

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

Document Title: Test of the Efficacy of Court-Mandated Counseling for Domestic Violence Offenders: The Broward Experiment

Author(s): Lynette Feder ; David R. Forde

Document No.: 184752

Date Received: October 4, 2000

Award Number: 96-WT-NX-0008

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

PROPERTY OF
National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)
Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20849-6000

184752

**A Test of the Efficacy of Court-Mandated Counseling for
Domestic Violence Offenders:
The Broward Experiment**

Lynette Feder
University of Memphis
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
405 Mitchell Hall
Memphis, TN 38152
PHN (901) 678-8155
lfeder@memphis.edu

David R. Forde
University of Memphis
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
405 Mitchell Hall
Memphis, TN 38152
PHN (901) 678-5733
drforde@memphis.edu

**National Institute of Justice
Grant NIJ-96-WT-NX-0008
Final Report
6/20/00**

The Broward Experiment Table of contents

Chapter One		
Historical Overview		1
Chapter Two		
Evaluation of Spouse Abuse Abatement Programs		10
Chapter Three		
Research Methodology		42
Chapter Four		
Experimental Integrity		54
Chapter Five		
Results		72
Chapter Six		
The Environment in Which Experiment Took Place and Its Limitations		116
Chapter Seven		
Discussion and Implications		132
Bibliography		150
Appendix One		
County & State Certification for Batterers' Intervention Programs		
Appendix Two		
Survey Instruments		
Appendix Three		
Judges' Court Order Ordering Random Assignment		

Acknowledgements

It has been a pleasure to work with two fine judges, Judges Geoffrey Cohen and Alfred Horowitz, who supported this project because of their commitment to victims of domestic violence. Debts of gratitude also go to Drs. Robert Boruch and Lawrence Sherman for their encouragement, support and advice. The study was fortunate to enlist the aid of some wonderful research assistants. (Thank you Dulce Guitierrez, Cassandra Harmon, Chelsea Marder, Deborah Rothmond, Linda Ryan and Laurie Shultz.) In addition, our contact person from National Institute of Justice, Mr. Bernie Auchter, showed great patience throughout the many ups and downs that this study presented. Finally, this study would not have been possible without the many victims who agreed to speak with us both candidly and at length. We hope this study repays their efforts if only in a small way.

Abstract

The study investigated the effectiveness of court-mandated counseling in reducing repeat violence amongst men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence. A classical experimental design was used whereby all male defendants convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence in Broward County Courthouse between May 1 and September 30, 1997 (N=404) were randomly assigned into either experimental (one year probation and 6 months court-mandated counseling) or control (one year probation only) conditions. The study followed these individuals for 12 months in the community. Information was provided through offender self-reports, victim reports and official measures on minor and severe abuse, violations of probation and rearrests. We analyzed the data in terms of both *Treatment Assigned* (assigned treatment versus no-treatment groups) as well as *Treatment Received* (since a man could be assigned to treatment and not go or, alternately, not be assigned to counseling and go).

Findings indicate no significant differences between the experimental and control groups in their attitudes, beliefs and behaviors regarding domestic violence. The experimental and control groups are equally likely to engage in both minor and severe partner abuse according to offender self-reports and victim reports. Furthermore, no significant differences maintained between the two groups in official measures of recidivism such as violations of probation (VOP) and rearrests. While no differences were found, a closer look revealed that completing the batterers' program lessened the likelihood of VOPs and rearrests for both those in the experimental and control conditions. However, this gain was offset by the increased likelihood of violation of probation and arrests that were associated with assignment into the counseling group.

CHAPTER ONE

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Domestic violence is defined as assaultive behavior involving adults who are married, cohabitating, or who have an ongoing or prior intimate relationship (Goolkasian, 1986). As the literature all too amply indicates, violence against women has a long tradition in western civilization (Cromwell and Burgess, 1996; Davidson 1977). Unfortunately, this practice continues today. Based upon crimes reported to the police in 1996, the FBI indicates that 30% of all female victims of murders were slain by their husbands, ex-husbands or boyfriends (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1998).

However, these numbers greatly undercount the true extent of domestic violence since most domestic violence victimizations are never reported to the police (Berk, Berk, and Newton, 1984; Dutton, 1987; Hirschel, Hutchison and Dean, 1992). The National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) uses a national sample of households in America to gather data on criminal victimization regardless of whether the event came to the police's attention. NCVS estimates indicated that in 1996 there were about one million rapes, sexual assaults, robberies, aggravated assaults and simple assaults in which the victim and the offender had an intimate relationship (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1998).

Until recently, NCVS was described to respondents as a "crime" survey. Therefore, individuals may not have answered affirmatively because they did not view victimization happening at the hands of an intimate as a crime. To avoid this problem, Straus and his colleagues surveyed a representative sample of couples within the United States asking them ways in which they resolved disputes. Their survey indicated that approximately 8.7

million domestic assaults occurred yearly (Gelles and Straus, 1985: 29). This equates to 16% of cohabiting couples in the United States being involved in one or more incidents of domestic violence yearly (Straus, 1991). Additionally, results from the National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAW), based upon a nationally representative telephone survey of men and women, found women significantly more likely than men to be at risk of intimate partner violence (Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998). In comparison to the above FBI statistics on homicide, the NVAW found that 76% of all women who were raped and/or physically assaulted reported that the assailant was a current or former husband, partner or boyfriend (Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998).

These numbers demonstrate the extent of this problem in terms of both the amount and severity of violence that women face. Additionally, research indicates that women who have been victims of domestic violence are at greater risk of future violence (Hilberman, 1980; Hirschel and Hutchinson, 1992; Langan and Innes, 1986). The cost to society is enormous. Domestic crime accounts for almost 15% of the total crime costs -- about \$67 billion per year (Miller, Cohen and Wiersema, 1996). Note also that this estimate does not include the effect on the children living in these families. The results from national studies demonstrating that violent homes produce violent adults thereby continuing this "cycle of violence" speak even more forcefully to the importance of finding meaningful interventions (Brisson, 1981; Dutton, 1988; Widom, 1992).

One of the earliest societal responses to domestic violence was the development of shelters for women who were battered (Johnson and Kanzler, 1993). Ironically, the idea of counseling men developed directly out of the women's shelter movement. The first shelter for battered women opened in the London suburb of Cheswick in 1971. In 1976,

they founded the "Men's Aid House" as a support facility for battering men (Jennings, 1987).

Though the first program started in England, domestic violence shelters quickly spread to the United States (Jennings, 1987) with spouse abuse abatement programs (SAAPs) following a similar pattern in the US. Specifically, they were started in direct response to requests from female advocates working with battered women at shelters in the late 1970s (Adams and McCormick, 1982; Gondolf, 1997; Jennings, 1987). These programs were founded upon a two-fold realization: (1) that a large percentage of abused women returned to their abusive partners (Gondolf, 1987; Hamberger and Hastings, 1993; Snyder and Scheer, 1981); and (2) even where separation occurred, these men typically continued their abusive patterns with a different partner (Gondolf, 1987; Farley and Magill, 1988). The conclusion seemed clear: the only way to stop the cycle of violence was to change the behavior of the abuser (Feazell, Mayers and Deschner, 1984).

In 1977 at the request of women working with battered women in the local shelters in Boston, a group of men joined together to form Project Emerge. This collective worked with men who were abusive to their partners through a combination of consciousness-raising and peer self-help (Adams and McCormick, 1982; Johnson and Kanzler, 1993). Innovative programs to treat battering men continued to develop independently at various sites across the country each offering something new and distinct. For instance, the Stop Abuse by Males (SAM) was created in Champaign, Illinois in 1978. This program was unique in that the administrators were former batterers themselves (Jennings, 1987). The Abusive Men Exploring New Directions (AMEND) was established in Denver and the Domestic Violence Program (DVP) in Massachusetts, both using structured psycho-

educational sessions followed by supportive group counseling (Jennings, 1987; Saunders, 1996).

