Introducing a Child Focus into a Batterer Program Curriculum: Does an Emphasis on Children Improve the Response?

by

Safe Horizon New York City

The research reported here was supported by grant #2003-WG-BX-1005 from the National Institute of Justice.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

May 2007

Introducing a Child Focus into a Batterer Program Curriculum Does It Make a Difference?

Introduction

Background and Purpose

Since the push to criminalize domestic violence in the 1970‘s and the adoption of pro-arrest and prosecution polices that led to an influx of cases into the courts, the criminal justice system has been searching for a rehabilitative program for offenders that would protect their current and future intimate partners from further violence. Recent metaanalysis of experimental research comparing the efficacy of batterer programs to true control groups has cast doubt on the ability of batterer programs to reduce reoffending above and beyond the deterrent effects of arrest (Feder & Wilson, 2005).

At the same time, the hope has grown that engaging batterers around their children rather than their partners or ex-partners would prove more effective in motivating offenders to stop their violence. Integration of discussion of the father-child relationship into batterer programs is driven in part by the observation that batterers seem to be more responsive when the topic is their children rather than their partners. Most of the evidence in this regard consists of anecdotal reports by batterer program staff. However, Groves, Van Horn and Lieberman concluded after reviewing surveys on this topic that fathers in batterer programs —express concern for their children and want continued contact with them“ (2007, p. 72). Furthermore, recognition of the overlap between partner abuse and child abuse (Saunders, 2003) or overly authoritarian parenting by batterers (Bancroft & Silverman, 2002) and recognition of the negative impact on children of exposure to violence against their mother has led to an increased interest in addressing parenting issues in batterer programs (Edleson, Mbilinyi & Shetty, 2003).

Therefore, not only is there a perceived need to address parenting issues with batterers, but also a focus on children is seen as a possible avenue to preventing future abuse of the other parent. For example, according to Arean and Davis (2007), the Family Violence Prevention Fund conducted focus groups with batterers and concluded that programs can use —fatherhood as an engagement strategy to help men stop their violence“ (p. 118).

Study Overview and Hypotheses

The sample consisted of domestic violence offenders enrolled in Safe Horizon‘s Domestic Violence Accountability Program (DVAP) in Brooklyn over a period of 18 months. Program participants who were active fathers of children with the victim in the case that led to the mandate to the batterer program were eligible to participate in the study classes and interviews. Eligible participants were randomly assigned to a 25-week child-focused curriculum or to a partner-focused curriculum. The men in these classes

who consented to the interviews and completed the program were interviewed at the time of their first class and their last class. The men who experienced these two curricula (Study Group) were compared to each other on the basis of interview data. The men in the Study Group were compared to other men in the program (—treatment as usual“ group) in regard to demographics, program completion and rearrest.
The primary hypotheses were:

. • Participants would find the topic of their children more engaging and less aversive than the topic of their partners or ex-partners; therefore, those assigned to the child-focused curriculum would be less likely to drop out of the program than those assigned to the partner-focused curriculum or those in the treatment-as-usual group;
. • Participants would be less resistant to the information about the impact of domestic violence on their children than to messages about the impact of domestic violence on their partners, and therefore retain the information from the child-focused curriculum better; and
. • Participants would be more motivated to stop abusing their child‘s mother once they understood the impact on the child and learned to see the violence and verbal abuse through their child‘s eyes, and therefore there would be less recidivism among men who completed the child-focused curriculum as compared to those who completed the partner-focused curriculum and the treatment as usual group.

Method

Domestic Violence Accountability Program

Approximately 650 men are served by Safe Horizon‘s batterer program annually, making the Domestic Violence Accountability Program (DVAP) the largest batterer program in the country. The program requires completion of 26 classes, including an orientation class. There is a required fee, which may be reduced if the participant can document inability to pay. If a participant has four absences or two consecutive absences, he is terminated from the program and the mandating agency is notified.

Designed as a service to the courts, the program rarely accepts —volunteers.“ Participants are typically ordered to the program by a criminal or civil justice agency. Mandating agencies include the Criminal Court (which adjudicates misdemeanors and ordnance violations in New York State); Probation; Supreme Court (which adjudicates felonies); the Administration for Children‘s Services as a condition of a child protective action; and Family Court. Offenders also come to DVAP to fulfill a sentence or condition imposed by an out of state court.

Design

Men mandated to DVAP who attended the program in Brooklyn and who had children under 18 with the woman against whom they had been charged with committing a domestic violence offence were eligible for participation in the study classes if they met

the study's criteria of an —active father."[1] They were randomly assigned either to the

[1] The eligibility criteria included the following levels of paternal involvement: lived with the child for one year of the past three, or 50% of the child's life; visited with the child for at least one hour every two weeks

—child-focused curriculum," which focused on children and domestic violence for 11 classes specifically and brought up children in regard to the other 14 lessons, or to the —partner-focused curriculum," which spent one class on the impact of domestic violence on children and one class on visitation, and focused on the partner and adult social issues for the other 23 classes. For example, the child-focused curriculum included classes on the impact of domestic violence on children, respectful parenting and co-parenting, accountability to children, talking to children about domestic violence, etc. The partner-focused curriculum included classes on male privilege, effective communication, violence against women, etc. The treatment-as-usual group did not strictly follow a curriculum, but drew from a compendium of lessons, including those in the partner-focused curriculum, and allowed the issues raised by class participants to determine the order and range of topics. (See Appendix of full report for outlines of the child-focused and partner-focused curricula.)

Interview Data

The interviews focused on knowledge, beliefs and cognitions about domestic violence and the impact on children, frequency and nature of contact with the partner and children, and changes in self-reported behavior. We asked whether the abuse affected the mother's parenting and the child's relationship with the father. Participants were asked whether any of their children needed counseling now or might in the future as a result of exposure to violence. In both interviews, participants were asked to assign responsibility for the incident that led to the mandate to DVAP by allocating the appropriate degree of responsibility to themselves, their partner and others (police, courts, child protective services) so that the total accounted for 100 percent. Three quantitative measures were administered at the first interview: the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, Hamby, et al., 1995); —Beliefs About Violence" adapted from Saunders's Attitude Toward Wife-Beating Scale (Saunders, Lynch, Grayson & Linz, 1987); and questions from the Paulhus Deception Scale (1998). The questions about the impact of domestic violence on their children, the mother's parenting, and the child's feeling about them, the attribution of responsibility for the mandate, and the Beliefs About Violence scale were repeated at follow-up interviews. (See full report appendices for scales.)

Recidivism Data

Information on arrests following program completion or termination from the program was secured from the New York State Division of Criminal Justices Services. We did not have access to partners of the men in the program and could not safely contact them for victim interviews.

Instructor Interviews

At the end of the project, the two pairs of instructors who taught the study classes using the child-focused and partner-focused curricula were interviewed using a semi-structured

or three hours every months for at least four months in the previous year; or having spent significant amounts of time with the child (as defined above) for more than half the child‘s life.

questionnaire. The interviews were taped and transcribed. (See appendix of full report for the instructor interview guide and excerpts.)

Results

Sample

The full sample consisted of 379 men mandated to and enrolled in DVAP‘s program in Brooklyn between July 14, 2004 and December 31, 2005. Overall, the drop-out or program termination rate was 42.5%, within the normal range of programs that have strictly enforced requirements for attendance (Labriola, Rempel, O‘Sullivan & Frank, 2007). Of the sample of 379, 75% were fathers of children with the woman who was the complainant in the case that led to their mandate and were therefore potentially eligible for the study.

Of the 285 fathers, 123 (43%) were enrolled in the study because they met the criteria of active fathers of minor children, were able to accommodate the schedule of the study classes that used the controlled curricula designed for the study œ in particular, they were able to attend on the day and time of the class to which they had been randomly assigned, and they agreed to participate in the interview portion of the study (Study Group). The remaining 256 (379 minus 123) were assigned to other classes and experienced — treatment as usual“ (TAU Group).

The 123 men in the Study Group were randomly assigned to receive the partner-focused curriculum (PF) or the child-focused curriculum (CF). Forty-six completed the child-focused curriculum and 35 completed the partner-focused curriculum.

Description of program participants

The most common disposition associated with the mandate to DVAP was the Conditional Discharge (CD), a criminal court sentence that brought about 70% of the full sample to DVAP. A distant second was a Condition of Probation (12%).

The vast majority of men in the Study Group, 83%, were Black or Latino; 7% were White. Their mean income was $14,000 per year, and 44% said they were unemployed or had no occupation but only 28% qualified for a reduced fee. The majority, 63%, were under 35. Fifty-three percent had a high school education or less. Thus, the men in our study tend to represent those involved in the criminal justice system, a socially and

economically marginalized population disproportionately consisting of non-white, under- and unemployed men.

Forty percent of men in the Study Group said that when they were growing up, men around them were abusive to women. By the end of the study, only 23% remained in an intimate relationship with the mother of their children. Their relationship with their children, in contrast, was ongoing.

Results of Inferential Statistical Tests

1. Representativeness of the Study Group

The men in the Study Group did not differ from the TAU group in regard to age, income, race/ethnicity or the agency that mandated them to the program. They did differ in that they were more likely to be fathers (only fathers were eligible for the study; 63% of the TAU Group were fathers).

2. Predictors of Program Completion

As shown in Table 1, men in the study group completed the program significantly more often than men in the treatment-as-usual group, $\chi^2(1, N = 379) = 5.18$, $p = .02$.

Table 1. Program completion rate by group

Completion status	**Treatment as Usual Group**	**Study Group**	**Total**
Completed program	137 (54%)	81 (66%)*	220 (58%)
Terminated (dropped out)	120 (46%)	42 (34%)*	162 (42%)
Total	256 (100%)	123 (100%)	379

We can only speculate on reasons that the men in the study group were less likely to drop out of the program. One possible reason is that those who were more involved with the criminal justice system appeared to be more wary of study participation and perhaps also more resistant to the program. Study participants may have been more inclined to complete the program because participation in the interviews was both inherently rewarding, in that they had the opportunity to talk about their feelings and perceptions in one-on-one interviews with non-judgmental interviewers, and financially rewarding, as they were paid for the interviews.

Predictors of Program Completion *within* Study Group

Within the study group, we found no significant predictors of program completion. Contrary to our hypothesis that the child-focused curriculum would be more engaging, curriculum type had no effect on completion rate.

Looking at possible predictors of completion from the interview data with the PF and CF groups, neither the men's allocation of responsibility for the incident nor confidence that they would ever be abusive to their partner again was associated with program completion.

3. Comparative Tests of Effects of the Two Curricula

To test the relative impact of the two curricula, we compared the men who completed the child-focused and partner-focused curricula on responses to questions at baseline and follow-up interviews.

.a. Responsibility. Overall, participants attributed more responsibility to themselves and less responsibility to their partner and the court at completion of the program for their having to come to the program (i.e., for the incident). Participants who completed the child-focused curriculum did *not* show a significant difference from those who completed the partner-focused curriculum.

.b. Attitudes. Similarly, scores improved among men in both types of classes on the Beliefs about Violence Scale after 26 weeks in the program. On this scale, 1= agree and 5=disagree, and the statements tend to justify violence (some items are reverse scored, so that higher scores are always better). Again, however, there was no statistical difference in the amount of change between men in the child-focused class and men in the partner-focused class (mean score change from baseline to follow-up among child-focused class participants = 3.02 and mean change from baseline to follow-up among partner-focused class participants = 1.06).

.c. Awareness of the impact of domestic violence on children. Comparing baseline and follow-up responses, men who completed the child-focused curriculum showed no more improvement than men who completed the partner-focused curriculum in regard to awareness of the impact of domestic violence on children, awareness that their child's feelings about them might be affected by the abuse, or their children's need for counseling.

4. Rearrest

In this study, rearrest was used as the measure of recidivism. We had no means to identify and contact victims, as the program does not collect this information and does not contact victims as a matter of policy. Official measures of recidivism certainly underestimate the amount of abuse that occurs since many if not most incidents will not be reported to authorities, and a criminal justice measure does not take into account emotional abuse. On the other hand, the full sample was mandated to DVAP because of incidents that were reported to the authorities. In terms of comparing the impact of the curricula across our three groups, the proportion of incidents of physical reabuse and threats that were reported to police should be consistent. That is, there is no reason to suppose that the curriculum the participant experienced would differentially affect the victim's willingness to report new incidents. Therefore, we have reasonable confidence in this measure as a basis of comparing our groups.

We tracked rearrests for six months after program completion or termination, and, for the

268 men in our sample who either completed or were terminated from the program by January 2006, we tracked rearrests up to one year after program completion or termination. Within a year of program completion or termination, thirty percent had been rearrested for any offense (i.e., not exclusively domestic violence offenses, which do not carry a specific charge in New York), a rate comparable to other studies if all offenses and completers and drop outs are included (cf. Labriola, Rempel & Davis, 2005).

We conducted logistic regression to examine factors associated with rearrest at six months and one year.

.a. Program factors predicting rearrest. The curriculum the participant experienced (child-focused, partner focused, or treatment-as-usual) did not influence whether he was arrested for a new offense six months or one year after leaving the program. Of factors related to the program, only completion status reliably predicted rearrest within six months ($\chi^2(1, N = 346) = 23.35, p < .0024$) and one year of program completion or termination ($\chi^2(1, N = 268) = 24.56, p < .0025$). Program drop outs were nearly 5 times more likely to recidivate than offenders who completed the program.

.b. Personal history and demographic predictors of rearrest. The following factors showed no relationship to new arrests: whether or not the man was a father, race/ethnicity, income, mandating agency, and sentence or condition under which he was mandated to the program (e.g., as a condition of parole, pretrial release, criminal court sentence of conditional discharge, etc.).

However, in logistic regression, the participant‘s age and criminal history (both number of prior misdemeanor arrests and number of prior felony arrests) significantly predicted re-arrest six months and one year post-program, $\chi^2(df = 4, n = 377) = 68.157, p < .001$. and $\chi^2(df = 7, n = 377) = 93.718, p < .001$, respectively. Younger men were both more likely to drop out of the program and more likely to be rearrested than older men. Unemployed men were also more likely to drop out of the program than employed men (52% vs. 28%), and more likely to be rearrested.

Instructors‘ Perspective

The instructors involved in the study preferred teaching the child-focused curriculum to the partner-focused curriculum, because, one instructor said, —When it was information about children, they were more attentive, interactive, more receptive“ and, the men didn‘t feel that —we were bashing them.“ The instructors felt that the focus on the children made clearer the men‘s responsibility for their choices but it also allowed them to avoid the more challenging issue of accountability to their former partner. The instructors‘ final assessment was that —they end up not getting it“ because —They continue to believe they can be abusive and still be good parents.“

Conclusions

The results are disappointing in that we did not find that the child-focused curriculum made a significant difference in our major outcome variables: recidivism rates, program completion rates or understanding of the impact of domestic violence on children. Similarly to facilitators of the Fathering After Violence program (Arean & Davis, 2007), the DVAP program instructors who taught the child-focused and partner-focused curricula to the study sample felt that the men were more receptive to the material in the child-focused curriculum. Importantly, however, the instructors felt that, on the whole, participants who received the child-focused curriculum did not grasp the critical point that exposure to domestic violence was having an impact on their children. Qualitative research with batterers has found similar results (Bent-Goodley and Williams, 2007).

Despite the instructors‘ clear impression that the men were more thoughtful about and interested in the material in the child-focused class, program participants were equally likely to be terminated from or drop out of the child-focused classes as the partner-focused classes. In other words, participants‘ apparent engagement in the material on children did not translate into better attendance. The disjunction between attitudes evinced in class and meaningful behavior change goes to the heart of the problem both in research on batterer programs and the criminal justice system‘s use of batterer programs as an effort to rehabilitate domestic violence offenders œ in that batterer programs have sometimes been shown to have a positive effect on measures of attitude, but have not generally been shown to have no or modest effects on reoffending, when measured by victim reports and official measures (Feder & Wilson, 2005), especially when other factors influencing rearrest are controlled, such as stake in conformity (Feder & Dugan, 2002).

The only factors significantly associated with rearrest were program termination, younger age, and criminal history. Men who completed the program were significantly more likely to avoid rearrest one year after they completed the program than men who were terminated from the program. Other studies that have tested this question, using experimental designs with random assignment to batterer programs and alternative sanctions, have also found that both program termination and rearrest were predicted by criminal history (Davis, Taylor & Maxwell, 2000; Feder & Dugan, 2002; Labriola, Rempel & Davis, 2005). Together, these studies suggest that there may be a group of chronic offenders, committing domestic violence and other crimes, for whom arrest is not a deterrent and batterer programs are ineffective (Wilson & Klein, 2007).

Implications and Recommendations

Although this study was not a definitive test of the efficacy of introducing a fatherhood curriculum into a batterer program, in their consistency with experimental research on batterer programs our findings provide grounds for concern about possibly premature adoption of such programs. The study presented here suggests that, like previous

attempts to modify batterer program content to make them an effective means of rehabilitating a significant number of domestic violence offenders, focusing on children is unlikely to produce a shift to non-violence that standard curricula do not. Greater scrutiny is necessary as courts continue to use completion of a batterer program as a condition of domestic violence offenders‘ less restricted access to their children, as suggested by the Model Code on Domestic Violence proposed by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (1994) and California Family Code (Edleson, et al., 2003).

Fatherhood programs for men who batter should also be carefully evaluated using experimental designs with true control groups and quantitative outcome measures before they are adopted by the criminal justice system (Klein, 2003). Unlike those programs, the goal of the child-focused curriculum tested in this study was not to improve the father-child relationship directly, but to use that empathic bond to facilitate behavior change toward the mother. Nonetheless, programs that aim to repair the father-child relationship and heal the child through working with the father should take heed of the results of the decade of research on batterer programs and the preliminary results reported here. One reason is that such programs as the Family Violence Prevention Fund‘s — Fathering After Violence“ assume that the healing can begin *after* the violence has stopped œ but we do not yet know how to stop violence. (See, in particular, Wilson and Klein‘s 2007 report on their longitudinal study, which found that 75% of domestic violence offenders had a new violation or arrest with a ten year follow-up period, as much as four times higher than rates found with a one or two year follow-up.) Another reason is that batterer programs provide an instructive example of how a program model can proliferate before we understand adequately the limitations of what it can achieve (Klein, 2003; Labriola, Rempel, O‘Sullivan & Frank, 2007).

Instead of continuing to modify program content in the unfulfilled hope that a curriculum better matched to the offender‘s interests or social identity will have positive effects that have not been clearly demonstrated in the extensive research to date, perhaps we should be looking elsewhere to improve the impact of batterer programs. One direction is to tighten the relationship between mandating agencies and participants‘ program performance; that is, to consider the effectiveness of batterer programs in providing a monitoring function and to implement practices that enhance that function (Harrell, Schafer, DeStefano, & Castro, 2006; Labriola, et al., 2007). Another is to examine the issue of recidivism more broadly. The men who drop out and reoffend in this study and others are among the marginalized non-white and underemployed men in our urban centers (see especially Feder and Dugan‘s [2002] careful analysis of stake in conformity as an explanatory variable predicting dropping out and rearrest). A deeper level of intervention and commitment may be necessary to help them choose to avoid and eschew repeated engagement with the criminal justice system, beyond modification of batterer program curricula.

References

Arean, J. D., & Davis, L. (2007). Working with fathers in batterer intervention programs:

Lessons from the Fathering After Violence Project. In J. L. Edleson & O. J. Williams (eds), *Parenting by Men who Batter: New Directions for Assessment and Intervention*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 118-130..

Bancroft, L., & Silverman, J. (2002). *The batterer as parent.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bent-Goodley, T., & Williams, O. J. (2007) Fathers' voices on parenting and violence. In J. L. Edleson & O. J. Williams (eds), *Parenting by Men who Batter: New Directions for Assessment and Intervention*, New York: Oxford University Press, p. 32.

Davis, R, Taylor, B. G., & Maxwell, C. D. (2000). *Does batterer treatment reduce violence? A randomized experiment in Brooklyn.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Edleson, J. L., Mbilinyi, L. F., & Shetty, S. (2003). *Parenting in the context of domestic violence.* San Francisco: Judicial Counsel of California. www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc/resources/publications.

Feder, L., & Dugan, L. (2002). A test of the efficacy of court-mandated counseling for domestic violence offenders: The Broward Experiment. *Justice Quarterly, 19*(2), 342-375.

Feder, L., & Wilson, D. B. (2005). A meta-analytic review of court-mandated batterer intervention programs: Can courts affect abusers' behavior? *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 1*, 239-262.

Groves, B. M., Van Horn, P., & Lieberman, A. F. (2007). Deciding on fathers' involvement in their children's treatment after domestic violence. In J. L. Edleson & O. J. Williams (eds), *Parenting by Men who Batter: New Directions for Assessment and Intervention*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 65-84.

Harrell, A., Schafer, M., DeStefano, C., & Castro, J. (2006). *The evaluation of Milwaukee's Judicial Oversight Demonstration.* Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Klein, A. (August, 2003). Batterer programs œ successful rehabilitation or false hope? *National Bulletin on Domestic Violence Prevention.* Boston, MA: Quinlan Publishing Group.

Labriola, M., Rempel, M., & Davis, R. (2005). *Testing the effectiveness of batterer programs and judicial monitoring: Results from a randomized trial at the Bronx Misdemeanor Domestic Violence Court.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Labriola, M., Rempel, M., O'Sullivan, C. S., & Frank, P. B. (2007). *Court responses to batterer program noncompliance: A national perspective.* New York: Center for Court Innovation.

National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (1994). *Model Code on Domestic and Family Violence.* Reno, NV: NCJFCJ.

Paulhus, D.L. (1998). The Paulhus Deception Scales: BIDR Version 7. Toronto/Buffalo: Multi-Health Systems**.**

Saunders, D. G. (2003). Understanding children exposed to violence: Toward an integration of overlapping fields. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*, 356-376.

Saunders, D., Lynch, A. B., Grayson, M., & Linz, D. (1987). The inventory of beliefs about wife-beating: The construction and initial validation of a measure of beliefs and attitudes. *Violence and Victims, 2*, 39-97.

Straus, M., Hamby, S., Boney-McCoy, S. & Sugarman, D. (1996). The Revised Conflict Tactic Scale (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues* 17(3), 283-316.

Wilson, D., & Klein, A. (2006). *Longitudinal study of a cohort of batterers arraigned in a Massachusetts District Court 1995 to 2004.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice. NCJ Number 215346.

Introducing the Impact of Domestic Violence on Children into a Batterer Program Curriculum: Does an Emphasis on the Kids Improve the Response?

by

Safe Horizon New York City

The research reported here was supported by grant #2003-WG-BX-1005 from the National Institute of Justice.

FINAL REPORT May 2007

Preface

The New York State Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) provided criminal history for the recidivism analysis. These data were provided in de-identified form that did not allow us to relate the criminal justice data to individuals, but only to aggregate groups according to variables used in the analysis. DCJS is not responsible for the methods of statistical analysis or any conclusions derived there from.

The New York City Criminal Justice Agency (CJA) provided unique identifiers (NYSID numbers) based on docket numbers and other identifiers when available that were then provided to DCJS for the criminal records search. Under the data sharing agreement with CJA, these NYSIDs were to be shared only with DCJS and the records provided by CJA were then destroyed. CJA bears no responsibility for the use of these records in the recidivism analysis and conclusions.

Acknowledgments

Safe Horizon would like to acknowledge Chris O'Sullivan, Principal Investigator; Kyla Levin-Russell, who managed the project; Lori A. King, who also worked on the project and conducted many of the interviews; Vincent Goldberg, who served as interviewer and observer; and Victoria Quiroz Becerra, who managed the project in the early stages. We appreciate the support of Ted Bunch, the Director of DVAP, and the instructors who led

the control and experimental classes: Juan Ramos, Kruti Parekh, Delores Valentin, Luis Matos and Rosemarie Salinger. Lundy Bancroft provided invaluable advice on the development of the child-focused curriculum.

