

Research Article

Domestic Violence: Combining AI Simulation and Mind Genomics Thinking to Explore Potential Mind-Sets and Relevant Responses

Sharon Wingert¹ and Howard Moskowitz^{1,2*}

¹Tactical Data Group, Stafford, Virginia, USA

²Mind Genomics Associates, Inc., White Plains, New York, USA

*Corresponding author: Howard R. Moskowitz, Tactical Data Group, Stafford, VA, USA & Mind Genomics Associates, Inc., White Plains, NY, USA

Received: August 11, 2025; Accepted: August 24, 2025; Published: November 03, 2025

Abstract

The paper deals with the issues involved in domestic violence, specifically the problem of how to help police officers understand the mind of the abuser. Through AI, the police office can develop a simulation system that allows the office to explore the “mind” of the abuser to learn what different abusers may be thinking and what might be effective strategies to deal with the abuser. In turn, Mind Genomics provides the user with a sense of the different types of thinking going on among abusers and what may be reasonable points of discussion. The paper shows how to simulate these mind-sets and how to simulate the advice that a psychotherapist might give the police officer when considering the domestic violence situation. The paper finishes with a vision of AI coupled with Mind Genomics as a new educational tool for police officers that in effect becomes a never-exhausted, “always on” guide which can be used to deal with problems in “real time.”

Keywords: Abuser mind-set, Domestic violence intervention, Mind genomics, Police training

Introduction

Domestic violence is a persistent issue affecting victims, families, and communities. Police officers play a crucial role in addressing this issue, but understanding the broader psychological, social, and economic dynamics is essential. Officers face intense and volatile situations, where victims may not disclose their mistreatment due to fear, shame, or a desire to protect the abuser. They must balance immediate protective duties with awareness of long-term psychological dynamics [1-3]. Victims may react differently, wanting immediate intervention or refusing assistance due to financial or emotional challenges. Societal stigma attached to domestic incidents can further complicate the situation, leading to victims retracting claims or minimizing the severity of the abuse [4-6]. Understanding the root causes of domestic violence, including familial upbringing, past trauma, substance abuse, and socioeconomic stressors, is crucial for effective intervention. Officers must be sensitive to these nuances and develop strategies that tailor responses to the nuanced mind-set of the individuals involved. Non-judgmental communication is key, and officers should engage both the victim and the abuser with respect and tact [7-10]. Providing victims with realistic options and resources, such as social services, local shelters, or legal aid, is also vital. Officers must walk a fine line between restraint and proactivity, ensuring their intervention not only addresses immediate violence but also opens pathways for long-term solutions [11-13].

The Issues Emerging When We Recognize the Different Mind-Sets of Domestic Abusers

Domestic violence perpetrators display a wide range of mind-sets that determine the severity of abuse, interaction with victims, and response to law enforcement. Standard, one-size-fits-all approaches often fail to account for the differing motivations, rationalizations, and emotional ecosystems driving abusive behavior. Common mind-sets include “control-oriented” abusers who rely on coercion, intimidation, and isolation tactics, “rage-driven” abusers who act explosively in moments of anger or frustration, and “calculating manipulator” abusers who abuse their partners covertly without physical violence. Some abusers may have underlying mental health issues, such as narcissistic or antisocial personality disorders, which require training in recognizing these conditions. Understanding the diversity of abusive mind-sets challenges the stereotype that domestic violence is always a one-time, heightened emotional situation. Officers trained in identifying abusive mind-sets can better approach victims and discern the full scope of violence. Recognizing key mind-sets can help provide victims with a path toward long-term safety and justice [14-16].

How AI can Provide Us with Rapid Learning

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has the potential to revolutionize law enforcement training, particularly, in teaching police officers about domestic violence. By incorporating AI technology into training programs, officers can enhance their understanding of domestic

violence, preparing them to respond more effectively. AI can create highly customized and interactive simulations, replicating real-life domestic violence situations, and providing immediate feedback and alternative responses. AI can handle large amounts of data, allowing for more comprehensive training modules. It also offers anonymity and privacy, fostering a deeper understanding of the subject matter. However, AI lacks the emotional intelligence of human instructors, which is crucial when dealing with sensitive societal issues. Over-reliance on AI may lead to a lack of human interaction, which is essential when dealing with sensitive societal issues. AI-driven training may also foster a “one-size-fits-all” mentality, limiting an officer’s

ability to improvise during unpredictable situations. Ethical concerns arise due to AI models that are based only on certain types of case data, potentially filtering out other experiences and reinforcing stereotypes [17-19]. The 15 questions presented in Table 1 give a sense of the range of information available through AI, using the Mind Genomics platform, BimiLeap.com (Idea Coach option). The strategy to obtain this information was simply to instruct AI to provide questions and then answers to those questions, regarding issues in the interaction of police officers with situations involving domestic violence. The Mind Genomics platform was used (BimiLeap.com), with the request put into the Idea Coach feature.

Table 1: AI-generated questions and answers regarding the use of AI in cases of domestic violence.