By January 1981, a national survey of treatment programs for batterers revealed that there were over 80 programs throughout the United States offering intervention services for violent men (Roberts, 1982). By 1985, another national survey of treatment programs for men who batter identified more than 200 programs nationwide (Roberts, 1982). But by far the greatest growth in these programs was brought about by the rise in pro-arrest laws in the late 1980s (Hotaling and Sugarman, 1986; Gondolf, 1997; Johnson and Kanzler, 1993). With increasing numbers of jurisdictions presuming or mandating arrest for misdemeanor domestic violence, growing numbers of men were being prosecuted and subsequently convicted. As police increased their rates of arrest for domestic violent offenses (Dutton and McGregor, 1991; Feder, 1997), pressure was placed on courts to deal with these offenders (Chen, Bersani, Myers and Denton, 1989; Ford and Regoli, 1993; Pence, 1983).

At the same time, this client population was proving difficult to work with, evidencing high rates of attrition (DeMaris, 1989; Gondolf, 1991). Court-mandated counseling was therefore viewed as one method to ensure greater compliance when treating this population (Dutton, 1984; Hamberger and Hastings, 1988; Gondolf, 1991). Mandating counseling was also viewed as beneficial to the court. Specifically, it furnished them with an appropriate alternative to the sanction of incarceration for domestic violence offenders (Dutton, 1984; Dutton and McGregor, 1991; Harrell, 1991). This was especially important given the premium placed on jail and prison beds during this time of extensive overcrowding. Additionally, given overloaded court dockets, mandated counseling offered

the promise of shortening court proceedings (Gondolf, 1991). Court-mandated counseling was also believed to add to the deterrent effects of arrest (Dutton, 1986). And all of this was done while holding out the hope of changing the behavior of domestic violence offenders and in that way ending the cycle of violence (Farley and Magill, 1988; Gondolf, 1987).

In 1980, California was the first state to mandate counseling for men convicted of domestic violence (Johnson and Kanzler, 1993; Sonkin, 1988). But jurisdictions all over the country turned to this method as pro-arrest laws put increasing numbers of batterers into the criminal justice system throughout the late 1980s (Davis, Taylor and Maxwell, 1999; Gondolf, 1997; Healey, Smith and O'Sullivan, 1998; Sonkin, 1988). And with the increase in the number of jurisdictions mandating counseling for men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence, there was an increase in the number of spouse abuse abatement programs nationally. A recent survey of SAAPs nationally found that 80% of men in these programs attended because they were court-mandated to do so (Healey, Smith and O'Sullivan, 1998).

Since the earliest programs dealing with batterers grew directly out of the women's shelter movement, it is not surprising that they borrowed heavily from this feminist orientation. In 1985, a national survey of batterers' interventions found that 81% of responding programs listed changing the batterers' attitudes about traditional sex roles as one of their goals (Pirog-Good and Stets-Kealey, 1985). However, over time, the structure and processes used to deliver this message changed. These unstructured consciousness-raising groups were eventually replaced by more structured groups using cognitive behavioral techniques. Still, all of this was done within a feminist context

(Gondolf, 1997; Healey et al., 1998; Jennings, 1987). Typically, the various programs encouraged men to confront their sexist beliefs and accept responsibility for their past abuse, while teaching them alternative behaviors and reactions (e.g., anger management, assertiveness, relaxation techniques and communication skills) (Davis et al., 1999; Jennings, 1987).

The most popular of these feminist cognitive psycho-educational approaches is the Domestic Abuse Intervention Project (DAIP) out of Duluth, Minnesota (Davis et al., 1999). Referred to simply as the Duluth Model, it developed around an understanding of how battering is part of a range of male behaviors used to control women. According to Healey and her colleagues, "The curriculum is taught in classes that emphasize the development of critical thinking skills around eight themes: (1) nonviolence; (2) non-threatening behavior; (3) respect; (4) support and trust; (5) honesty and accountability; (6) sexual respect; (7) partnership; and (8) negotiation and fairness " (Healey et al., 1998: 47). And all of this is done within a context that recognizes battering as a problem that must be met by a broader coordinated community response.

What has not been settled is whether these programs lead to changes in a batterer's attitudes and, if so, whether this then translates to changes in his behavior (Shepard, 1991; Harrell, 1991). Speaking about the field's current treatment of choice (e.g., a structured cognitive behavioral approach), Jennings has noted the harm that accrues from the field's heavy emphasis on these specific types of programs. "First, premature closure on this topic may be potentially harmful and delimiting. Second, there is a severe lack of empirical evidence, especially controlled therapy outcome studies, in support of current assertions regarding the most effective therapeutic approach with

batterers. . . . On the contrary, it is important to be flexible and open to new ideas at this early exploratory stage in the field" (Jennings, 1987: 194).

But the question of the effectiveness of interventions can be equally applied to programs other than the Duluth Model. As the National Research Council has noted, "The urgency and magnitude of the problem of family violence have caused policy makers, service providers, and advocates to take action in the absence of scientific knowledge that could inform policy and practice" (Chalk and King, 1998:2).

Soon after spouse abuse abatement programs began appearing, studies evaluating their efficacy began surfacing. In this first wave of evaluation research, the results indicated suspiciously high rates of success in reducing the frequency and/or severity of subsequent violence amongst this offender population (Deschner and McNeil, 1986; Neidig, Friedman and Collins, 1985; Rosenfeld, 1992). A number of researchers have since noted that these findings more reflected the methodological shortcomings inherent in these studies rather than the programs' actual efficacy in reducing violence (Chen et al., 1989; Ford and Regoli, 1993; Gondolf, 1987). These deficiencies included small sample sizes (and therefore lower power), failure to study the total population to be evaluated (as opposed to only those who complete the program), failure to use random assignment to treatment, lack of appropriate comparison groups, inadequate or variable specification of the primary outcome measures, use of unreliable measures or questionable sources of data to measure treatment outcome, use of inadequate follow-up intervals, and failure to control for the batterer's accessibility to the victim when computing the "success" of the intervention (Hamberger and Hastings, 1993; Harrell, 1991; Tolman and Bennett, 1990).

This led one prominent team of researchers to lament, "After reviewing much of the research literature, what do we 'know' about the short and long-term effects of treatment on wife assault? The answer, unfortunately, is 'not much'. . . We cannot confidently say whether 'Treatment works.' We should be well beyond that question, asking instead, 'What treatment works best on which types of client and under what conditions?' " (Hamberger and Hastings, 1993: 220). And, as Klein has astutely noted, "After dealing with hundreds of batterers on probation for more than a decade, I have strong opinions on batterers treatment. I am a firm agnostic. . . . Remember, batterers treatment was adopted not because there was any evidence it worked, but because police, prosecutors and judges refused, in effect, to proceed against batterers unless there was some place to put them after arrest, prosecution and sentencing. . . . The criminal justice system didn't move against drunk drivers until development of drunk-driver education programs provided a place to send them after conviction. Like batterers treatment, there was no evidence these programs worked. Nevertheless, they were adopted with enthusiasm in almost every state" (Klein, 1997: 1).

As more communities are called upon to develop coordinated responses to the problem of domestic violence we will most likely see a continued increase in the number of court-mandated treatment programs (Chen et al., 1989). Evaluation of these programs, therefore, becomes increasingly important. The possibility that these interventions may not only be ineffective in reducing violence but may provide a disservice to victims must be considered. To continue mandating counseling for convicted abusers necessarily means that limited resources will be diverted away from alternative programs for battered women and their children (Gondolf, 1987; Tolman and Bennett, 1990). And, even more

problematic, is the possibility that ineffective treatment may be more dangerous for the victim than no treatment at all. Specifically, research indicates that the most influential predictor of an abused spouse's return to her husband is his participation in counseling (Feazell, Mayers, and Deschner, 1984; Gondolf, 1987). However, if treatment is essentially ineffective in decreasing recidivism than we may inadvertently be providing these victims with a false sense of security which, in the end, may lead to a higher likelihood of future injury (Harrell, 1991; Hamberger and Hastings, 1993).