We would also like to thank Freda F. Solomon of the New York City Criminal Justice Agency and Steve Greenstein of New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services for their assistance in collecting the criminal justice recidivism data. Finally we would like to thank Bernie Auchter, our grant manager at NIJ, for his support.

Abstract

Introducing a Child Focus into a Batterer Program Curriculum Does It Make a Difference?

Purpose

Some researchers and practitioners have come to believe that men who abuse their partners might be more engaged by an intervention that focused on the impact of domestic violence on children than one that focused on the impact of the adult partner or ex-partner (cf. Arean & Davis. 2007; Peled & Perel, 2007). Programs have been developed to capitalize on fathers‘ attachment to their children as a means of combating domestic violence. To date, these programs have not been rigorously evaluated.

Method

Safe Horizon conducted an experiment in which men mandated to its batterer program and who had minor children in common with the victim in the incident that led to the mandate were randomly assigned to a partner-focused curriculum (two out of 25 classes discussed children and domestic violence) or a child-focused curriculum (11 out of 25 classes focused exclusively on children, and the other 14 classes discussed the relevance to children). Men who completed the two curricula and consented to the study were interviewed at the time of their first class and around the time of their last class (Study Group). Data were collected on program completion and rearrests for men in the study and men assigned to other classes during the study (Treatment-As-Usual Group).

Results

There were 379 men in the total sample; 46 completed the child-focused curriculum (CF) and 35 completed the partner-focused curriculum (PF). Men in the Study Group (SG) were more likely to complete the program (66%) than men in the Treatment As Usual (TAU) Group (54%), but there was no difference in completion rates of men assigned to the two curricula. There were no differential effects of the CF and PF curricula on the amount of responsibility the participants took for their violence, awareness of the impact of domestic violence on children or on their children‘s feelings about them, or on their belief that their children might need counseling. Group membership did not affect rearrest rates. Significant predictors of rearrest were program termination (i.e., dropping out), younger age, and number of prior misdemeanor and felony arrests.

Conclusion

Unfortunately, this study joins a growing body of research demonstrating little to no effect of batterer programs in reducing domestic violence. Before courts mandate batterers to programs emphasizing the impact of domestic violence on children or require batterer programs as a condition of parental access, research should be conducted with control groups to discover whether such programs have any effect on reoffending. Future research might look to strengthening mandates and imposing penalties for noncompliance rather than focusing on program content.

Table of Contents

Preface and Acknowledgments……ii

Abstract……..iii

Chapter 1. Introduction: Background and purpose……..1

Chapter 2. Review of relevant literature……. 4
The Function and Efficacy of Batterer Programs Children and Domestic Violence Battering and Fathering

Chapter 3. Method……...13
Domestic Violence Accountability Program Design Overview Procedures Curricula Measures

Chapter 4. Results……...20
Sample Representativeness of Study Sample Predictors of Program Completion Comparative Tests of Partner-Focused and Child-Focused Curricula Predictors of Rearrest Instructors‘ Perspective

Chapter 5. Discussion…….35
Study Limitations Summary of Findings Conclusions Implications and Recommendations

References…….41

Appendices

Appendix A. DVAP registration form (with added screening questions for study) 48 Appendix B. Outline of child-focused and partner-focused curricula 50 Appendix C. Baseline interview 75 Appendix D. Instructor interview guide 91 Appendix D. Excerpts from interviews with instructors 93

Chapter 1. Introduction

Since the —battered women‘s movement“ emerged in the seventies, leading to the development of services for victims and a call for the criminal justice system to treat domestic violence as a real crime comparable to assaults on non-intimates, there has been an influx of domestic violence cases into the courts. The criminal justice system has been searching for an alternative to incarceration, and in particular, for a rehabilitation program that would protect current and former intimate partners of offenders. More recently, there has been concern with the impact of domestic violence on children and sparing them the effects of continuing abuse. Despite the increase in the use of this option in sentencing, and the adoption of batterer program referrals by other agencies, such as probation, parole and child protective services, recent metaanalysis of experimental research on batterer programs with non-treatment controls indicates that they do not significantly reduce participants‘ physical or psychological abuse of their intimate partners (Feder & Wilson, 2005). The small positive effects that have been found may be encouraging at a clinical level, if they spare a small number of women and children from continuing harm, but at a policy level, a 5% benefit is not sufficient to justify a widespread program: a more effective response must be found.

Rather than abandon hope for batterer programs as a means of ending domestic violence, a number of modifications and innovations have been developed and the efficacy of many of these variations on the theme of batterer intervention has been tested. One hypothesis was that the programs were too short and exposure too limited. However, varying program length has not improved outcomes (Gondolf, 1999; Davis, Taylor & Maxwell, 2000; Bennett & Williams, 2002). Experiments have been conducted using different approaches or modalities, including structured versus unstructured groups (Edleson & Syers, 1990), cognitive-behavioral vs. process psychodynamic groups (Saunders, 1996), and groups matching program content to racial identity (Gondolf, 2005). None of these modifications showed significantly better effects than the comparison condition. Studies that did not have an experimental design but compared sites using different models have also failed to find that one approach works better than another in reducing domestic violence: Gondolf (1999) found no difference in rates of reoffending across four programs that used a didactic approach, a —process“ approach, and a process approach providing ancillary substance abuse and mental health services, nor did Cissner and Puffett‘s (2006) comparison of a 26-week educational program and a 12-week therapeutic program find any differential impact.

At the same time that the evidence has been accumulating regarding the inefficacy of batterer programs in rehabilitating offenders, there has been increasing attention to the —Batterer as Parent,“ as the title of one of the first major published works on this topic puts it (Bancroft & Silverman, 2002). This interest in batterers as fathers stems from several relevant social realities. One is a substantial body of research that demonstrates that exposure to domestic violence can have a serious negative impact on children‘s mental and physical health, cognitive and emotional development (see Wolfe, Crooks, Lee, McIntyre-Smith and Jaffe‘s meta-analysis of over 40 studies on the impact of domestic violence on children). Along the same lines, there is a great deal of overlap between abuse of intimate partners and physical abuse of children, ranging from 40% to 60% in different studies (Saunders, 2003). Therefore, the issue of intimate partner violence and

safety of the adult victim cannot be separated from that of the well-being of children of victims and offenders, and both problems need to be addressed.

Another body of research brought to bear on the issue of fathers removed from the family because of their violence is that on father involvement and father absence, which suggests that children raised without fathers or father figures are more likely to be raised in poverty, fail to finish school, be unemployed and engage in delinquent behavior (Pardue & Rector, 2004). Notably, however, there are a number of confounds in this research, especially when applied to absent fathers who have abused the mother (Cattlet & Artis, 2004). This literature supports the political zeitgeist and social movement that advocates greater engagement of fathers in families, expressed in such policies as the marriage initiative, parenting education of fathers, and joint or paternal custody. (For a description of the —social movement to involve fathers," ranging from responsible fatherhood to fathers' rights contingents, see the introduction by Edleson and Williams to their edited volume, *Parenting by Men who Batter* [2007]). The value placed on paternal involvement suggests that the solution for victims and children is not simply to remove the father from their lives, but to effect a solution that makes continued involvement not harmful and even reparative.

More clearly related to the issue of batterers and parenting, however, is the fact that fathers' parental rights are rarely revoked because they have abused the mother. For example, batterers will typically be granted visitation (Rosen & O'Sullivan, 2005) and will sometimes be granted custody (Liss & Stahly, 1993; Morrill, Dai, Dunn, Sung & Smith, 2005). Research has also found that many women who have been abused by the father of their children want to keep the father involved in their children's lives, as long as it is safe, and the children frequently want to maintain a relationship with their father (DeVoe & Smith, 2002; Tubbs & Williams, 2007). With or without court involvement, there is likely to be contact between children and their father despite a history of domestic violence, and most often this involvement will require ongoing interaction between the parents.

In response to this reality œ including the fact of their own accommodation of abusers' petitions for visitation and custody, courts have mandated batterer programs as part of custody and visitation orders (see, for example, the Model Code on Domestic Violence proposed proposed by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges [1994] and California Family Code [Edleson, et al., 2003], and researchers and practitioners have been developing and adopting programs specifically for fathers with a history of domestic violence. These developments make it even more pressing to try to identify an intervention with batterers that will make it safe for mothers to co-parent with a former abusive partner.

Attention to the topic of programs for batterers that focus on or integrate the father-child relationship is also driven by the observation that batterers seem to be more responsive when the topic is their children rather than their partners. For example, the Family Violence Prevention Fund developed the —Fathering After Violence" project after conducting focus groups and concluding that programs can use —fatherhood as an

engagement strategy to help men stop their violence“ (Arean & Davis, 2007, p. 118). The specific hypothesized mechanism whereby a focus on fatherhood could be used to help end violence against women was helping batterers to develop empathy for their children, and using that empathy as a motivator (Arean and Davis, 2007). Although these premises were based in qualitative research with small samples of batterers and victims, Groves, Van Horn and Lieberman also reviewed the few surveys on this topic and concluded that fathers in batterer programs —express concern for their children and want continued contact with them“ (2007, p. 72). Citing qualitative research by Litton Fox and colleagues (2001), Groves et al. further note that the role of father appears to provide a route to moral rehabilitation for the abusers.

Given the expressed commitment of batterers in programs to their children, it seemed reasonable to hypothesize that that they would be more interested and engaged in discussing how to repair and strengthen that relationship than in how to repair and maintain their relationship with their current or former intimate partner. In addition, it seemed logical to infer from their concern with their children that protecting their children from further harm could be a stronger motivator for men who have abused their partner than preventing further harm to her. In the study described in this report, domestic violence offenders mandated to Safe Horizon‘s Domestic Violence Accountability Program who were fathers of minor children with the victim in the case that led to the mandate were randomly assigned to a 25-week curriculum that focused on the impact of domestic violence on children and related topics, or to a partner-focused curriculum. The men in these classes who consented and completed the program were interviewed at the time of their first class and their last class. The men who experienced these two curricula were compared to each other and to other men in the program (and other fathers in the program) in regard to program completion and rearrest.

Chapter 2 Review of the Literature

The Function and Efficacy of Batterer Programs

Batterer Programs as a Criminal Justice Response to Domestic Violence

A number of factors led to the proliferation of batterer programs and their use by the courts. The second wave of the feminist movement in the 1970‘s and 1980‘s gave birth to services for battered women and a push to recognize assault of wives in their homes as a crime comparable to assault by a non-intimate outside the home. The first large national survey of violence in American families (Straus and Gelles, 1990) indicated that —spousal violence“ was prevalent. Pro-arrest polices produced an influx of domestic violence cases into the courts, forcing the courts to come up with a generic disposition appropriate to this type and level of offense (Sherman, 1992; Feder, 1997). Group counseling became the preferred response. Advocates for battered women, reflecting their clients‘ hope of maintaining their families intact and their frequent choice to return to abusive husbands after leaving shelter, supported the programs.

The prevailing model became psycho-educational groups offering techniques and strategies for avoiding violence and managing conflict. Many batterer programs have a feminist component, relating intimate partner violence to gender inequities produced by sexism and social structures that gave men more power in society at large, more control over family finances, and a sense of entitlement in regard to female partners and children. Anger management came to be regarded as inappropriate (and is prohibited by most state standards and funders) because physical abuse was viewed as choice and not an uncontrollable response.

Initial evaluations of batterer programs showed positive effects on those who completed programs in regard to recidivism whether measured by victim report or by new offenses reported to the criminal justice system (cf. Palmer, Brown & Berrera, 1992), although the first major quasi-experimental study by the Urban Institute (Harrell, 1991) actually showed a deleterious effect of batterer program participation. Recently, more rigorous research using experimental designs with true control groups and meta-analysis of these experiments indicates there is no strong and consistent positive effect on recidivism of participation in a batterer program (Davis, Taylor & Maxwell, 2000; Feder & Forde, 2000; Feder & Wilson, 2005). As Feder and Dugan (2002) suggest, a program that does not reduce recidivism can be more than innocuous; it could be dangerous if it gives victims, advocates and courts false confidence that the program participant has been rehabilitated and no longer poses a danger.

Research on program length and content

Is a longer program more effective?

Because the early programs did not require attendance for more than 15 to 20 hours, it was reasonable to infer that the dosage was too small œ exposure to the program was too brief œ to reverse a lifetime of socialization to dominance and a practice of abuse of power in intimate relationships. Programs were extended from two or three months to six months or a year. California now requires a 52-week program for offenders mandated to probation (California State Auditor, 2006). Studies comparing programs of different durations appear to yield similar outcomes of small to no effects on recidivism across different levels of exposure (Bennett & Williams, 2002; Davis, Taylor & Maxwell, 2000). Bennett and Williams contend that there is little support for an argument that longer programs are more effective in reducing violence than shorter ones. They do point out that longer programs may in fact be beneficial in promoting victim safety as well as justice and accountability, important goals of such programs. That is, keeping the batterer in a longer program may have a deterrent or suppression effect, as the batterer is likely to refrain from violent behavior during that time. At the very least, longer programs may afford a longer period when the victim can take measures to secure her safety. In the interest of accountability, longer programs also provide the courts with a more severe sanction, indicating that intimate partner violence is a serious offense meriting a serious response.

Are some approaches more effective?

Researchers have tried different modalities and approaches to determine whether batterer programs might be more effective in reducing domestic violence if the content and

structure were different. Edleson and Syers's (1990) study found a slight but non-significant effect favoring more structured programs. Saunders (1996) reported no significant main effects of treatment modality on recidivism in an experiment in which 218 men were randomly assigned to either a cognitive-behavioral program or a process-psychodynamic program. Gondolf (1999) compared four batterer programs that varied in length and type of intervention provided. They included a three-month didactic program; a three-month process program with victim services; a five-month didactic program; and a nine-month process program with complementary services addressing substance abuse, mental health and women's services. Men and their partners were interviewed every three months for fifteen months and police records were reviewed. There were no significant differences in re-assault, threats or victim quality of life across sites. An overall 30% re-assault rate did not vary across programs, providing no basis to conclude that treatment length or modality affect recidivism (Gondolf, 1999). Similarly, Hanson and Wallace-Capretta (2000) compared programs using cognitive-behavioral, humanist, feminist and eclectic orientations and found no difference in arrest and conviction rates following the program. Cissner and Puffett (2006) compared a free 12-week therapeutic program that encourages self-reflection and has a great deal of flexibility with a 25-week educational program with strictly enforced rules and a required fee. Surprisingly, no differences were found in completion rates after controlling for offender characteristics. In addition, the programs did not differ in rates of participants' recidivism during the program, recidivism one year after sentencing or one year after the program, whether the new offenses involved violent crimes or criminal contempt offenses for violating a protection order.

Matching approach to individual psychological or demographic characteristics

Others have suggested that the problem with batterer programs is the —one-size-fits all" approach. Thus Hamburger and Hastings suggested over a decade ago that, instead of measuring overall effectiveness of a program, researchers needed to investigate which programs work for whom (1993). In his comparison of cognitive-behavioral and psychodynamic approaches, although he found no main effects, Saunders (1996) did find that less structured groups appeared to be more effective among men with high levels of dependency, and more structured groups to be more effective with violent, antisocial men.

Matching programs to social identity has also been suggested and tested. Saunders and Hamill (2003) proposed that discriminatory treatment by the criminal justice system in particular and society in general poses an obstacle in regard to working with African American men and men from other oppressed groups in batterer programs.[1] Gondolf (2005) conducted a test of a culturally focused program for African American men. In the experiment, the men were assigned to a mixed-race group using a standard curriculum for that program, to an all black group using the standard curriculum, or to an all black group using the culturally focused curriculum. This study found a higher retention rate in the all black groups but no impact of racial composition of the groups or curriculum type on recidivism.

An intervention centered on the role of fatherhood

A program designed specifically for fathers who have abused their children's mother can be conceived of as a variation on matching offender characteristics to curriculum. As described in the introduction and elaborated below, in addition to the need to address the issue of batterers as parents, there were a number of reasons to expect that a fatherhood focus would encounter less resistance and might effectively capitalize on the participants' continuing investment in their children rather than the perhaps expendable, replaceable or already abandoned investment in maintaining a relationship with the adult victim.

Children and Domestic Violence

Impact on children of exposure to domestic violence

The majority of children from homes where there is intimate partner violence directly witness the abuse. Pagelow (1990) found that as many as 90 percent of children from

[1] It is worth noting that the staff of Safe Horizon's batterer program is African American and Latino, that the curriculum integrates cultural considerations and uses culturally appropriate support materials, and addresses participants' accurate perception that men of color are disproportionately caught up in and penalized by the criminal justice system. An objective review of the program would put it in Williams and Beckers's (1994) category of culturally focused programs violent homes witness their fathers battering their mothers. Reviews of the literature generally support the view that there is a positive correlation between children's' witnessing domestic violence and impaired development (cf. Fantuzzo & Mohr, 1999; Saunders & Hamill, 2003). Children witnessing violence inflicted on their mothers have been found to exhibit behavioral, somatic, or emotional problems similar to those shown by physically abused children (Wolfe, et al., 2003).

Co-occurrence of partner abuse and child abuse

A review of the research on the overlap between child maltreatment and domestic violence concluded that in 30 to 60 percent of families where either child maltreatment or woman abuse is occurring, one will find that the other form of violence is also being perpetrated (Edleson, 1999; Saunders, 2003). Findings from a US national survey (Straus & Gelles, 1990) suggest that 50 percent of the men who abused their wives also abused a child more than twice a year, a rate about seven times that of non-violent husbands. The *severity* of the wife beating is predictive of the severity of child abuse (Bowker, Arbitell & McFerron 1988). Abuse of children by a batterer is more likely when the marriage is dissolving, the couple has separated, and the husband/father is highly committed to the dominance and control of the mother and children (Bowker, Arbitell & McFerron, 1988).

Impact of domestic violence on children's relationship with their mother and father

One concern highlighted by Bancroft and Silverman (2002) and others is the effect on the child's response to the mother. Verbal abuse of the mother can —teach children a negative and disrespectful outlook on their mother" (Silverman and Bancroft, 2002, p. 57). The mother's vulnerability and inability to protect herself may make children feel unsafe. Mothers may also severely discipline their children to prevent them from

angering their father (Saunders & Hamill, 2003). Children's relationship with their father when he abuses their mother is likely to be ambivalent and complex, several studies have shown (Peled, 2000; Sternberg, Lamb, & Dawud-Noursi, 1998). On the one hand, children may fear him and be angry at him, but he also represents strength and power, and therefore safety, and they may also like and admire his positive traits.

Maintaining the child's relationship with the batterer/father

Previous research by the PI and others (cf. Rosen & O'Sullivan, 2005) indicates that batterers will be granted visitation if they seek it. Most mothers, and their children, prefer that the abuser remain in their children's lives as a father figure. In fact, many mothers have the same ambivalent feelings as their children about maintaining the father-child relationship, with safety concerns conflicting with a profound belief that the children need their father (and he needs them), as reported by Tubbs and Williams (2007). Finally, fathers do have legal rights, and many are still living with their children despite a history of violence against the mother.

Given these realities, some clinicians have proposed that the father needs to repair the relationship with the child in order to have his ongoing presence be a positive force in the child's life (Peled, 2000; Peled & Perel, 2007). Bancroft and Silverman even suggest that, with safety provisions, maintaining the relationship with a dangerous father is important to prevent the child's idealization of an absent father. One controversial study found that, absent exposure to severe violence, children benefit psychologically from contact with their fathers as shown in lower internalizing symptoms reported by the mothers (Stover et al., 2003).

At the same time, exchange of children for visitation can pose a risk to the mother and visitation can offer the father a chance to manipulate the mother. Recent research, in a revision of earlier findings, shows that the most important factor in a child's recovery is a strong relationship with the custodial parent, usually the mother and victim (cf. Jaffe & Geffner, 1998), thus it is important that shared custody not interfere with the primary relationship. One problem noted by Bancroft and Silverman (2002) is the father's interference with counseling for the children. Furthermore, repair of the relationship and healing of the child through involvement with the abuser cannot begin unless the violence has stopped. Continued exposure to violence and psychological abuse only perpetuates the problem, as well as possibly compromising the stability of the victimized parent.

Battering and Fathering

Batterers' victimization and exposure to violence in childhood

Some studies suggest that observing violence in the family of origin more consistently predicts violence by men toward their partners than being physically abused as a child (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986). Rosenbaum & O'Leary (1981) report that the male batterers in their study were much more likely to have grown up in homes where adult domestic violence was occurring. However, they also found that 82 percent of these men

reported having been physically abused as well, thus obscuring the unique impact of witnessing domestic violence. Widom (1989) marshaled data from her longitudinal study to support the hypothesis that children from violent families of origin carry violent and violence-tolerant roles to their adult intimate relationships. Kantor and Straus (1989), using data from the survey of violence in American families, found that observation of parental battering in the husband's family of origin predicted minor marital violence but did not predict severe marital violence. Retrospective accounts of men who batter their partners indicate that a majority have been exposed to similar behavior on the part of their fathers (Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981; Pagelow, 1981). The findings on batterers and abuse in childhood are consistent with social learning theory that predicts that modeling of violence during childhood would increase the likelihood of the behavior later in life.

The frequency of violence in batterers' family of origin has led some researcher/practitioners to propose that batterer programs address early victimization. Tolman and Bennett (1990), for example, recommend addressing childhood abuse and exposure to domestic violence in batterer intervention. Observing that many men become more aware of their own victimization as children during battering programs, they hypothesize that rediscovering these early experiences of vulnerability may ultimately facilitate empathy for their victims. A caveat Tolman and Bennett raise is that the offenders have the support to address their victimization without diminishing their responsibility for their own violent actions. The risk, then, is that a focus on the batterer's victimization and exposure to violence can implicitly justify his behavior. A second concern is whether a batterer program is the appropriate setting for uncovering and disclosing potentially traumatic personal history.

Shift in focus: Addressing a critical issue domestic violence research and practice

Research on batterers as fathers

Until recently, there has been little attention paid to the topic of batterers as fathers in either research or practice (Saunders & Hamill, 2003). Most research investigated the impact of domestic violence on the mother's parenting, and interventions were designed to give mothers understanding of the impact of domestic violence on children (Edleson, Mbilinyi, & Shetty, 2003). One early exception was Holden and Ritchie's (1991) comparison of parenting styles of a small sample of batterers to a sample of non-batterers, as reported by the mothers. The batterers were reported to be more likely to use punishment, including corporal punishment, to be less involved with their children, and to be more frequently angry at their children.

More recent research has been contradictory. Bent-Goodley and Williams's (2007) focus group with 17 fathers who had battered their children's mother showed a complete failure to recognize that their violence and abuse had an impact on their children, and a lack of recognition that this history was relevant to their ongoing relationship to their children. These findings contrast with Mandel's thesis data (2003) based on internet surveys of men in batterer programs who self-selected to participate in his study of fathers. Mandel found that most men were aware of and concerned about the negative effect of their verbal and physical abuse on their children and the psychological fall out.

Clinical issues in regard to batterers as fathers

Matthews (1995) contended that the impact of domestic violence on family members and family relationships raises significant parenting challenges for the perpetrator. These challenges include a limited knowledge of child development, inability to have empathy with their children's experiences of their violence, step-parenting and willingness to make a commitment to non-violent parenting. Until recently, few programs had incorporated intervention models based on Matthews' work or on a similar outline (see for example, Pence et al., 1991; Peled & Davis, 1995).

Peled suggested in 2000 that then-current practice and ideology of domestic violence services let abusive men —off the parenting hook." Similarly, Bancroft and Silverman argued in 2002 that assessments of batterers' parenting sometimes overlook the most evident problem œ the batterer's exposure of his children to domestic violence. By contrast, other parenting choices that expose children to disturbing or unsafe conditions, including substance abuse, are generally treated as relevant to judicial decisions. This tendency to make an exception for domestic violence may result in part from a failure to view the batterer as fully responsible for his conduct, thus implicitly (and sometimes explicitly) holding the mother equally responsible for the children's exposure to violence (Bancroft & Silverman, 2002).