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why is it important for police to understand the different mind-types of domestic violence abusers? Understanding the different mind-types of abusers allows police to develop more effective intervention strategies by addressing the unique psychological drivers behind the abuse. For instance, a control-oriented abuser may require strategies that account for their need to dominate, while a rage-driven abuser might need interventions that de-escalate volatile anger. This differentiation could prevent further harm and assist in properly evaluating the danger level to the victim. Summary slogan: Different minds, different risks—tailored approaches save lives. 2. How do control-oriented abusers differ from rage-driven abusers in terms of behavior and interaction with victims? Control-oriented abusers meticulously manipulate and dominate their victims over time, often using psychological tactics to maintain their authority. In contrast, rage-driven abusers tend to act out impulsively, using physical or verbal aggression primarily in moments of losing emotional control. Recognizing these distinct behaviors helps law enforcement apply the right strategies in restraining or disarming abusers. Summary slogan: Control or chaos—the key is knowing the type. 3. What are the consequences of using a “one-size-fits-all” approach to domestic violence intervention? A “one-size-fits-all” approach overlooks the individual motivations and methods that drive different abusers, potentially leading to ineffective intervention. For instance, using standard conflict-resolution techniques with a manipulative abuser might not address the root of the problem and leave the victim vulnerable. Such an approach could also misinterpret high-risk situations, resulting in inadequate protection. Summary slogan: One-size-fits-all fails all—precision is the key to safety. 4. In what way might a “calculating manipulator” differ from other types of abusers? A “calculating manipulator” meticulously plans their actions, often using subtle emotional abuse or undermining their victim’s mental health, while maintaining a façade of charm or normalcy in public. This insidious use of power contrasts with more overt physical or emotional abuse, making detection more difficult for both victims and law enforcement. Summary slogan: Quiet control—the manipulator hides in plain sight. 5. Why might some cases of domestic violence involving “calculating manipulators” be overlooked by law enforcement? Law enforcement may overlook cases involving “calculating manipulators” because these abusers often present a polished, non-violent public persona that makes allegations hard to believe. Victims may appear unstable or unsure after undergoing sustained psychological abuse, which can further confuse the investigation. Summary slogan: Hidden abuse, overlooked. 6. How can police effectively identify whether an abuser has an underlying mental health issue such as narcissistic or antisocial personality disorder? Law enforcement can look for patterns consistent with these disorders, such as extreme self-centeredness, a lack of empathy, or a consistent pattern of deceit and violation of others’ rights. Collaboration with mental health professionals, as well as specialized training, can help in identifying when these disorders might be driving abusive behavior. Summary slogan: Mind the disorder—recognizing mental health signals saves lives. 7. What specific tactical differences might be required when dealing with a narcissistic or antisocial personality disorder abuser? When engaging a narcissistic or antisocial abuser, law enforcement may need to avoid engaging in power struggles or confrontational tactics. Narcissists might escalate situations out of a need to preserve their ego, while those with antisocial traits may react violently without remorse. De-escalation and calculated strategies that minimize the abuser’s opportunity for control are critical. Summary slogan: Ego or disregard — tactical engagement varies by psyche. 8. How do societal stereotypes about domestic violence hinder the appropriate identification of abusers and their mind-types? Stereotypes often focus on physical violence or the image of a “typical” abuser, who is overtly aggressive and male. These societal assumptions make it harder to recognize psychological, financial, or emotional abuse, or to understand that abusers come in many forms. Victims of less visible forms of abuse may not be believed, or their abusers may be trusted because they don’t fit the stereotype. Summary slogan: Stereotypes mask reality—Abuse wears many faces. 9. How do different mind-types influence the behavior of victims in reporting or downplaying domestic violence incidents? Victims of manipulative or charm-driven abusers may be more hesitant to report abuse, either because they’ve been psychologically conditioned to doubt their own perceptions or because they fear others won’t believe them. On the other hand, victims of rage-driven abusers may feel too intimidated to report immediate threats. Summary slogan: Different abusers, different fears—every voice matters. 10. Why might a victim of domestic violence involving a “charismatic” abuser be hesitant to seek help from the police? A charismatic abuser may have built a strong reputation as a caring individual within their community, making it difficult for the victim to be believed if they report abuse. The fear of not being taken seriously or of societal backlash could prevent the victim from seeking help. Summary slogan: Charm conceals harm—victims need belief, not judgment. 11. How can the nature of the abuser’s mind-type influence the immediate outcome of a police intervention? The mindset of the abuser can determine whether an incident escalates or de-escalates during police intervention. For instance, a rage-driven abuser might act unpredictably and with aggression, requiring police to take immediate control of the situation, while a manipulator may attempt to deceive officers into minimizing the issue. Summary slogan: Know the mind—avoid escalation, ensure safety. 12. What role can mental health professionals play in helping law enforcement understand and address various abusive mind-types? Mental health professionals can provide insight into the psychological traits that drive different forms of abusive behavior, offering tailored approaches to prevention and intervention. Collaborating with law enforcement, they can help develop effective interrogation techniques, intervention strategies, and rehabilitation programs. Summary slogan: Mental health expertise bridges the gap for safer solutions. 13. How does identifying the specific mind-type of an abuser contribute to long-term solutions for domestic violence? Identifying the mind-type helps in implementing targeted interventions that not only stop the immediate abuse but also reduce the chance of reoffense. Tailored interventions or rehabilitation can address the root causes of an abuser’s behavior, leading to better long-term outcomes, both for the abuser (if rehabilitation is viable) and the victim. Summary slogan: Tailored solutions last longer — target the mind for lasting change. 14. In what ways can police training be improved to better address the psychological aspects of domestic violence? Police training can be enhanced to include psychological profiling of abusers and understanding different mind-types, and relevant mental health conditions. This could involve scenario-based training regarding abuser-specific behavior patterns, collaboration with mental health professionals, and learning de-escalation techniques suited for different psychological mindsets. Summary slogan: Train to understand—psychology-informed policing protects. 15. How might understanding the psychological diversity in domestic violence abusers empower law enforcement to offer more effective pathways to victim safety and justice? Understanding psychological diversity in abusers enables law enforcement to craft differentiated approaches to intervention, where responses can be tailored to the specific risks posed by different mind-types. This helps improve victim safety, creates paths to justice, and reduces the likelihood of repeated abuse. Summary slogan: Knowledge is power—psychological diversity breeds effective justice.
--

Mind-Sets Revealed by Mind Genomics and Potential Advances in Understanding Domestic Violence

