—not moral failings. Psycho-education about the survival brain helps reduce shame, normalize symptoms and build motivation for regulatory intervention. For example, counsellors might explain that the amygdala acted like a “smoke-alarm” in the relationship and now continues to sound even in safe contexts; therapy aims to “rewire” the smoke alarm, retrain the brain to recognize safety. This framing fosters collaboration, self-compassion and engagement.

Clinical Conceptualization for DV/IPV Survivors

For behavioral-health providers, integrating trauma-neurobiology into assessment and treatment involves:

- Case conceptualization: Map the client's history of DV/IPV, including relational threats, coercive control, partner behaviors, neuro-regulatory symptoms (hyperarousal, dissociation), somatic complaints and attachment impacts.
- Regulation first: Prioritize safety and stabilization of nervous system regulation over trauma-memory processing. For example, begin with grounding, body regulation, relational psychoeducation before deep trauma work.
- Relational repair: Consider attachment injuries and relational neurobiology—help clients build secure relational experiences, differentiating safe from unsafe, and recalibrating relational nervous systems.
- Flexible pacing: Because DV/IPV trauma often involves ongoing or repeated relational threat, therapy must move at the client's pace—monitor nervous system activation, provide "windows of tolerance," and integrate somatic regulation throughout.
- Inter-agency coordination: Collaborate with medical, social, legal services to address neuro-health consequences (e.g., TBI, chronic pain, sleep disorders), child regulation issues, community-based resources and safety planning.
- Psychoeducation: Educate clients and family about neurobiology of trauma, impact of relational threat, and path to regulation—reducing shame and enhancing engagement.
- Outcome monitoring: While standard symptom change (PTSD, depression) is important, also monitor regulation metrics (sleep, dissociation, somatic complaints, relational trust) and relational functioning over time.

By integrating neurobiology, trauma theory and relational practice into DV/IPV treatment, behavioral health providers become more effective in promoting safety, regulation, relational health and long-term recovery.

Cultural, Gender, and Developmental Considerations

Cultural Conceptions of Violence and Dependency

Cultural norms profoundly influence how domestic violence (DV) and intimate partner violence (IPV) are defined, justified, or condemned. While Western legal frameworks view IPV as a human-rights violation and public-health crisis, many societies conceptualize family hierarchy, privacy, and gender roles differently, shaping both perpetration and disclosure patterns (Krause et al., 2023).

In collectivist contexts, family honor, harmony, and male authority may supersede individual autonomy, creating moral and relational conflicts for victims who contemplate leaving abusive partners. Studies among South Asian and Middle-Eastern immigrant women reveal that leaving an abusive spouse can be perceived as dishonoring the family or violating cultural expectations of endurance and obedience (Alhusen et al., 2023). Conversely, community-based interventions grounded in cultural humility—where providers acknowledge rather than pathologize cultural norms—have been shown to enhance trust and engagement (Guruge et al., 2023).

Behavioral-health providers must therefore adopt culturally responsive, non-judgmental frameworks, recognizing that what constitutes "violence" or "abuse" is mediated by cultural scripts regarding gender, duty, and privacy. For example, economic control may not be labeled as abuse in patriarchal households where male breadwinning is normative; however, assessing whether such practices restrict agency remains critical. Providers should use interpreters trained in DV/IPV sensitivity, ensure confidentiality, and avoid relying on family or community members as translators to prevent coercion or retaliation (Alhusen et al., 2023).

Gender and Power Structures

Gender continues to be one of the strongest predictors of DV/IPV exposure, perpetration, and harm severity. A 2024 global systematic review confirmed that women remain disproportionately affected by severe and coercive forms of IPV, while men are more likely to report situational couple violence of lower intensity (Hamel et al., 2024). Feminist and intersectional theories locate this disparity within structural inequalities—economic dependency, patriarchal power, and gendered socialization that normalizes male dominance (Walker et al., 2023).

However, gendered analysis must remain nuanced. Men, non-binary, and transgender individuals also experience IPV, often with distinct barriers to disclosure. Male victims may fear stigma, loss of masculinity, or disbelief by authorities (Hamel et al., 2024). Transgender and non-binary survivors face additional risks related to identity-based abuse, such as being "outed," denied medical care, or subjected to corrective violence (Flores et al., 2023).

Behavioral health providers should apply a gender-inclusive but power-aware framework: assess patterns of control, fear, and injury rather than gender stereotypes about victimhood or aggression. Screening questions should be neutrally phrased ("Have you ever felt afraid of a partner?") and providers should avoid assumptions about who is the perpetrator or victim. Treatment plans must consider gendered coping norms—men may externalize distress (anger, substance use), whereas women more often internalize

(depression, guilt). Integrating gender-sensitive psychoeducation and validating diverse survivor identities reduces shame and fosters engagement.

LGBTQ+ and Minority Stress

Among LGBTQ+ populations, IPV prevalence mirrors or exceeds heterosexual rates but remains under-reported due to stigma and minority stress. A meta-analysis of 76 studies (Flores et al., 2023) found lifetime IPV prevalence of 44% among sexual-minority women and 35% among sexual-minority men, with psychological abuse most common. Minority stress theory posits that chronic experiences of discrimination, internalized stigma, and societal marginalization amplify vulnerability to relational violence and impede help-seeking.