Focus on fathers

Recently, there has been an explosion of interest in batterers as parents on the part of service providers, policy makers, and government. In part, this interest is driven by a social movement to give fathers a more prominent role in their children's lives. Edleson and Williams (2007) describe this movement as consisting of three or four contingents with very different goals and values: responsible fatherhood, father involvement, and fathers' rights contingentsœ and the Bush administration's Marriage Initiative. Within domestic violence programs, there is great interest in developing interventions that will increase the role of fathers in their children's lives —after battering," help men who have been identified as abusing the mothers of their children to interact in positive ways with their children, and motivate abusers to stop their violence to protect their children (cf. Arean & Davis, 2007). The last five years have seen the publication of Bancroft and Silverman's *The Batterer as Parent* (2002); the volume edited by Edleson and Williams, *Parenting by Men who Batter: New Directions for Assessment and Intervention* (2007); and Mandel's (2002) thesis work on batterers as father. These publications and the programs described in the next section signal an intense new focus on this sphere of domestic violence and batterer interventions.

The literature on integrating fathering into batterer programs was not yet developed when this project was initiated. Linda Melgren (NIJ Workshop Notes 2002) noted that fatherhood programs had not connected with batterer programs and suggested that more conversation between these types of programs was needed in order to address the issue of batterers as parents. Anecdotal information from batterer program providers indicated that understanding the effects of violence on children could be a powerful motivator for abusive men to change their behavior.

Recently, qualitative research has been conducted with batterers and their victims, leading to the same conclusion. On the basis of interviews with eight fathers in a batterer program, Litton Fox, Sayers and Bruce (2001) speculate that a focus on children could motivate the men to change, and that their positive role as fathers reconnected them to society and a sense of redemption. Saunders and Hamill (2003) reference Stosny‘s report that beginning the program with an exercise in compassion increased participation and retention. The exercise consisted of the showing and discussion of a video that depicts a resistant offender in his first session at a batterer program and then switches to the perspective of a child (the offender) watching his father physically abuse his mother. In 2002, the Family Violence Prevention Fund conducted focus groups with survivors of domestic violence that indicated that the women, for the most part, wanted the fathers of their children to remain in their children‘s lives (Arean & Davis, 2007). Tubbs and Williams had similar findings from focus groups conducted in 2003 with African American women who had been abused by the father of their children.

Peled and Perel (2007) argue that the research on batterers as fathers has been unidimensional and one-sided, focusing on their deficits. Using a naturalistic qualitative approach in in-depth interviews with 14 fathers, the researchers found a more complex dynamic. First, they found that the men viewed fathering as extremely important, devoted energy to being good fathers, and felt they succeeded. On the other hand, these efforts were compromised by their children‘s exposure to violence, problems with co-parenting, their own limitations and their personal history. The researchers reiterate the word —yearning“ in regard to the fathers‘ aspirations for a closer and warmer relationship with their children.

Fathering programs for batterers

This socio-political, research and clinical interest in batterers as fathers has been accompanied by the development of programs for men who batter and parenting, in the context of batterer programs, of parenting or fathering programs, programs for divorcing parents, and supervised visitation programs. Examples include Meg Crager and Lily Anderson‘s development of a batterer program curriculum focusing on parenting with complementary sections for victimized mothers in Seattle (1997); the Family Violence Prevention Fund‘s —Fathering After Violence“ initiative (Arean & Davis, 2007); Peled and Perel‘s (2007) development and testing in Israel of an intervention for fathers who batter; the Caring Dads pilot in Canada for men who have abused their partners or their children (Scott, Francis, Crooks & Kelly, in press); and Mandel‘s development of workshops on batterers as parents for child protective services and batterer programs (2003). Edleson et al. (2003) describe the development and piloting of six other programs, which are most often used as an adjunct or supplement to a batterer program but may also stand alone or be fully integrated into a program as a module.

The Fathering After Violence project is described as —a conceptual framework to help end violence against women by using fatherhood as a leading approach“ (Arean & Davis, 2007, p. 119.) From this framework, the Family Violence Prevention fund has worked with practitioners to develop intervention strategies and practice recommendations for

different settings, including batterer programs, supervised visitation programs, child protection and responsible fatherhood programs. The intervention was piloted and evaluated in a batterer program in Massachusetts. Like Arean and Davis, Peled and Perel (2007) see the possibility of repairing the damage and using fatherhood as a nexus for change in other domains.

Evaluating programs focusing on batterers as fathers

The newly developed programs have not yet been evaluated and most are evolving. Although a few were designed with an evaluation component, the experimental designs necessary to detect actual efficacy in reducing violence have not yet been conducted. Sullivan (2007) suggests that, at this stage of program development, process and formative evaluation are appropriate, and a phenomenological approach may be necessary given the widely varying contexts in regard to program and staff philosophies, populations served and social service settings in which these new programs are operating.

Sullivan identifies broader issues that must be considered in evaluating the program. The primary question is the purpose of the program (to decrease the father‘s abuse of the mother, to increase his access to the children, to improve his parenting skills?). Another headline question is what sort of change will be measured to consider the program effective. Citing Bancroft and Silverman‘s 12 core elements for determining whether a batterer is a safe father, Sullivan notes that signs that a man may continue to be abusive after completing a parenting program include continuing denial of the full extent of his abuse. In addition to acknowledging his behavior, he must take responsibility for his actions, demonstrate increased empathy toward his children *and* toward their mother, be able to articulate exactly how he has been controlling, make amends for and accept the consequences of past behavior and commit to not repeating abuse. Additional questions are about the implementation of evaluation, such as how the data will be gathered; physical and psychological safety if mothers and children are to be interviewed; and confidentiality.

Chapter 3. Method

Domestic Violence Accountability Program

Safe Horizon is the nation‘s leading crime victim assistance organization and serves over 350,000 people annually. Beginning as a victim/witness program in the courts in 1978, Safe Horizon began offering a batterer program in 1982. The program serves the court by providing a viable requirement when more severe penalties are legally unavailable and by providing a mechanism to monitor compliance with the court order. Annually, over 900 men are referred to the program by courts and other mandating agencies and approximately 650 are served by the program. DVAP operates 30 classes (including two orientation classes) around the city, making it the largest batterer program in the country.

The program requires completion of 26 classes, including an orientation class at which the rules are explained and the men are given a pamphlet about the program. (A national survey of batterer programs found that 26 weeks is the most common length [Labriola, Rempel, O‘Sullivan & Frank, 2007].) The mandating agency may require a longer term

of classes. Classes last an hour and fifteen minutes, slightly shorter than is common (Labriola, et al. found that 90 minutes or two hours is more common). Attendance is strictly monitored, and a late arrival is counted as an absence. Participants are allowed three absences before they are terminated from the program, but they will be terminated if two absences are consecutive. If they have a documented excuse, they are to present it to the agency that mandated them to the program and the mandating agency decides if they are to be counted absent. They must also pay a fee by money order at the beginning of the class. If they do not have the money order at the beginning of the class, they are counted absent. The full fee is $35 per class and is reduced if the offender can document inability to pay. When offenders are terminated from the program, typically for absences, the mandating agency is informed. The agency may reorder the offender to the program unless the reason for termination is problematic conduct at the program. These consistently enforced rules relate to the program's role in serving the court and the goal of accountability. Enforcement of rules is more strict than at many programs around the country, and the mandating agency is more consistently informed (Labriola et al., 2007) but these practices conform to the New York Model for Batterer Programs, supported by the New York State Office for the Prevention of Domestic Violence.

Use of DVAP by the Courts

Criminal courts and Integrated Domestic Violence Courts (IDV) in New York City mandate men to DVAP as a condition on disposition of misdemeanor charges and ordinance violations. The majority of men in DVAP have been ordered to the program by the criminal courts on a Conditional Discharge (CD). A number of offenders ordered to probation by the criminal court are also ordered to the batterer program as a condition of probation. A smaller number of men are sent to the program by criminal courts prior to conviction on an Adjournment in Contemplation of Dismissal (ACD). On an ACD, if the defendant completes the program and fulfills any other conditions ordered by the court, the charges are dismissed and the case is sealed. The Brooklyn Supreme Court Domestic Violence Part, a felony court, also orders defendants to DVAP as a condition of pretrial release. Following trial, they may be sentenced to jail or prison, and usually are ordered to complete the program following their incarceration, or they may complete the program while awaiting trial. Finally, respondents are ordered to DVAP by the Family Court as part of a Family Offense finding (e.g., condition on an order of protection) or by the Administration Children's Services (ACS) on a child protection petition.

Design Overview

Fourteen classes (as defined by rolling enrollment into a 25-week cycle) of a batterer program were randomly assigned to receive either a partner-focused curriculum that spends one class on the impact of domestic violence on children or a child-focused curriculum that focuses on children and domestic violence for ten classes specifically and brings up children in regard to the other 15 lessons. A number of measures had to be developed, as there are no standard measures for assessing the impact of addressing fatherhood in a batterer program, and we needed to use outcome measures beyond re-offending, primarily fathers' self-report of their beliefs about the impact of domestic

violence on their children, on their relationship with their children and on the mother, and their responsibility for the incident that led to their mandate to the program.

Structured interviews were conducted with participants at the beginning and end of their program participation. For the first cycle of classes, brief session evaluations were completed by participants and instructors after every class. A criminal justice records check was conducted for a minimum of one year following the participants‘ enrollment in the program. The study was conducted in Brooklyn; a plan to include the Bronx, which has the highest rate of court mandates, was not possible to implement because the program lost space in the Bronx and had to cut the number of classes in that borough.

Men mandated to Safe Horizon‘s Domestic Violence Accountability Program (DVAP) who attended the program in Brooklyn and who had children under 18 with the woman against whom they had been charged with committing a domestic violence offence were eligible for participation in the study. At DVAP registration, usually conducted at the criminal court but sometimes at DVAP‘s office, eligible men were randomly assigned either to the —child-focused curriculum“ or to the —partner-focused curriculum,“ if they were able to make the class meeting day and time. Participants were compensated $25 for the baseline interview and $35 for the follow-up interview.

The primary hypotheses were that the men would be more engaged by the topic of their children and therefore less likely to drop out of the program if they were assigned to the child-focused curriculum; that they would be less resistant to the information about the impact of domestic violence on their children than to the message about their treatment of their partners, and therefore retain the information better in the experimental condition; and that they would be more motivated to stop abusing their child‘s mother once they understood the impact on the child and learned to see the violence and verbal abuse through their child‘s eyes. In addition to pre- post-program comparisons of responses of men completing the child focused and partner focused curricula, we also compared men in the study to men not in the study, and fathers in the program to non-fathers in the program in regard to program completion and new offenses reported to the criminal justice system.

Procedures

Recruitment

Men with children with the victim who were mandated to the program from July 2004 through December, 2005 and who signed up for classes in Brooklyn were eligible for the study. As men are referred to DVAP by the courts or other agency, they first go through registration where they are assigned to a class location and time; they then attend a centralized, weekly Orientation Session (class 1); and join the class the following week. Men can enter a class at any point in the curriculum and stay for 25 weeks. Thus, classes have rolling entry points. When men registered for the Brooklyn classes during the study intake period, they were screened for eligibility during registration conducted by DVAP staff at the court or at DVAP‘s office. To the program registration form, we added a

question about whether the man had children in common with the woman involved in the complaint that led to his mandate to DVAP. (See Registration Form, Appendix A.) If they did have children together, then the registrar followed up to determine whether he met our criteria for being an —active father.“[2] If the questions identified the man as eligible for the study, the registrar then used a random assignment sheet to choose a condition and asked the participant whether he could attend a class at the hour and day corresponding to that condition. If not, the participant was assigned to a non-study class. The random assignment sheet consisted of a list of computer-generated random numbers. Even numbers were assigned to a child-focused class and odd numbers to a partner-focused class.

In addition, the researchers attended the weekly orientation class. Toward the end of orientation, they would introduce the study and determine who in the room was eligible. They would have a list of the men who had already been assigned to a study class, and would attempt to recruit them into the study. At this time, they would open enrollment to other qualified men, including men who had been mandated by Manhattan or Bronx courts but who could or would prefer to attend a class in Brooklyn. Any additional men picked up at this point would be assigned to a condition using the same random assignment sheet used by the DVAP registrar. The researcher would then secure a signed letter from DVAP giving the new recruits their new class time and location. As a result of these procedures, there were some eligible men who declined to participate in the study after the introduction at Orientation but who remained in the study class, and other men who transferred into a study class. (A few of these men then transferred back into their original class after participating in and being paid for the baseline interview.)

[2] The eligibility criteria included the following levels of paternal involvement: lived with the child for one year of the past three, or 50% of the child‘s life; visited with the child for at least one hour every two weeks or three hours every months for at least four months in the previous year; or having spent significant amounts of time with the child (as defined above) for more than half the child‘s life.

Interviews

Initially, interviews were conducted before or after the participant‘s first class. This procedure resulted in a number of problems: the men were late for class if the interview was not completed and were counted absent, and after class the secure space where the classes are held was closed and the interview had to move to another location. We then secured permission from the program to conduct interviews during class. The participant would sign in to his first class, pay for the class, and then leave the class for the interview, which was conducted outside the classroom. This procedure was repeated for the final interview around the time of the participant‘s last class, if he completed the program. In some cases, the participant completed ahead of schedule by taking make-up classes on another night, and the follow-up interview had to be conducted by telephone. For those participants who dropped out of the program but could be located, the follow-up interview was conducted by telephone around the time he would have completed the program. When interviews were conducted in person, the participants were paid in cash. When they were conducted by telephone, a money order was mailed to the participant. The interviewers were conducted by part-time interviewer (a man who was a doctoral

student in anthropology), research assistants, research associates and the PI (all women).

Curricula

In planning the project, we expected to develop a child-focused curriculum and to use regular classes as the control condition. This plan had to be revised for two reasons. First, although DVAP has an instructor‘s manual with a large number of lessons, the curriculum serves more as a guide and background for the instructors. The program is highly interactive. The instructors address issues as they come up and may draw from lessons out of order if a topic becomes relevant to the discussion and spend more or less time on a given topic depending on what is happening in the class. Therefore, the instructors teaching the study classes had to change their modus operandi and adhere to the outline for each class, deviating little from the lesson plan if an interaction with a class member raised a divergent issue. Second, it emerged once the grant began that the program had begun to integrate child focused material into the standard curriculum, such that is was not clear whether it was the child-focused or the partner-focused curriculum that was the —non-standard“ curriculum. Therefore we had to develop two differentiated curricula.

The two curricula (see Appendix B) were developed by the research staff in conjunction with the Deputy Director of the program at the time and with the instructors who were being trained for the study. Lundy Bancroft advised on design of the child-focused curriculum, especially suggesting that the curriculum avoid giving the abuser tools that he might use to manipulate the children and that it emphasize not undermining the mother‘s parenting. The child-focused curriculum drew on the wealth of materials the Deputy Director had collected (including Crager and Anderson‘s curriculum for parents, 1997), adaptations to current material proposed by the instructors (e.g., modifications of exercises and use of films from their library), and original lessons developed by the researchers from the research literature (e.g., impact of domestic violence on children at different stages of development). The partner-focused curriculum was based on the program‘s curriculum, with some tightening. The child-focused curriculum had 11 lessons focused explicitly on children; the remaining lessons were modified to include consideration of children. In developing and adapting the material for the child-focused curriculum, we kept in mind the concerns expressed by Lundy Bancroft and shared by the program staff that the curriculum not focus on parenting skills per se but that it emphasize accountability to children and supporting the mother‘s parenting.

Measures

Interviews with Offenders

Interview questions were developed by reviewing the literature, consulting with program staff, consulting experts, and piloting drafts with men from the batterer program. We found that well-validated scales œ for example, one on parenting involvement that elicited no variability among respondents, all of whom claimed to be the primary parent in regard to their child‘s feeding, clothing and supervision of schoolwork œ did not

necessarily work with this population, because of varying educational levels, a propensity for denial and impression management, and other psychological and social characteristics. The main problem, however, was time. Answering multiple choice questionnaires was not a familiar experience for some of our participants, and required a learning curve. As with any interview, some respondents were talkative and presented information that was beyond our purview. The setting required that interviews be conducted on a strict timetable.

Knowledge, beliefs and impact of domestic violence on children

The interviews focused on knowledge, beliefs and cognitions about domestic violence and the impact on children, frequency and nature of contact with the partner and children, and changes in behavior. Domains queried included description of the problem in the relationship from their perspective and the partner‘s perspective, past violence and abuse, children‘s exposure to the violence and the impact on the children. We asked whether the abuse affected the mother‘s parenting, the child‘s relationship with the father, and whether the children would need counseling. (See Appendix B for a sample baseline interview.)

Responsibility for incident

In both interviews, participants were asked to assign responsibility for their having to attend DVAP by allocating the appropriate degree of responsibility to themselves, their partner and others so that the total accounted for 100 percent. (Note that we did not ask about responsibility for the violence or abuse, because a number of our participants claimed there had been none. However, they were well aware that something had happened that led to their being in court and then ordered to the program. They were usually quite able to describe their level of responsibility for the situation or event that led to the court order.)

Standardized measures

The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, Hamby, et al., 1995) was administered at the first interview and at follow-up. This scale was not used as an actual measure of violent behavior. Instead, it was included to assess the participant‘s acknowledgement of his past behavior. Attitude questions were adapted from Saunders‘s Attitude Toward Wife-Beating Scale (Saunders, Lynch, Grayson & Linz, 1987). This scale was also administered at baseline and follow-up, as a measure of the participant‘s learning and changing their attitudes toward the justifiability of violence and inevitability of violence against women. Our scale had a Cronbach‘s alpha reliability of .65. (Principal components analysis did not reveal subscales.) We incorporated questions from the Paulhus Deception Scale (1998) to assess general truthfulness of individuals at baseline only. We intended to use scores as a covariate when looking at change scores on other attitude measures. However, because ten men did not complete this scale and recruitment was lower than expected and attrition higher, we could not afford the loss of power that adding a variable and reducing the n would entail. Interestingly, however, the distribution of scores was almost perfectly normal with a single outlier (with a score of one) and the distribution of scores did not differ between the two Study Group samples.

Family relationships

One section of the semi-structured interview probed the status of their relationship with the partner involved in the case that led to the DVAP referral, including level of involvement. Participants were asked about any new relationships. These questions were repeated in the follow-up interview.

In the baseline interview, each study participant was asked about his relationship with parents or guardians/caregivers; relationship between his mother and father or her other partners, or, if he was raised by his father but not his mother, his father's relationships with his partners, in particular whether these relationships were physically or emotionally abusive; whether other men were abusive to women when he was a child; and about how he was treated by his parents or guardians as a child.

In the baseline interview, participants were asked what they expected to get from the program and in the final interview, they were asked whether they had learned anything useful in the program or benefited from attending. We asked about their confidence on a scale of 1 to 10 in avoiding future violence with their partner or ex-partner.

Criminal Justice recidivism data

Six months after the last participant completed the program, we secured criminal justice recidivism data. With the assistance of New York City Criminal Justice Agency, we were able to check docket numbers of the men mandated to the program by criminal justice agencies and to secure unique identifiers (NYSIDs) used by the criminal justice system. (Some men sent by family court and out of state criminal courts did not have a criminal history in New York State.) The full data set was then submitted to the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS), which returned the data with criminal histories with our identifiers removed. The removal of identifiers allowed DCJS to provide us with information about sealed cases. Domestic violence cases are frequently sealed, especially among men whose only penalty is a mandate to a batterer program, because they are convicted on a charge below the severity of a criminal offense, i.e., they are convicted of a violation rather than a misdemeanor or felony. Once these cases are closed, they are sealed. We counted as new offenses only those committed within a month before program completion or termination or any time thereafter.

Victim reports show higher rates of reoffending than criminal justice data. Some studies, but not all, use both victim interviews and criminal justice data. In this study, we were unable to conduct victim interviews to assess unreported incidents of abuse during the follow up period because we recruited participants directly from the batterer program and only had access to the offenders. DVAP does not keep information on victims. Therefore, to conduct victim interviews, we would have had to ask the study participants for the name, phone number and address of the victim. It was the opinion of the New York State Office for the Prevention of Domestic Violence that this procedure would have posed a risk to victims. We assume that reported offenses that resulted in an arrest underrepresent the actual offenses that were committed by the offenders in our sample but that the ratio of unreported offenses to reported offenses would be comparable to studies that used both official records and victim interviews.

Instructor Interviews

At the end of the project, the two pairs of instructors who taught the study classes using the experimental and control curricula were interviewed using a semi-structured questionnaire. The interviews were taped and transcribed.

Chapter 4. Results

We conducted four primary sets of analyses using different predictors and dependent variables:

1. 1. Tests using demographic data to determine whether the study sample was representative of the men in the program or whether our sample was in some way inherently biased.
2. 2. Predictors of program completion vs. termination.
3. 3. Comparisons of the two curricula based on measures from our interviews to determine whether the child-focused curriculum had different effects from the partner-focused curriculum.
4. 4. Analysis of predictors of rearrest based on both demographic and other DVAP

data (e.g., mandating agency and sentence type) and curriculum. When multiple comparisons are made, family-wise error is inflated. Therefore, Bonferroni corrections were used to set significance levels based on the number of tests. This corrected alpha will be stated at the beginning of each section of analyses.

Sample

The full sample consisted of 379 men mandated to and enrolled in DVAP's program in Brooklyn between July 14, 2004 and December 31, 2005. Men in the Spanish language classes were excluded from the sample (n=30) because we did not translate the curricula into Spanish. Overall, the drop-out or program termination rate was 42.5%. This rate is within the normal range for batterer programs that have strict enforcement of attendance requirements but higher than those that are less demanding, including those that serve volunteer participants rather than participants mandated by criminal justice agencies (Labriola, et al., 2007).

Of the sample of 379, 75% were fathers of children with the woman who was the complainant in the case that led to their mandate or were raising children with her and were therefore eligible for the study. Of the 285 fathers, 123 (43%) were able to attend the study classes that used the controlled curricula and agreed to participate in the interview portion of the study (Study Group). -- Some men were interested in participating but could not attend on the day that the study classes were offered; some men were assigned to study classes but declined to participate in the study. Therefore, 256 experienced the regular program (Treatment as Usual or TAU Group).

The Study Group was further divided into those assigned to the Partner-Focused Currliculum (PF) and those assigned to the Child Focused Curriculum (CF). Forty-six of

the men who completed baseline interviews were enrolled in the PF curriculum and 77 men were enrolled in the CF curriculum.

Because of a scheduling issue with the first pair of child-focused and partner-focused classes, the initial drop-out rate from the child-focused class was much higher than the other class.[3] We added one additional child-focused section, and by the end of the study the number of men who completed each curriculum was roughly equivalent: 46 for the child-focused and 35 for the partner-focused.

Description of Sample

Table 1 below shows the demographics of the two subgroups in the Study Group and the TAU Group.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of sample

Race/Ethnicity	**Partner Focused**	**Child Focused**	**Treatment As Usual**
African-American	48%	61%	55%
Hispanic/Latino	35%	22%	29%
White	9%	7%	7%
Other	9%	9%	6%
Unknown	0	1%	3%
Income			
Mean (SD)	$17,499 (14,184)	$11,219 (12,112)	$12772 (12,916)
Mode (Range)	$10,000 (0-51,000)	$10,000 (0-51,000)	$10,000 (0-51,000)
Fee Paid			
Mean (SD)	$30.78 (8)	$29.83 (9)	$30.42 (9)
Median (Range)	$35 (10-35)	$35 (10-40)	$35 (0-35)
Age			
Mean (SD) Mode (Range)	35 (9) 34 (20-52)	33 (9) 24, 31[a] (19-61)	35 (10) 31 (18-61)
Born in US	56%	76%	(no data)
Employed	72%	62%	70%

[a] multiple modes

Characteristics of Study Group

Demographics of Study Group

The vast majority of men in the Study Group, 83%, were black or Latino; only 7% were white. Their mean income was $14,000 per year, and 44% said they were unemployed or had no occupation. A smaller percentage, 28%, was able to demonstrate an inability to pay the fee of $35 per class and qualified for a reduced fee. The majority, 63%, were under 35. (See Table 2.) Just under a third (32%) were born outside the US. Fifty-three

[3] For the first wave of classes in the study, we had a single pair, the child-focused class at 5:30 pm and the partner-focused class at 7:00 pm. The men in the earlier class were frequently late, marked absent, and terminated from the program. When we opened a second pair of classes six months later, the partner-focused was the earlier class and the child-focused the later class. Around the same time, DVAP pushed the start time for both classes back fifteen minutes. With this change, lateness, absences and terminations dropped for the earlier classes.

percent had a high school education or less and 12% had a college degree or postgraduate degree.