Mind Genomics is an emerging science that posits that individuals display unique, patterned ways of thinking through their responses to various stimuli in everyday life. This field, originally applied in consumer behavior to understand how different personalities react to specific messages, extends to broader areas, contributing to revelations about societal and interpersonal behavior. At its core, Mind Genomics proposes that the human mind is organized into various “mind-sets” or cognitive segments, which refer to stable, shared patterns of reasoning coordinated by specific stimuli. These mind-sets represent different cognitive predispositions toward processing experiences, emotions, and behavior. When applied to the studies of abusers in cases of domestic violence, Mind Genomics offers a structured way to categorize individuals based on how they think and interpret their actions, intent, and consequences [20-23]. In this context, mind-sets can be understood as specific patterns or clusters of thought processes that lead to specific behaviors or attitudes. Conceptually, mind-sets are a form of subgrouping within a larger population, crucially helping identify common responses shared by individuals within the same cognitive pattern. In terms of domestic violence, mind-sets could unveil how abusers cognitively justify, rationalize, or express their actions. One abuser might function within a mind-set of domination and control, motivated by power dynamics, while another’s behavior may be propelled by a defensive mind-set characterized by paranoia or insecurity. These divided categories can be used to reflect underlying mental frameworks that influence behavior and to understand abusers as individuals shaped by distinct cognitive lenses. Defining and categorizing abusers based on mind-sets could lead to more effective intervention strategies, helping law enforcement, social workers, and counselors understand the underlying motives behind such behavior. Recognizing whether an abuser perceives their actions through a lens of entitlement, frustration, or trauma can guide distinct approaches to rehabilitation or policing. For instance, abusers operating from a mind-set of control may require different therapeutic interventions from those who commit abuse sporadically in response to perceived emotional threats. By understanding mind-sets, patterns of abuse can be identified from early situational cues and interventions can be tailored based on cognitive predispositions. The value of positing hypothetical mind-sets lies in the ability to frame domestic violence in a non-homogeneous way. One criticism of prior generalized approaches to understanding abusers is that they often overlook the diversity of thought processes and personal histories underlying domestic violence. Instead of assuming that all abusers have the same motivations, positing different mind-sets helps domestic violence responders acknowledge the complexity of this behavior. Applying mind-sets allows for empathy-driven, psychologically informed intervention programs, making protective services more precisely suited to individual needs. This nuanced approach serves both the victim’s safety and the abuser’s potential rehabilitation. The law enforcement community can significantly benefit from applying Mind Genomics thinking to categorize abusers. When officers respond to domestic disputes, the traditional focus might be on immediate cessation of conflict or criminal arrest. However,

with training in mind-sets as informed by Mind Genomics, law enforcement might also gain insight into the cognitive frameworks guiding the abuser’s actions. By identifying early markers of cognitive predispositions through statements, behavior, or situational history, officers could better predict the likelihood of reoffending, immediate safety risks, and guide victims toward the most appropriate services depending on the abuser’s mind-set. Additionally, police officers could more effectively diffuse situations by understanding the specific psychological motivations driving the behavior rather than using blanket approaches to all cases of abuse. The origins of Mind Genomics stem from decades of research into behavioral psychology and consumer science, aimed at decoding how people intellectually process stimuli. The concept was introduced in marketing programs to categorize consumers based on their emotional and intellectual responses to products, services, or advertisements. Behind this idea was the understanding that people process information in diverse, context-dependent ways, which could be traced and cataloged. This practice was later expanded to areas outside commercial issues. The rationale is that segmented, data-driven understandings of mind-sets bring value to domains like criminal justice, providing tools for better psychological prediction and tailored interventions. By incorporating Mind Genomics thinking into law enforcement approaches, the community stands to gain a new, deeper framework for profiling criminal behavior beyond rudimentary labels such as “violent” or “non-violent.” This could mean that police forces, probation offices, social workers, and courts can develop more intelligent, predictive forms of justice. Instead of intervention tools that rely on generic assessments of aggression or conflict, understanding mind-sets allows for interventions that recognize cognitive diversity among offenders. As this approach gains traction, we can expect collaboration between data scientists, psychologists, and public safety professionals to create systematic tools that identify structured pathways toward behavioral reform—ideal for criminals who might otherwise remain in cycles of abuse.

Combining Mind Genomics Thinking with AI to Simulate Three Hypothetical Mind-Sets of Domestic Abusers

When analyzing domestic violence, it is important to understand that abusers might fall into different behavioral and psychological types. These mind-sets’ impact may affect how each abuser approaches their victims, how they view their actions, and how they might react to authority or intervention by law enforcement. For law enforcement officers, understanding these mind-sets can be crucial in handling the situation safely and effectively. This section explores how AI can be used to hypothesize the existence of three mind-sets of abusers in domestic violence cases, and then immediately simulate the “deeper nature” of each mind-set. The three mind-sets were generated by AI through the prompt to only identify three mind-sets. AI was not told the nature of these mind-sets.

The three mind-sets emerging from AI’s simulation are:

1. **Entitled & Control-Oriented Mindset:** This person sees violence as a way to assert dominance and control, motivated by entitlement.

2. **Emotionally Volatile Mindset:** This abuser is driven by strong emotions, often unable to manage intense anger or jealousy.

3. **Avoidant & Manipulative Mindset:** This abuser is more calculated and strategic, using manipulation and more subtle forms of abuse to maintain control, but might be quick to downplay or deny their actions to outsiders, like law enforcement.

By framing responses from these different mind-sets, officers

can start to identify patterns in abuser psychology—whether the abuser leans more towards outright control, emotional volatility, or calculated manipulation—thus better equipping themselves to see through manipulation and respond appropriately to each unique situation. Table 2 shows eight questions that a police officer might ask—or observe—when arriving at a domestic violence scene, along with three potential responses from abusers, each aligned with one of the above mindsets.

Table 2: Eight questions that a police officer might ask, and simulated answers from mind-sets.