There is no doubt that there is a "tremendous sense of urgency and alarm in the treatment of domestic violence - and rightly so. After all, protecting the physical and emotional safety of women and their children is the first priority. Consequently, clinicians feel a primary obligation to "do something" immediately and decisively to halt and prevent violence" (Jennings, 1987: 204). But as the above has indicated, doing something may not help and may even harm. Therefore, we need to be guided by rigorous research in helping us set our course. As Saunders (1988) has so elegantly written, "One source of tension seems to arise from the simple fact that social action usually means immediate action, whereas the knowledge gained from science takes a long time to acquire.. Yet action that is not well informed can be less than optimal, ineffective, or worse, counter-productive. Movements for social justice, then, need to use the scientific search for truth as a guide" (Saunders, 1988: 92).

CHAPTER TWO

EVALUATIONS OF SPOUSE ABUSE ABATEMENT PROGRAMS

Does mandating treatment for batterers reduce the future likelihood of violent reoccurrences among this population? As noted previously, a plethora of studies have investigated this question. Some surveyed the batterers' programs asking them to provide their overall rate of "treatment failure". In one survey, the 90 treatment programs responding reported that 25% to 34% of their couples experienced repeated violence one year after counseling (Feazell et al., 1984). A second and later survey of treatment programs indicated a recidivism rate of 16% over a four-month period for the 59 treatment programs responding (Pirog-Good, and Stets-Kealey, 1985).

Given the problems with the validity of this type of survey research to answer the question of program efficacy, we instead turn our attention to evaluations that investigate the effectiveness of a specific program using precise outcomes. Undoubtedly, there are a large number of studies measuring batterers pre- and post- an intervention (see for instance Deschner and McNeil, 1986; Farley and Magill, 1988; Saunders and Hanusa, 1986). These use a wide variety of non- behavioral outcome measures (e.g., those assessing marital satisfaction, social functioning, depression, and attitudes toward women). These studies are listed in Table One. It is difficult to assess program efficacy using these studies because of the wide variety of (other than behavioral) outcome measures used.

Fortunately, there are a sizable number of studies speaking to the efficacy of court-mandated counseling for men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence using

Table One
Pre-Experimental Design
One Group Pre- and Post-Test on Non-Behavioral Outcomes

Study	Treatment Typed	Population Frame	Sample Size/ # in Study	Reason for Difference	Client Type	Information Source	Criteria	Length of Follow-Up	Non-Behavioral Outcomes
Deschner & McNeil, 1986	Anger control training for couples	Men & women attending 4 or more sessions	82/69	Where usable data provided	Self-referred for spouse or child abuse	Self-reports	Subjects rate themselves on anger, depression and likelihood to aggress	4 mths to 1 year after completing tx	Subjects reported being less angry & depressed. Only 15% said they used violence.
Farley & McGill, 1988	NIP	All men attending 12 SAAP sessions and attending follow-up	17/17	N/A	Self-referred	Self-reports	Pre- and post-testing on Heimler Scale of Social Functioning	NIP	Post-test revealed normal functioning as per HSSF
Lindquist, Feesenden & Taylor, 1983*	Cognitive behavioral for couples	Mild to moderate abusive couples who completed SAAP	8/8	N/A	Self and court-referred	Batterers Victims	Shortened Marital Adjustment Test	6 weeks	Couples were significantly < angry and jealous and significantly > assertive
Rynerson & Fishel, 1993	Cognitive behavioral for couples	All men and some of the women who agreed to participate in SAAP	85/53	Not all men completed post-test	Self-referred	Self-reports	Newicki-Strickland Locus of Control Dyadic Adjustment Scale	NIP	Improvement in both male batterers and female victim scores
Saunders & Hanusa, 1986	Cognitive Behavioral	Men who completed tx program	NIP/92	N/A	Self, agency or court referred	Pre- & post-test scores from men	Anger Toward Partner, Work/Friend Male Threat From Female Competence Beck Depression Inventory Attitudes Towards Women Jealousy Scale	NIP	Significant differences between pre- and post-test

NA Not Applicable
 NIP No Information Provided
 * Reports a sister study

behavioral outcomes. The large number of studies in this area requires a method for organizing these studies and their results. This is because, as Sherman and his colleagues have noted, not all study results should be given equal weight (Sherman, Gottfredson, MacKenzie, Eck, Reuter and Bushway, 1997). Instead, some studies use more rigorous research methodology and, therefore, their results should be given greater weight when making policy determinations.

The National Research Council (NRC) spoke of a hierarchy of study designs when they evaluated intervention programs in family violence. They organized all studies in terms of those using pre-experimental designs, quasi-experimental designs and experimental designs (Chalk and King, 1998). The more rigorous research designs allow for greater confidence in the validity of the results observed and their generalizability to the larger population. As noted by many, the classical Experimental Design, with random assignment to experimental and control groups, provides the most rigorous test of an intervention (Berk, Boruch, Chambers, Rossi and Witte, 1985; Chalk and King, 1998; Farrington, 1983). Therefore, all other things equal, findings from experiments should be given greater weight than those from lower level designs.

We will borrow from the NRC's typology. To further clarify, quasi-experimental designs will be split into those that use non-equivalent control groups and those with matched control groups. Therefore, all studies assessing the efficacy of treatment for men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence shall be organized and discussed in one of the following four study designs:

Table Two: Pre-Experimental Design

Table Three: Quasi-Experimental Design/Non-Equivalent Control Group

Table Four: Quasi-Experimental Design/Matched Control Group

Table Five: Experimental Design

Tables Two through Five correspond to each of these categories of design. A few things must be noted about the studies and how they have been listed. First, some authors note that they have used one type of research methodology but then only present partial information. For instance, Edleson and his colleagues note that they used a pre- and post-test design but then only provide data on the post-test (Edleson, Miller, Stone and Chapman, 1985). In such situations, we organized according to the information provided. Additionally, many studies omit important information such as the population frame used, the client type, the information source for assessing outcome and even the specific outcome used. This information, therefore, is provided where possible. However, if it is not found in the original report, it is not inferred. Another common omission is the failure to provide whether observed differences are statistically significant. Again, the authors report what is provided in these reports and note where the information is missing. Finally, some studies have multiple listings in one table (see for instance Edleson and Grusznski, 1988; Gondolf, 1998) or are listed in two tables (see Lindquist, Fessenden-Telch, and Taylor, 1983; Shupe, Stacey and Hazlewood, 1987). This was necessary where one study reported nested studies using different comparison groups or methodologies.

Two things are immediately apparent when looking through these four tables. First is the very large amount of missing information that is fundamental to interpreting what these results mean. This speaks to Boruch's (1997) call for the need to report basic information in evaluation research. Interestingly, the amount of missing information decreases as researchers use more rigorous research methodology. Also, of note, there clearly is a negative relationship between rigor of research and the number of studies falling under each category. Clearly, these tables show that most studies have used less rigorous methods.