Table 2. Age distribution of men in Study Group

Age Range	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Cumulative %**
19-24	18	15%	15%
25-29	23	19%	33%
30-34	31	25%	59%
35-39	15	12%	71%
40-44	19	15%	86%
45-49	11	9%	95%
50-54	2	1.6%	97%
55-59	1	.8%	97%
60+	1	.8%	98%
missing	2	1.6%	100%
Total	*123*	*100%*	

Mandating agency

About 80% of the Study Group participants were mandated to the program by criminal courts. The most common disposition associated with the mandate to DVAP was the Conditional Discharge (CD), a criminal court sentence that brought about 70% of the sample to DVAP. With the CD, if the participant had been convicted of a violation rather than a misdemeanor and finished the program without incurring a new offense, the case would be the sealed, effectively wiping the defendant‘s record clean, at least for the offense that brought him into the program. A distant second was a Condition of Probation (12%).

Relationship status

At the first interview, the fathers in the Study Group were divided 50-50 between those who were currently married or had been married to their victim and those who had never been married to her. Thirty-seven percent were involved in new relationships. By the time of the follow-up interview, 69% said they were separated or no longer involved with the victim and mother of their children and 43% of those who completed the program said they were in a new relationship, ranging from casual to living together to married. A majority of the men felt that the relationship with the mother of their children was over at the beginning of the program, and by the end, only 23% remained in an intimate relationship with her. Their relationship with their children, in contrast, was ongoing.

Family background

At the baseline interview, men in the Study Group were asked about their family situation and environment growing up. Over a fifth of the men (22%) said they grew up without a father figure, and nearly a third (32%) said they witnessed domestic violence against their mother by their father or her other intimate partners. A larger percentage (40%) said that when they were growing up men around them were abusive to women.

1. Representativeness of the Study Group

Demographic representativeness

The first tests conducted assessed the representativeness of men in the Study Group as compared to overall Brooklyn enrollment (TAU Group), based on demographic data. As predicted, average age did not differentiate men in the Study Group (M = 33.71) from men in the TAU Group (M = 34.83): $t(369) = 1.04$, p=.30. The average age for all the men in the program was 34.5 years. In addition, income did not differ significantly between men in the Study Group (M = $14,024.57) and men in the TAU (M = $12,771.65): $t(374) = -.88$, $p = .38$. The same percentages of men in both groups (83 œ 84%) were African American, West Indian/Caribbean immigrants or Latino. Table 1 displays race/ethnicity of the sample. (These data were taken from DVAP records and use the categories of that database.) Overall, the racial/ethnic composition of the Study Group did not differ from the comparison group, $\chi^2(5, N = 379) = 3.13$, $p = .68$. (See Table 3.)

Table 3. Race/ethnicity of participants in study group and comparison group Mandating agency

Race/Ethnicity	**Study Group** N (%)	**TAU Group** N (%)	**Total Sample** N (%)
African American	59 (48%)	121 (47%)	180 (48%)
Latino/Hispanic	33 (27%)	73 (29%)	106 (28%)
White or European Ethnics	9 (7%)	19 (7%)	28 (7%)
West Indian/Caribbean	10 (8%)	20 (8%)	30 (8%)
Other	11 (9%)	15 (6%)	26 (7%)

Unknown	1 (1%)	8 (3%)	9 (2%)
Total	*123 (100%)*	*256 (100%)*	*379 (100%)*

There was no difference between men in the Study and TAU Groups in regard to which criminal justice agency mandated them to the program, $\chi^2(4, N = 379) = 5.59$, $p = .23$.

Table 4. Mandating agency for participants in the Study Group and Treatment-As-usual Group

Referral Source	**Study Group** N (%)	**TAU Group** N (%)	**Total** N (%)
Criminal Court*	89 (73%)	175 (68%)	242 (70%)
Probation (criminal court)	11 (9%)	37 (14%)	48 (13%)
Supreme Court*	4 (3%)	17 (7%)	21 (5%)
Admin. for Children's Services/Family Court	9 (7%)	12 (5%)	21 (5%)
Out-of-State Court	10 (8%)	15 (6%)	25 (7%)
Total	*123 (100%)*	*256 (100%)*	*379 (100%)*

*The criminal court in New York State adjudicates misdemeanors and lesser charges. The Supreme Court adjudicates felonies.

Fatherhood status

As predicted, men in the study sample *did* differ from men in the comparison group in regard to fatherhood status, $\chi^2(1, N = 379) = 60.06$, $p < .001$. All the men in our Study Group were fathers, while only about 63% of the men in the comparison group were fathers. (Fathers in the TAU group may have been ineligible for the study because they did not have children in common with the complainant in the case that led to their mandate to DVAP but only had children with other women, because their children were adults or because they were not —active fathers." They also may have been eligible but unable to attend the program on the nights when study classes were held, or at the class time to which they were randomly assigned.) Therefore, we next compared fathers in the Study Group to fathers in the TAU Group.

Comparison of Study Group to Other Fathers

Similar results were obtained when we compared fathers in the Study group to Fathers in the comparison group in regard to demographics. Fathers in the Study Group were no different in age (M = 33.71) or income (M = $14,024.57) from the fathers in the TAU

Group (M_{age} = 34.79 and M_{income} = $13,236.02): $t_{age}(275) = .942$, $p = .35$ and $t_{income}(281) = -.50$, $p = .62$. The racial composition of the Study Group did not differ from the comparison group of fathers ($\chi^2(5, N = 285) = 4.07$, $p = .54$), nor was there a difference in mandating agency for the fathers in the TAU group and the fathers in the study group: $\chi^2(4, N = 285) = 2.22$, $p = .70$.

Therefore, we can conclude that the men in the study were representative of the men in the program as a whole in most respects, but differed in regard to whether they had children with the victim. There were no differences in age, income or mandating agency between participants in the interviews and controlled classes and other fathers mandated to DVAP.

2. Predictors of Program Completion

Study Group vs. TAU Group

Fathers were not more likely to complete the program (78%) than non-fathers (72%): $\chi^2(1, N = 379) = 1.49$, $p = .22$. However, men in the Study Group completed the program significantly more often than men in the TAU Group, $\chi^2(1, N = 379) = 5.18$, $p = .02$. Table 5 shows the completion rates by group.

Table 5. Completion rate by group

Completion status	Study Group	TAU Group	Total
Completed program	81 (66%)	137 (54%)	220 (58%)
Terminated (dropped out)	42 (34%)	120 (46%)	162 (42%)
Total	123 (100%)	256 (100%)	379

Predictors of Program Completion within Study Group

We ran 14 tests to examine predictors of program completion within the study group. With the Bonferroni correction, statistical significance is set at .0033.

Curriculum type

Of the 123 men in the Study Group, 81 completed the program and 42 were terminated by the program, primarily for absences (drop outs). Table 6 shows the breakdown of completers and drop-outs by curriculum type (child-focused versus partner-focused). Contrary to our hypothesis that the child-focused curriculum would be more engaging and less aversive to the participants and therefore more men would complete the program than would complete the partner-focused classes, in fact, curriculum type had no effect on completion rate, $\chi^2(1, N = 123) = 3.90$, $p = .048$. However, as noted earlier, there was

an initial confound with class time and curriculum type for the first two classes that was corrected for the remaining 12 classes.

Table 6. Completion Status by Curriculum Type

Curriculum type	**Completion Status**		
	Child Focused	**Partner Focused**	**Total**
Completed	45 (59%)	36 (77%)	*81 (66%)*
Terminated (dropped out)	31 (41%)	11 (23%)	*42 (34%)*
Total	*76*	*47*	*123*

Relationship status and age of children

Although on average men who completed the program had been in the relationship longer than those who were terminated from the program, with a mean of 99 months (8 years) vs. 84 months (7 years), the difference was not statistically significant: $t(121) = -1.12$, $p = .27$, nor did completers differ from drop outs in the number of children they had, either with the victim or with other women. In regard to the number of children under six living with them, drop outs did not differ statistically from completers ($M = 1.48$ vs. $M=1.09$), $t(121) = 2.16$, nor did they differ in the number of children under three living with them ($M = .90$ for drop-outs and $M=.59$ for completers). The type of relationship the participant had with the victim (married vs. unmarried) was not associated with program completion nor did the initiation of a new relationship affect completion rates.

Accepting responsibility, beliefs about violence, deceptiveness and confidence

One question asked each respondent the percentage of responsibility for the incident that led to the mandate he would allocate to himself, his partner, the police, court, child protective services (ACS), or someone else, for a total of 100%. There was no difference between drop-outs and completers in answer to this question, except in allocation of responsibility to ACS: None of the men who completed the program attributed any responsibility to ACS at the initial interview, and only one attributed some responsibility to ACS at the end of the program. Completers and drop outs did not differ on the Paulhus Deception Scale, the Conflict Tactics scale, the Beliefs about Violence Scale nor confidence that they would ever be abusive to their partner again.

Childhood exposure to domestic violence

The answer to a question about whether they grew up around men who abused women was not associated with program completion.

3. Comparative Tests of Effects of the Two Curricula

To test the relative impact of the two curricula, we compared the men who completed the

child-focused and partner-focused curricula at baseline and follow-up interviews. We did not control for any factors because we found no baseline differences between the men in the two groups. We ran nine tests; with Bonferroni correction, significance is set at .0056.

Relative impact of the curricula on acceptance of responsibility

Study Group participants were asked at the baseline and follow-up interviews to allocate responsibility for their mandate to DVAP to themselves, their partner, the police, court, ACS (child protective agency) or others to add up to 100%. To test the relative impact of the two curricula on acceptance of responsibility, we calculated change scores from baseline to follow-up interviews for each man for each of the domains of responsibility. Participants who completed the child-focused curriculum did not show a significant difference from those who completed the partner-focused curriculum. See Table 7 for the average amount of change in attribution of responsibility to self, partner, police, court, ACS, and —other“ under the two curricula.

Table 7. Average change in attribution of responsibility for Study Group by curriculum type

Responsibility Attributed to…	**Condition**	**N**	**Mean Change in % Responsibility**	**Std. Deviation**
Himself	Partner-focused	33	+15.91	43.76
	Child-focused	41	+12.19	43.97
His partner	Partner-focused	33	-7.88	39.71
	Child-focused	41	-4.27	37.97
The police	Partner-focused	33	-3.49	12.28
	Child-focused	41	+1.58	11.31
Court	Partner-focused	33	-3.94	35.50
	Child-focused	41	-8.76	25.30
ACS	Partner-focused	33	.00	.00
	Child-focused	41	+.12	.78
Other	Partner-focused	33	-.61	10.29
	Child-focused	41	-1.12	7.87

Overall, as can be seen in Table 7, participants attributed more responsibility to themselves and less responsibility to their partner and the court at completion of the program regardless of curriculum. The two curricula did not have a differential impact,

however.

Beliefs about violence

In general, men in both types of classes tended to disagree more with the statements on the Beliefs about Violence Scale at time 2 than at time 1 (M_{child} = 3.02 M_{parent} = 1.06). There was no significant difference in the amount of change between men in the child-focused class and men in the partner-focused class. This scale did not have subscales that held up from baseline to follow-up interviews, but had decent reliability overall (Cronbach's alpha=.65)

Beliefs about the Effect of DV on Children

We assessed the men's beliefs about the impact of domestic violence on children with the following five questions: Did the child see or hear physical abuse? Did child see or hear arguing? Did the child's feelings about you change because of the fighting? Is it good to be honest with the child about your feelings about their mother? Do any of their children need counseling as a result of the fighting? We hypothesized that, if the child-focused curriculum had an impact, respondents would acknowledge their children's exposure to physical and verbal abuse at the end of the program more than at the beginning; that they would be more aware of the consequences for their own relationship with the child of their abusive behavior after exposure to conflict and abuse, if violence was denied; that they would understand that honesty in regard to their perception of the mother's failings was not the best policy; and that they would be more likely to acknowledge that their children might need counseling, at present or in the future.

In these tests, the difference between Time1 and Time 2 was represented as positive change (more recognition of the impact on children), negative change (less recognition or denial of any impact), or no change. There were no significant differences between men in the child-focused group and men in the partner-focused group in the amount of change in their beliefs about the effect of domestic violence on children. To conserve power, we attempted principal components factor analysis, and found that there were no reliable subscales that held from time 1 to time 2. Therefore, we had to run each item separately. Only one of the four questions that assessed these changes, greater awareness that the child's feeling about them might be altered by witnessing physical fighting with their mother, even approached significance, but with the Bonferroni correction (alpha=.0056), the difference between men in the two conditions was not significant ($\chi^2(2, N = 66) = 6.54$, $p = .04$). This outcome is shown in Table 8.

Table 8. —Do you think that your child's feelings about you have changed because of the fighting they have witnessed between you and their mother?"

	Condition		
Change direction	**Partner-focused**	**Child-focused**	**Total**
Negative change	10 (37%)	6 (15%)	16 (24%)

No change	11 (41%)	28 (72%)	39 (59%)
Positive Change	6 (22%)	5 (13%)	11 (17%)
Total	*27*	*39*	*66*

4. Predictors of Rearrest: Full Sample

We had rearrest data on both the Study Group and TAU Group members. For those participants on whom we had data for a longer period of time (i.e., they completed or were terminated from the program by January 2006), analysis was performed on rearrest for one year from program completion or termination. Rearrests on all criminal charges were included. New York State does not have specific domestic violence crimes, and categorizing crimes as domestic violence is only inferential and often inaccurate (e.g., a theft or robbery might be a crime against a former partner or a stranger). Both sets of tests œ six months after program completion or termination and one year after -- used 10 predictors, described below.

1) *Age* at the beginning of the program: Many studies have found that younger men are more likely to reoffend (e.g., Labriola, Rempel, and Davis, 2006).

2) *Fatherhood status* (father or not): As noted above, when testing the sample in the study for representativeness, we compared men in the Study Group to all other men in the DVAP program in Brooklyn during the time frame of our study (TAU Group) and to just fathers in the TAU Group. Since only fathers in the program were eligible for the study, we needed to be able to determine whether being a father was, in itself, associated with a difference in recidivism rates.

3) *Race/ethnicity*: Black/African American, Latino/Hispanic, Various White or European ethnicities, West Indian Caribbean, other, and unknown (the categories used by DVAP at registration). The majority of the men in the study were African American and Latino. This variable was included to test whether being White or another race/ethnicity was associated with a lower rate of re-arrest, as it is associated with a lower likelihood of arrest in the first place.

4) *Fee rate*: We originally intended to use income the men reported to the program at registration as a predictor variable, but instead decided to use the fee paid to the program as an indicator of income, because the income the men reported to the program appeared unreliable. The full fee per class is $35 and to qualify for a reduced fee ranging from 0 to $25, the men had to produce documentation of inability to pay. Men who were recorded as saying they had no income, and a few who recorded as being on public assistance, were paying the full fee, whereas others who said they were employed at skilled jobs qualified for a reduced fee. It is quite likely that, for many men in the program, employment was unstable, particularly at a time when they had recently been arrested. This variable was included as an indicator of —stake in conformity.“ Stake in conformity is a collection of variables indicating that the individual has a vested interest

in avoiding involvement with the criminal justice system, because they are employed, married, have a stable housing situation (e.g., own their own home or have lived in the neighborhood for a long time), etc. œ in other words, they have something to lose if they are rearrested. In experimental studies of batterer programs, some stake in conformity variables have been found to be significantly related to rearrest (Labriola et al., 2005; Feder & Dugan, 2002). We planned to use occupation as well, but it also proved unrelated to income and fee rate. (DVAP does not collect data on educational attainment, so we had that information on men interviewed for the study only.)

5) *Mandating agency*: Criminal Court (misdemeanor or ordinance violation); Probation (criminal court); Brooklyn Supreme Court (felony); Administration for Children's Services(ACS)/Family Court; and Out of State Court. The majority of men in the study were mandated to the program by the Brooklyn Criminal Court and some from the Bronx and Queens criminal courts, but we thought there might be a different recidivism rate depending on the intensity of monitoring and possible penalties. For example, those mandated to the program by ACS or Family Court were not under a criminal sentence (unless there was an associated criminal case), so there might be less severe consequences, whereas those mandated to the program by probation were presumably more carefully monitored.

6) *Mandate condition/sentence type*: Conditional Discharge (CD); Adjournment in Contemplation of Dismissal (ACD); Condition of Probation; Condition of Order of Protection; Pre-trial Release (condition of bail); Term of a Child Protective Petition. Those referred to the program from the Supreme Court (felony DV court) usually attended as a condition of bail, while awaiting trial for or disposition of a felony in the domestic violence court. For those mandated to the program on an ACD œ that is, they accepted the program rather than go to trial and receive a disposition and sentence --, if they completed the program and did not recidivate, then the record would be sealed and the charges dismissed. (On a CD if the charge was less than a misdemeanor, i.e., a violation, the case would also be sealed if they fulfilled the conditions.) If they recidivated during the program on an ACD, the case would then be adjudicated. However, if they were rearrested after they finished the program and the charges had been dismissed, this new arrest would be treated like a first offense (assuming there were no prior unsealed convictions). Therefore, there was a greater benefit in both completing the program and avoiding rearrest before the program was completed on an ACD, but a lesser penalty for arrest after the case had been dismissed.

7) *Completion status* (whether the offender completed the program); and 8) *Curriculum type*: child-focused, partner-focused, or treatment as usual.

9) *Number of prior misdemeanor arrests*

10) *Number of prior felony arrests*

<u>Descriptive data on rearrest six months following program termination or completion</u>

Thirty-three cases had missing values on at least one of the predictor variables and were excluded from analysis. After these exclusions, 346 cases were available for analysis: 265 offenders who were not arrested in the time frame and 81 offenders who were arrested within six months following program completion or termination, for an arrest rate of 23%.

Frequencies on predictor variables of 346 cases in tests of rearrest

Of the 346 men on whom the six-month rearrest outcome was tested, 216 (62%) completed the program, and 130 (38%) did not. Seventy-five (22%) were assigned to a child-focused class; 45 (13%) were assigned to a partner-focused class; and 226 (65%) were in TAU Group, or the comparison classes. The mean age was 35, the modal age was 31 and 76% were fathers.

Table 9. Race/ethnicity of program participants in tests of rearrest

Race/ethnicity	**N**	**Percent**
African American/Black	161	47
Latino/Hispanic	96	28
European/White	28	8
West Indian/Caribbean	28	8
Other	25	7
Unknown	8	2
Total	*346*	*100*

The fee paid to DVAP ranged from $0 to the full fee of $35, and one man paid a higher fee. The distribution of fees by men in the sample is shown in Table 10.

Table 10. Fees paid by DVAP participants in the tests of re-arrest six months after program completion or termination

Fee rate	**N**	***Percent***
$0	4	*1*
$7	2	*1*
$10	20	*6*
$12	2	*1*
$15	29	*8*
$20	14	*4*
$25	8	*2*
$30	3	*1*
$35	263	*76*
$40	1	*0*
Total	346	100

The agency that mandated the man to the program was entered into the logistic regression, with categories and frequencies shown in the table below.

Table 11. Mandating agency for 346 men in tests of rearrest six months following program completion

Referring Agency	**N**	**Percent**
Criminal Court*	236	68
Probation (Criminal Court)	46	13
Out of State Court (Criminal Court)	19	5
Supreme Court (felony court)	21	6
ACS/Family Court	24	7
Total	346	100

*Primarily Brooklyn, also includes Manhattan, Bronx, Queens, and Staten Island Table

12. Sentence or condition under which offender was mandated to the program

Mandate Condition	**N**	***Percent***
Conditional Discharge (CD)	213	*62*
Condition of Probation	50	*14*
Condition of Protection Order	18	*5*
Condition of bail	17	*5*
Term of Child Protect. Petition	13	*4*
ACD	8	*2*
Unknown/Other	27	*8*
Total	346	100

Tests of Predictors of Rearrest

To determine which characteristics predicted re-arrest six months post-program and one year post-program, we computed correlations between these factors and re-arrest both at six months and one year post-program, see Table 13.

Table 13. Simple correlations of case characteristics with six-month and one-year post-program arrest outcomes

	New Arrest w/in 6 months	**New Arrest w/in 1 year**
Race/Ethnicity		
African-American	.042	.080
Latino/Hispanic	-.053	-.039
White	.014	-.022

West Indian/Caribbean	.046	.007
Other	-.091	-.098
Unknown	.064	.041
Age	-.105*	-.115**
Fee Paid	.072	.060
Fatherhood Status	.025	-.010
Mandating Agency		
Criminal Court	.044	.000
Probation	-.012	.026
Supreme Court	.091	.129*
ACS/Family Court	-.066	-.068
Out of State Court	-.087	-.092
Mandate Condition		
Adjournment in contemplation of dismissal	.079	.095
Conditional discharge	.036	.001
Condition of OP	.019	-.011
Condition of Probation	-.034	-.017
Pre-trial release/condition of bail	.027	.101
Term of child protection petition	.-.047	-.037
Unkown/Other	-.073	-.081
Completion Status	-.285**	-.333**
Group		
Child-Focused	-.049	-.067
Partner-Focused	-.076	-.118**
Treatment-As-usual	.095	.140**
Criminal History		
Number of prior misdemeanors	.217**	.259**
Number of prior felonies	.239**	.255**

**p<.01 *p<.05 (based on Tau-B statistic)

For the logistic regression analysis, we used only those characteristics that were significantly correlated with re-arrest. For re-arrest within six months of leaving the program, these characteristics included age, completion status, number of prior felonies, and number of prior misdemeanors. For re-arrest within one year of leaving the program,

in addition to age, completion status, prior felonies, and prior misdemeanors, the additional factors of supreme court as mandating agency, partner-focused curriculum group, and TAU (comparison) group were significantly correlated with re-arrest. The results from the logistic regressions are presented in Table 14.

Arrests within six months of leaving the program were significantly predicted by age, completion status, number of prior felonies, and number of prior misdemeanors: χ^2(df = 4, n = 377) = 68.157, $p < .001$. All four predictors were significant.

The same four predictors were also significant in the regression predicting arrest within one year of leaving the program. The entire model (age, completion status, number of prior felonies, number of prior misdemeanors, supreme court as mandating agency, partner-focused curriculum group, and treatment as usual group) significantly predicted re-arrest one year after the man left the program, χ^2(df = 7, n = 377) = 93.718, $p < .001$. However, Supreme Court as mandating agency, partner-focused curriculum, and treatment-as-usual group were not significant predictors.

Table 14. Logistic regression of predictors of re-arrest at six months and one year post-program	Six-month re-arrest	One-year re-arrest
	Odds Ratio	
Age	.959**	.959**
Completion Status	.379***	.341***
Prior felonies	1.148**	1.153*
Prior misdemeanors	1.138*	1.179**
Supreme court		2.097
Control group		.727
Comparison group		1.475
Nagelkerke R^2	.242	.308

***p<.001 **p<.01 *p<.05

The results indicate that the curriculum type had no effect on re-arrest within both six months and one year post-program.

Instructors‘ Perspective

All the instructors involved in the study preferred teaching the child-focused curriculum to the partner-focused curriculum, because, one instructor said, —When it was information about children, they were more attentive, interactive, more receptive.“ Another instructor said, —they seem to lower their guard, their defenses.“ One instructor sensed an increase in awareness from the child-focused curriculum, because the men could relate the lesson back to their own childhood.