<p>Question 1: What happened here?</p> <p>Entitled & Control-Oriented: “I had to put her back in her place. She doesn’t listen, and it’s my right to discipline her.” Why? This person feels justified in their violence, seeing it as an appropriate means of maintaining control and asserting dominance.</p> <p>Emotionally Volatile: “I just lost my temper. I didn’t mean to hit her. She pushed me too far, and I couldn’t control myself!” Why? This mindset is impulsive, responding emotionally rather than methodically. The abuser externalizes the blame (on the victim), suggesting their rage is “understandable” given the circumstances.</p> <p>Avoidant & Manipulative: “We just had a regular argument, and she’s blowing it out of proportion. This is nothing.” Why? They minimize the situation in front of authorities in an attempt to manipulate perceptions and downplay the severity of the incident, protecting their image.</p> <p>Question 2: How often do you fight like this?</p> <p>Entitled & Control-Oriented: “She needs to learn from her mistakes, so I’ll call her out whenever she steps out of line.” Why? They view confrontations as corrective actions, seeing conflict as part of their role in keeping control.</p> <p>Emotionally Volatile: “It’s not like this all the time! Just when things get out of hand because she... she makes me so mad!” Why? They are reactive, and while they don’t attempt to control the frequency of incidents, they blame the situation on momentary emotional outbursts.</p> <p>Avoidant & Manipulative: “We rarely fight. Honestly, this was a misunderstanding.” Why? Here, they attempt to distance themselves from any pattern of harm, shrugging it off as isolated or infrequent to ward off scrutiny.</p> <p>Question 3: Why do you think this happened?</p> <p>Entitled & Control-Oriented: “Because she’s disrespectful. Women need to know their role.” Why? They feel a deep sense of right to command respect and enforce traditional or patriarchal expectations through violence.</p> <p>Emotionally Volatile: “I was angry, and it all came out. It’s not like I wanted it to go this far.” Why? While they may show remorse, they refuse to take accountability for their uncontrolled emotions and suggest it’s just how they felt at the moment.</p> <p>Avoidant & Manipulative: “I honestly don’t know what she’s talking about. She’s exaggerating again.” Why? Denial and gaslighting are key tools for manipulation—by questioning reality, they shift focus away from their actions and onto the victim while downplaying responsibility.</p> <p>Question 4: Did you hurt her?</p> <p>Entitled & Control-Oriented: “Yes. I had to teach her a lesson.” Why? They rationalize violence as a form of discipline or rightful punishment and will admit openly, as long as they feel justified.</p> <p>Emotionally Volatile: “I didn’t mean to hurt her that badly! I didn’t even realize I was hitting her so hard.” Why? They tend to downplay intent, more willing to admit to some harm but distancing themselves from the severity of their violence.</p> <p>Avoidant & Manipulative: “No, not at all. I barely touched her.” Why? They will often make excuses or outright deny physical violence occurred, even if signs of injury are present.</p> <p>Question 5: What do you think is your role in this conflict?</p> <p>Entitled & Control-Oriented: “I’m doing what I have to. I provide for her; she owes me respect.” Why? They maintain a worldview where their contributions (e.g., finances, traditional roles) give them the right to control and correct behaviors.</p> <p>Emotionally Volatile: “I lose control sometimes, but she... it’s like she pushes every one of my buttons.” Why? They acknowledge a loss of control but place the responsibility for their outbursts on the victim’s behavior or actions.</p> <p>Avoidant & Manipulative: “I’m just trying to live a peaceful life, but she keeps starting fights.” Why? They position themselves as the victim of circumstances, needing to distance themselves from blame while subtly manipulating the story.</p> <p>Question 6: How does she act toward you?</p> <p>Entitled & Control-Oriented: “She’s defiant. Doesn’t respect me at all. Always questioning my decisions.” Why? They perceive any autonomy or independent behavior on the victim’s part as insubordination that challenges their authority.</p> <p>Emotionally Volatile: “She’s always nagging me, and it sets me off.” Why? This abuser interprets any conflict-related behavior by the victim as aggravation, quickening emotional volatility.</p> <p>Avoidant & Manipulative: “She’s the problem—always emotional. Honestly, she’s unstable.” Why? By projecting instability onto the victim, they create doubt about their accountability and frame the majority of the issues as stemming from the victim’s “emotional state.”</p> <p>Question 7: What should happen next to fix things?</p> <p>Entitled & Control-Oriented: “She needs to learn her place. I don’t need to change anything.” Why? They feel they are in the right and place all the burden of resolution on the victim “learning” obedience or submission.</p> <p>Emotionally Volatile: “I need to calm down more often, but it won’t happen again if she just acts right.” Why? They might acknowledge some level of need for change but ultimately still blame the victim and conditions of the conflict rather than themselves.</p> <p>Avoidant & Manipulative: “We need space, and she needs counseling. She’s the one with mental health issues.” Why? By putting the responsibility for “fixing” things on the victim’s implied psychological deficiencies, they deflect their own role in the abuse.</p> <p>Question 8: Do you regret what happened?</p> <p>Entitled & Control-Oriented: “I regret that she made me do this.” Why? They only express regret in a way that still maintains blame on the victim.</p> <p>Emotionally Volatile: “Of course I regret it. You don’t understand how much guilt I feel after these things.” Why? They often express intense regret after the fact, in a way that might seem sincere but fail to take ownership moving forward.</p> <p>Avoidant & Manipulative: “I regret getting into this stupid argument in the first place. We didn’t need the cops called.” Why? Their regret is about the consequences (police presence) rather than their behavior towards the victim.</p>