Pre-Experimental Design

Results from non-experimental studies are thought to be the least persuasive because we cannot infer that changes in respondents are due to the introduction of the experimental stimulus. All fourteen studies listed in Table Two would be labeled the One Shot Case Study (Campbell and Stanley, 1963). Each study measures respondents' standing on the dependent variable (reoccurrence of violence) after applying the experimental intervention (batterers' treatment). All these studies assessed the efficacy of the cognitive behavioral approach. Most applied this intervention only to the batterer. Some, however, used a cognitive behavioral approach when counseling the couple (see for instance Deschner, McNeil and Moore, 1986; Harris, 1986; Neidig, Friedman and Collins, 1985). The sample size used in these studies is typically small (not unusually in the single digits) though a few use samples of 100 and more (see Johnson and Kanzler, 1993; Shupe et al., 1987). While one study failed to note the client source (Deschner,

McNeil and Moore, 1986), four other studies use mostly (Rosenbaum, 1986) or exclusively (Edleson et al., 1985; Farley and Magill, 1988; Rynerson and Fishel, 1993) self-referred clients. All others used court-referred and/or court and self-referred clients. Where noted, the length of follow-up varies from 6 weeks to 5 years. In a similar manner, there is wide variation in the outcome used to assess the treatment's efficacy.

Some studies in Table Two used additional police contacts, victim reports of threats or reoccurring minor or severe violence, or batterers' self-reports of violence or abuse as their operationalization of treatment failure. Surprisingly, three studies do not note the criteria used to assess treatment success or failure (Edelson and Syers, 1991; Harris, 1986; Neidig, Friedman and Collins, 1985). While one study (Harris, 1986) fails to note the source of information on the outcome variable, another four studies use batterers' self-report to measure repeat violence (see Beninati, 1989; Demaris and Jackson, 1987; Edleson et al., 1985; Rosenbaum, 1986). One study uses official records exclusively (see Shepard, 1992) and three use victims' reports (Edleson and Grusznski, 1988; Johnson and Kanzler, 1993; Tolman and Gauri, 1991). The remaining studies use some combination of batterer self-report, victim report and official measures (Deschner, McNeil and Moore, 1986; Edelson and Syers, 1991; Lindquist et al., 1983; Neidig, Friedman and Collins, 1985; Shupe et al., 1987). These studies find a rate of recidivism (however measured in the study) varying from a low of 7% (Johnson and Kanzler, 1993) to a high of 100% (Lindquist et al., 1983). The recidivism rate weighted by sample size provides an average rate of 21% of the batterers "failing" (as variously defined) for these fourteen studies.

**Table Two
Pre-Experimental Design
One Group Post-Test Only**

Study	Treatment Typed	Population Frame	Sample Size/ # in Study	Reason for Difference	Client Type	Information Source	Criteria	Length of Follow-Up	Outcome
Bennati, 1989	Cognitive Behavioral	Men accepted into program who completed it	16/9	NIP	Self and court-referred	Batterer	New violence	NIP	19% recidivate
DeMaris & Jackson, 1987	Cognitive Behavioral	Of 550 men, those 312 with complete addresses	312/53	Mail survey with 17% response rate	Self and court-referred	Batterer	Modified Straus Conflict Tactics Scale	NIP	35% self-reported repeat violence
Deschner, McNeil & Moore, 1986	Cognitive Behavioral for couples	Couples who completed program and who had addresses	28/15	Did not respond to mail survey	NIP	Batterer	Minor and severe physical incidents	8 mths	33% minor violence 13% severe violence
Edleson, Miller, Stone & Chapman, 1985	Cognitive Behavioral/ Psycho-educational	Men who completed program	9/9	N/A	Self-referred	Batterer	Men self-report physical battering	7 to 21 weeks	22% recidivism
Edleson & Grusznski, 1988	Cognitive Behavioral	Men who completed program	86/42	Where info available through victims	Self, agency & court referrals	Victims	Direct or severe violence (excludes threats w/o violence)	9 mths post-treatment completion	33% recidivated
Edleson & Syers, 1991	Cognitive Behavioral	Men who completed program	153/70	Others could not be located	Self and court-referred	Mostly victim, but batterer in 9%	NIP	18 mths	33% violence 80% continued threatening

Harris, 1986	Cognitive Behavioral for Couples	Of 200 couples who completed program, 40 selected and 30 available for follow-up	200/30	Selected to study diff tx types. Then 25% not available for follow-up	NIP	NIP	NIP	2 mths to 3 yrs	27% labeled treatment failures
Johnson & Kanzler, 1993	Cognitive Behavioral	First time DV offenders who completed program where victim could be reached	687/485	Could not locate the women	Court-referred	Victim	Further abuse	NIP	7% abuse
Lindquist et al., 1983	Cognitive Behavioral for couples	Mild to moderate abusive couples who complete program	8/8	N/A	Self-referred	Batterer	Physical threats or violence	6 wks to 5 mths	50% recidivism at 6 wks 100% recidivism at 6 mths
Nedig, Friedman & Collins, 1985	Couple Counseling	NIP	100+/NIP	NIP	Mandated by Marine Corps	Batterer Victim Official	NIP	NIP	23% recidivated
Rosenbaum, 1986	Psycho-educational Group	Men completing all 4 workshops	12/9	Follow-up info only available for 9 men	"Most" self-referred	Batterer	"Recurrence of violence"	6 to 18 mths	11% self-reported repeat violence
Shepard, 1992	Cognitive Behavioral	Men who had contact with program during 3 mth pd of time	NIP/100	NIP	Court-Mandated	Official	Police contacts and/or convictions for DV, orders for protection	5 years	40% recidivated 22% convicted for DV
Shupe, Stacer & Hazelwood, 1987	Cognitive Behavioral	All men who entered and completed program who were located	7/102	N/A	Self and court-referred	Batterer	NIP	NIP	16% of offenders self-report violence 30% of victims report violence
Tolman & Gauri, 1991	Cognitive Behavioral	All men completing program where woman could be found	99/53	Could not locate women	Self and court-referred	Victim	Modified Straus Conflict Tactics Scale	NIP	41.5% physically aggressive

NA Not Applicable
 NIP No Information Provided
 * Reports a sister study

Quasi-Experimental Design - Non-Equivalent Control Group

This design introduces a control or comparison group to study the impact of the experimental stimulus in relation to a group that did not receive the intervention. The individuals are selected or self-select themselves into one or the other of the groups. The experimental group receives the intervention and the control group does not. All respondents are measured on the outcome post-intervention. Any differences in the two groups' performance are assumed to be due to the experimental intervention. As listed in Table Three, seven studies use this methodology. Again, most of these studies focus on a batterers' intervention program using a cognitive behavioral approach. The number of respondents included in these studies is typically larger than those in the Pre-Experimental Design. The smallest sample noted is 62 and the largest is 446. All of these studies follow court-referred and/or court and self-referred men (Dobash, Dobash, Cavanagh and Lewis, 1996; Dutton, Bodnarchuk, Kropp, Hart and Ogloff, 1997; Edleson and Grusznski, 1988; Hamberger and Hastings, 1988; Shupe et al., 1987; Syers and Edelson, 1992; Waldo, 1987). The length of follow-up of individuals ranges from 4 months (Dutton et al., 1997) to 11 years (Dutton et al., 1997). Regarding measurement tools, one study fails to list the source of outcome measurement (Waldo, 1987) and no study exclusively uses batterers as the source of information on outcomes. One study exclusively uses victim reports (Edleson and Grusznski, 1988) and another official measures (Dutton et al., 1997). The remaining studies use some combination of batterer self-reports, victim reports and official measures. The groups studied are typically comprised of program completers versus program dropouts from the batterer intervention