The instructors suggested, however, that the receptiveness to the child-focused curriculum was the flip side of not being forced to confront the issue that had led to the mandate; that is, abuse of their adult partner, the mother of the children. The instructors observed that the men didn‘t feel that —we were bashing them,“ with the class focusing less on their abuse and the victim. One instructor elaborated, —They are more engaged in the child-focus…anything that takes away from the partner focus.“ The instructors also noted that it is more acceptable for men to express anger at their partner or women in general in the class, but displaying negative attitudes toward children as a group is less acceptable. Thus, balanced against the greater receptiveness of the participants to the child-focused curriculum was the possibility that it allowed the men to avoid talking about the hard issues underlying violence against women that led to their mandate to the program. On the plus side, though, focusing on the children also allowed these fathers to isolate their own behavior and see its impact without blaming the partner. If the father was out of the picture, one instructor said, most of the men would want the children to be with the mother œ so they were able to see that she had a central role in their children‘s lives and to value her for that.

In a critical area of the intent of the child-focused curriculum, the instructors‘ assessment was that the lessons failed to hit home. The instructors felt that the men did not take in the impact of the children‘s exposure to violence: —They continue to believe they can be abusive and still be good parents.“ The instructors also felt that the participants did not understand the message that the abuse can affect the mother‘s parenting, even if the child is not directly exposed to the violence. These were two primary mechanisms that we had hoped the child-focused curriculum would engage to motivate the men to be less abusive.

In summary, the instructors said of the hypothesis behind this study, —They are engaged in the child-focused curriculum; they embrace it; they listen,“ and, instead of excuses you hear, —‘I didn‘t know that‘ and —Wow, yeah, maybe you‘re right,‘…the stuff you hear that you don‘t hear in the partner-focused.“ Yet —They struggle to understand it but they end up not getting it.“ In the end, they did not understand the link between abuse of the mother and harming the child.

Chapter 5. Discussion

Limitations

This study had important strengths and limitations. Among the strengths were an experimental design, cooperativeness and dedication of the program instructors, and cooperativeness from the participants in the interviews. There were also obstacles to implementation that compromised the quantity and quality of the data.

In general, obtaining the sample was a problem and we never achieved our targets. Mandates to DVAP by the courts and other criminal justice agencies wax and wane in indecipherable patterns and we were unable to expand the study to the Bronx when the program had to cut classes there. We were unable to conduct victim interviews and had to rely on the men‘s self-reported behavior to assess change, although this limitation was

really only problematic in regard to measurement of new violence.

The range of educational levels of the men made it difficult to administer standardized questionnaires. Some participants were not familiar with that format and struggled to answer, and interviews would take too long. We changed the format of questions to appear open-ended and then tried to extract concrete answers that could be coded. This strategy appeared to work but depended on the skill of the interviewer and required additional coding. The denial often described as a characteristic of batterers was also a problem: questions about the effect of abuse on the children, on the father's relationship with the children and on the mother's parenting became unanswerable when the participant claimed that there had been no violence or abuse whatsoever.

Summary of findings

The majority of men were mandated to the program by the criminal court on a conditional discharge. They were mostly African American and Latino, 35 or younger, and most had children. They men in the study were all fathers, and only in that consistency did they differ from the comparison group.

Overall, 58% of the men who entered the program between July 2004 and January 2006 completed it by July 2006. Men in the study were significantly more likely to complete the program (34% dropped out) than men in the comparison group (46% dropped out). However, within the study group there was no difference in completion rates between the two curriculum groups. We can only speculate as to why participants in the interviews and the controlled-curriculum classes (Study Group) were more likely to complete the program. On the one hand, there may have been a selection bias, in that those who were angriest about being sent to the program and those with most wariness or hopelessness about continuing involvement with the criminal justice system were least likely to agree to participate. (Unlike some studies of batterer programs, we used informed consent forms and lost some potential participants after they read the informed consent and learned we would be securing criminal justice data.) Possibly, too, participation in the study was an incentive to remain in the program, because most participants appeared to appreciate the opportunity to express their views in a private discussion and the financial incentive can not be ignored.

No other variables in the study group predicted completion, including relationship status, number of children under six, accepting responsibility for the mandate, the level of violence they admitted to in the relationship, their beliefs about violence, or their deceptiveness. However, in the overall sample, criminal history (number of prior felonies and number of prior misdemeanors) as associated with failure to complete the program.

The main questions this study was designed to answer were whether a focus on children in a batterer program would engage the participants more than a focus on women as victims, as evidenced by lower drop out rates and more learning of the material, a greater awareness of the impact on children, and more motivation to change. In our analyses comparing the two curricula, we found no difference in the impact on acceptance of

responsibility. Men who completed either the child focused or partner focused curriculum took more responsibility for the mandate at the end of the program than at the beginning, but there was no difference between the two curricula in the average degree of change. Similarly, the men's beliefs about violence were less victim-blaming and more negative toward the use of violence at the end of the program than at the beginning, but there was no differential impact of the two curricula.

Most importantly, there was no difference between the men who completed each curriculum in regard to understanding of the impact of domestic violence on children. Men who experienced the child-focused curriculum were no more likely than men who completed the partner-focused curriculum to acknowledge that their children saw or heard physical fighting or arguing, to believe that the abuse or fighting affected their child's relationship with them, or to believe that it was not the best policy to disclose to their children about their true feelings about their mother. Disappointingly, they were no more likely to acknowledge after completing the child-focused curriculum that any of their children might need counseling. Each of these topics was addressed and thoroughly discussed in the child-focused curriculum.

Finally, men experiencing each curriculum did not differ in re-arrest rates. The factors that predicted arrests after the participant left the program (either through completion or termination) had nothing to do with program content. The significant predictors of new arrests either six months or one year after the program were younger age, dropping out, number of prior misdemeanors and number of prior felonies.

Conclusions

We found that the child-focused curriculum did not make a significant difference in program completion or rearrest rates. Neither did we find differences between the men in the two curricula in regard to the mechanisms by which we hoped to effect change or motivate the fathers to stop abuse in all forms through the child-focused curriculum: awareness of their children's exposure to the violence and the impact on their children. Qualitative studies have reported similar findings. Bent-Goodley and Williams (2007), in their focus group with 17 batterers, observed little recognition of the impact of their violence on their children. The evaluation of the Fathering After Violence program found mixed results, with some men showing evidence of increased understanding and appreciation of the impact on the child's relationship with them, while other men showed no comprehension of the impact on the child. The instructors in our study felt that, on the whole, the men in the child-focused curriculum could not grasp this point.

This study did not seek to answer the question of whether the children are better off if their father participated in and completed a batterer program, whether the father-child relationship has been strengthened, or whether the custodial mother feels that her parenting is less disrupted. Those topics were addressed in the curriculum, but only as a pathway. Similarly to some other interventions focusing on children, the goal of emphasizing the impact of abuse on children in the child-focused curriculum was primarily to engage the men more effectively and perhaps to decrease their abuse by

building on their expressed concern for their children. It appears that the child-focused curriculum did not accomplish this goal, and that the partner-focused curriculum was equally effective or ineffective in changing particular attitudes.

The instructors felt that the men in the child-focused classes were more engaged with and less resistant to the material than the men in the partner-focused classes. The evaluation of the Fathering After Violence program reported similar responses by the facilitators, who felt that the material was engaging to the men (Arean & Davis, 2007). However, in this study, the men were equally likely to be terminated from the child-focused classes as from the partner focused classes. In other words, engagement or lack of resistance did not translate into better attendance.

The problem of attitudes evinced in class not translating into behavior is a critical one for batterer programs and highlights the importance of empirical research to test practitioners‘ intuitions and qualitative findings. This problem also goes to the heart of the criminal justice system‘s use of batterer programs and raises the question of whether they should be used solely with the goal of rehabilitating batterers or with the goal of accountability, regardless of whether they can significantly effect behavioral change.

The matter of attendance may seem trivial in itself, but it is critical to this question. Not to attend the program according to program specifications is to violate a court order. That the men‘s apparent engagement with the material in the child-focused curriculum did not translate into better attendance and therefore compliance with the court order illustrates the divide between using the program to effect behavioral change through psychological motivation and education as opposed to using the program as a mechanism of accountability and possibly effecting behavioral change through incentives, penalties and stigmatization of domestic violence.

Men who completed the program were significantly more likely to avoid rearrest six months and one year after they completed the program than men who were terminated from the program. No inferences can be drawn from the association between program completion and a lower arrest rate, however: we cannot attribute the lower arrest rate among those who completed the program to exposure to the curricula because we did not have random assignment to the program vs. a control group that was not mandated to DVAP. Therefore, we cannot exclude the possibility that pre-existing differences between program drop-outs and completers may also be associated with the likelihood of rearrest. In fact, our results suggest that association is highly likely: program completion and avoiding arrest were correlated; arrest was associated with a history of multiple prior arrests. Other studies that have tested this question, using experimental designs with random assignment to batterer programs and alternative sanctions, have also found that program termination and rearrest were predicted by criminal history (those with more prior offenses are more likely to drop out and to reoffend) and that avoidance of rearrest is associated with having a stake in conformity, such as living with the intimate partner, stable employment, stable residence and maturity (Davis, Taylor & Maxwell, 2000; Feder & Dugan, 2002; Labriola, Rempel & Davis, 2005; Cissner & Puffet, 2006).

It is easy to dismiss null results. Absence of positive effects can be attributed to a myriad

of causes: design of the intervention, delivery of the intervention, design of the study, execution of the design, inadequate measures and inappropriate statistical tests. There is a convergence in the research literature, however, that suggests we may be pursuing false leads or false hopes in modifying batterer program content to find the right approach (or approaches, tailored to different populations). The picture that emerges across experimental studies is that there is a cadre of domestic violence offenders that may be career criminals in the making, who have difficulty completing the program and will be œ and have been œ arrested on domestic violence and other criminal charges. We suggest that we need to start thinking seriously about how to intervene with these chronic offenders in a way that will help them, their partners and their children.

Although this study was not a definitive test of the efficacy of introducing a fatherhood curriculum into a batterer program, the findings should raise a cautionary alarm. As noted in the literature review, considerable resources have been expended attempting to find a batterer program that engages domestic violence offenders and motivates them to stop abusing women. Variations on program treatment approach have been tested with no effect on reoffending rates. Importantly, Gondolf‘s (2005) study matching on social identity showed no more positive effects than the standard curriculum. The study presented here suggests that, like previous attempts to modify batterer programs to make them effective, focusing on children in an attempt to capitalize on offenders‘ attachment to their children, motivation to remain in their children‘s lives, and empathy is unlikely to make batterer programs an effective means of rehabilitation to non-violence for those likely to reoffend.

Implications and Recommendations

There are two important implications. One is that great scrutiny and caution is necessary before courts begin to use programs for men who batter as a condition of greater access to their children. The popularity of instituting parenting programs for batterers is a newer development that must be carefully considered by the justice system. How, when and whether fathering programs for batterers should be incorporated into court orders and plans for families is not a decision that should be made in the absence of empirical research. We risk institutionalizing such programs just as batterer programs were adopted by the criminal courts with unfulfilled expectations of what they can and cannot accomplish. As Andy Klein (2003) wrote in an essay about the Family Violence Prevention Project‘s —Fathering After Violence“ project, building on the unproven model of batterer programs and suggesting that dangerous abusers will become better fathers after the programs are reformulated is —a high risk gamble“ (Klein, 2003, p. 1).

Recommendations for future research and practice include careful evaluation of these interventions before they are used as the basis for allowing greater parental access of batterers. In particular, studies of the interventions should use experimental designs with true control groups.

We also recommend that researchers and policy makers direct their attention in what might prove a more fruitful direction. Instead of continuing to modify program content in the unfulfilled hope that a curriculum better matched to the offender‘s interests, social

identity or psychological status will have effects that no such modifications have shown in extensive research to date, perhaps we should be looking elsewhere to improve the impact of batterer programs. One promising direction is the relationship between batterer programs and mandating agencies. Currently, penalties are rarely or inconsistently imposed by mandating agencies for non-compliance with an order to a batterer program (California State Auditor, 2006; Labriola, Rempel, O'Sullivan & Frank, 2007). Future research should investigate whether modifying the relationship between courts and batterer programs, and increasing penalties for dropping out of programs would, in fact, do more to reduce recidivism than modifying program content. New data from the Judicial Oversight Demonstration Project suggests that more attentive supervision and greater responsiveness to violations has a depressive effect on new offenses œ although possibly only through incapacitation of the offender (Harrell, et al., 2006). At the least, though, this focus would addresses the issue of accountability.

Finally, we strongly recommend paying attention to the chronic offenders. At least in this study, conducted in New York City, they tend to be the marginalized and oppressed among us, disproportionately unemployed or under-employed, non-white, and apparently resigned to frequent arrests. A deeper level of intervention and commitment may be necessary to help them choose to eschew repeat encounters with the criminal justice system, victimization of their partners and traumatization of their children, beyond modification of batterer program curricula.

References

Appel, A. E., & Holden, G. W. (1998). The co-occurrence of spouse and physical child abuse. *Journal of Family Psychology, 12*, 578-599.

Arean, J. D., & Davis, L. (2007). Working with fathers in batterer intervention programs: Lessons from the Fathering After Violence Project. In J. L. Edleson & O. J. Williams (eds), *Parenting by Men who Batter: New Directions for Assessment and Intervention*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 118-130..

Bancroft, L., & Silverman, J. (2002). *The batterer as parent.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bent-Goodley, T., & Williams, O. J. (2007) Fathers' voices on parenting and violence. In J. L. Edleson & O. J. Williams (eds), *Parenting by Men who Batter: New Directions for Assessment and Intervention*, New York: Oxford University Press, p.
32.

Bennett, L., & Williams, O. (2002). Controversies and recent studies of batterer intervention program effectiveness. Violence Against Women Online Resources.

Bowker, L.H., Arbitell, M., & McFerron, J.R. (1988). On the relationship between wife beating and child abuse. In K. Yllo and M. Bograd (Eds.), *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

California State Auditor (2006, November). *Batterer Intervention Programs: County*

Probation Departments Could Improve their Compliance with State Law, but Progress in Batterer Accountability Also Depends on the Courts. California State Auditor Report 95814. Bureau of State Audits: Sacramento, CA.

Catlett, B. S., & Artis, J. E. (2004, November). Criquing the case for marriage promotion. *Violence Against Women, 10,* 1226-1244.

Cissner, A. B., & Puffett, N. K. (2006). *Do batterer program length or approach affect completion or re-arrest rates? A comparison of outcomes between defendants sentences to two batterer programs in Brooklyn.* New York City: Center for Court Innovation.

Crager, M., & Anderson, L. (1997). *Helping children who witness domestic violence: A guide for parents.* Seattle, Washington: King County Women's Program.

Davis, R, Taylor, B. G., & Maxwell, C. D. (2000). *Does batterer treatment reduce violence? A randomized experiment in Brooklyn.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Dutton, D.G. (1986). The outcome of court-mandated treatment for wife assault. *Violence and Victims, 1*(3), 163-175.

Edleson, J. L. (1999). Children's witnessing of adult domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 14(8), 839-870.

Edleson, J. L., Mbiliny, L. F., & Shetty, S. (2003). *Parenting in the context of domestic violence.* San Francisco, CA: Judicial Council of California.

Edleson, J. L., & Williams, O.J. (2007). Introduction: Involving men who batter in their children's lives. J. L. Edleson & O. J. Williams (eds), *Parenting by Men who Batter: New Directions for Assessment and Intervention*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 3-18.

Edleson, J., & Syers, M. (1990). The relative effectiveness of group treatments for men who batter. *Social Work Research and Abstracts, 26*, 10-17.

Fantuzzo, J.C., & Lindquist, C.U. (1989). The effects of observing conjugal violence on children: A review and analysis of research methodology. *Journal of Family Violence, 4,* 77-94.

Fantuzzo, J. W. & Mohr, W. K. (1999). Prevalence and effects of child exposure to domestic violence. *The Future of Children, 9*(3), 21-32.

Feder, L. (1997). Domestic violence and police response in a pro-arrest jurisdiction. *Women and Criminal Justice, 8,* 79-98.

Feder, L., & Forde, D. R. (2000). *A test of the efficacy of court-mandated counseling for domestic violence offenders: The Broward Experiment.* NIJ-96-WT-NX-0008. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Feder, L., & Dugan, L. (2002). A test of the efficacy of court-mandated counseling for domestic violence offenders: The Broward Experiment. *Justice Quarterly, 19*(2), 342-375.

Feder, L., & Wilson, D. B. (2005). A meta-analytic review of court-mandated batterer

intervention programs: Can courts affect abusers' behavior? *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 1*, 239-262.

Gondolf, E. W. (1999). A comparison of four batterer intervention systems: Do court referral, program length, and services matter? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 14(1): 41-61.

Gondolf, E. (2005). Culturally-focused batterer counseling for African-American men. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

Groves, B. M., Van Horn, P., & Lieberman, A. F. (2007). Deciding on fathers' involvement in their children's treatment after domestic violence. In J. L. Edleson & O. J. Williams (eds), *Parenting by Men who Batter: New Directions for Assessment and Intervention*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 65-84.

Hanson, R. K., & Wallace-Capretta, S. (2000). *A multi-site study of treatment for abusive men.* Ottawa: Department of Solicitor General of Canada.

Harrell, A. (1991). *Evaluation of Court-Ordered Treatment for Domestic Violence Offenders: Final report.* Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Harrell, A., Schafer, M., DeStefano, C., & Castro, J. (2006). *The evaluation of Milwaukee's Judicial Oversight Demonstration.* Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Holden, G. W., & Ritchie, K. L. (1991). Linking extreme marital discord, child rearing, and child behavior problems: Evidence from battered women. *Child Development 62*(2), 311-327.

Hotaling, G.T. & Sugarman, D.B. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of knowledge. *Violence and Victims, 1* (2), 101-124.

Klein, A. (August, 2003). Batterer programs œ successful rehabilitation or false hope? *National Bulletin on Domestic Violence Prevention.* Boston, MA: Quinlan Publishing Group.

Jaffe, P., Wolfe, D., & Wilson, S. K. (1990). *Children of Battered Women*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Jaffe, P. G., & Crooks, C. V. (2007). Assessing the best interests of the child: Visitation and custody in cases of domestic violence. In .J. L. Edleson & O. J. Williams (eds), *Parenting by Men who Batter: New Directions for Assessment and Intervention*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 45-63..

Kantor, G.K. & Straus, M.A. (1989). Substance abuse as a precipitant of wife abuse victimizations. *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse, 15* (2), 173-189.

Hamburger, K. & Hastings, J. (1993). Court-mandated programs for men who assault their partner. In Z. Hilton (Ed.), *Legal Responses to Wife Assault: Current Trends and Evaluation*, pp. 188-229. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Jaffe, P., & Geffner, R. (1998). Child custody disputes and domestic violence: Critical issues for mental health, social service, and legal professionals. In G. W. Holden, R. Geffner, & E. N. Jouriles (Eds.) *Children exposed to marital violence: Theory, research, and applies issues*, pp. 371-408. Washington, DC: American

Psychological Association.

Labriola, M., Rempel, M., & Davis, R. (2005). *Testing the effectiveness of batterer programs and judicial monitoring: Results from a randomized trial at the Bronx Misdemeanor Domestic Violence Court.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Labriola, M., Rempel, M., O'Sullivan, C. S., & Frank, P.B. (2007). *Court responses to batterer program noncompliance: A national perspective.* New York, NY: Center for Court Innovation.

Liss, M. B., & Stahly, G. B. (1993). Domestic violence and child custody. In M. Hansen & M. Harway (Eds.), *Battering and family therapy: A feminist perspective* (175-187*).* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Litton Fox, G., Sayers, J., & Bruce, C. (2001). Beyond bravado: Redemption and rehabilitation in the fathering accounts of men who batter. *Marriage and Family Review, 32*(3-4), 137-163.

Mandel, D. (2003). Highlights from a national study of batterers' perceptions of their children's exposure to violence and abuse. *Issues in Family Violence, 5*(1), 26-37..

Matthews, D.J. (1995). Parenting groups for men who batter. In E. Peled, P.G. Jaffe, and J.L. Edleson (Eds.), *Ending the Cycle of Violence: Community Responses to Children of Battered Women*. Newbury Park, CA, Sage.

Melgren, L. (2002). *Batterer Intervention: Where do we go from here?* Workshop Notes. National Institute of Justice Web-document.

Morrill, A.C., Dai, J., Dunn, S., Sung, I., & Smith, K. (2005). Child custody and visitation decisions when the father has perpetrated violence against the mother. *Violence Against Women, 11*(8), 1076-1107.

National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (1994). *Model Code on Domestic and Family Violence.* Reno, NV: NCJFCJ.

Osofsky, J. (1998). Children as invisible victims of domestic and community violence. In G. W. Holden, R. Geffner, & E. N. Jouriles (Eds.) *Children exposed to marital violence: Theory, research, and applies issues*, pp. 95-117. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Pagelow, M. (1990). Effects of domestic violence on children and their consequences for custody and visitation agreements. *Mediation Quarterly, 7*(4).

Pardue, M. G., & Rector, R. E. (2004, March 30). *Reducing domestic violence: How the healthy marriage initiative can help* (Backgrounder #1744). Washington, DC: Heritage Foundation. Cited in J. L. Edleson & O. J. Williams (eds), *Parenting by Men who Batter: New Directions for Assessment and Intervention*, New York: Oxford University Press, p. 17.

Palmer, S., Brown, R., & Berrera, M. (1992). Group treatment program for abusive husbands. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 62*, 276-283.

Paulhus, D.L. (1998). The Paulhus Deception Scales: BIDR Version 7. Toronto/Buffalo: Multi-Health Systems**.**

Peled, E. (2000) Parenting by men who abuse women: Issues and dilemmas. *British Journal of Social Work, 30* (1), 25-36.

Peled, E. & Davis, D. (1995). *Groupwork with Children of Battered Women: A Practitioners Manual*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Peled, E., & Perel, G. (2007). A conceptual framework for fathering intervention with men who batter. In J. L. Edleson & O. J. Williams (eds), *Parenting by Men who Batter: New Directions for Assessment and Intervention*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 85-101.

Pence, E., Hardesty, L., Soderberg, J. & Ottman, L. (1991). *What about the kids? Community intervention in domestic assault cases: A focus on children.* Duluth, MN: The Duluth Domestic Abuse Intervention Project.

Rosen, L., & O'Sullivan, C. S. (2005). Outcomes of custody and visitation petitions when fathers are restrained by protection orders: The case of New York Family Courts. *Violence Against Women, 11*(8), 1054-1075.

Rosenbaum, A., & O'Leary, D.K. (1981). Childhood victimization and violent offending. *Violence & Victims, 5,* 19-35.

Saunders, D.G. (1996). Interventions for men who batter: Do we know what works. *Psychotherapy in Practice, 2(3),* 81-93.

Saunders, D. G. (2003). Understanding children exposed to violence: Toward an integration of overlapping fields. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18,* 356-376.

Saunders, D. G., & Hamill, R. M. (2003, June). *Violence Against Women: Synthesis of Research on Offender Interventions.* Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Jusitce, NCJ 20122.

Saunders, D., Lynch, A. B., Grayson, M., & Linz, D. (1987). The inventory of beliefs about wife-beating: The construction and initial validation of a measure of beliefs and attitudes. *Violence and Victims, 2,* 39-97.

Scott, K. L., Francis, K. J., Crooks, C. V., & Kelly, T. (in press). *Caring dads: Helping fathers value their children.*

Sherman, L. (1992). *Policing domestic violence.* New York: Free press.

Sternberg, K. J., Lamb, M. E., & Dawud-Noursi, S. (1998). Using multiple informants to understand domestic violence and its effects. In G. W. Holden, R. Geffner, & E. N. Jouriles (Eds.) *Children exposed to marital violence: Theory, research, and applies issues*, pp. 121-156. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Straus, M., & Gelles, (1990). *Violence in 10,000 American Families.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Straus, M., Hamby, S., Boney-McCoy, S. & Sugarman, D. (1996). The Revised Conflict Tactic Scale (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues* 17(3), 283-316.

Stover, C. S., Van Horn, P., Turner, R., Cooper, B., & Lieberman, A. F. (2003). The effects of father visitation on preschool-aged witneses of domestic violence. *Journal*

of Interpersonal Violence, 18, 1149-1166.