Combining Mind Genomics Thinking with AI to Simulate a Therapy Session

Police officers can enhance their understanding of domestic violence incidents by simulating different mind-sets of potential abusers. By observing how different abusive mind-sets engage in therapeutic dialogue, officers gain insight into the psychological motives, behavioral triggers, and rationalizations that drive abusive behavior. This knowledge can help officers approach domestic violence situations with more nuanced strategies, potentially de-escalating situations or identifying early warning signs before violence occurs. By incorporating multiple mind-sets, officers can witness and analyze abuser reactions when challenged within a therapeutic framework, improving communication skills and informs appropriate intervention strategies. Additionally, simulating different mindsets can help officers distinguish abusive actions from mental health crises or substance-

related violence, allowing officers to refer individuals to social or mental health services if necessary. Finally, simulating various personalities and therapeutic responses helps officers develop increased empathy for both abusers and victims, enhancing their ability to connect victims with resources and reduce the risk of retaliation or further violence in the home. AI can be instructed to provide varying levels of depth in its simulation. By slightly altering the instructions to AI, the user can incorporate the thinking of the psychotherapist as well, beyond simply the psychotherapist moderating the session. Table 3 shows the instructions given to AI, and the additional, optional instructions, to provide a deeper insight into the mind of the psychotherapist. Table 4 compares simulations from a session talking about a “code word” to signal when the emotions are overly strong. Table 5 compares simulations from a session talking about “taking a break” when the emotions are overly strong. Table 6 compares simulations from a session talking about moving the argument away from accusation.

Table 3: Instructions to AI to simulate a group therapy session with the psychotherapist making a suggestion and the three mind-sets responding, as well as the private thoughts of the three mind-sets.

<p>You are recording a group psychotherapy session. In the session, there are three different mind-sets of domestic abusers: Mind-Set 1 = Entitled & Control Oriented; Mind-Set 2 = Emotionally Volatile; Mind-Set 3 = Avoidant & Manipulative. There is also a psychotherapist. The objective of the session is to find ways to avoid a domestic violence event.</p> <p>The psychotherapist suggests an idea about how to avoid a domestic violence event. Each of the three mind-sets comments on the idea. Express the idea fully in the way the psychotherapist said it. (OPTIONAL: <i>and discuss why the psychotherapist suggested this idea</i>)</p> <p>Preface by PSYCHOTHERAPIST SUGGESTION:</p> <p>Talk about how the Entitled and Control Mind-Set reacted, and how the mind-set felt about this idea being relevant. Talk about the private thoughts. Give a slogan to emblemize feelings. Preface by REACTION BY ENTITLED & CONTROL:</p> <p>Talk about how the EMOTIONALLY VOLATILE Mind-Set reacted, how the mind-set felt about this idea being relevant. Talk about the private thoughts. Give a slogan to emblemize feelings. Preface by EMOTIONALLY VOLATILE:</p> <p>Talk about how the AVOIDANT & MANIPULATIVE Mind-Set reacted, and how the mind-set felt about this idea being relevant. Talk about the private thoughts. Give a slogan to emblemize feelings. Preface by AVOIDANT & MANIPULATIVE:</p> <p>Finally, provide a nine-sentence paragraph summarizing and also professionally interpreting this particular conversation that the psychotherapist can record for teaching police officers.</p>

Table 4: Psychotherapist suggestion about a code word to signal and then reduce tensions—a comparison of two levels of analysis.

<p>USING A CODE WORD TO REDUCE TENSIONS</p> <p>Simulation that does not include the Reason Behind the Psychotherapist’s Recommendation</p> <p>PSYCHOTHERAPIST SUGGESTION: “Consider committing to a ‘code word’ with your partner or household members, signaling when tensions are rising. When someone says the word, it’s time for everyone to stop and briefly reflect.”</p> <p>REACTION BY ENTITLED & CONTROL: “I don’t need a code word to know that they’re pushing my buttons. I’m in control. I don’t wait for someone else to tell me things are tense.” Private Thoughts: “They’ll start using it to control me instead. This just gives them power.” Slogan: “Give them an inch, they take control.”</p> <p>REACTION BY EMOTIONALLY VOLATILE: “A code word? I get too mad, too fast to even hear those things. And even if I hear it, by that time I’m too far gone.” Private Thoughts: “I’m a storm. A word isn’t going to stop me when I’m already caught in it.” Slogan: “Words can’t stop a cyclone.”</p> <p>REACTION BY AVOIDANT & MANIPULATIVE: “I like the idea of a code word, but I can see myself using it for the wrong reasons. If things aren’t going my way, I’ll call a time-out whenever I want.” Private Thoughts: “This gives me an easy way to get out of tough conversations when I’m not winning.” Slogan: “Use the word—and control the room.”</p> <p>SUMMARY/INTERPRETATION FOR POLICE: The “code word” method is suggested to instantly halt rising tensions and give all parties a chance to step back before the situation escalates further. However, those with an Entitled & Control mind-set resist using such a word unless they are the ones in control of its use, perceiving it as a dilution of their authority. The Emotionally Volatile individual might struggle to notice or stop when the word is used, as they often enter emotional overload too quickly. Meanwhile, the Avoidant & Manipulative mindset sees the potential to overuse or abuse this tactic, strategically manipulating pauses to steer conversations in their favor. For law enforcement, this reinforces the need to approach communication methods with flexibility, as predetermined words or strategies may be adopted or abused differently depending on individual dynamics.</p> <p>Simulation that Includes the Reason Behind the Psychotherapist’s Recommendation</p> <p>DEEPER ANALYSIS OF PSYCHOTHERAPIST SUGGESTION: “Create a ‘safe word’ with your partner—something you both agree on in advance—that signals it’s time to stop and take a break if things are getting too heated.” Reason for Suggestion: Having a pre-agreed “safe word” can act as a neutral, non-confrontational way to de-escalate an argument before it spirals into violence.</p> <p>REACTION BY ENTITLED & CONTROL: “You want me to have a ‘code’ word like we’re playing some type of game? Sounds childish. If they know I’m mad, they should back off without needing some stupid word. I don’t need this.” Private Thoughts: They believe this idea undermines their natural authority. The idea of a “safe word” feels trivial and diminutive, and they get frustrated that the suggestion involves having to compromise their role in the relationship. Slogan: “Safe word? How about ‘I’m in charge?’”</p> <p>REACTION BY EMOTIONALLY VOLATILE: “Maybe the word would help. Because when I’m angry, I don’t see anything, I just react. A word could... maybe bring me back. But how can I trust they’ll use it? If they don’t care, what’s the point?” Private Thoughts: They see the potential for it but feel deeply insecure about whether they’d even recognize the word while emotionally escalated. They worry others might not use it correctly or might manipulate them with it. Slogan: “What if I don’t hear the word in my rage?”</p> <p>REACTION BY AVOIDANT & MANIPULATIVE: “Interesting. A safe word could definitely come in handy if I need to distract them from an argument or if things aren’t going in my favor. I can just call it, and they’ll pause.” Private Thoughts: To them, this idea isn’t about preventing violence but rather controlling when and how to pause conflicts. They feel it offers them another tool to control the pace of quarrels, potentially stopping them on their own terms. Slogan: “Safe words—my escape valve.”</p> <p>OUTCOME SUMMARY FOR TEACHING POLICE OFFICERS: The concept of a “safe word” to de-escalate arguments can be a helpful tool in abusive relationships, but abusers will react differently depending on their psychological profile. Entitled & Control-oriented individuals tend to dismiss the idea as offensive to their authority, while Emotionally Volatile abusers may see its worth but question its practical efficacy when emotions run high. Avoidant & Manipulative abusers, however, are more likely to see the safe word as a way to control the situation to their advantage. Police officers should approach this method of conflict de-escalation with caution, taking into account how abusers may either misconstrue or manipulate the tool.</p>