Unique forms of control—threatening to "out" the partner, exploiting gender dysphoria, or withholding hormones—illustrate how abusers weaponize identity. Structural barriers compound risk: lack of LGBTQ-competent shelters, fear of transphobic policing, and exclusion from heteronormative DV programs (Holland et al., 2024). Behavioral-health providers should ensure practice inclusivity: display affirming materials, use correct pronouns, and link clients to LGBTQ-specific advocacy organizations.

Culturally competent assessment involves understanding how minority stress interacts with trauma responses. For example, a bisexual survivor may attribute distress to homophobia rather than abuse, or fear reinforcing stereotypes about LGBTQ+ relationships. Integrating intersectional frameworks (e.g., gender, race, sexuality, disability) helps providers conceptualize layered oppression.

Developmental Stages and Vulnerable Populations

Children Witnessing DV

Children exposed to DV—even without direct physical harm—experience trauma comparable to direct abuse. Neurobiological studies demonstrate that exposure to parental violence alters stress-response systems, attachment patterns, and executive functioning (Letourneau et al., 2023). Behavioral sequelae include aggression, anxiety, school problems, and later perpetration or victimization. The intergenerational transmission of trauma and violence underscores the necessity of family-centered intervention models.

Providers should assess child exposure routinely, collaborate with child-protection services when indicated, and incorporate trauma-informed family therapy or parent-child interaction therapy. Psychoeducation for parents can reduce guilt and promote safe-parenting strategies after separation from the perpetrator.

Adolescents and Dating Violence

Adolescent dating violence shares features with adult IPV but presents distinct risk factors: peer normalization of aggression, digital monitoring, and limited relationship experience. A 2023 U.S. study reported that 8–10% of teens experienced physical or sexual dating violence annually, with girls and LGBTQ+ youth disproportionately affected (Reed et al., 2023). Early intervention through school-based education, mentorship, and digital-safety training can prevent escalation into adult IPV. Behavioral-health providers working with youth should screen for cyber-harassment, sextortion, and coercive digital behaviors forms often invisible to adults.

Elder Abuse and Caregiver Dynamics

Elderly individuals face DV primarily through caregiver or partner abuse, often hidden under the guise of dependency or cognitive impairment. A 2024 systematic review found that approximately 15% of adults ≥ 60 experience abuse, most commonly psychological or financial (Dong et al., 2024). Cognitive decline, isolation, and reliance on caregivers create vulnerability. Providers should remain alert for indicators such as withdrawal, unexplained financial changes, or fear of a caregiver.

Integrating geriatric mental-health assessment with DV screening, involving adult-protective services when needed, and promoting autonomy (e.g., durable power-of-attorney education) are key steps.

Ethical and Practice Implications for Diversity-Informed Care

Cultural and developmental competence is an ethical imperative under major professional codes (APA, ACA, NASW). Providers must avoid imposing personal or cultural biases and instead apply cultural humility—a stance of curiosity, respect, and lifelong learning. This includes:

- Self-reflection: examining personal attitudes about gender, culture, sexuality, and aging.
- Informed consent and transparency: explaining confidentiality limits in culturally sensitive ways, especially when clients fear community stigma.
- Collaborative safety planning: balancing respect for cultural values (e.g., family unity) with survivor safety.
- Community partnership: engaging cultural brokers, faith leaders, or ethnic organizations that promote safety without reinforcing oppression.

- Interdisciplinary coordination: consulting with culturally specific DV agencies or interpreters trained in confidentiality.

Ultimately, culturally responsive DV practice integrates awareness of how power, identity, and developmental stage shape both risk and resilience. By embedding these principles, behavioral-health professionals can provide equitable, sensitive, and effective care for diverse populations affected by domestic and intimate partner violence.

Evidence-Based Interventions

Foundations of Trauma-Informed Care

Trauma-informed care (TIC) has become the prevailing framework for clinical work with survivors of domestic violence (DV) and intimate partner violence (IPV). It recognizes that exposure to violence fundamentally alters neurobiological, psychological, and relational functioning and that treatment must emphasize safety, trust, collaboration, empowerment, and choice (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration [SAMHSA], 2023).

TIC requires providers to recognize the prevalence of trauma, understand its effects, and actively prevent re-traumatization. Within behavioral-health settings, this means clinicians must consider how therapy structure, tone, and environment affect survivor safety and autonomy. For example, mandating immediate disclosure of violent incidents without assessing readiness can replicate coercive control dynamics. Empirical evidence indicates that TIC-based programs improve engagement, retention, and symptom reduction in survivors compared with standard care (Berliner et al., 2023).

Key principles include:

1. Safety: physical and emotional safety are prerequisites to therapeutic progress.
2. Trustworthiness: transparent communication about treatment goals and confidentiality.
3. Peer and collaboration: involving clients in goal setting and pacing.
4. Empowerment: focusing on strengths and restoring agency.
5. Cultural and gender sensitivity: integrating awareness of intersectionality into care (Alhusen et al., 2023).