Table Three
Quasi-Experimental Design
Non-Equivalent Control Group Design

Study	Treatment Typed	Population Frame	Sample Size/ # in Study	Client Type	Comparison Groups	Criteria	Length of Follow-Up	Information Source	Outcome
Dobash, Dobash, Cavanagh & Lewis, 1996	Cognitive Behavioral	DV convictions/ Where it was possible to trace cases and sample	932/256	Court-referred	(1) Men convicted & sentenced to SAAP (2) Men convicted & given other than SAAP	Conviction for additional DV offense with same victim	12 mths	Official	(1) 7% recidivated (2) 10% recidivated (SNR)
Dutton, Bodnarchuk, Kropp, Hart & Ogloff, 1997	NIP	Men assessed for SAAP/Whose records could be located	518/446	Self and court-referred	(1) Men referred who never appeared for (2) Men referred & deemed inappropriate (3) Tx non-completers (4) Tx completers	Police arrests for assaults on women	4 mths to 11yrs	Official	(1) 230 per 1000 (2) 290 per 1000 (3) 500 per 1000 (4) 230 per 1000 (NSR)
Edleson & Grusznski, 1988	Cognitive Behavioral	Treatment (tx) completers and non-completers/Where offenders located	86/62	Self, agency and court-referred	(1) Tx completers (2) Tx non-completers	Her report of his use of violence	4.7 mths for completers 8.9 mths for non-completer	Victim	(1) 33% recidivated (2) 46% recidivated (S)
Edleson & Grusznski, 1988	Cognitive Behavioral	Treatment (tx) completers and random sample of non-completers/ Where victims located	159/121	Self, agency and court-referred	(1) Tx completers (2) Tx non-completers	Direct or severe violence excluding threats without violence	6-7 mths for completers 12 mths for non-completer	Victim	(1) 41% recidivated (2) 49% recidivated (NS)

Hamberger & Hastings, 1988	Cognitive Behavioral	Men completing 3 or more assessment sessions/Subjects not lost to follow-up	71/68	Self or court-referred	(1) Tx completers (2) Tx non-completers	Reporting on CTS anything more than pushing and up	1 year	Batterer Victim Official	(1) 28% recidivated (2) 47% recidivated (S)
Shupe, Stacey & Hazelwood, 1987	Cognitive Behavioral	All men entering 3 SAAPs/Those located who completed program	NIP/102	Court-referred	(1) Men who completed program (2) Men terminated from SAAP	NIP	NIP	Batterer	(1) 16% recidivated (2) 45% recidivated (SNR)
								Victim	(1) 16% recidivated (2) 45% recidivated (SNR)
Syers & Edleson, 1992	NIP	Men who had contract with police for domestic violence/Where victim located	358/196	Court-mandated	(1)Police Contacts-No Arrest (2)Arrest-No Court-Ordered Treatment (3)Arrest-Court-Mandated Counseling	Any source indicated additional act of violence against same victim	12 mths	Victim Official	(1) 39% recidivated (2) 45% recidivated (3) 43% recidivated (SNR)
Waldo, 1987	Psycho-educational	Men convicted of DV/NIP	NIP	Court-referred	(1) Men arrested for DV completing SAAP (2) Untreated men	NIP	12 mths	NIP	(1) 0% recidivated (2) 20% recidivated (SNR)

NA Not Applicable
 NIP No Information Provided
 • Reports a sister study
 (S) Findings Significant
 (NS) Findings Not Significant
 (SNR) Significance Not Reported

program (see for instance Edleson and Grusznski, 1988; Hamberger and Hastings, 1986). The comparison is therefore biased since it is based on self-selection.

However, some of these studies make comparisons between men convicted and court-mandated into counseling with those convicted and given an alternative sanction and/or rejected from battering counseling (see for instance Dobash et al., 1996; Shupe et al., 1987; Syers and Edelson, 1992; Waldo, 1987). Again, these studies have introduced bias since external sources have selected out those men deemed appropriate for the batterer treatment. One study uses a combination of men completing, dropping-out and being rejected from treatment (Dutton et al., 1997).

The recidivism rate weighted by sample size (excluding for measures on batterers' self-reported violence) is 36% for the experimental and 57% for the control group. However, taking these numbers as an indication of the effectiveness of spouse abuse abatement programs in reducing violence, while regularly done, is incorrect. The problem is that we cannot necessarily assume that the comparison group was comparable to the experimental group prior to the introduction of the intervention. Unless we know that the groups were comparable prior to the experimental stimulus (batterer treatment), then differences observed post-intervention may be due to the intervention itself or it may be due to the differences between the two groups prior to the introduction of the experimental stimulus.

For instance, a plethora of studies indicate that there are significant differences between batterers who complete treatment and those who dropout of treatment (Phillips, 1987; Saunders, 1995; Steer, 1983; Wierzbicki and Pekarik, 1993). Treatment non-completers are more likely to be young (Leigh, Ogborne and Cleland, 1984; Saunders and

Hanusa, 1986; Tolman and Bennett, 1990), unemployed (Grusznski, and Carrillo, 1988; Hamberger and Hastings, 1989; Pirog-Good and Stets, 1986), less educated (Hamberger and Hastings, 1993; Harrell, 1991; Saunders and Parker, 1989), have lower incomes (Cadsky, Hanson, Crawford and Lalonde, 1996; Demaris, 1989; Wierzbicki and Pekarik, 1993), less psychopathology (Cadsky et.al, 1996; Hamberger and Hastings, 1989) more prior criminal justice contacts (Demaris, 1989; Hamberger and Hastings, 1989; Steer, 1983) and more drug or alcohol problems (Demaris, 1989; Leigh et.al, 1984; Steer, 1983). It is interesting to note how similar these factors are to the correlates associated with spouse assault (see Edleson, Eisikovits and Guttman, 1985; Hotaling and Sugarman, 1986; Straus and Gelles, 1986) and the correlates associated with recidivism amongst domestic violence offenders (see Hamberger and Hastings, 1990; Shepard, 1992).

As Palmer and her colleagues stated, ". . . because attendance is a confounding variable; that is, since better attendance can be taken as an indication of higher motivation to change, even before treatment, differential recidivism could be attributed to previous differences in the men, rather than the treatment" (Palmer, Brown and Barrera, 1992: 277). And Cadsky and his colleagues have noted, "Given the similarity between the factors associated with attrition and with spouse assault itself, it is not surprising that the recidivism rates for men who drop out of treatment are higher than for treatment completers" (Cadsky et.al, 1996: 61).

In a similar manner, where judges assigned some men to the court-mandated counseling programs and others to some other sanction, we must ask ourselves whether the judges were reacting to differences between these individuals that affected who was court-mandated into counseling and who was given an alternative sanction (e.g., prison

time). It is imminently feasible that judges may decide that more serious and/or frequent domestic violence offenders, or those with alcohol or drug problems, may make poor candidates for court-mandated counseling. The few studies that have provided comparisons between those mandated into counseling versus those given an alternate disposition lend credence to this interpretation (see for instance Dobash et al., 1996; Dutton et al., 1997).

Therefore, this design leads to serious problems with internal validity. In other words, we may draw conclusions from the study's results that do not accurately reflect what has actually occurred in the study. In this case, we would incorrectly conclude that differences between the two groups post-intervention were due to the introduction of the experimental treatment rather than the fact that the groups were different from the study's inception. To guard against problems with internal validity, researchers sometimes match subjects so that they are then comparable prior to the introduction of the experimental stimulus.

Quasi-Experimental Design - Matched Control Group

In this design, the experimental group is provided with the intervention while it is withheld from the control group. However, to ensure that the two groups are comparable prior to the intervention, the control group is matched to the experimental group on factors thought to be associated with the dependent variable. As can be seen in Table Four, four studies were located using this design. All of these studies tested the efficacy of a cognitive behavioral batterer intervention to reduce future likelihood of repeat assault. The smallest study had a sample size of 100 (Dutton, 1986) and the largest had 840

(Gondolf, 1998). One used a combination of court and self-referred clients (Gondolf, 1998) while the other three exclusively used court-referred clients (Chen et al., 1989; Dutton, 1986; Harrell, 1991). The men were then followed in the community from 6 months (Dutton, 1986; Harrell, 1991) to 3 years (Dutton, 1986). Two studies used official measures exclusively (Chen et al., 1989; Dutton, 1986) and two used batterer self-reports, victim reports and official measures (Gondolf, 1998; Harrell, 1991). Each of the studies is described below.