Table 5: Psychotherapist's suggestion about removing oneself from the situation—A comparison of two levels of analysis.

<p>TEMPORARILY REMOVING ONESELF FROM THE SITUATION BY "TAKING A BREAK"</p> <p>Simulation that does not include the Reason Behind the Psychotherapist's Recommendation</p> <p>PSYCHOTHERAPIST SUGGESTION: "Take a step back and ask yourself: Does the action I'm about to take serve to actually improve the situation, or am I trying to force control or get a reaction? Pausing gives us the chance to de-escalate before things get worse."</p> <p>REACTION BY ENTITLED & CONTROL: This mind-set likely resents the suggestion. The idea of "taking a step back" feels offensive for someone who sees control as their right. This person might privately think, "Why should I step back and give up control? That's weakness." To this mindset, stepping back equals losing power, something they won't easily concede. Slogan: Control is Power.</p> <p>REACTION BY EMOTIONALLY VOLATILE: This individual might see value but struggles with it. Pausing feels like suppressing emotions that feel overwhelming. Internally, they might think, "I don't want to explode, but I don't know how to stop it. What if it just comes out in worse ways later?" They see the merit but doubt their ability to manage it in the heat of the moment. Slogan: I'm like a bottle ready to pop.</p> <p>REACTION BY AVOIDANT & MANIPULATIVE: This mind-set may immediately think about ways to use this suggestion to manipulate the partner. They may privately think, "If I pause and let them think they have the upper hand, I can come back later when they're calm and more vulnerable." While they may outwardly agree, they intend to use the pause to further their control. Slogan: Wait it out, win later.</p> <p>PROFESSIONAL INTERPRETATION: In this discussion, the therapist suggested pausing as a de-escalation technique before a situation turns violent. The Entitled and Control-Oriented abuser feels this threatens their dominance, blocking their need for control. The Emotionally Volatile individual may see the benefit but lacks belief in their own ability to pause due to their instinctual emotional outbursts. Meanwhile, the Avoidant & Manipulative mindset uses the suggestion to improve their strategic control over their partner. While the step-back technique can be effective for self-awareness, each type of abuser interprets this strategy through the lens of power and control, allowing it to morph into a tool that supports their abusive mechanisms.</p> <p>Simulation that Includes the Reason Behind the Psychotherapist's Recommendation</p> <p>DEEPER ANALYSIS OF PSYCHOTHERAPIST SUGGESTION: "When you start to feel anger rising, take a "time-out" for 20-30 minutes and step away from the situation. Do something else to calm down, whether it's walking, breathing exercises, or listening to some music. Once you're calmer, you can address the issue without violence." Reason for Suggestion: The psychotherapist suggested this idea to break the immediate cycle of emotional escalation and prevent harm from occurring in the heat of the moment. Stepping away allows the abuser to regain emotional control and reevaluate the situation from a more rational standpoint.</p> <p>REACTION BY ENTITLED & CONTROL: "Step away? Are you kidding me? I'm the one who's in charge—why should I walk away? They're the ones that made me mad in the first place. They need to understand who's boss here." Private Thoughts: The Entitled & Control-oriented abuser feels that relinquishing control—even for a short period—compromises their authority, which they perceive as vital. Stepping away seems like surrender, and that's unacceptable in their view. Slogan: "Walking away is losing control."</p> <p>REACTION BY EMOTIONALLY VOLATILE: "Yeah, okay. I guess it makes sense. But do you realize how hard it is to think straight when everything's blowing up? I feel like I have no control anyway when I get mad. What if stepping away just makes it worse?" Private Thoughts: While they may agree with the intention, those in this mind-set fear they won't be able to follow through, and stepping away could heighten their internal tension even more. They're conflicted, fearing their own emotional storms. Slogan: "But what if I explode?"</p> <p>REACTION BY AVOIDANT & MANIPULATIVE: "Sure, I could step away. But what's in it for me? I can use this "time-out" idea as a way to "win" the argument later, right? Buying time could work in my favor." Private Thoughts: This mind-set sees stepping away as an opportunity, not necessarily for calming down but for calculating how best to turn the situation to their advantage later. Avoidance, in this context, can be manipulative. Slogan: "Take time to scheme."</p> <p>OUTCOME SUMMARY FOR TEACHING POLICE OFFICERS: Time-outs are useful in preventing immediate escalation in domestic violence scenarios. However, abusers perceive this strategy through the lens of their psychological mind-set. Entitled & Control-oriented abusers may resist time-outs because they view them as losing power, while Emotionally Volatile abusers might struggle with the intensity of their feelings and doubt their ability to follow the suggestion. Avoidant & Manipulative individuals can misinterpret time-outs as strategic breaks to reframe the argument for their benefit. Understanding how various abusers interpret techniques like "time-out" is critical when de-escalating domestic situations and ensuring safety for everyone involved.</p>

Table 6: Psychotherapist suggestion about a reframing and moving away from anger towards communication—A comparison of two levels of analysis.