Behavioral-health providers should therefore begin every DV/IPV case with a stabilization phase emphasizing grounding, psychoeducation, and basic resource connection before trauma processing.

Stage-Based Treatment Framework

Judith Herman's (1992/2015) triphasic trauma-recovery model continues to guide evidence-based practice: (1) Safety and stabilization; (2) Remembrance and mourning (processing); (3) Reconnection and reintegration. Recent adaptations affirm its relevance to DV/IPV survivors (Najavits et al., 2023).

1. Stage 1: Safety and stabilization
    - Establish physical, psychological, and social safety.
    - Create safety plans addressing housing, finances, legal protection, and digital security.
    - Introduce regulation skills: breathing, grounding, mindfulness, sleep hygiene, and body awareness.
    - Coordinate with multidisciplinary supports (medical, legal, advocacy).
2. Stage 2: Processing and meaning-making
    - Use structured, time-limited trauma therapies (TF-CBT, EMDR, narrative exposure therapy) once the survivor demonstrates stability.
    - Integrate cognitive restructuring of trauma-related beliefs ("I deserved it," "I cannot trust anyone").
    - Avoid prolonged exposure when ongoing threat persists; focus instead on fragmented memory integration.
3. Stage 3: Reconnection and relational repair
    - Rebuild community ties, intimacy, and life purpose.
    - Address self-esteem, sexuality, parenting, and post-traumatic growth.
    - Support advocacy and leadership roles for empowerment.

Providers should communicate that progress is non-linear; regression during stress is common and does not represent failure.

Individual and Group Interventions for Survivors

Cognitive-behavioral approaches

Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) remains a cornerstone for addressing trauma-related cognitions in DV survivors. A meta-analysis of 17 RCTs found trauma-focused CBT significantly reduced PTSD, depression, and anxiety among women survivors (Nguyen et

al., 2024). Techniques include identifying maladaptive thoughts (“I caused the violence”), challenging cognitive distortions, and reinforcing safety-focused behaviors.

Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT)

DBT skills, mindfulness, emotion regulation, distress tolerance, and interpersonal effectiveness, are effective for survivors experiencing intense affect or self-harm tendencies (Griffin et al., 2023). DBT’s emphasis on acceptance and behavioral change aligns well with trauma-informed principles.

Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT)

ACT helps survivors distance from trauma-related cognitions and reconnect with personal values. A 2023 trial with IPV survivors demonstrated significant decreases in experiential avoidance and psychological inflexibility, mediating PTSD symptom reduction (Cano-González et al., 2023).

Narrative and Meaning-Centered Therapies

Narrative therapy allows survivors to reconstruct identity beyond victimization, while logotherapy and meaning-centered interventions enhance post-traumatic growth. Behavioral-health providers can integrate narrative re-authoring exercises or trauma timelines, emphasizing strengths and resilience.

Group-based Interventions

Group therapy offers normalization and peer validation, reducing isolation. Research supports psychoeducational support groups combining empowerment education with skills training (Bhandari et al., 2023). However, group safety protocols must screen for ongoing coercive relationships and avoid re-traumatization.

Perpetrator Treatment

Addressing perpetrators remains critical to long-term prevention. Evidence indicates heterogeneity in efficacy among Batterer Intervention Programs (BIPs); success depends on theoretical orientation, accountability mechanisms, and integration with the justice system (Lee & Wong, 2024).

Cognitive-Behavioral and Accountability Models

Modern BIPs integrate CBT, motivational interviewing (MI), and trauma-informed principles rather than relying solely on psychoeducation. A 2023 meta-analysis found that BIPs incorporating MI and individualized case management reduced recidivism by 23 % compared with traditional models (Juodis et al., 2023). Clinicians working with court-mandated clients should focus on accountability (“You choose your behavior”) while exploring emotional regulation, cognitive distortions (entitlement, minimization), and empathy deficits.

Trauma-Informed Perpetrator Work

Emerging research recognizes that some perpetrators have trauma histories themselves, but trauma explanation must never replace accountability. Integrating trauma awareness helps clinicians understand triggers without excusing harm (Lee & Wong, 2024).

Differentiated Intervention

Typology-guided treatment (e.g., Johnson's situational vs. coercive-controlling violence) can improve outcomes. Situational perpetrators may respond to anger-management and couples communication training (with safety screening), while coercive-controlling perpetrators require intensive accountability programs and monitoring.

Couple and Family Work

Conjoint therapy in DV/IPV is contraindicated when coercive control or significant fear exists. However, in lower-risk, situational violence cases, couple-based interventions focusing on mutual accountability and communication can be beneficial (Stith et al., 2024).

The Domestic Violence–Focused Couples Therapy (DV-FCT) model includes:

- Comprehensive safety screening and partner consent.
- Separate initial assessments.
- Structured in-session contracts against violence.
- Emotion-regulation training, conflict resolution, and joint problem-solving.

Preliminary evidence suggests that when applied judiciously, DV-FCT can reduce conflict and improve relational satisfaction in non-coercive couples (Stith et al., 2024). Behavioral-health providers must collaborate with advocacy professionals and maintain safety checks throughout treatment.