Dutton, 1986: Fifty men who completed a spouse abuse abatement program were compared with 50 men who did not complete the program (due to dropping-out or rejection by the program administrators or probation). However, Dutton notes that the groups were similar in terms of variables related to demographics and prior criminality. Only 4% of the treatment completers had a police report of a repeat assault. In comparison, fully 40% of "comparable" treatment non-completers had one or more reports of assault. This difference was reported as significant.

Chen, Bersani, Myers and Denton, 1989: This study compared 120 men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence and court-mandated into counseling with 101 men similarly convicted but not mandated into counseling. Though the authors engage in a complex modeling equation to control for the effects of selection bias, no information is provided on how control subjects were "proportionately matched" to those in the experimental condition. Based on official measures, 5% of the treated group had subsequent domestic violence charges within the follow-up period versus 10% of the

**Table Four
Quasi-Experimental Design
Matched Control Group Design**

Study	Treatment Typed	Population Frame	Sample Size/ # in Study	Client Type	Comparison Groups	Matching on Groups	Length of Follow-Up	Criteria	Information Source	Outcome
Chen, Bersani, Myers & Denton, 1989	Cognitive Behavioral	Men convicted of DV some who have been court-referred to SAAP & control group who has not	221/221	Court-referred	(1) 120 men convicted of DV and mandated into SAAP (2) 101 men convicted of DV and not mandated into counseling	Proportionately matched though never says how they have been matched	NIP	Subsequent charges (DV and non-DV assaults)	Official	(1) 5% recidivated (2) 10% recidivated (NS)
Dutton, 1986	Cognitive Behavioral	Men arrested for domestic violence	100/100	Court-referred	(1) Tx completers (2) Tx non-completers & those rejected for program	Groups similar demographically & on prior criminal records	6 mths to 3 yrs	Police reports of repeat assaults	Official	(1) 4% recidivated (2) 40% recidivated (S)
Gondolf, 1998	Cognitive Behavioral	200 men at each of 4 sites involved in SAAPs	840/840	Self and court-referred	(1) Tx completers (2) Tx non-completers	Controlling for background variables	15 mths	Reassault of this victim or new victim	Batterer Victim Official	(1) 28% reassault 5% rearrest (2) 40% reassault 20% rearrest (S)
Harrell, 1991	Cognitive Behavioral	Men convicted of misdemeanor DV – some court-ordered into SAAP	348/348	Court-referred	(1) Those convicted of DV and ordered into SAAP	Groups matched on marital status, prior crimes and unemployment	6 mths	Reports by victim of physical aggression	Batterer Victim	(1) 43% recidivated (2) 12% recidivated (S)
					(2) Those convicted of DV but through judges not using SAAP		29 mths	New DV charges	Official	(1) 19% recidivated (2) 7% recidivated (NS)

NA Not Applicable
 NIP No Information Provided
 * Reports a sister study
 (S) Findings Significant
 (NS) Findings Not Significant
 (SNR) Significance Not Reported

untreated group. While this difference is not statistically significant, Chen and his colleagues found that, "abusers who attend 75% or more of the sessions were [significantly] less likely to be recidivists" (Chen et al., 1989: 320). However, they also found that a significantly higher percentage of those attending 75% or more of the sessions were employed in comparison to those who failed to attend 75% of the sessions.

Harrell, 1991: In this study, 171 men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence and court-ordered into a SAAP were compared to 177 men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence who were not so ordered. Harrell thought the groups would be comparable since a small cadre of judges was exclusively responsible for mandating men into counseling. Convicted men from the other judges, she reasoned, could be used as her control group. In the end, the two groups showed significant differences in terms of marital status, employment and criminal record (those in the experimental group were more likely to be married, employed and less likely to have a criminal record than those in the control group). She therefore controlled for these variables when studying recidivism between the groups. Based on victim reports, she found 43% of those in the experimental group physically aggressed compared to 12% in the control condition. Official reports indicated a similar picture. Fully 19% of the men in batterers' treatment had new domestic assault charges compared to 7% of those not in counseling. Both differences achieved statistical significance.

Gondolf, 1998: This study compared 840 men, most court-mandated but some self-referred, from four different SAAPs. Program completers were compared to program

dropouts controlling for "background variables." They are then followed for 15 months in the community. Based on victim reports, 28% of the men who completed the treatment reassaulted. In comparison, 40% of the program non-completers reassaulted. A similar picture emerges when studying official measures. Only 5% of the men who completed treatment versus 20% of the non-completers were rearrested during the follow-up (Gondolf, 1998). Both differences were reported as statistically significant.

Again, computing a failure rate and weighting it by sample size indicates that the experimental group failed on average 19% of the time in comparison to the control group failing 23% of the time over the four studies in the Quasi-Experimental Matched Control Group design.

The problem with this design, though, is that when researchers match the groups on variables thought to be related to the outcome variable, they cannot be sure that there aren't other variables that they did not know and therefore take into account when matching. As such, it is always possible that there were other unmeasured differences between the two groups that went unnoticed and therefore uncontrolled that really accounted for differences observed between the groups post-intervention.

This criticism applies equally to each of the four matched control group studies above. Whether talking about Gondolf's comparisons between program completers and drop-outs "controlling for background variables" (Gondolf, 1998: 79) or Harrell's use of, "statistical techniques . . . to control for observed differences in factors potentially related to violence and/or the tendency to continue abuse" (Harrell, 1991: 24). There is always the possibility that the researcher failed to control for factors that truly affect recidivism in domestic violence offenders.

In fact, the only way to avoid this problem and to ensure that the groups being compared are truly comparable prior to the intervention is to randomly assign subjects to experimental and control groups. Random assignment, the hallmark of an experimental design, guarantees that the two groups, prior to the intervention, are comparable. As Weisburd has noted, "Only experimental designs allow researchers to make an unambiguous link between effects and their causes. Random assignment of subjects into treatment and "control" groups - the defining feature of experimental research - provides a statistical basis for making the assumption that the outcomes observed in an experiment result from the interventions that are studied. In contrast, correlational or quasi-experimental designs are always plagued by the possibility that some important confounding factor has not been taken into account by researchers" (Weisburd, 1993: 337).

Experimental Design

In an experimental design, subjects are randomly assigned to experimental and control groups. Since the groups are comparable prior to the intervention, any differences observed between the groups post-intervention can be said to be due to the introduction of the intervention. In this manner, experiments are high on internal validity. As Table Five indicates, there are presently four studies that have used an experimental design to test the efficacy of court-mandated counseling in reducing future likelihood of violence amongst men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence. As with all the above research, each study has limitations that need to be recognized to understand more fully the meaning of the study's results and its applicability.

All tested a cognitive behavioral approach for batterers though one included an additional group targeted to couples (Dunford, forthcoming). The Ford and Regoli (1993) study is an evaluation of prosecution policies. Since these prosecutorial policies included diversion to a spouse abuse abatement program or probation with a recommendation to a SAAP, it provides an additional test of the efficacy of court-mandated counseling (whether it is associated with pre-trial diversion or post-conviction as a recommendation to probation).

The sample size in these studies is typically large. The smallest study has 59 subjects (Palmer et al., 1992) and the largest 861 (Dunford, forthcoming). The men are court-referred though the sampling frame differs widely from study to study in regards to the specific type of court-referred men in the sample. One study uses official records exclusively (Palmer et al., 1992) while another uses victim reports (Ford and Regoli, 1993). The remaining two studies use a combination of victim reports and official measures (Davis et al., 1999; Dunford, forthcoming).

Palmer, Brown and Barrera, 1992: Palmer and her colleagues conducted the first experiment testing the efficacy of court-mandated counseling. Fifty-nine men were randomly assigned to control (n=29) or experimental (n=30) groups. They used a block random procedure whereby individuals were assigned to the experimental condition if a new batterer group was to begin within three weeks. Otherwise, the individual was assigned into the control group. To deal with the strong ethical concerns those attached to the court system had about assigning men into the no-treatment control group, probation officers were allowed to refer control subjects to treatment. In fact, two control

subjects volunteered for treatment thereby bringing down the control sample to twenty-seven individuals.