<p>MOVE FROM ANGER TO REASONED COMMUNICATION</p> <p>Simulation that does not include the Reason Behind the Psychotherapist's Recommendation</p> <p>PSYCHOTHERAPIST SUGGESTION: "Before engaging in an argument, try to acknowledge at least one positive thing about your partner or the situation. It helps keep the focus from being entirely on the negative and allows you to open the channels of communication."</p> <p>REACTION BY ENTITLED & CONTROL: Dismissive. Seeing good in their partner would diminish the perceived justification for maintaining control. Privately, they might think, "I don't need to praise them, they should be grateful I'm here holding things together." In their worldview, acknowledgment of good things weakens their authority. Slogan: Gratitude is not earned, it's enforced.</p> <p>REACTION BY EMOTIONALLY VOLATILE: They might try to see the good, but it could seem like a distraction. This mind-set would think to themselves, "When I'm this mad, it's hard to see anything but what's wrong. Why should I think about the good when I'm hurting this much?" They may feel conflicted because they want to stop the fight, but their emotions overtake them. Slogan: Too furious to appreciate the little things.</p> <p>REACTION BY AVOIDANT & MANIPULATIVE: This suggestion might play right into their hands, allowing them to present a forced kindness as a way to manipulate their partner. They may privately think, "I can throw them a compliment here or there, make them feel like I'm loving, and then they won't even see what I'm planning." They manipulate the idea for personal gain. Slogan: Use kindness like a leash.</p> <p>PROFESSIONAL INTERPRETATION: Offering a positive reflection before entering an argument is meant to soften attitudes and create a buffer for constructive communication. However, while well-intentioned, this action is warped by different abuser mind-sets. The Entitled and Control-Oriented individual sees no need for this, interpreting it as giving up control. The Emotionally Volatile individual finds it difficult to focus on positives during moments of emotional overload, though they may feel sadness for their inability to see the good. Lastly, the Avoidant & Manipulative person sees it as another tool for emotional control, presenting loving behavior to eventually tighten their abusive grip. De-escalation strategies must take into account how abusers interpret and misuse positive behaviors unless closely monitored.</p> <p>Simulation that Includes the Reason Behind the Psychotherapist's Recommendation</p> <p>DEEPER ANALYSIS OF PSYCHOTHERAPIST SUGGESTION: "When conflict arises, try shifting the focus from what the other person did "wrong" to what you're feeling in the moment. Communicate from your own emotions rather than blaming them." Reason for Suggestion: The idea is to encourage taking personal responsibility for one's emotions, defusing blame, and opening a channel for genuine emotional communication.</p> <p>REACTION BY ENTITLED & CONTROL: "Why should I? What matters isn't how I feel; it's what they did! They need to understand they messed up. My feelings are fine—it's their actions that are the problem." Private Thoughts: This mind-set isn't interested in exploring their own emotional vulnerability. They steadfastly believe the problem lies entirely with the other person's failure to fulfill duties or respect their authority. Slogan: "My emotions aren't the issue—their disrespect is."</p> <p>REACTION BY EMOTIONALLY VOLATILE: "I'm always the one feeling like I'm losing control anyway. So yeah, I get it, but it's tough. Every time I say something like that, they don't listen—it just pours more gas on the fire." Private Thoughts: They're aware of their emotional volatility but feel communicating emotions in a calm way won't yield results. There's wariness about re-engaging in arguments they think they can't win emotionally. Slogan: "My feelings set the fire."</p> <p>REACTION BY AVOIDANT & MANIPULATIVE: "Interesting. Maybe if I can play the emotional card, they'll back off for a bit. Yeah, focusing on how I feel as an excuse might do the trick." Private Thoughts: This kind prefers to use this communication strategy to manipulate the situation in their favor. Displaying emotions isn't about genuine connection but rather another tactic. Slogan: "Feelings as leverage."</p> <p>OUTCOME SUMMARY FOR TEACHING POLICE OFFICERS: Encouraging abusers to focus on emotions rather than actions ascribed to their partners can help reduce direct blame and shift the conversation toward a more constructive channel. However, the potential misuse of this approach by different mind-sets becomes apparent. Entitled & Control-oriented individuals disregard emotions as irrelevant, seeing fault only on their partner's side. Emotionally Volatile abusers recognize their emotional intensity but may be skeptical about its effectiveness in reducing tension. Finally, Avoidant & Manipulative abusers could use emotional communication as a manipulation tactic rather than seeking resolution. Police must be aware of these differences in interpreting dialogues about emotions versus actions to better understand abusers' responses during intervention.</p>

Discussion and Conclusions

Police personnel often struggle with domestic violence calls in the complex, emotionally charged environment of law enforcement. AI and Mind Genomics are rapidly changing training methods, offering officers realistic simulations with unmatched depth and accuracy. AI offers broad to detailed situational training for real-time decision-making, enabling officers to join simulated crises, engage with everyone, forecast results, and refine the plan. AI simulations are intriguing for their agility and realism, as they allow officers to learn comprehensively in dynamic, reactive situations. AI can mimic emotions, relationships, and personality, while Mind Genomics combined with AI simulates the minds of victims and offenders, allowing the exploration of domestic violence occurring with people of different mind-sets and ways of thinking about the same issue. AI's tolerance for human variations is strong, as everyone in a domestic violence situation discusses their emotions and experiences. AI allows police officers to explore the range of reactions to the same situation, including victims being terrified yet compliant, hesitant, doubtful, or protective of the abuser, and perpetrators being violent, manipulative, or repentant.