Multidisciplinary Collaboration

Because DV/IPV impacts multiple life domains, effective treatment requires coordinated, multidisciplinary systems integrating behavioral-health, medical, legal, and social-service responses. Interprofessional collaboration improves safety outcomes, reduces service fragmentation, and decreases re-traumatization (Wiemann et al., 2024).

Behavioral-health clinicians should:

- Maintain referral partnerships with shelters, legal advocates, and primary-care providers.

- Participate in case-coordination teams or community-response networks.
- Use shared but secure documentation protocols compliant with HIPAA and VAWA.
- Advocate for trauma-informed policies in agencies and health systems.

Collaboration also extends to technology: telehealth and digital-safety integration are essential. During and after the COVID-19 pandemic, tele-behavioral health expanded access but increased digital abuse risks. Providers must ensure privacy (headphones, code words, safety checks) and document digital-safety planning (Holland & Lewis, 2024).

Emerging Modalities and Digital Innovations

Recent years have witnessed a surge of technology-assisted interventions: mobile safety apps, AI-based risk assessment, and virtual-reality (VR) exposure therapy for trauma regulation. A 2025 pilot study demonstrated that a VR-based relaxation program for IPV survivors significantly decreased physiological arousal and improved emotion regulation after six sessions (Martínez-Pastor et al., 2025).

While promising, digital tools raise confidentiality, access, and safety issues—particularly if abusers monitor devices. Behavioral-health providers must evaluate technological interventions within safety protocols, obtain informed consent, and stay updated on digital-security guidelines.

Ethical and Practical Integration

Providers must maintain ethical vigilance when applying evidence-based models to DV/IPV populations. APA, NASW, and ACA ethics codes require competence in trauma and cultural diversity. Ethical integration means:

- Prioritizing safety and non-maleficence.
- Avoiding dual relationships with perpetrators or shared-couple cases.
- Documenting risk assessments and safety plans.
- Engaging in supervision and continuing education specific to IPV.

Clinicians should also track outcomes and adapt interventions to client feedback—an evidence-based practice principle emphasizing integration of best research evidence, clinical expertise, and client values (APA, 2023). By grounding treatment in empirical evidence, trauma-neurobiology, and ethical awareness, behavioral-health professionals can improve outcomes and safety for individuals and families affected by domestic violence.

Ethical, Legal, and Supervision Considerations

Professional Ethics and Duty of Care

Domestic violence (DV) and intimate partner violence (IPV) present profound ethical challenges for behavioral-health providers. Clinicians must balance autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, justice, and fidelity while navigating confidentiality, safety, and reporting mandates (American Psychological Association [APA], 2023).

The ethical mandate is clear: providers are responsible for protecting clients from foreseeable harm. The duty of care extends beyond symptom management to include risk assessment, safety planning, and coordination with community resources. When working with survivors, clinicians must avoid re-traumatization and empower clients to make informed decisions.

However, ethical tension often arises between autonomy and protection. For instance, a client may choose to remain in a relationship despite severe abuse. The provider's role is not to impose decisions but to explore ambivalence safely, enhance motivation, and clarify risk. Applying motivational interviewing principles can foster autonomy while reinforcing safety-focused reasoning.

Professional codes (APA, 2023; National Association of Social Workers [NASW], 2024; American Counseling Association [ACA], 2024) collectively require competence in trauma and cultural sensitivity. Ignorance of IPV dynamics can constitute ethical negligence. Clinicians must pursue ongoing continuing education on risk assessment, coercive control, and trauma-informed care.

Duty to Warn, Protect, and Report

The duty to warn and protect derives from the landmark *Tarasoff v. Regents of the University of California* (1976) decision, which established that mental-health professionals have a legal and ethical obligation to take reasonable steps to protect identifiable victims from threats of harm.

1. When the duty applies

- A client expresses intent to harm a partner or family member.
- A credible threat exists and the victim is identifiable.
- The provider believes the threat is imminent.

In DV contexts, this duty can be complex: abusers may threaten partners as part of control rather than immediate homicide risk, while victims may disclose intentions to harm

an abuser out of desperation. Providers must evaluate intent, means, and imminence and document consultation with supervisors or legal counsel.

2. Mandatory reporting

All U.S. jurisdictions require reporting of suspected child abuse; most also require reporting of elder or dependent-adult abuse (NASW, 2024). Some states mandate reporting of IPV-related injuries by healthcare professionals. Clinicians must know their state statutes and inform clients during informed consent about these limits to confidentiality.

3. Balancing confidentiality

Confidentiality is foundational to the therapeutic alliance, but it is not absolute. Providers must explain exceptions early in treatment, revisit them during safety planning, and avoid unnecessary disclosures. When possible, disclose only the minimum necessary information, document rationale, and involve the client in the reporting process when safe.

Documentation and Record Management

Documentation serves both clinical and legal functions. Accurate, objective notes protect clients, clinicians, and third parties.

Best-practice documentation includes:

- Direct quotes when feasible ("Client stated, 'He said he'd kill me if I left.'")
- Detailed behavioral descriptions rather than interpretations ("Client appeared with bruises on right forearm, stated cause was partner pushing.")
- Records of risk assessment, supervision, and safety-planning steps.
- Avoiding subjective or diagnostic labels without supporting data (e.g., "appears manipulative").