A psycho-educational approach was used in the court-mandated treatment program emphasizing skill building in dealing with anger and modeling values. Seventy percent of the men completed treatment as defined by attending seven or more of the ten sessions. Palmer and her colleagues gathered data from men's self-reports, victim reports and police reports. Because information was collected twelve months after treatment ended, not surprisingly they had low response rates from the batterers and their victims, 55% and 22% respectively.

Though the study collected information from batterers and their victims, only information from police reports are provided in the results. According to police reports, men in the control group were significantly more likely to recidivate than those in the experimental group. (Recidivism was defined as evidence of physical abuse or serious threats to partners according to police reports.) While 31% of the men assigned into the control group recidivated, only 10% of those assigned into the experimental group failed.

Palmer and her colleagues note that the results suggest "...that a short-term treatment program following conviction for wife abuse can reduce abusive behavior in men over the long term" (Palmer et al., 1992: 281). However, they are quick to qualify these results by noting that their reliance exclusively on police reports is problematic. They end by stating, "In measuring outcome, it is essential to engage the victimized partners of the men" (Palmer et al., 1992: 282).

**Table Five
Experimental Design**

Study	Treatment Typed	Population Frame	Sample Size/ # in Study	Client Type	Comparison Groups	Length of Follow-Up	Criteria	Info Source	Outcome
Palmer, Brown and Barrera, 1992	Psycho-educational	Men convicted of DV minus those in control who went to tx on their own	59/56	Court-referred	(1) Men court-mandated into tx (2) Men not court-mandated into tx who did not attend SAAP on their own	Up to 24 mths post-treatment	Police records indicating further abuse or serious threats	Official	(1) 10% recidivated (2) 31% recidivated (S)
Ford and Regoli, 1993	Cognitive Behavioral	All men charged with misdemeanor DV excepting those where defendant previously prosecuted (for violence against women or felony) or prosecutor thinks too dangerous	678/590	Court-referred	(1) Pre-trial diversions to SAAP (2) Conviction with reck to SAAP as condition of probation (3) Conviction and reck for presumptive sentencing (not including counseling)	6 mths post-adjudication	Victim indicates a reassault	Victim	Approximately 20% of men recidivated – same for men receiving tx and those not receiving tx (NS)
Davis, Taylor and Maxwell, 1999	Cognitive Behavioral	All men convicted of misdemeanor DV in one county where judge, prosecutor and defense agree to SAAP	11,000 /376	Court-referred	(1) Men assigned to 8 week intensive SAAP (2) Men assigned to 26 week SAAP (3) Men assigned into a 40 hour community service group	12 mths	Reports of a further incident by victim	Victim	(1) 18% recidivated (2) 15% recidivated (3) 22% recidivated (NS)
							Reports to police of new incidents involving same victim	Official	(1) 25% recidivated (2) 10% recidivated (3) 26% recidivated (S)
Dunford, Forthcoming	Cognitive Behavioral	All married men in navy where an incident of physical abuse substantiated and men not getting divorced, without alcohol or severe mental problems	861/861	Referral by Navy Family Advocacy Center	(1) Men assigned 1 yr Tx (2) Men assigned 1 yr cognitive behavioral conjoint Tx (3) Men assigned to rigorous monitoring (4) Men assigned no Tx	12 mths	Victim reports of continued abuse	Victim	(1) 29% recidivated (2) 29% recidivated (3) 27% recidivated (4) 35% recidivated (NS)
							DV rearrests with original victim	Official	(1) 5% recidivated (2) 4% recidivated (3) 6% recidivated (4) 5% recidivated (NS)

NA Not Applicable
 NIP No Information Provided
 * Reports a sister study
 (S) Findings Significant
 (NS) Findings Not Significant
 (SNR) Significance Not Reported

Indeed, apart from the small sample size, there is another troubling aspect to this study. Specifically, we are not told how this sample of 59 men was derived. We are told that the sampling period took place over a seventeen-month period. And we are also informed that there were strong ethical concerns about the experiment. The small sample size (N=59) may mean that all men convicted of wife abuse and placed on probation in this jurisdiction were not necessarily included in this experiment. Since we do not know the sampling frame, it is impossible to know whether the individuals in the sample represent only those where there was a consensus amongst court professionals that they could be involved in the experiment. Alternately, it may be that the batterers themselves had to consent to the treatment program and being part of this study before they were placed in the sample. In the former case, we have issues with external selection whereas with the latter we have questions dealing with self-selection. These problems have been covered previously (see Quasi-Experimental Designs, Non-Equivalent Control Groups) so they will not be discussed now. Suffice it is to say, that both alternatives could lead to a higher likelihood of finding treatment effects since the sample may have included the "better" or "more motivated" candidates for treatment.

Finally, Palmer and her colleagues failed to find a relationship between attendance and recidivism. If treatment, per se, were responsible for decreasing the likelihood of future violence among these men, one would expect attendance at treatment to correlate with recidivism.

Ford and Regoli, 1993: As previously noted, Ford and Regoli's study did not set out to test the efficacy of court-mandated counseling per se. However, in testing different

prosecutorial responses to domestic violence, their experiment randomly assigned subjects to one of three groups: (1) pre-trial diversion to a spouse abuse abatement program; (2) conviction with a recommendation to a SAAP as a condition of probation; or a (3) recommendation for presumptive sentencing not including counseling. Again, the spouse abuse abatement program in their study used a cognitive behavioral approach emphasizing values clarification and anger management.

Included in the sample were all men formally charged with a misdemeanor assault against a female conjugal partner during a thirteen-month period where the defendant had not previously been prosecuted for a violent act against the same victim, did not have a criminal history of felony violence or was not viewed by the prosecutor as posing a serious threat of imminent danger to the victim (N=678). However, despite the no-drop prosecutorial policy in this jurisdiction, approximately 13% of the cases were dismissed because of an uncooperative victim.

Failure was defined as assaulting the original victim. Information was gathered from victim reports six months post-adjudication. Ford and Regoli report a victim survey response rate of 63%. They found no significant differences in the rate of reassault for batterers in any of the three groups whether in terms of treatment assigned or treatment received. They conclude, "Mandated counseling appears to be a successful rehabilitative treatment for up to 80% of the assailants in the Indianapolis experiments. Those who received no counseling, however, were equally likely to desist for the six-month follow-up period. The point, then, is that *any* intervention helps, not necessarily counseling" (Ford and Regoli, 1993: 157).

There are two limitations with the Ford and Regoli study. First, though the sample size is large, we are not told how many of the batterers were rejected from sample inclusion because the prosecutor viewed them as posing "such a serious threat of imminent danger that the prosecutor took immediate action against the suspect prior to his inclusion in the experiment" (Ford and Regoli, 1993: 150). The language makes it clear that the more violent men convicted of misdemeanor domestic assault in this population frame were likely to be weeded out of this sample. In so doing, they may have made it more difficult to find a treatment effect since the men who could have theoretically most benefited from the program were not included in the study.

Equally problematic in interpreting their findings, victim interviews occurred six months post-adjudication. Since we cannot assume that men immediately began their counseling upon adjudication, we do not know how many had completed their counseling (versus those still in counseling) when the interviews occurred.

Davis, Taylor and Maxwell, 1999: This recently completed experiment tested the efficacy of court-mandated counseling for batterers in Kings County Criminal Court (Brooklyn). Three hundred and seventy-six men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence where the judge, prosecutor and defendant agreed to batterer treatment were randomly assigned to a forty-hour spouse abuse abatement program based on the Duluth Model (offered in a 26 week, and later, an 8 week format) or to a control condition of forty hours of community service. While 23% of the men were on probation for six months, the remainder served one year. Batterers, victims and official records were used to track differences in the three groups' performance.