Sullivan, C. M. (2007). Evaluating parenting programs for men who batter: Current considerations and controversies. In J. L. Edleson & O. J. Williams (eds), *Parenting by Men who Batter: New Directions for Assessment and Intervention*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 137-148.

Tolman, R., & Bennett, L.W. (1990). A review of quantitative research on men who batter. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5,* 87-118.

Tubbs, C. Y., & Williams, O. J. (2007). Shared parenting after abuse: Battered mothers' perspectives on parenting after dissolution of a relationship. J. L. Edleson & O. J. Williams (eds), *Parenting by Men who Batter: New Directions for Assessment and Intervention*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 19- 44.

Widom, C.S. (1989). *The intergenerational transmission of violence.* New York: Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation.

Williams, O. J., & Becker, R. L. (1994). Domestic partner abuse treatment programs and cultural competence: The results of a national survey. *Violence and Victims, 9,* 287-296.

Wilson, D., & Klein, A. (2006). *Longitudinal study of a cohort of batterers arraigned in a Massachusetts District Court 1995 to 2004.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice. NCJ Number 215346.

Wolfe, D. A., Crooks, C. V., Lee, V., McIntyre-Smith, A., & Jaffe, P. G. (2003). The effects of children's exposure to domestic violence: A meta-analysis and critique. *Clinical and Family Psychology Review, 6,* 171-187.

Appendices

Appendix A DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM CLASSES FOR MEN

REGISTRATION FORM

This form will be completed at the registration for each person referred for enrollment to DVAP-Classes for Men

Name: _____ Date:

Address:

Street City Zip

State

Telephone: (___)_____

(___)_____

Home Other phone number

Work

Case ID #: _____ Date Referral Received:

Date of Birth: _____ Interviewer:

Attendance Begins On: _____ Weekly Class Fee:

Language: _____**ENGLISH ONLY**_____ Registration Fee:

CONFIDENTIALITY DISCLAIMER:

The Domestic Violence Accountability Program-Classes for Men is **not** a form of mental health treatment and is not confidential. The classes are about domestic violence. There is ample opportunity for questions and discussion about the information that is presented. This is not the place, however, to deal with individual circumstances. I am also aware that if I threaten to commit further acts of domestic violence, or to cause injury to another person, or if I am viewed to be a danger to myself or to others, or if child abuse or neglect is suspected, the Domestic Violence Accountability Program staff will notify the appropriate law enforcement or crisis agency

Your initials indicate that you understand this.

Participant's Initials

1. Indicate if referral is **Mandated** ☐ or **Other** ☐

☐ **Mandated**: Required length of attendance to the program: _____ weeks.
Specify the referral source. Please check one:
☐ Family Court Judge: _____
☐ Criminal Court Judge: _____ Court Part:

☐ Probation Department Probation Officer:

☐ District Attorney's Office ADA:

☐ Pre-Trial Release Program
☐ Other (specify)

2. Attendance to the program is mandated through: (check one) ☐ Condition of Probation ☐ Adjournment in Contemplation of Dismissal (ACD) ☐ Condition of an Order of Protection ☐ Term of a Child Protective Petition in Family Court

☐ Conditional Discharge (CD) ☐ Pre-Trial Diversion
☐ Other (specify) _____ ☐Unknown

1. **3.** Participant's current or most recent occupation:
_____
2. **4.** Participant's ethnic/cultural background:
_____
3. **5.** Is there an Order of Protection currently in place against the Participant?

☐ No ☐ Yes **If Yes**, which court? ☐ Family Court ☐ Criminal Court ☐ Supreme Court

Judge: _____ Borough: _____

6. If yes, indicate the type of Order of Protection currently in place against the Participant and the period
covered.
☐ Temporary From: _____/_____/_____ to _____/_____/_____

YUnknown
☐ Final From: _____/_____/_____ to _____/_____/_____

1. **7.** Participant's current employment status: (check one) ☐ Unemployed ☐ Employed/Full-Time ☐ Disabled ☐ Employed/Part-Time ☐ Retired ☐ Student/Full-Time ☐ Other (specify)_____
2. **8.** In which of the following groups does the Participant's income fall (or did fall last year) before taxes?

☐ No Income ☐ Public Assistance ☐ under 10,000 ☐ 10,000 to 19,999
☐ 20,000 to 29,999 ☐ 30,000 to 40,000 ☐ 40,000-50,000 ☐ 51,000 +

9. What are the Participant's current living arrangements? (Check one) ☐ Lives with partner ☐ Lives alone ☐ ×⓿⑨ ❩⑩⑦⓪❺□

☐ Lives with new partner ☐ Lives with parents/relatives

10. Does the Participant have children in common with partner or has he been raising children with her?
☐ No ☐Yes If yes, how many? ___ What are their ages?_____

2. **11.** What specific abusive acts did Participant do to his partner during the incident that resulted in his

3. **12.** Was the Participant arrested in connection with this incident? (check one) ☐ Yes - If known, check the arrest charge/s: ☐ No

referral?

☐ Threatened to hit ☐ Burned her ☐ Threatened to kill her
☐ Threw or broke things ☐ Beat her ☐ Used Weapons
☐ Pushed or shoved her ☐ Slapped her ☐ Forced partner to have sex against her will
☐ Punched her ☐ Kicked her ☐ Choked her
☐Other (specify) ☐ Argument ☐ Violated Order of Protection

☐ Harassment ☐ Disorderly Conduct ☐ Violation of an Order of Protection
☐ Assault 2nd. ☐ Reckless Endangerment ☐ Endangering the Welfare of a Child
☐ Assault 3rd. ☐ Attempted Assault ☐ Other (specify)_____

☐ Menacing ☐ Trespassing ☐ Possession of a Weapon
☐ Not Applicable ☐ No (explain briefly)_____

B. If known, check the conviction type ☐ Verdict (case went to trial) ☐ Plea _____ ☐ Other (specify)_____

EVALUATION OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR ATTENDANCE

(For internal use only)

Appendix B. Study Curricula

OUTLINE

CHILD-FOCUSED Curriculum

(Class 1 is program orientation)

Part 1. Foundations and Your Children

Lesson 2 House of Abuse & Power and Control Wheel.

Primary objectives: To illustrate that domestic violence occurs in the context of a society that gives men power over women (male privilege) and that domestic violence

is about exerting power and control over women and children.

Main lesson points:

. • Power and control is represented as a house that the men have built with 8 rooms, each representing a different form of abuse: using children; economic abuse; emotional and verbal abuse; intimidation, coercion, threatening behavior; social isolation; blaming, denying, and minimizing; physical and sexual abuse; male privilege (the first floor of the house)

. • The point is that good relationships cannot be built on a shaky foundation; cleaning the house requires more than cosmetic changes œ the flaws must be addressed and reparations made to children and partners before better relationships can be established.

. • Challenge men to think about how they would build a healthy, strong house

Lesson 3 Effects of Domestic Violence on Children œ infants/toddlers; young kids; teens

Primary objectives: To demonstrate the impact that domestic violence has on children of different ages; to demonstrate the impact domestic violence has on a child‘s relationship with her or his mother; to suggest some ways parents can help diminish the effects on children of witnessing violence

Main lesson points:

. • Discuss different ways children experience domestic violence

. • Describe a wide range of potential behavioral, emotional, and social consequences of domestic violence on children at different stages of development

. • Discuss how domestic violence might affect a child‘s relationship with her mother and the mother‘s ability to parent

. • Discuss specific ways a parent can help diminish the effects of witnessing violence: talking with and listening to their children; cultivating trust and respect; providing emotional and physical security; providing discipline; being encouraging and supportive; giving affection

Lesson 4 —The Great Santini“ & How DV Affects the Perpetrator (Accountability I)

Primary objectives: Using selected scenes from the film *The Great Santini*, illustrate characteristics of an abuser in the context of a family; discuss the costs of an abusive relationship for the abuser especially in regard to how his children feel about him and change their behavior around him, not being their genuine selves.

Main lesson points:

. • Show how an abuser‘s expectations generate a fearful climate within the

family

. • Demonstrate how an abuser‘s notions of masculinity and tactics of shame and humiliation oppress his son

. • Demonstrate how an abuser suppresses and discourages emotional expression

. • Demonstrate how each child in a family might react differently to violence in the home

. • Discuss the negative consequences of abuse on the abuser himself and on his relationships with his partner and children

Lessons 5-6 Emotional Bank Account

Part I Primary objectives: To introduce a —bank account“ as a metaphor for a relationship, and to focus on the actions that strengthen a relationship between a father and child and actions that can damage that relationship

Main lesson points:

. • Discuss —deposits“ or positive contributions to a relationship that build a —reserve“ of trust in a parent-child relationship

. • Give examples of the six most important —deposits“: understanding the individual; attending to the little things; keeping commitments; clarifying expectations; showing personal integrity; apologizing sincerely when you make a —withdrawal“

. • Read the —story of unconditional love of a rebellious son“ to illustrate a productive way to resolve a father-son conflict

Part II Primary objectives: To discuss emotional abuse and the importance of respecting your partner as a mother and respecting your children; to engage in exercises to increase participants‘ awareness of how they support and/or undermine their partners‘ parenting and their relationships with their children

Main lesson points:

. • Brief discussion of the effects of emotional abuse on partners and children

. • Conduct exercise that asks men to write down the actions they could perform to support their partner‘s parenting, or —deposits“ they could make into the —bank account“ and those that would make her job as a parent harder, or —withdrawals“

. • Conduct exercise that asks men to write down the —deposits“ they could make to strengthen their relationship with their children, and the —withdrawals“ that could damage their relationship with their children

Lesson 7 Talking to Your Kids About DV/Listening to Your Kids

Primary objectives: To suggest ways to help children heal from the effects of family violence; to give specific strategies to men for talking with their children about the violence they have witnessed

Main lesson points:

. • List basic requirements to help children heal from violence (e.g., no new abuse, taking responsibility for scaring the child, talking to the child, listening to the child, taking them to counseling)

. • Discuss strategies for talking with children about violence

. • Engage in exercise that asks men to list children‘s possible responses to a talk about violence, and the feelings the children may be experiencing associated with each response

. • Discuss obstacles to listening to children and tips for effective listening

. • Listening for and Accepting Feelings exercise œ Read examples of things kids say (e.g,. I don‘t want to play with Eric every again. He‘s stupid!) and ask men to offer responses that deny the child‘s feeling and responses that acknowledge the child‘s feeling

. • Discuss counseling as an option for children

Lesson 8 Effect of Denial on children (Accountability II)

Primary objectives: To introduce concepts of denial, minimizing, and blaming; to explain impact of denial on the denier, victim, and children; to discuss impact of denying the effects of violence on children; to discuss talking with kids about violence

Main lesson points:

. • Discuss denial as a defense against unwelcome feelings of shame, fear, and guilt about oneself.

. • Discuss effects of defense of denial: obscures and hides problems; blocks ability to fix or change problems; avoids accountability

. • Explain and discuss —three faces of denial“: minimizing; simple denial; blame

. • Discuss how denial affects kids (e.g., child is afraid to talk about violence; blames him/herself; thinks s/he is crazy; feels isolated, etc.)

. • Discuss how to overcome obstacles to talking with kids about violence and engage in real conversations with children

Part 2. Gender Socialization, Oppression and the œisms

Lesson 9 Gender Socialization (*Tough Guise)*

Primary objectives: To explain learning of gender roles through socialization; to critically analyze the concepts of masculinity & femininity; to examine the connection between children‘s gender socialization and violence towards women

Main lesson points:

. • View selected scenes from —Tough Guise,“ which examines masculinity as a social
construction and focuses attention on the correlation between violent crime and gender in our society

. • Define —socialization“

. • Discuss —gender“ and —gender roles“
• —Boy in the Box“ diagram œ Ask men what characteristics and attributes we expect boys to have (e.g., physical strength, determination, aggressiveness, intelligence)
• —Girl in the Box“ diagram œ Ask men what characteristics and attributes we expect girls to have (e.g., beauty, gentleness, passiveness, sentimentality)

. • Give examples of positive masculine role models for children (e.g., Christopher Reeve, Mark McGuire, —Boyz in the Hood“)

Lesson 10 Oppression

Primary objectives: To know the definition of oppression from the perspective of a power
and control model; to see the connections among different systems of oppression (e.g. sexism, racism and classism); to understand the hierarchical power structure of North American society and to show how these hierarchies play a role in violent and abusive
behavior

Main lesson points:

. • Define oppression and discuss examples of oppression (e.g., slavery, denying groups the right to vote, modern day slave trade, police brutality)
. • Discuss sexism, racism, and classism and give examples of each
. • Ask men to list powerful groups in our society and groups that are often oppressed (examples of powerful groups include white people, men, rich people, heterosexuals; examples of oppressed groups include people of color, women, poor people, homosexuals)
. • Ask men to give examples of the behaviors that are used to oppress these groups (e.g., domestic violence, housing and job discrimination, degrading language or jokes)
. • Discuss some of the effects of oppression and abuse on people (e.g., distorted self-image; anger/rage; feelings of helplessness; substance abuse) and victim blaming

Lesson 11-12 —*All Men Are Sons*“-- Discussion; —Man in the Box“

Primary objectives: To illustrate that sons often repeat their fathers‘ parenting mistakes; to demonstrate that sons suffer from the loss or absence of their fathers or their fathers‘ inability to connect; to review —Man in the Box“ and discuss sexism, homophobia

Main lesson points:
. • Day 1 - Screen —All Men are Sons“ film
. • Day 2- Discuss —All men are Sons. Points for discussion include the setting; diversity; impact on child of an absent father; mothers‘ roles; men‘s ability to not only

identify with the sons but with the fathers, as well; whether the fathers offered praise and support for their sons; central conflicts for the fathers; central conflicts for the sons

. • Use —Man in the Box“ diagram to discuss sexism, homophobia, and how parents cultivate and reinforce gender stereotypes in their children

Lessons 13-14 <u>Sexual abuse and Socialization œ Trains</u>

Primary objectives: To understand how young men‘s sexuality is shaped by their peers to impress other young men œ to bolster their own masculinity**;** to understand the range of sexual abuse œ that it doesn‘t have to be —rape“ to be abusive and destructive**;** to see the consequences for young men of exploitive sexual relations with girls and women: Not only do they demean women, they demean themselves, they shut down their feelings and their souls; to illustrate that through the media and peer relations we have learned to see sex as an arena where boys and men win (—get over“) and girls and women lose (—give it up“)

Main lesson points:

. • Distribute copies of the chapter —Trains“ from Nathan McCall‘s book, *Makes Me Wanna Holler: A Young Black Man in America.* Ask men to read the first three pages.

. • Engage in a Q & A session with the men (sample questions include: What did Nathan

learn about sex from Nutbrain? Why is it viewed as shameful or unmanly to fall in love?

Who establishes this value? Why? Why is it valued to get over on women? On *many*

women?) Be sure to illustrate that status with other men comes from exploiting girls and

women; that treating female peers as real people is not valued œ being hard and cruel to them is valued; that men or teens support and enforce exploitation of women

. • Move through the remainder of the chapter, which is about running —trains“ on girls (or gang-rape) by alternating between reading the story and summarizing the events.

. • Engage in an analysis of Nathan‘s actions and his motives. Include the following questions: What was the victory they were celebrating? Is raping a 13-year-old, scared girl a victory? What contest had the boys won?

Lesson 15 Hip Hop Culture œ Ayanna

Primary objectives: To sensitize participants to the role the media plays in shaping perceptions of sex and gender; to make parents more aware of the impact of the media

on their children in shaping perceptions of sex and gender.

Main lesson points:

. • Instructional aid: —The Exploitation of Women in Hip-hop Culture“ by Ayanna

. • Discuss historical roots of stereotype of black women as promiscuous and oversexed, and how women came to be valued, and to value themselves, only for their sexuality.

. • Discuss hip-hop culture today, its influence on youth, and how hip-hop often expresses negative views toward women

. • Illustrate how rap music and videos degrade women by summarizing main points made by Ayanna

. • Pose discussion questions to class (e.g., Why are women held responsible for what men do sexually? What value do women hold other than their sexuality? What is your responsibility as a man in regard to sexual exploitation of women? How are adolescents and young adults, both male and female, affected by images they see in hip-hop videos and lyrics in hip-hop music?)

Part 3. How Abuse Affects Your Family‘s Relationships with You

Lesson 16 Film —*Hidden Victims“*

Primary objectives: Use film to explore some of the devastating ways that children are affected by growing up in a home in which there is domestic violence.

Main lesson points:

. • Screen —Hidden Victims: Children Of Domestic Violence“

. • Briefly review the film to prepare men for a discussion and role-play the following class. Pose these questions: How do children feel? What do they learn? How do they act?

. • Emphasize that although there are negative effects of DV on children, once parents understand these effects they can do a lot to help their children cope

Lesson 17 *Hidden Victims* discussion; role-play

Primary objectives: Discussion of effects of domestic violence on children; role-play exercise to place men in the position of being boys who have witnessed violence between their parents

Main lesson points:

. • Pose question: Do you think children are affected by domestic violence?
. • Tell class: Many men who have been violent to their children‘s mother tell themselves that they have never hurt their children. ***But when a man is violent and abusive toward his children‘s mom, he is also violent to his children.*** Take a moment to listen to the class‘s reaction to this statement.
. • Engage in role-play exercise whereby men place themselves in the position of being young children who have witnessed domestic violence. Ask a series of questions about their experiences of the violence.
. • Use guidelines to emphasize how children feel (e.g., powerless, helpless, anxious), how the fighting changes mom (e.g., she is angrier and more strict, she is depressed, she is distracted), what children learn (e.g., loss of trust in parents, women are vulnerable, violence is normal), and how children act (e.g., more childish, aggressive, trouble concentrating, emotional problems).

Lesson 18 <u>Accountability to our children</u>

Primary objectives: To help men define responsible parenting; to look at the impact of DV on children; to help men be accountable to their children for the violence; to share ways to help children exposed to DV

Main lesson points:

. • Define responsible parenting and generate a list of examples (e.g., provide for children, teach them positive values, teach them respect for others, etc.)
. • Ask men to consider effects of domestic violence on children
. • Read —Jack‘s Story“ about a man who is violent with his wife in front of his children and how his children respond to him
. • Dicuss —Jack‘s Story,“ asking men to consider what Jack‘s abusive actions were, what his children saw and heard, how his children felt, how they acted as a result of his actions, how his behavior affected his relationship with his children, and what his children need from him in order to recover
. • Define —accountability“ to children
. • Discuss ways to help children heal from the effects of family violence (e.g., no new abuse; initiate conversation about violence; set firm, loving, consistent limits; use nonviolent discipline; support counseling for children and/or their mother; support partner‘s parenting)

Lesson 19 <u>Respectful parenting</u>

Primary objectives: To define respect; to broaden definition of —discipline“ beyond punishment or reward; to introduce model for respectful parenting

Main lesson points:

. • Ask men to define respect; generate a list of various definitions on the board

. • Activity: Child discipline & encouragement vs. punishment
. • Activity: Good teacher/Bad teacher œ generate list of qualities of a good teacher (e.g., fair, good listener, cares) and qualities of a bad teacher (e.g., unfair, unpredictable, unclear about expectations)
. • Discuss permissive vs. punitive parenting styles. Point out that swinging back and forth between these two extremes is common in domestic violence relationships
. • Discuss respectful parenting. Compare and contrast respectful parenting with punitive and permissive parenting styles.
. • Read —Ben‘s Story“ and —Katie‘s Story“ to give examples of children‘s behaviors and ask men to consider the different ways parents can respond to these behaviors

Part 4. Partnering and Parenting: Accountability, Responsibility & Respect

Lesson 20-21 —*Tracy Thurman Story“* video and discussion

Primary objectives: Screen and discuss the —A Cry for Help œ The Tracy Thurman Story,“ which tells the story of the landmark case that led to the adoption of domestic violence legislation and reforms in police response to domestic violence calls.

Main lesson points:

. • Screen excerpts from film
. • Discuss significance of the Tracy Thurman case (e.g., Forced lawmakers to recognize the seriousness of domestic violence and a woman‘s right to be protected from an intimate partner; brought about changes in police officers‘ and others‘ notions of public vs. private spheres and the role of law enforcement when responding to domestic assaults)
. • Discuss some of the procedural and organizational reforms that were adopted around the country, citing Thurman v. Torrington (e.g., Police departments adopted pro-arrest or mandatory

arrest policies; Domestic violence units were formed in prosecutors‘ offices; Reforms were made in legislation regarding protection orders -- It became easier to get an emergency OP.)

• Emphasize that it was *not* the attempted murder of Tracy Thurman by her husband that led to these changes in laws and police practices. What ultimately forced the changes was the lawsuit she won and **$**. Decisions were not made in order to protect women from violent domestic abuse, but rather to protect police and other officials from litigation.

Lesson 22 Impact of exposure to multiple forms of violence, PTSD and depression

Primary objectives: To understand that children exposed to multiple forms of violence will be more severely affected; to understand that children are victimized more frequently and severely than adults, as witnesses and direct victims, inside the home and outside; to understand what depression and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) —look like“ in children; to be able to distinguish a —bad kid“ from a traumatized

child

Main lesson points:

. • Discuss examples of multiple forms of violence (e.g., drug and gang-related violence, racial and ethnic violence, bullying, etc.)
. • Share findings of two studies done on children‘s exposure to violence in their communities
. • Discuss psychological effects of victimization and exposure to violence on children (e.g., mental health problems, PTSD, depression)
. • Focus on how to recognize depression in a child. Generate list of symptoms on the board (e.g., frequent sadness, hopelessness, loss of interest in activities, low self-esteem, etc.)
. • Focus on how to recognize PTSD in a child. Discuss various symptoms of PTSD (e.g., anxiety and agitation, avoidance, headaches and other physical signs of stress, symptoms of depression)
. • Emphasize the importance of distinguishing —bad“ kids from depressed, anxious, or traumatized kids.

Lesson 23 Respectful Co-Parenting & Visitation

Primary objectives: To define and discuss —Respectful Co-Parenting“ -- respectful behaviors towards children‘s mother; to understand and be accountable for the ways men use their children to control their partner; to learn to handle parenting conflicts respectfully

Main lesson points:

. • Discuss meaning of respectful co-parenting. Generate a list of the general principles on the board (e.g., showing respect to the other as a parent, valuing and honoring the other parent‘s needs; sharing decision-making about raising the children)
. • Ask men to list specific examples of how they show respect for their child‘s mother
. • Discuss the use of children as a tactic to control their mother. List specific ways men use their children against their children‘s mother (e.g., criticizing mother in front of children, changing the rules to make her look bad, getting children to side with him against her)
. • Optional activity œ Read —Charles‘s Story“ to illustrate examples of how men use their children to humiliate their children‘s mother

. • Discuss guidelines for male parental figures who are not living with their children‘s mother
. • Discuss guidelines for safe visitation with children, including appropriate things to discuss with children (e.g., plans for the next visit, child‘s feelings about separation) and inappropriate things to discuss (e.g., child support, anger with mother, mother‘s activities)
. • Ask me to examine a situation when they have used their children as a way to control their partner

Part 5. Building Healthy Relationships

Lesson 24 Choice & Proactivity

Primary objectives: To define proactivity; to demonstrate that, as humans, we have the freedom to choose how we respond to external circumstances; to recognize tendencies to blame outside forces for our actions

Main lesson points:
. • Discuss freedom to exercise choice base on conscience, free will, self-awareness, and imagination
. • Activity: Ask participants to think about their self-awareness, imagination, free will, and conscience in relationship to their children
. • Read excerpt from —The seven habits of highly effective people: Restoring the character ethic“ by Stephen Covey to give an example of a proactive person
. • Draw —Circle of Influence“ diagram. Ask me to give examples of people and situations that are sources of stress
. • Discuss how proactive people would handle stressful situations vs. how reactive people would handle them
. • Look at examples of reactive language (e.g., —There is nothing I can do,“ —That child doesn‘t listen“) and proactive language (e.g., —What are the alternatives,“ —I can choose a different approach“)

Lesson 25 Communication Skills: Aggression vs. Assertion & Role Play

Primary objectives: To discuss respectful communication; to examine different ways of communicating; to show that respectful communication is helpful not only in our relationships with our kids, but in all aspects of our lives.