Digital confidentiality requires additional vigilance: clinicians should use secure, encrypted record systems compliant with HIPAA and the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). Providers should avoid emailing sensitive DV information unless encrypted and verify that shared portals are not accessible to abusive partners.

When documentation may become legal evidence (e.g., custody or protective-order proceedings), providers should maintain neutrality, describe facts, and refrain from conclusions about guilt or innocence.

Supervision and Vicarious Trauma

Because DV work exposes clinicians to repeated accounts of trauma, clinical supervision and peer consultation are essential ethical safeguards.

1. Functions of supervision

Supervisors must ensure:

- Ongoing risk-assessment competence.
- Adherence to ethical and legal standards.
- Awareness of transference and countertransference related to violence.
- Monitoring of emotional burnout and vicarious trauma.

2. Vicarious trauma and compassion fatigue

Research indicates that clinicians working primarily with DV/IPV clients show elevated rates of secondary traumatic stress and compassion fatigue (Baird et al., 2024). Symptoms include emotional numbing, hypervigilance, intrusive imagery, and cynicism. Supervisors should normalize these experiences and promote resilience through structured debriefing, workload balance, and reflective practice.

Mindfulness, peer support, and trauma-informed supervision models have demonstrated efficacy in reducing provider distress and improving clinical judgment (Gilbert & Cohen, 2023). Ethical competence requires emotional sustainability. Clinicians should set boundaries regarding availability, avoid over-identification with survivors, and engage in personal therapy if secondary trauma impairs functioning.

Ethical Practice in Perpetrator Work

Working with perpetrators introduces distinct ethical dilemmas: managing safety, accountability, and therapist neutrality.

Key ethical considerations include:

- Dual relationships: Avoid treating both victim and perpetrator concurrently.
- Informed consent: Clarify confidentiality limits and consequences for ongoing violence.
- Accountability: Emphasize choice and responsibility; avoid collusion or over-empathizing with justifications.
- Safety collaboration: Coordinate with partner's counselor or victim advocate when possible, ensuring no information jeopardizes safety.

Perpetrator work should never proceed without consistent safety monitoring. If new threats or escalation emerge, clinicians must reassess risk and, if warranted, report to authorities.

Multijurisdictional and Telehealth Considerations

The expansion of telebehavioral health requires awareness of interstate practice laws and digital-safety obligations. Providers delivering telehealth services must hold valid licensure in both the client's and clinician's jurisdictions unless interstate compacts (e.g., PSYPACT) apply.

Digital practice introduces new confidentiality challenges for DV survivors: partners may monitor devices or accounts. Clinicians must verify the client's safety environment at each session, use code phrases to end sessions safely, and document digital-safety measures (Holland & Lewis, 2024).

Providers should also stay informed about state-specific IPV reporting statutes and telehealth consent laws. Failing to verify jurisdictional requirements may result in ethical and legal violations.

Ethical Decision-Making Models

Structured ethical-decision models help clinicians navigate dilemmas in DV cases. Common steps include (Corey et al., 2024):

1. Identify the problem and relevant ethical principles.
2. Consult professional codes and state laws.
3. Assess potential harm and benefits.
4. Seek supervision or legal consultation.
5. Consider client values and cultural context.
6. Document the process and chosen action.

Applying a systematic approach enhances defensibility and consistency of care. For example, when deciding whether to report a threat, the clinician documents ethical reasoning (imminence of danger, prior violence history, consultation notes).

Organizational and Policy Ethics

Beyond individual practice, ethical DV response requires institutional commitment. Agencies should implement:

- Written policies on IPV screening, confidentiality, and safety protocols.
- Staff training on trauma-informed principles and implicit bias.
- Procedures for responding to staff disclosures of DV.
- Culturally competent outreach to marginalized communities.

Leadership support ensures ethical consistency and reduces moral injury among clinicians. Organizational ethics intersect with social justice: advocating for survivor-protective legislation and funding trauma services aligns with professional mandates for justice and beneficence.

Ethical and legal literacy is inseparable from clinical competence. Behavioral-health providers serve as both healers and gatekeepers—protecting clients, families, and communities through informed, compassionate, and legally compliant practice.

Training, Prevention, and Policy Development

Workforce Training and Capacity Building

To shift the response to domestic violence (DV) and intimate partner violence (IPV) from reaction to prevention, behavioral-health systems must invest in workforce training and capacity building. Key components include:

- Competency in DV dynamics: Clinicians need structured training on recognizing coercive control, technology-facilitated abuse, cultural and gender diversity in DV, and perpetrator typologies. Without foundational knowledge, screening and intervention remain inconsistent.
- Trauma-informed and cultural-humility training: As noted, trauma-informed care principles (safety, trust, empowerment) must be integrated into standard practice. Providers should also receive training on cultural humility and intersectionality to address DV within diverse communities.
- Skill-building in screening, risk assessment and safety planning: Providers often report discomfort or lack of confidence in DV screening. Training programs that include role-play, supervision and risk-assessment labs improve clinician readiness and referral rates.
- Ongoing supervision and organizational support: Training alone is insufficient unless supported by institution-wide policy, supervision for vicarious trauma, and embedded workflows (e.g., DV screening prompts in electronic records, referral pathways).