AI exercises can be tailored to train police regarding tactical de-escalation, such as calming the scene, separating victims and abusers, and calling social workers or mental health professionals. Gamification boosts situational preparation and learning, and AI can become a patient, persistent, data-driven mentor most police officers never had.

AI and Mind Genomics-trained cohorts may collaborate on domestic violence strategies that include social work, psychology, and legislation. By challenging the AI to generate novel social situations, new intervention and conflict resolution approaches may develop. Despite imperfections, the approach helps individuals acquire more knowledge than from textbooks or lectures. AI that correctly simulates reality, calculates emotional intelligence, biases, human behaviors, cognitive load during decision-making, and more, is decades ahead. This level of readiness changes police work in stressful, unpredictable circumstances, opening up a new era of opportunities in our ever-changing world.

Acknowledgments

The authors are delighted to acknowledge the ongoing help of Vanessa A. and Angela A. in the preparation of this and companion manuscripts.

References

1. Campbell AM, Thompson SL, Harris TL, Wiehe SE (2021) Intimate Partner Violence and Pet Abuse: Responding Law Enforcement Officers' Observations and Victim Reports From the Scene. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. [crossref]
2. Piquero AR, Jennings WG, Jemison E, Kaukinen C, Knaul FM (2021) Domestic violence during the COVID-19 pandemic - Evidence from a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. [crossref]
3. Saxton MD, Olszowy L, MacGregor JCD, MacQuarrie BJ, Wathen CN (2021) Experiences of Intimate Partner Violence Victims With Police and the Justice System in Canada. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. [crossref]
4. Hine B, Noku L, Bates EA, Jayes K (2022) But, Who Is the Victim Here? Exploring Judgments Toward Hypothetical Bidirectional Domestic Violence Scenarios. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. [crossref]
5. Muñoz-Rivas M, Bellot A, Montorio I, Ronzón-Tirado R, Redondo N (2021) Profiles of Emotion Regulation and Post-Traumatic Stress Severity among Female Victims of Intimate Partner Violence. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. [crossref]
6. Ullman SE (2021) Correlates of social reactions to victims' disclosures of sexual assault and intimate partner violence: a Systematic review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*. [crossref]
7. Black A, Lumsden K (2023) Precautionary policing and dispositives of risk in a police force control room in domestic abuse incidents: an ethnography of call handlers, dispatchers and response officers. In: *Ethnography and the Evocative World of Policing*. Routledge.
8. Franklin CA, Garza AD, Goodson A, Bouffard LA (2020) Police perceptions of crime victim behaviors: A trend analysis exploring mandatory training and knowledge of sexual and domestic violence survivors' trauma responses. *Crime & Delinquency*.
9. Nancarrow H, Thomas K, Ringland V, Modini T (2020) Accurately identifying the "person most in need of protection" in domestic and family violence law. *Australia's National Research Organisation for Women's Safety*. rossref]
10. Notko M, Husso M, Piippo S, Fagerlund M, Houtsonen J (2021) Intervening in domestic violence: interprofessional collaboration among social and health care professionals and the police. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*. [crossref]
11. Fagerlund M (2021) Gender and police response to domestic violence. *Police Practice and Research*.
12. Notko M, Husso M, Piippo S, Fagerlund M, Houtsonen J (2021) Intervening in domestic violence: interprofessional collaboration among social and health care professionals and the police. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*. [crossref]
13. Saxton MD, Jaffe PG, Dawson M, Straatman AL, Olszowy L (2022) Complexities of the Police Response to Intimate Partner Violence: Police Officers' Perspectives on the Challenges of Keeping Families Safe. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. [crossref]
14. Kadiani A, Chaudhury S, Saldanha D, Pande N, Menon P (2020) Psychosocial profile of male perpetrators of domestic violence: A population-based study. *Industrial Psychiatry Journal*. [crossref]
15. Peraica T, Kovačić Petrović Z, Barić Ž, Galić R, Kozarić-Kovačić D (2021) Gender differences among domestic violence help-seekers: socio-demographic characteristics, types and duration of violence, perpetrators, and interventions. *Journal of Family Violence*.
16. Wexler DB (2020) *The Stop Domestic Violence Program: Group Leader's Manual*. WW Norton & Company.
17. Amusa LB, Bengesai AV, Khan HTA (2022) Predicting the Vulnerability of Women to Intimate Partner Violence in South Africa: Evidence from Tree-based Machine Learning Techniques. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. [crossref]
18. Khurana B, Seltzer SE, Kohane IS, Boland GW (2019) Making the 'invisible' visible: transforming the detection of intimate partner violence. *BMJ Quality & Safety*. [crossref]
19. McDaniel JL, Pease K, eds. (2021) *Predictive Policing and Artificial Intelligence*. Routledge.
20. Jahja E, Papajorgji P, Moskowitz H, et al. (2024) Measuring the perceived wellbeing of hemodialysis patients: A Mind Genomics cartography. *PLoS ONE*. [crossref]
21. Moskowitz HR, Kover A, Papajorgji P (2022) *Applying Mind Genomics to Social Sciences*. Information Science Reference.
22. Moskowitz HR, Wren J, Papajorgji P (2020) *Mind Genomics and the Law*. Lambert Academic Publishing.
23. Papajorgji P, Moskowitz H (2022) The 'Average Person' thinking about radicalization: a mind genomics cartography. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*. [crossref]

Citation:

Wingert S, Moskowitz H (2025) Domestic Violence: Combining AI Simulation and Mind Genomics Thinking to Explore Potential Mind-Sets and Relevant Responses.. *Arch Law Econ* Volume 2(1): 1-7.