Main lesson points:
. • Discuss four common styles of communication: assertive, aggressive, passive-aggressive, and passive, and the goals and messages of each
. • Compare and contrast assertive communication and aggressive communication
. • Role-play exercise: Practice responding to a conflict with assertive

communication and with aggressive communication

. • Define self-esteem and generate examples of high self-esteem and low self-esteem

. • Demonstrate correlations between low self-esteem and aggressive behavior and high self-esteem and assertive behavior

Lesson 26 Balancing You, Me, Us & Understanding Boundaries

Primary objectives: To think about and learn to set appropriate boundaries for intimate relationships (not too enveloping; allowing the other person autonomy œ but not too distant); to set different levels of boundaries for less intimate relationships; to better understand expectations of a relationship; to increase sense of personal responsibility for their side of a relationship

Main lesson points:

. • Define —boundaries“ and draw diagram of four concentric circles to illustrate different boundaries for different kinds of relationships

. • Define —relationship“ and discuss different kinds of relationships (e.g., work relationship vs. partner relationship)

. • Draw four diagrams (each containing two circles with varying degrees of proximity, from far apart to almost completely overlapping) to represent four different kinds of relationships. Discuss the qualities and characteristics of each kind of relationship

. • Focus on how each relationship model would affect a child

. • Brainstorm about characteristics that men look for in a partner, and list items on the board. Ask men what their partners‘ lists would look like.

. • Ask men to think about which characteristics are important in a good mother and co-parent

OUTLINE

Partner-Centered Curriulum

I. Power and Control: The Emotional/Psychological Foundations

Lesson 2 <u>House of Abuse & Power and Control Wheel</u>.

Primary objectives: To illustrate that domestic violence occurs in the context of a society that gives men power over women (male privilege) and that domestic violence is about exerting power and control over women.

Main lesson points:

. • Power and control is represented as a house that the men have built with 8 rooms, each representing a different form of abuse: using children; economic abuse; emotional and verbal abuse; intimidation, coercion, threatening behavior; social isolation; blaming, denying, and minimizing; physical and sexual abuse; male privilege (the first floor of the house)

. • The point is that good relationships cannot be built on a shaky foundation; cleaning the house requires more than cosmetic changes œ the flaws have to be addressed

. • Challenge men to think about how they would build a healthy, strong house

Lesson 3: How DV Affects Perpetrator (House of Abuse Day 2)

Primary objectives: To understand the costs of an abusive relationship to the abuser; to develop empathy for the feeling of being controlled; to discuss the power and control wheel

Main lesson points:

. • Discuss how an abuser‘s use of violence may affect his relationship with his partner. Generate a list of these consequences on the board (e.g., loss of trust from his partner, loss of intimacy, loss of respect, etc.)

. • Exercise œ Ask class to think of a time when they felt controlled by another person or situation. Ask: What did the person do to control you? How did it feel? How do you think they felt towards you? Why do you think you did not leave sooner?

Lesson 4: Denial and Accountability

Primary objectives: To emphasize the importance of taking personal responsibility for your actions; to discuss defenses used to avoid accountability; to understand consequences of denial on individual and on victim

Main lesson points:

. • Discuss denial as a defense against unwelcome feelings of shame, fear, and guilt about oneself.

. • Discuss consequences of denial: obscures and hides problems; blocks ability to fix or change problems; avoids accountability

. • Explain and discuss —three faces of denial“: minimizing; simple denial; blame

. • Discuss how denial affects the individual (e.g., inability to change; inability to take responsibility; denial takes over)

. • Discuss effects of denial on the victim (e.g., feelings of going crazy; confusion; anger)

. • Discuss effects of blaming on individual and victim

. • Discuss other common defenses (e.g., rationalizing, intellectualizing, diversion, hostility)

Lessons 5-6 Emotional Bank Account

Part I Primary objectives: To introduce a —bank account“ as a metaphor for a relationship; to discuss emotional abuse; to focus on the actions that strengthen an intimate-partner relationship and actions that can damage that relationship

Main lesson points:

. • Discuss —deposits“ or positive contributions to a relationship that build a —reserve“ of trust in a relationship

. • Ask men to think of the actions that would be considered —deposits.“ Generate a list on the board (e.g., giving partner a back or foot rub; sharing household responsibilities; picking up dinner on the way home)

. • Ask men to think of actions that would be —withdrawals.“ Generate a list on the board (e.g., yelling, putting her down; coming home late; getting drunk; forgetting her birthday)

Part II Primary objectives: To discuss trust and the importance of building up a —trust reserve“ in a relationship; to discuss six major deposits

Main lesson points:

. • Discuss the deposits that need to be made in order to build up a —reserve of trust“ in a relationship (e.g., treating partner with kindness, courtesy, respect; keeping commitments made to partner)

. • Give examples of the six most important —deposits“: understanding the individual; attending to the little things; keeping commitments; clarifying expectations; showing personal integrity; apologizing sincerely when you make a —withdrawal“

II. Gender Socialization

Lessons 7-8: *Wrestling with Manhood*

Primary objectives: To explain learning of gender roles through socialization; to critically analyze the concepts of masculinity & femininity; to examine the connection between homophobia and violence towards women

Main lesson points:

. • View —Wrestling with Manhood,“ which examines how masculinity is constructed and represented in wrestling

. • Define —socialization“

. • Discuss —gender“ and —gender roles“

. • Ask men to discuss examples from the film of characteristics of a —real man,“ of how wrestlers punish those who don‘t act like —real men,“ and of characteristics of women

. • Ask men to think about how relationships between men and women are characterized in wrestling (e.g., clear power dynamic, inequality, domination, fear, threat, etc.)

. • Discuss how wresting glorifies violence against women (by making it look like fun to hit women; by making it seem like the women secretly enjoys it; by making the victim of violence seem at fault for the violence; by making violence against women

acceptable and normal behavior; by making it seem like there are no consequences to violence against women)

Lesson 9: Man in the Box œ show part of *In the Mix* (to use Michael and Tamara for discussion)

Primary objectives: To analyze constructions of masculinity and femininity; to discuss socialization; to discuss sexism and homophobia

Main lesson points:

. • Show part of the film —In the Mix“ to use Michael and Tamara for discussion of Man/Woman in the Box.

. • Tell class to think of Michael‘s and other men‘s roles inside a box that contains all the ways men are supposed to be. Draw a box on the board and ask men to help fill it up with characteristics (e.g., physical strength, competitive, focused, determined, etc.)

. • Discuss ways men get punished if they —step out of the box“ (e.g., get called names such as weak, punk, sissy, fag)

. • Tell class to think about Tamara and other women‘s roles inside a different box. Draw a box on the board and ask men to fill in characteristics of femininity (e.g., pretty, clean, nurturing, polite, submissive)

. • Discuss ways women get punished if they —step out of the box“ (e.g., get called names such as loose, easy, lesbian, pushy, aggressive)

Lesson 10: Perspective-Taking Exercise (What Would She Say? œ attending her support group)

Primary objectives: To encourage men to understand their partner‘s perspective and experience of being in an abusive relationship

Main lesson points:

. • Inform men to imagine that they are their partners and that they are attending a support group for battered women

. • Ask men to explain, as if they are their partners, why she is there and what happened

. • Continue to facilitate —support group“ by asking men to answer questions (e.g., Why does he stay in the relationship? What do you want to happen? What did he do to make you feel afraid?)

Lesson 11: Hip Hop Culture - Ayanna

Primary objectives: To sensitize participants to the role the media plays in shaping perceptions of sex and gender; to make parents more aware of the impact of the media on their children in shaping perceptions of sex and gender.

Main lesson points:

. • Instructional aid: —The Exploitation of Women in Hip-hop Culture“ by Ayanna
. • Discuss historical roots of stereotype of black women as promiscuous and oversexed, and how women came to be valued, and to value themselves, only for their sexuality.
. • Discuss hip-hop culture today, its influence on youth, and how hip-hop often expresses negative views toward women

. • Illustrate how rap music and videos degrade women by summarizing main points made by Ayanna
. • Pose discussion questions to class (e.g., Why are women held responsible for what men do sexually? What value do women hold other than their sexuality? What is your responsibility as a man in regard to sexual exploitation of women? How are adolescents and young adults, both male and female, affected by images they see in hip-hop videos and lyrics in hip-hop music?)

III. Oppression and the œisms (sexism, racism, classism)

Lesson 12: *The Color Purple* œ exemplify definitions of racism and sexism

Primary objectives: To increase participants‘ awareness of structures of inequality in our society; to show how these hierarchies play a role in violent and abusive behavior

Main lesson points:
. • Show excerpts from the film, —The Color Purple“
. • Use Celie‘s story to illustrate the oppression of black women by hierarchies of race (white over black, or light-skinned over dark-skinned), gender (man over woman), and class (rich over poor)
. • Discuss that Within the black community, power structures result in the exploitation of black women by black men.
. • Because of racist oppression of black men, it is regarded as treachery for black women to expose (especially to whites) negative images of black men.
. • Review details of Celie‘s experiences (e.g., raped, separated from her children, married off by her father, abused by Mister, unable to escape)

Lesson 13: *The Color Purple* discussion: male privilege

Primary objectives: To define —male privilege“; to understand the role of male privilege; to discuss how male privilege plays out in men‘s relationships with their female intimate partners; to discuss the rewards and consequences of possessing male privilege; to begin to identify how and when NOT to use male privilege

Main lesson points:

. • Ask men to define the word —power“ and —privilege“
. • Exercise: —Seven operating rules of privilege“ handout œ Discuss each statement and determine whether it is true or false (e.g., Privileged people don‘t have to follow the rules they set up; Unprivileged people are not allowed direct or honest communication with privileged people)
. • Engage in an —expectations exercise“ to examine the expectations that men have for services (e.g., cooking, cleaning, care giving) provided by their female partners.
. • Examine how male privilege is at the very foundation of men‘s abuse of their female intimate partners and how male privilege is used to justify abusive behavior

• Discuss why women stay in abusive relationships

Lesson 14: *The Color Purple* œ —Parallel Universe“

Primary objectives: To use the different treatment of Celie and Shug to illustrate the House of Abuse, different ways of exercising and abusing power, and choice

Main lesson points:
. • Construct the House of Abuse and ask the men give examples for each room in the house using treatment of Celie
. • Construct a house that is the reflection of the House of Abuse œ the mirror image, upside down and ask the men to fill each room with examples of treatment of Shug
. • Discuss the different ways people exercise power over others and different ways of coping with abuse from others.

Lesson 15: Oppression, racism and sexism: Definitions; Tony Porter‘s Diamond

Primary objectives: To know the definition of oppression from the perspective of a power and control model; to see the connections among different systems of oppression (e.g. sexism, racism and classism); to understand the hierarchical power structure of U.S. society

Main lesson points:
. • Define oppression and draw Tony Porter‘s diamond (figure illustrating hierarchies of oppression based on race and gender)
. • Discuss examples of oppression (e.g., slavery, denying groups the right to vote, modern day slave trade, police brutality)
. • Discuss sexism, racism, and classism and give examples of each
. • Ask men to list powerful groups in our society and groups that are often oppressed (examples of powerful groups include white people, men, rich people,

heterosexuals; examples of oppressed groups include people of color, women, poor people, homosexuals)

. • Ask men to give examples of the behaviors that are used to oppress these groups (e.g., domestic violence, housing and job discrimination, degrading language or jokes)

. • Discuss some of the effects of oppression and abuse on people (e.g., distorted self-image; anger/rage; feelings of helplessness; substance abuse) and victim blaming

Lesson 16-17: Sexual abuse *Trains,* excerpt from Nathan McCall (Handout)

Primary objectives: To understand how young men's sexuality is shaped by their peers to impress other young men œ to bolster their own masculinity**;** to understand the range of sexual abuse œ that it doesn't have to be —rape" to be abusive and destructive**;** to see the consequences for young men of exploitive sexual relations with girls and women: Not only do they demean women, they demean themselves, they shut down their feelings and their souls; to illustrate that through the media and peer relations we have learned to see sex as an arena where boys and men win (—get over") and girls and women lose (—give it up")

Main lesson points:

. • Distribute copies of the chapter —Trains" from Nathan McCall's book, *Makes Me Wanna Holler: A Young Black Man in America.* Ask men to read the first three pages.

. • Engage in a Q & A session with the men (sample questions include: What did Nathan

learn about sex from Nutbrain? Why is it viewed as shameful or unmanly to fall in love?

Who establishes this value? Why? Why is it valued to get over on women? On *many*

women?) Be sure to illustrate that status with other men comes from exploiting girls and

women; that treating female peers as real people is not valued œ being hard and cruel to

them is valued; that men or teens support and enforce exploitation of women

. • Move through the remainder of the chapter, which is about running —trains" on girls (or gang-rape) by alternating between reading the story and summarizing the events.

. • Engage in an analysis of Nathan's actions and his motives. Include the following questions: What was the victory they were celebrating? Is raping a 13-year-old, scared girl a victory? What contest had the boys won?

Lesson 18: History: civil rights/women's rights (Elizabeth Cady Stanton/Susan B. Anthony video; Frederick Douglass scene); Rosie the Riveter

Primary objectives: To provide a historical overview of violence against women; to provide an international perspective on violence against women; to understand women's rights and oppression through history and how that past still influences violence against women today

Main lesson points:

. • Give examples from ancient Rome, and other historical periods, when humans œ especially women and children -- were considered property

. • Discuss violence in African and Asian cultures

. • Define and discuss —patriarchy"

. • Discuss history of domestic violence and women's rights in the United States using timeline of significant events, customs, and practices

. • Discuss violence against women of color and some of the justifications that have been used for this violence

Lessons 19-20: Violence against Women (history) -*Tracy Thurman Story* & Why Women Stay

Primary objectives: Screen and discuss the —A Cry for Help œ The Tracy Thurman Story," which tells the story of the landmark case that led to the adoption of domestic violence legislation and reforms in police response to domestic violence calls.

Main lesson points:

. • Screen excerpts from film

. • Discuss significance of the Tracy Thurman case (e.g., Forced lawmakers to recognize the seriousness of domestic violence and a woman's right to be protected from an intimate partner; brought about changes in police officers' and others' notions of public vs. private spheres and the role of law enforcement when responding to domestic assaults)

. • Discuss some of the procedural and organizational reforms that were adopted around the country, citing Thurman v. Torrington (e.g., Police departments adopted pro-arrest or mandatory arrest policies; Domestic violence units were formed in prosecutors' offices; It became easier to get an emergency OP.)

. • Emphasize that it was *not* the attempted murder of Tracy Thurman by her husband that led to these changes in laws and police practices -- what brought about the changes was the lawsuit she won and $ -- and that ultimately decisions were not made in

order to protect women from violent domestic abuse, but rather to protect police and other officials from litigation.

. • Discuss reasons why abuse victims stay in an abusive relationship (e.g., relationship with batterer, children, economic issues, external pressures, past experiences, physical or logistical challenges, other considerations)

IV. Domestic Violence and Children

Lesson 21: Helping children cope with effects of DV

Primary objectives: To discuss children‘s power and control wheel; to understand effects on children of exposure to violence; to understand legal responses to protect children; to discuss ways to help children cope with DV

Main lesson points:

. • Use children‘s power and control wheel to define domestic violence and its impact on children

. • Emphasize that children are affected by domestic violence œ provide findings from research studies about impact of domestic violence on kids

. • Discuss experiences and emotions of children exposed to DV (e.g., grief, ambivalence towards parents, fear, worry)

. • Discuss legal Responses to Protect Children Affected by DV (e.g., ACS can remove the child from the home, courts consider DV when making custody and visitation decisions)

. • Discuss ways to help children heal from the effects of family violence (e.g., no new abuse; initiate conversation about violence; set firm, loving, consistent limits; use nonviolent discipline; support counseling for children and/or their mother; support partner‘s parenting)

Lesson 22: <u>Family Court & Visitation</u>

Primary objectives: To understand law enforcement policies and procedures; to offer guidelines for fathers who are no longer living with their children‘s mother

Main lesson points:

. • Discuss orders of protection œ different kinds, different terms

. • Discuss court-ordered custody and visitation

. • Discuss guidelines for safe visitation with children, including appropriate things to discuss with children (e.g., plans for the next visit, child‘s feelings about separation) and inappropriate things to discuss (e.g., child support, anger with mother, mother‘s activities)

. • Ask men to examine a situation when they have used their children as a way to control their partner

V. Proactivity and Communication

Lesson 23: Choice & Proactivity

Primary objectives: To define proactivity; to demonstrate that, as humans, we have the freedom to choose how we respond to external circumstances; to recognize tendencies to blame outside forces for our actions

Main lesson points:

. • Discuss freedom to exercise choice base on conscience, free will, self-awareness, and imagination

. • Activity: Ask participants to think about their self-awareness, imagination, free will, and conscience in relationship to their partners

. • Read excerpt from —The seven habits of highly effective people: Restoring the character ethic“ by Stephen Covey to give an example of a proactive person

. • Draw —Circle of Influence“ diagram. Ask me to give examples of people and situations that are sources of stress

. • Discuss how proactive people would handle stressful situations vs. how reactive people would handle them

. • Look at examples of reactive language (e.g., —There is nothing I can do,“ —That child doesn‘t listen“) and proactive language (e.g., —What are the alternatives,“ —I can choose a different approach“)

Lesson 24: Communication Skills: Aggression vs. Assertion & Listening

Primary objectives: To discuss respectful communication; to examine different ways of communicating; to show that respectful communication is helpful in all relationships; to introduce skills for being a good listener

Main lesson points:

. • Discuss four common styles of communication: assertive, aggressive, passive-aggressive, and passive, and the goals and messages of each

. • Compare and contrast assertive communication and aggressive communication

. • Role-play exercise: Practice responding to a conflict with assertive communication and with aggressive communication

. • Define self-esteem and generate examples of high self-esteem and low self-esteem

. • Demonstrate correlations between low self-esteem and aggressive behavior and high self-esteem and assertive behavior

. • Discuss listening as a necessary component of respectful and effective communication

. • Activity œ Examine different responses to someone who shares their story with you. For each response, ask men to think about how that would feel. Write their ideas on

the board

. • Discuss good listening skills and obstacles to good listening; discuss how to listen for and accept feelings

VI. Building Healthy Relationships

Lesson 25: —Balancing you, me, and us“ & —Understanding Boundaries“

Primary objectives: To think about and learn to set appropriate boundaries for intimate relationships (not too enveloping; allowing the other person autonomy œ but not too distant); to set different levels of boundaries for less intimate relationships; to better understand expectations of a relationship; to increase sense of personal responsibility for their side of a relationship

Main lesson points:

. • Define —boundaries“ and draw diagram of four concentric circles to illustrate different boundaries for different kinds of relationships

. • Define —relationship“ and discuss different kinds of relationships (e.g., work relationship vs. partner relationship)

. • Draw four diagrams (each containing two circles with varying degrees of proximity, from far apart to almost completely overlapping) to represent four different kinds of relationships. Discuss the qualities and characteristics of each kind of relationship

. • Brainstorm about characteristics that men look for in a partner, and list items on the board. Ask men what their partners‘ lists would look like.

Lesson 26: War Zone œ film and discussion

Primary objectives: To examine how men harass women; compare and contrast treatment of women who are strangers and women who are family members; to compare and contrast treatment of women in different cultural contexts

Main lesson points:

. • Show film —War Zone“ to class

. • Ask men to share their thoughts and reactions to the film (watching out for men‘s tendency to blame the victim for the harassment)

. • Ask men to consider the Latina woman in the context of her family.

. • Ask men to think about the similarities and the differences between harassment on the street by a stranger and harassment by family members.

. • Point out that the filmmaker does acknowledge that there are men who choose to be different and to respect women.

Appendix C

Case ID

☐☐☐☐☐☐

DVAP CURRICULUM STUDY Initial Interview

Date

Interviewer

Complete contact sheet first.

Relationship

A1. *Tell me about your relationship with your former (or current) partner (woman who led to mandate to DVAP). What's her first name? Are you still involved with her?*

• First name-for ease of reference

Married

Estranged

Divorced

GF

Ex-GF

☐Married ☐Estranged ☐Divorced ☐GF ☐Ex-GF

. • Status of relationship

. • If no longer involved,

• How long involved? ☐ Years ☐ Months

• Lived together? Until? ☐ Never lived together ☐ Lived tog. __ Years __Month

☐When incident occurred

when did relationship

Relationship ended ___ years ago ___ months ago

end?

When incident occurred

. • Frequency of contact
• Type of contact (i.e.,
phone, see each other occasionally, only child visits)
. • New relationship?

☐None since incident __ months ago ☐a few times/yr
☐Monthly ☐Weekly ☐Daily

☐Live tog ☐Spend time together ☐Exchange kids only
☐N/A-don't see each other: ☐ Stay away Order of Prot
☐ In-person ☐ Phone

☐NO ☐ Yes: how long? _____
☐re-married ☐casual ☐serious ☐living together

A2. How many children do you have in common with [HER NAME]?

_____ A3. Do you have children with other women?

☐ Yes How many?

☐ No

A3a. Could you give me the age and sex of all your biological children? (Record age and sex of each child and mark (✞) whether she is the mother)

	Age	Sex	Complain-ant is mother	Another woman is mother	How's he involved in raising kid?
First child (oldest)					

Second child			
Third child			
Fourth child			
Fifth child			

A4. Do you serve as father figure/stepfather for other children – for example, were you raising other children of hers with her?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If yes, how many?

☐ Takes care of them

☐ Supports them

A4a. Could you give me the age and sex of the children for whom you serve as a father figure?

	Age	Sex		Complain-ant is the mother	Other woman is the mother	How is he involved in raising child?
		Female	Male			
First child (oldest)						
Second child						
Third child						
Fourth child						
Fifth child						

A5. (1) Who has custody of your children with her? (2) How often do you see the kids, if you are not living with them? Do you have court-ordered visitation? If not, do you see or interact with the child at all? In what ways?

	She has legal custody	She has physical cust.
(1) Custody (legal, permanent, temporary?)	Dk if she has legal Joint custody	He has custody
(2) Visitation: Is he seeing kids	Court ordered visits or	just agreement

Are they staying over?(court ordered?)	NO VISITS – Since when? # months ago

If no visits, ask why: OP Other # times month # hours Visitation condition Supervised Unsupervised Sup. transfer *Other visitation arrangement:* • Satisfied with visits? Satisfied Not satisfied If not satisfied, ask: *Why?* Not enough visitation Too much visitation **Other reason:**

A6. What do you think is the main problem in the relationship? (Probe to get specific answers)

☐	Communication	☐	I work too much	☐	I hang out with friends	☐	I drink
☐	She has no ambition, doesn't improve self	☐	She drinks/drugs	☐	She is jealous		

OTHER:

What does *she* think is the main problem in the relationship?

☐
☐

Communication

☐ I work too much

☐ I hang out with friends

I have different values

☐ She wants more money

☐ Other women in my life

OTHER:

Do you want to maintain this relationship? If so, what are you willing to do to maintain it?

	Yes
	Not right now, don't know
	No

A15. Who do you think is responsible for your being mandated to attend DVAP? Please

assign each factor a percentage ranging from 0% to 100%. All factors combined should

total 100%

% I am; my own actions put me here
% My partner is; her actions put me here
% The police
% The court
% Administration for Children's Services (ACS)
% Someone else (e.g. neighbors, relative, fate, etc.

Explain **(For the largest % of responsibility)**

B. Beliefs about Violence

Now I'm going to read some beliefs that people have about violence. There are no right or wrong answers for any of these questions. Tell me if you agree, agree somewhat, disagree or disagree somewhat with the statements.