- Measurement and evaluation: Organizations should track DV-related metrics (screening rates, referral outcomes, staff competence) to ensure training translates into practice change.

For behavioral-health providers, thriving in DV/prevention practice means that training and capacity building are not optional but foundational. Providers should advocate for organizational investment in DV training, cross-discipline collaboration, and reflexive practice (i.e., continuous learning based on outcome data).

Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Prevention Strategies

Prevention of DV/IPV can be conceptualized along a public health continuum: primary (before violence occurs), secondary (early intervention), tertiary (reduce harm and recurrence). Clinical providers play a role across all levels.

Primary prevention aims to stop violence before it begins. Evidence now supports programs that:

- Promote healthy relationships and gender equity (e.g., in schools or youth programs)
- Implement community mobilization and social norm change (e.g., bystander programs, media campaigns)
- Address structural factors – e.g., economic supports for families, housing security, community connectedness.
  A 2024 systematic review found that multi-component community-based interventions significantly reduced IPV incidence when combined with economic and social-support elements. (Bacchus et al., 2024)

Secondary prevention focuses on early identification and intervention for individuals at elevated risk. Examples include behavioral-health screening of emerging relationship conflict, trauma-informed counselling for survivors, and intervention for young people showing dating violence behaviors. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) research agenda highlights the need for community- and organizational-level policies to reduce inequities in IPV. (CDC, 2024)

Tertiary prevention aims to minimize harm among those already affected. For behavioral-health providers, this means delivering trauma-informed therapy, perpetrator intervention, relapse-prevention planning, and coordination with legal/advocacy systems to reduce recurrence of violence and long-term sequelae.

Understanding this continuum enables providers to situate their role within a broader prevention ecosystem, where clinical work complements community, educational and policy interventions.

Policy Development and Advocacy

Effective DV/IPV prevention requires supportive policy frameworks at institutional, state/provincial, national and international levels.

Protective legislation and funding frameworks

Policies that bolster DV-prevention include:

- Grant programs for community-based DV services, especially for under-served populations (e.g., Family Violence Prevention and Services Improvement Act amendments in the U.S.) (U.S. Congress, 2023)
- Legislation enhancing protective orders, firearm removal for abusers, digital-abuse regulation, and child-welfare screening for DV exposure
- Funding allocations for shelters, advocacy services, training, research and cross-sector coordination.

Behavioral-health providers should remain apprised of relevant legislation in their jurisdictions and collaborate with advocacy coalitions, legal services and policymakers to influence DV-prevention policy.

Systems coordination and data infrastructure

Policy development must prioritize cross-system-coordination (health, justice, social services, education) and data systems that track DV/IPV prevalence, outcomes and service utilization. For example, the 2024 policy brief "Nine Ways Policymakers Can Improve Domestic Violence Response" emphasizes integrating survivors' voices, tailoring accountability, supporting service collaboration and improving data-sharing protocols (Dusenbery & Nembhard, 2024), all vital to organizational policy design.

Scaling and Sustainability of Prevention Programs

A persistent policy challenge is scaling evidence-based prevention programs with fidelity, especially in marginalized communities. The CDC's IPV research priorities highlight the need to study cost-effectiveness, implementation barriers and adaptation of programs for diverse settings (CDC, 2024). Providers can support by engaging in program evaluation, offering feedback on cultural relevance and helping refine policy implementation manuals.

Equity-centered Policy

Policy must focus on equity, prioritizing communities facing the highest DV burden (e.g.,

Indigenous, immigrant, LGBTQ+, disabled survivors). Prevention policy must include funding for culturally specific services, using community-led models, and incorporating equity metrics into policy success. Behavioral-health providers can contribute field insights and partner with community organizations to advocate for inclusive policy.

Training for Prevention: Provider Role in Education and Early Intervention

Behavioral-health providers also serve as educators and prevention agents within their communities.

- Provider-led training: clinicians may train school-counselors, primary-care staff and community workers to recognize early signs of relational aggression, digital abuse, coercive control and dating violence.
- School-based prevention: Providers can collaborate with schools for healthy-relationship curricula, youth mentoring and early intervention programs that address emotional regulation, boundary-setting and digital abuse.
- Workplace training: Given the economic and productivity impacts of DV, training for workplaces on recognition, referral and survivor-support policies is increasingly important. Providers may lead or consult on organizational DV-prevention programs.
- Telehealth and digital tools: The rise of virtual services demands provider-competence in delivering safe screenings, digital-safety planning, and online group interventions. Practice-based adaptations are vital for remote and underserved populations.

Evaluation, Research and Emerging Directions

Prevention policy and training must rest on a solid evidence base.