B1. It is normal to get angry sometimes 1

2

3

4

5

B2. Men are naturally aggressive 1

2

3

4

5

B3. When men are violent, it is because they have been 1

2

3

4

5

pushed to the limit B4. Children forget the violence they witness very quickly

1

2

3

4

5

B5. Women could avoid being abused by their partners if they 1

2

3

4

5

knew when to stop talking B6. When a woman is abused, it is caused by her behavior in

1

2

3

4

5

the weeks before the battering B7. A sexually unfaithful woman is more likely to be hit

1

2

3

4

5

B8. A man can get out of control when his partner constantly 1

2

3

4

5

refuses to have sex with him B9. Violence between

a couple usually takes place when

1

2

3

4

5

children are not present

Agree

B10. Sometimes it is OK for a man to hit his partner 1

2

3

4

5

B11. If a woman gets abused and she doesn't leave, she 1

2

3

4

5

Agree Somewhat

deserves what happens B12. A man should go to jail for abusing his partner 1

2

3

4

5

Neither Agree nor Disagree

B13. Children who witness violence are more likely to be 1

2

3

4

5

abusers later on in their lives

Disag

					Agree Somewhat
B14. Sometimes women want to be abused as a way to get	1	2	3	4	5
their partner's attention or sympathy from others					
					Disagree
B15. Most women secretly desire a little rough treatment by	1	2	3	4	5
their partners					
					Declin

e
d

B16. Young children (under 3) are rarely aware of any 1

2

3

4

5

problems between their parents

PDS (BIDR Version 7) by Delroy L. Paulhus

I'm going to read you a series of statements. For each one tell me if this describes you on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 means Not True and 5 means Very True

	Not True				Very True
1. My first impressions of people usually turn out to be right.	1	2	3	4	5
2. It would be hard for me to break any of my bad habits.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I don't care to know what other people really think of me.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I have not always been honest with myself.	1	2	3	4	5
6. When my emotions are aroused, it biases my thinking.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Once I've made up my mind, other people cannot change my opinion.	1	2	3	4	5

9. I am fully in control of my own fate.	1	2	3	4	5
10. It's hard for me to shut off a disturbing thought.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I never regret my decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I sometimes lose out on things because I can't make up my mind soon enough.	1	2	3	4	5
14. People don't seem to notice me and my abilities.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I am a completely rational person.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I rarely appreciate criticism.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I am very confident of my judgments.	1	2	3	4	5
19. It's alright with me if some people happen to dislike me.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I'm just an average person.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I sometimes tell lies if I have to.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I never cover up my mistakes.	1	2	3	4	5
23. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone	1	2	3	4	5
24. I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I have said something bad about a friend behind his or her back.	1	2	3	4	5
26. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I have received too much change from a salesperson and didn't say anything.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I have never dropped litter on the street.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I have done things that I don't tell other people about.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I never take things that don't belong to me.	1	2	3	4	5

31. I have called in sick to work or school even though I wasn't really sick.	1	2	3	4	5
32. I have some pretty awful habits.	1	2	3	4	5

D. Description of Incident that led to DVAP mandate

D1. What happened that led to your being mandated to DVAP? Tell me about that incident. Who was involved? How did things turn out? Who called police? Did she have injuries or bruises? Did he?

Look for following:

☐ He was drinking

☐ He acted in self-defense

☐ He was just restraining her

☐ He denies or omits any injuries to her

☐ Police arrested the wrong person

D2. Looking back, do you think that you could have done anything differently during the incident?

☐ Yes, I should have left/never should have gone there

Yes, I should have left/never should have gone there

E. Conflict Tactics Scale

Adapted from Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, Hamby, et al., 1996)

For the next set of questions, I want you to tell me if you did any of the following things, and also if your partner (ex-partner) did these things. If this ever happened in your relationship, please tell me whether it happened in the past six months or before.

If he hasn't seen her in six months because of OP, then count the six months before he had to avoid contact.

	Never	**Yes, in the past 6 months**	**Yes, but not in the past 6 mo.**
E1 Did you shout or yell at your partner?	0	1	2
E1a. Did she do this to you?	0	1	2
E2. Did you slam her against a wall?	0	1	2
E2a. Did she do this to you?	0	1	2
E4. Did you stomp out of the room or house during a disagreement?	0	1	2
E4a. Did she do this to you?	0	1	2
E5. Did you threaten to hit or throw something at your partner?	0	1	2

E5a. Did she do this to you?	0	1	2
E6. Did you push, shove, or grab your partner?	0	1	2
E6a. Did she do this to you?	0	1	2
E9. Did you twist your partner's arm or pull her hair or slap her?	0	1	2
E9a. Did she do this to you?	0	1	2
E10. Did you call your partner names (fat, ugly or other)?	0	1	2
E10a. Did she do this to you?	0	1	2
E11. Did you insult or swear at your partner?	0	1	2
E11a. Did she do this to you?	0	1	2
E13. Did you punch, hit, or kick your partner?	0	1	2
E13a. Did she do this to you?	0	1	2
E14 Did you destroy something belonging to your partner?	0	1	2
E14a. Did she do this to you?	0	1	2
E15. Did you accuse your partner of being a lousy lover?	0	1	2
E15a. Did she do this to you?	0	1	2
E16. Did you use threats to make your partner have sex?	0	1	2
E16a. Did she do this to you?	0	1	2
E17. Did you use force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make your partner have sex?	0	1	2
E17a. Did she do this to you?	0	1	2
E18. Did you use a knife or a gun on your partner?	0	1	2
E18a. Did she do this to you?	0	1	2
E22. Did you throw something at your partner that could hurt?	0	1	2

E22a. Did she do this to you?	0	1	2
E23. Did you insist on sex when your partner did not want to (but did not use physical force)?	0	1	2
E23a. Did she do this to you?	0	1	2

F. Co-parenting

Now, I'm going to ask you some questions about being a parent

F1. Tell me some ways that your partner is a good mother. What is the best thing she does as a mother?

☐ Takes care of kids: ☐ clean ☐ well-fed
☐ Loving ☐ OTHER:

F2. And what are some ways that she is not a good mother?

☐ NONE ☐ Too permissive ☐ Too strict ☐ Neglects them ☐ junk food
☐ Not a good role model
☐ OTHER:

F3. Tell me some ways that you are a good father.

☐ Provide for them ☐ Buy them things ☐ Take them to park, play with them
☐ Help with homework ☐ Take to doctors ☐ Provide discipline ☐ Praise them

☐ OTHER:
OTHER:

F4. What are some ways you are not a good father?

☐NONE	☐Can't see them	☐Angry in front of them	☐Spoil them
☐Learning not to respect women/their mother			
☐OTHER:			

G. Child exposure to violence

G1. How often do you think your child(ren) saw or heard a physical fight between you and your partner/former partner?

☐ N/A – (There was no physical fighting)

Never

☐ once or twice

☐ 3 to 5 times

☐ 6 to 10 times

☐ 11 or more times

☐

G2. How often do you think your children saw or heard verbal abuse/arguing between you and your partner/former partner?

☐ N/A - (There was no verbal abuse/arguing)

Never

☐ once or twice

☐ 3 to 5 times

☐ 6 to 10 times

☐ 11 or more times G3. How much do you think being exposed to physical violence and/or verbal fighting has negatively affected you child(ren) in each of the these areas:

					☐
a. School performance	A lot	Some	A little	Not at all	n/a
b. Behavior at home	A lot	Some	A little	Not at all	n/a
c. Relationship w/ their mother	A lot	Some	A little	Not at all	n/a
d. Relationship with you	A lot	Some	A little	Not at all	n/a
e. Mental and/or emotional health	A lot	Some	A little	Not at all	n/a

G4. Has it affected them in any other ways, besides those we just mentioned? If so, in what ways? (*Move on if no quick answer*.)

G5. Do you think that the fighting in the home affected your partner's parenting at any time? If so, in what ways?

☐ N/A(there was no fighting)

☐ No

G6. How much has your physical violence and/or verbal abuse (fighting, arguing)

_____

negatively affected your feelings about yourself as a father?

N/A

A lot Some A little Not at all

HOW?

G7. Have you ever talked to your child about the fighting between you and your partner? If so, what did you tell them?

N/A No

G8. Do you think that your child's feelings about you have changed because of the fighting they have witnessed between you and their mother?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ DK

☐ N/A

If yes, ask: In what ways have they changed? (Record any answer he gives, including "they miss me," etc.)

G9. Do you think it's good to be honest with your children about your true feelings about your partner, whether positive or negative? Why (or why not)?

G10. Do you think that any of your children need counseling now? If not, do you think

they might in the future?

Yes, one or two of them which one? (sex and age)	Now Future
Yes, all children	
Maybe, in the future – too young	
No, I don't think so	

H. Relationship with Your Own Parents

H1. Tell me who raised you – parents, grandparents, other relatives.

H1a.Mother figure (mother, other relative, foster…)	Biol. mother Stepmother Foster mother
	Aunt Grandmother Other No mother figure
H1b. Father figure (biological, step, other)	Biol. father Stepfather Foster father
	Uncle Grandfather Other No father figure
H2. Relationship between parents or mother and male partners (violent, loving, distant)	
H3. Who supported you economically (mother, father, both, other)?	Mother (or mother figure) Father (or father figure)
	Both Other
H4. Any drug or alcohol abuse in household?	Yes No Don't Know
	If yes, who?/what?
H5. How were you treated by parents or guardians? (lovingly, harshly, fairly)	

H6. When you were growing up, were men around you *physically, emotionally or financially* abusive towards women?

I. Knowledge

I1. What is the range of behaviors that you would consider domestic violence? What are the forms of abuse? Write example or description . . . . . 8.

I2. What do you think *causes* domestic violence?

I3. List all the effects on children of witnessing domestic violence (prompt for as many as possible, and as specific as possible). How might the effects differ for a toddler vs. a school-aged child vs. an adolescent?

I4. What advantages do men in our society have that women don't?

I5. What advantages do women have in our society that men don't?

I6. On a scale of 1 to 10, how confident are you that there will be no more violence between you and [HER NAME]?

Extremely uncharacteristic of me

1-not at all confident 2 3 4 5- maybe 6 7 8 9 10 – I know nothing is going to happen

17. What do you think you will get out of this program?

Extremely characteristic of me

J. Buss Scale

Please tell me how well the following statements describe you on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means very uncharacteristic (untrue) of you and 5 means very characteristic (true) of you.

1. When people are especially nice, I wonder what they want 1

2

3

4

5

2. I tell my friends openly when I disagree with them 1

2

3

4

5

3. I flare up quickly but get over it quickly 1

2

3

4

5

4. I am sometimes eaten up with jealousy 1

2

3

4

5

5. There are people who pushed me so far that we came to blows	1	2	3	4	5
6. I often find myself disagreeing with people	1	2	3	4	5
7. When frustrated, I let my irritation show	1	2	3	4	5
8. At times I feel I have gotten a raw deal out of life	1	2	3	4	5
9. Given enough provocation, I may hit another person	1	2	3	4	5
10. If somebody hits me, I hit back	1	2	3	4	5
11. When some people annoy me, I may tell them what I think	1	2	3	4	5
12. I wonder why sometimes I feel so bitter about things	1	2	3	4	5
13. I get into fights a little more than the average person	1	2	3	4	5
17. I can't help getting into arguments when people disagree with me	1	2	3	4	5
18. I am an even-tempered person	1	2	3	4	5
19. I have threatened people I know	1	2	3	4	5
20. I know that "friends" talk about me behind my back	1	2	3	4	5
21. If I have to resort to violence to protect my rights, I will	1	2	3	4	5
23. I am suspicious of overly friendly strangers	1	2	3	4	5
24. I can think of no good reason for ever hitting a person	1	2	3	4	5
25. I have trouble controlling my temper	1	2	3	4	5

26. I sometimes feel that people are laughing at me behind my back	1	2	3	4	5
27. I have become so mad that I have broken things	1	2	3	4	5
29. Sometimes I fly off the handle for no good reason	1	2	3	4	5

We are at the end of the interview. I just want to ask you a couple of questions.

N. Demographic Information

N1. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

☐ 8th grade or less ☐ Some high school ☐ High school graduate/GED ☐ Some college or vocational school

☐ College graduate (BA/BS)
☐ Some graduate school
☐ Advanced

N2. Were you born in the U.S.?

☐ Yes

☐ No If no, in what country were you born?

N3. Are you currently employed?

☐ Yes

☐ No If yes,

☐ Full-time

☐ Part-time N4. If employed, how long have you worked at your present job? ____ yrs ___months N5. If unemployed, how long had you worked at your previous job? __yrs __months N6. How long have you lived in your current residence? ____yrs ____ months N7. If

you had to move because of separation from your partner, how long had you lived in your previous residence? _____ yrs. _____months

N8. Have you attended a program like this before?

☐ No

☐ Yes Batterer program: _____ Did you complete it?

☐ No

☐ Yes

a. ☐ Anger management
b. ☐ Parenting
c. ☐ Substance abuse

☐ Therapy/counseling

Appendix D

Focus Group with DVAP Instructors Discussion Points for a 1-hour session

Overall Experience as Instructors

1. 1. What have been your positive and negative experiences as DVAP Instructors?
2. *2.* What challenges have you faced as DVAP Instructors?
3. *3.* Do you think the men's beliefs about violence could change?
4. 4. To what extent, if any, do the men's beliefs change?

Overall experience with study

1. 5. What were the advantages and drawbacks of following a curriculum versus responding to issues that the men present, as a teaching strategy?
2. 6. What were the obstacles to adhering to each curriculum?
3. 7. How much did you ultimately adhere to, or stray from, the two curricula?

Any differences between teaching child focused and partner focused

1. 8. What are your opinions of our study hypothesis that the child-focused curriculum would engage the men more than the partner-focused curriculum?
2. 9. What thoughts do you have about the assumptions that led to our hypothesis?

i) The men can relate to their own childhood and thus identify with their children's exposure to violence. ii) The men are very attached to their children and therefore will be protective of their children.

iii) The men are eager to maintain positive relationship with their children.

1. 10. Were there any aspects of the partner-focused curriculum that were brought into the regular (non-study) curriculum? If so, which were they?
2. 11. Were there any aspects of the child-focused curriculum that were brought into the regular curriculum? 11a If so, which were they?

Men's responses to the two curricula

1. 12. How did the men respond to each curriculum?
2. 13. Were there any particular topics or exercises in the child-focused curriculum that engaged the men?
3. 14. Were there any particular topics or exercises in the child-focused curriculum that the men resisted?
4. 15. Do you think the men's beliefs about the impact of DV on children could change? To what extent, if any, did the men's beliefs change?
5. 16. Do you think it would be possible to change their behavior toward their children?

Appendix E
Thematic Excerpts from Interviews with DVAP Instructors

Conducted by Cecilia Castelino, Ph.D.

Program philosophy regarding ability of program to instigate and assess change:

2M: We don't know whether men actually change only because we cannot gauge or measure the change. 2F: We see the class as having enormous value: the potential of bringing about social change of all men…The curriculum speaks to all men.

1M: I think that the philosophy is not that the men can't change, it's just that they can change even before coming to the program if they choose to. It's all about challenging themselves.

1F: …You hear, you see changes in the room. But …It could be attributed to so many different things. We are very cautious in how we're trying to define what those changes are. But we certainly are not saying that they can't change.

2F: Although we cannot measure and gauge the change in men's beliefs, it does not

mean that we must not challenge those beliefs. Beliefs can be challenged…We hope they get it but we don‘t know.

1F: …it‘s not even fair to expect these men to do stuff that we‘re not expecting men outside of this classroom to do…So therefore, …we understand that once they walk outside of this room everything stays status quo…

So our expectations have to be very real. But what does happen in these classrooms is that we do see men take risks and they challenge the other men in the class…

Extent of change in the men‘s beliefs in study classes?

2F: We can only gauge participation and dialogue in the classroom; not actual change.

2M: We can gauge whether they‘ve been receptive and retained the information. We sense that there is some retention of the information because a few sessions later they discuss and make points based on information imparted in previous sessions, but we don‘t know how they integrate it into their relationship dynamic.

1M: I wouldn‘t necessarily say it changed their beliefs, because, again, we don‘t know who is changing and who is not. What I will say … is that men do become more aware of some of these things in their lives. You know, like, maybe a man due to his time in the program, especially under the child-focused curriculum, realized that, —Wow, I myself experienced this as a child and here I am putting that forward in my own relationship and my child is experiencing it.“ So it creates an awareness for him. Now will that make him change? We don‘t know. Because they‘ll still leave here and be angry with her about everything that he claims is going on in their relationship that‘s her fault. It‘s not until, again, he makes a personal choice outside of this room or inside of this room or throughout his daily day to make changes in his life that he can really make changes about. We won‘t know who that is.

What were the obstacles to adhering to each curriculum?

2M: …not having ample time. 2F: We have a dialogue and it takes time to process what we‘re saying.

1M: there weren‘t that many obstacles. Just…for the most part, because men don‘t understand how their violence and how they‘re abusiveness affects the children, because for a lot of them, you know, they‘ve never felt they‘ve abused their child in any way, from what they know abuse to be. But they don‘t understand that even the emotional climate that they‘re creating at home affects their children. And when they start seeing that in some of the activities and some of the lessons that we‘ve brought in, you could see a little difference in how they approach looking at their violence and how that may have affected the entire family as a whole.

Were they more receptive to any particular topics in the child-focused curriculum?

2F: They were receptive to visitation and respectful parenting. 1M: I think one of the exercises in particular was when we had them sit in a room and forget who they are for the moment, and think of themselves as their child sitting in a room, speaking to a counselor based on what's going on at home. And some of the things that their children may have been experiencing. Some of the warning signs that they themselves saw in their children but only recognized it today because they're able to process it in a different way here in these classes.

1F: That exercise is a particularly very powerful one…No matter how much, you know, how they come in with their guards up or how angry they are, we start talking about children and for the most part they seem to lower their guard, their defenses, much quicker and they're more transparent. They'll become more transparent in the [make-believe] room for their children, when talking about their children as opposed to talking about their partner, or their wife or a woman.

Why do you think that happens?

1M: …I think that most men who come to the program always think about what's beneficial for their children and kind of let their guard down.

1F: ...it's okay to be angry at women…But child abuse is looked at differently in our society...

What aspects of the child-focused curriculum helped…

1M: I think the "House of Abuse' helped also, looking at it from a child's perspective. In the sense that traditionally we do the house…where they have to look at their behavior. But the way we did the house in this curriculum, not only did they have to look at their behavior, but they had to look at the impact of their behavior on their children, which is a deeper look into what exactly happened and who is affected by it. And I think that kind of captures them because they see… —I also have to be responsible and accountable to my child in the process." That made, I think, a big impact in the sense that the accountability factor is not only towards me changing my behavior but me having the ability as a parent to have conversations that I may not want to have with my child, based on my behavior.

1F: …but we also gave them ideas to think that they could change, and how they could be more responsible parents. So it's not just taking things away by showing them how they're hurting their children but giving them something on how you can repair it.

I was going to ask you if they don't feel hopeless that the damage is already done?

1M: And that's what I think the child-focused curriculum did. That at the same time that it brought accountability to the table at all times, it also provided them with, —Okay, it's not that I don't know what to do, I'm given tools now and what I do with those tools is really up to me, now that I'm examining my behavior and I see how I'm affecting my child œ how am I going to use what I know now, what I know today, what I overlooked before, and how am I going to use that to help my

child?“ And a lot of men were interested in that.

1F: For the most part, I think, almost 100% of the men, we asked them: —What do you want for your child?“ and they all wanted better than what they had. So that‘s the starting point. If you want better than —me,“ then look at what you‘re doing and how you‘re not making it better and how you can make it better.

What about visitation and respectful parenting…?

1M: You can see a lot of them dislike the system for what they‘re currently going through. They don‘t see the positives or maybe how the system could help with their children œ as long as they are open and respectful and not abusive.

1F: I think that a lot of times when visitation came up in the classroom the men felt like they were the victim because usually the children stay with the mother œ that‘s usually the case. Some of them feel very different about that because now they don‘t have their wife and they don‘t have the children and they‘re not at the home anymore…But a lot of times you‘re talking to men of color and they are not accustomed to …going [to court] and asking for it [visitation rights], you know, whether it‘s something that they may have a right to.

But we‘re saying that, once you get that [court-ordered visits], what are you going to do with that? Are you going to use it as a manipulation?…Because we don‘t want to set women up and children up where we are giving them the information to be able to use that more manipulatively.

1M: …”You know, if you weren‘t in the picture, who would you want your child with?‘ Absolutely they would want that woman with that child…. —I can‘t say that she‘s not fit to be the mother of my children when one of the reasons why I got into a relationship with her was because I thought she was a loving person and a person that I would love to have children with.“ And then they would have to look at that.

How different did the partner-focused and child-focused curriculums end up being?

2M: The difference was more in the fact that in the child-focused curriculum there was
a tendency for them not to feel that we were bashing them. They were conscious that we were targeting their parenting abilities, and so they did not feel they were

being held accountable. The child-focused curriculum was more directed towards parenting abilities than accountability.

Were there any particular exercises in the child-focused curriculum that engaged the men, and exercises they resisted?

2F: —Boundaries: You, Me, Us“ is one that they do not get…They don‘t quite get

the difference between corporal punishment versus time-out… A lot of them believe in corporal punishment.

How about changes in their beliefs regarding the impact of children's exposure to violence?

2M: They don't get that. They continue to believe they can be abusive and still be good parents.

2F: They struggle with the issue of exposure to violence. 2M: We teach them that even if the child is not in the room, the fact that their mother is abused means that she may not be completely able to attend to them and shower them with all her love and care. They struggle with the concept that if the primary giver, meaning the victim, is impacted then the children will be impacted as well.

They don't get that**.** If the victim is affected then the whole family is affected.

2F: A lot of them think they are the primary parent.

1M: …we can have a guy sitting in this room and say everything he's supposed to say the right way or how he thinks we want to hear it and you know it only becomes a different type of tool or tactic that he uses to manipulate every situation. Or he can be the guy that is honest in saying "I want to change,' "I want to do this.' But we don't know who that guy is. We don't know who he is when he goes home. So we really can't answer that.

Your opinions of our study hypothesis that the child-focused curriculum would engage the men more than the partner-focused curriculum?

2M: They are engaged in the child-focused curriculum. They embrace it. They listen.

2F: They struggle to understand it, but they end up not getting it.

1M: I think, for me, I think that both curriculums are engaging. It's how you as a facilitator engage your audience and how you bring them information and process information. And really make them feel like they're a part of the process.

Would you say that in most of the issues, their response to the child-focused curriculum is mixed? Or are they receptive?

1M: I would say they're receptive to hearing the information. But we don't know if they're receptive to making the changes based on the information they get. But they're more receptive to hearing it.

1F: Definitely, I agree.

What's the indication that they're hearing it? What happens in the traditional curriculum that doesn't happen in the child-

focused curriculum?

1F: They're not giving excuses. They're hearing it…you see acknowledgement. It's not like they're giving us applause but you see a difference in the room.

1M: Or maybe you'll hear them say something like, you know: "but, I didn't know I was doing anything wrong when I sent him to his room to start the argument.' Or, "You know, when we argued and we sent him to grandma's house, we didn't know that he was still being affected by coming back home and seeing things differently.' And again it speaks to that emotional climate that I think we did a good job at always keeping for them in focus that you create an emotional climate in your home. You know, even if you believe you're being a responsible parent and not arguing in front of your children or being abusive in front of your children that they still feel the effects.

1F: And, I think what you're asking is how would we tell. Like when we have the regular partner-focused sometimes you just get excuses. But here you really hear them challenging themselves like —I didn't know that." Oh it's like, —Wow, yeah, maybe you're right." And then you'll also hear them talk about their own childhood, —I remember damn, I used to be pissed at my father."… So that's the stuff you hear that you don't hear in the partner-focused. You hear those things.

Can you talk about what parts of the child-focused curriculum you integrated into the partner-focused?

1M: We were good at separating. Because that's the only way we can tell how the curriculums are different. What works and what didn't work. So we're very careful with that.

What do you find more effective…

1M: I think they're one and the same. 2M: But what is the alternative? Incarceration or nothing. Men in general, and these men in particular, would not have this dialogue, and not have this venue to explore such beliefs.