- A 2024 systematic review in *The Lancet Public Health* of interventions to prevent/respond to IPV found that multi-component programs (e.g., combining community mobilization, economic empowerment, behavior-change interventions) produce the strongest effect sizes. (Bacchus et al., 2024)
- Research priorities emphasize long-term follow-up, cost-effectiveness analysis, digital-intervention evaluation, and underserved-population adaptation (CDC, 2024)
- Emerging innovations include digital risk-assessment tools, artificial-intelligence chatbots for survivor support, and virtual-reality prevention modules (Saglam, Nurse & Sugiura, 2024)

- As policy evolves, providers should engage in practice-based research, program evaluation, and interface with knowledge translation to inform policy.

Implications for Training, Practice and Policy Alignment

Behavioral-health providers are uniquely positioned at the nexus of clinical practice, community prevention and policy advocacy.

- Practice: integrate screening, risk assessment and trauma-informed therapeutic work into daily practice.
- Training: engage in and lead DV-specific professional development, supervise peers, and contribute to organizational training programs.
- Policy: advocate for client-centered, equity-driven DV policies, contribute practitioner-voice to legislation and funding, and evaluate prevention initiatives.

Together, these efforts help shift the DV paradigm from reactive to proactive, from individual treatment to system-wide prevention, from isolated intervention to integrated public-health strategy.

Domestic violence (DV) and intimate partner violence (IPV) remain pervasive public-health, ethical, and human-rights crises, inflicting profound psychological, neurobiological, relational, and intergenerational harm. For behavioral-health providers, addressing DV is not a peripheral responsibility, but a professional imperative rooted in the principles of trauma-informed, ethical, and culturally responsive care.

Across this manuscript, several key themes emerge. First, DV is multidimensional shaped by psychological, sociological, and ecological systems that sustain coercive control and dependency. A thorough understanding of these frameworks equips clinicians to identify patterns of dominance and victimization beyond physical injury alone. Second, attachment, trauma, and neurobiological research illuminate how violence reshapes the nervous system, impairing regulation, trust, and decision-making. This knowledge empowers clinicians to interpret survivors' behaviors as adaptive survival strategies rather than pathology, promoting compassion and effective intervention.

Third, ethical and cultural competence anchor safe, equitable practice. Providers must balance autonomy with protection, maintain clear documentation, and uphold confidentiality while fulfilling duties to warn and protect. Culturally responsive practice acknowledges that violence is filtered through culture, gender, sexuality, and systemic inequities; ethical care therefore demands humility, curiosity, and ongoing self-reflection.

Fourth, the path toward prevention and systemic change lies in integration of trauma-informed treatment, multidisciplinary collaboration, and policy advocacy. Evidence demonstrates that coordinated interventions combining behavioral-health care, community advocacy, and legislative support produce the most enduring impact. Behavioral-health professionals stand at the front line of this integration, uniquely positioned to bridge the micro (clinical) and macro (policy) levels of response.

Finally, healing from domestic violence is both an individual and collective endeavor. At the individual level, survivors reclaim safety, agency, and identity through compassionate, evidence-based care. At the systemic level, prevention and justice require societal commitment, adequate funding, education, and policy reform grounded in research and lived experience.

When behavioral-health providers combine scientific understanding with empathy, advocacy, and ethical integrity, they become catalysts for transformation, breaking cycles of violence, fostering resilience, and advancing a culture of safety and dignity. The integration of trauma science, cultural humility, and public-health prevention represents the future of domestic-violence intervention. By embracing that future, the profession affirms its highest calling: to protect life, promote healing, and help build communities free from fear and coercion.

References

Aboagye, R. G., Obiri, S., Teye, A. K., & Adjei, A. N. (2023). Determinants of intimate partner violence in low- and middle-income countries: A systematic review. *BMC Public Health, 23*(1), 1854. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-16118-8

Annual Review of Public Health. (2024). *Violence against women as a global public health issue. Annual Review of Public Health, 45*, xxx–xxx. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-060722-025138

Arseneault, L., Brassard, A., Lefebvre, A.-A., Lafontaine, M.-F., Godbout, N., Daspe, M.-È., Savard, C., & Péloquin, K. (2023). Romantic attachment and intimate partner violence perpetrated by individuals seeking help: The roles of dysfunctional communication patterns and relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Family Violence*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-023-00600-z

CDC. (2024, May 16). *About intimate partner violence.* Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/about/index.html

Clemens, V., Huber-Lang, M., Plener, P. L., Brähler, E., & Fegert, J. M. (2023). The prevalence of intimate partner violence worldwide: Updated review and implications for public health. *Frontiers in Psychiatry, 14*, 1152779. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2023.1152779

Douadi, M., Tabet, Y., Benyamina, A., & Verdeau, C. (2024). The role of affect dysregulation and gender hostility in associations between attachment insecurities and intimate partner violence perpetration. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605241234598

Essue, B. M., et al. (2025). Women's experiences of gender-based violence supports … [Journal]. [Details].

Fisher, C., Law, T., & Campbell, A. (2024). "It's like you're a living hostage and it never ends": A qualitative examination of the trauma and mental-health impacts of coercive control. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 39*(5–6), NP1392–NP1410. https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605231204642

Frontiers Public Health. (2024). *Intimate partner violence, prevalence and its consequences. Frontiers in Public Health, 12*, Article 1412788. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1412788

Hine, B. A., Bates, E. A., & Wallace, S. (2024). Coercive control in LGBTQ+ relationships: Expanding inclusive definitions and culturally responsive interventions. *Violence and Victims, 39*(2), 221–240. https://doi.org/10.1891/VV-D-23-00102

Hine, B. A., Murphy, A., & Roberts, J. (2024). Conceptualizing coercive control in LGBTQ+ relationships: A review of current measures and inclusivity gaps. *BMC Psychology, 12*(1), 204. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-01745-2

Jiménez, I. T. B., & Rodríguez Ávila, N. (2024). Factors associated with domestic violence in women: Systematic ecological review. *Revista Cuidarte, 16*(1), e3857. https://doi.org/10.15649/cuidarte.3857

Kim, J. Y., Lee, S. J., & Park, H. Y. (2023). Intergenerational transmission of intimate partner violence: Mediating roles of attachment and emotion regulation. *Journal of Family Psychology, 37*(6), 812–824. https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0001125

Krause-Utz, A., Feneberg, A. C., & Elzinga, B. M. (2023). Psychological factors linked to intimate partner violence: The role of childhood maltreatment severity, maladaptive schemas, and attachment. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 24*(4), 912–926. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380231101554

Liu, R., & Xu, Y. (2023). Witnessing parental intimate partner violence and later relationship aggression: A meta-analytic update. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 24*(5), 1874–1889. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380221101543

Lohmann, H., Crane, C., & Hilton, N. Z. (2023). Coercive control and patterns of intimate partner violence: Implications for assessment and treatment. *Violence Against Women, 29*(15–16), 3042–3061. https://doi.org/10.1177/10778012231146587

Lyons, N., Roberts, A., & Jones, E. (2023). Applying the social-ecological framework to link intimate partner violence and its multilevel determinants. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 38*(9–10), 7654–7676. https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605231100842

Meyer, S. R. (2023). Sociological theories to explain intimate partner violence: A structural and ecological perspective. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 24*(7), 1520–1537. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380221127644

Morales-Sanhueza, K., Alvarado, M. E., & López-Soler, C. (2024). Dyadic attachment patterns and conflict escalation in intimate partner violence: An integrative model. *Frontiers in Psychology, 15*, 1457893. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1457893

Negash, M., Abera, H., & Wondimu, H. (2024). Prevalence and associated factors of domestic violence among pregnant women in rural Ethiopia. *BMC Women's Health, 24*(1), 331. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-024-03234-7

Rastogi, M., Singh, R., & Thomas, S. (2024). Co-occurrence of physical and psychological intimate partner violence: Epidemiological and clinical correlates. *Frontiers in Public Health, 12*, 1429876. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1429876

Seedall, R. B., & McCourt, J. (2024). Gender, attachment, and demand/withdraw patterns in the context of intimate partner conflict. *Journal of Family Psychology.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0001234

Silva, D. F., Cardoso, A. S., & Mendes, R. (2024). Mental-health consequences of intimate partner violence: A systematic review of recent evidence. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 25*(3), 551–566. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380231201526

Smith, L. K., & Jones, A. P. (2024). Rethinking social learning theory in intimate partner violence: Integrating relational and contextual nuance. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 75*, 102004. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2023.102004

Spangaro, J., Zwi, A. B., & Poulos, R. (2024). Effectiveness of intimate partner violence screening in healthcare settings: A systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *BMJ Open, 14*(7), e092781. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2023-092781

Suryanarayanan, V., Khan, M., & Rahman, F. (2024). Global prevalence of intimate partner violence during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLOS ONE, 19*(2), e0293567. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0293567

Tani, F., Bonifacci, P., & Rossi, A. (2023). Insecure attachment, emotional dysregulation, and partner-directed aggression: A dyadic study of communication rigidity and control. *Frontiers in Psychiatry, 14*, 1120567. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2023.1120567

Tolmie, J. R. (2023). Technology-facilitated and economic abuse: Emerging forms of coercive control. *Journal of Family Violence, 38*(6), 845–859. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-023-00463-0

White, S. J., Sin, J., & Sweeney, A. (2023). Global prevalence and mental health outcomes of intimate partner violence among women: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 25*(1), 494–511. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380231155529

Williams, A., Heise, L., & Perrin, N. (2025). Intimate partner violence help-seeking norms: Measuring ecological influences on disclosure and response. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605241234567

Williamson, E., Jones, K., & Ferrer-Perez, V. A. (2023). The psychological impacts of coercive control: A meta-analysis of posttraumatic stress and depression outcomes. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 24*(7), 1421–1436. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380221154322

Williamson, E., Stanley, N., & Bell, J. (2023). Coercive control and mental health outcomes: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 336*, 94–106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2023.05.024

Wong, I., & Denson, T. F. (2025). Understanding the mechanisms underlying the association between insecure attachment and intimate partner violence: Meta-analyses of mediators. *Clinical Psychology Review, 121*, 102645. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2025.102645

Wright, E. N., Anderson, J., Phillips, K., & Miyamoto, S. (2022). Help-seeking and barriers to care in intimate partner sexual violence: A systematic review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 23*(5), 1510–1528. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838021998305