Davis and his colleagues (1999) report a misassignment rate of 14%. That is, in 52 of the cases, random assignment was overridden. According to the researchers, the direction of this misassignment was always for the judges to place individuals assigned into the control group into the experimental group. A comparison of characteristics between those in the control and the override group indicated no significant differences in characteristics. Additionally, while only 7% of the victims refused to be surveyed, victim response rates were 50% for the first interview, 46% for the second interview and 50% for the third interview.

Their results indicated that men were more likely to complete the shorter (n= 61) than longer (N=129) counseling program (67% versus 27% respectively). Despite more of the men from the 8-week session graduating, those from the 26-week program did significantly better in terms of new criminal justice incidents than those from either the shorter program or the control group (10%, 25% and 26% respectively). Though not significant, the researchers note that victim interviews indicated a similar pattern with men mandated into the longer programs being reported as engaging in less new incidents than either those ordered into the shorter treatment program or those given community service (15%, 18% and 22% respectively).

In placing the results from their study within the context of other relevant research included in their literature review, the authors concluded, "Taken together, these studies provide a case for rejecting the null hypothesis that treatment has no effect on violent behavior toward spouses" (Davis et al., 1999: 76).

There are a few limitations to the Davis et al. study that need to be noted. First, their population frame included all men adjudicated for misdemeanor domestic violence in

Brooklyn during a one-year period of time where the judge, prosecutor and defendant agreed to batterer treatment. Though there were more than 11,000 domestic violence cases adjudicated in that time period, in only 376 cases did all parties agree to the treatment program and were therefore eligible for inclusion in their sample. As such, these individuals are not necessarily representative of all batterers but instead only those who are willing to be in this treatment program. This selection bias makes it more likely to find a treatment effect since those without interest were not included in the experiment. Most jurisdictions adopting court-mandated counseling programs do not set such a threshold for inclusion into a batterer program. This therefore threatens external validity in that we cannot assume that results from this experiment can be applied to what occurs outside of this experiment. Indeed, the authors seemed to realize this problem with their study's external validity (see Davis et al., 1999: 23).

More importantly is the researchers' assumption that forty hours of community service is an adequate control condition to a court-mandated batterer intervention program. Though they state that a community service program is "irrelevant to the problem of violence" (Davis et al., 1999: 24), no information is provided supporting this appraisal. Specifically, we are not provided with information that tells us that men mandated into the 40 hour community service program versus those mandated to attend the 26 week batterer treatment program are provided with the same degree and duration of criminal justice monitoring. Without this information we cannot assume that the groups being compared received the same things in all ways save the introduction of being mandated into counseling. This point is critical in assessing the internal validity of Davis and his colleagues' experiment.

In fact, their results (see Table Five for outcomes of Davis et al.'s study) fit an alternative interpretation that focuses not on treatment but instead on criminal justice monitoring. Specifically, it is easy to imagine that men mandated into a 40 hour community service program may complete that judicial sanction much more quickly than those mandated to attend a 26 week batterer intervention program. If criminal justice oversight realistically ends at the point that the men meet the requirements of their sanction, then those mandated into the 26 week batterer program would receive more criminal justice supervision than those told to attend the 8 week batterer program who receive more monitoring than those given a 40 hour community service sanction.

Such an interpretation fits with the results presented by the authors. First, there was no indication that treatment led to changes in batterers' attitudes about domestic violence, conflict resolution or responsibility for their actions. Second, since more men completed the 8 week batterers program in comparison to the 26 week program, one would expect the men assigned into the shorter program to perform as well or better than those mandated into the longer program. Yet, the men in the longer counseling program performed consistently better than the two other groups. Additionally, the performance of those ordered into the shorter counseling program is more similar to those mandated into the community service (control) group. Finally, Davis and Taylor (1998) had previously reported that attendance at the counseling sessions was not related to recidivism. (Men assigned to counseling who attended all of the sessions and those who attended few or none of the sessions did equally well.) Again, such a finding runs contrary to logic. If treatment were effective in reducing the likelihood of future violence among men convicted

of misdemeanor domestic violence, then one would expect attendance at treatment to correlate with recidivism.

Dunford, forthcoming: Dunford recently completed what is the largest of the experiments reviewed on efficacy of mandated counseling. Working out of a naval base, with the full cooperation of the Navy, all men who had a substantiated physical assault against their wives, who were not divorcing, had more than 6 months left to serve and were not severely alcoholic or mentally ill were included in this study. Eight hundred and sixty-one men met this criteria and they were randomly assigned to one of four groups: (1) a men's group based on a cognitive behavioral model; (2) a conjoint counseling group also based on the cognitive behavioral model; (3) a rigorously monitored though untreated group; and (4) a control group who received neither the treatment or the rigorous monitoring. Batterer and victim reports, in addition to official measures, were used to measure the performance of the subjects for one year.

Because Dunford had the full cooperation of the Navy, he had more control over the implementation of the experiment than is typically afforded a researcher working in a social science setting (for discussion, see Berk, Smyth and Sherman, 1988; Orwin, Sonnefeld, Garrison-Mogren, and Smith, 1994; Petersilia, 1989). As such, he was able to ensure high treatment fidelity with a low misassignment rate. Only 23 cases (2.7%) were not delivered as assigned. Additionally, his study had one of the highest victim response rates of all of the experiments reviewed. Eight-six percent of the victims completed the first interview; 82% the second, 78% the third and 75% the fourth and final interview. These high rates of victim survey completion were probably due to the study

being set within a naval base, inherently a much more structured environment than one finds in a non-military setting. This, in turn, made it easier to follow victims over time.

Victim reports indicated no significant differences in outcomes between the four groups in the one-year follow-up period: 29.3% versus 29.7% versus 26.5% versus 34.5% of the men were reported by their wives as reassaulting (as defined as pushing or hitting or more) in the batterers' group, couples' group, rigorously monitored group or control group respectively. Official measures of rearrest indicated a similar pattern of no significant differences between groups: 5.4% versus 3.9% versus 6.4% versus 5.3% of the men were rearrested in the batterers' group, couples' group, rigorously monitored group or control group respectively. Dunford concludes, "Findings from this study indicate that the cognitive behavioral model, as implemented, demonstrated little power to foster change in men receiving treatment for spouse abuse. All of the assessments made, including comparisons of victim reports of continued abuse, perpetrator reports of continued abuse, official arrest records, and survival analyses, point to the same conclusion: The intervention of the cognitive behavioral model failed to produce meaningful changes in the behavior they were designed to impact" (Dunford, forthcoming: 27).

While Dunford's study is undoubtedly one of the strongest in terms of issues dealing with internal validity, there are important concerns regarding the external validity of his findings. Specifically, can the findings from a population of enlisted men living on a naval base be generalized to men in the general population who do not live in such a structured setting?

Study Overview

The purpose of the present study was to rigorously test the efficacy of court-mandated counseling as implemented in jurisdictions throughout the country for men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence. As such, the study included men from the general population rather than a smaller specified subpopulation. Additionally, it included all men and not just those where they or others first agreed to a batterers' treatment program. In so doing, we ensured that the two groups were not only comparable prior to implementation of the experimental stimulus but, additionally, that this experiment approximated the population and conditions existing in most jurisdictions nationwide.

Just as critical to the integrity of the design, though, was the need to be certain that the two groups continued to receive the same things in the same amount - save the experimental stimulus - throughout the study. For instance, men in both experimental and control conditions had to receive the same amount and duration of criminal justice supervision, monitoring and non-treatment contact so that the only differences between the two groups continued to be that one group was mandated to receive counseling and the other was not. Only if these criteria were met could we conclude that differences observed between the two groups were due to the spouse abuse abatement program.

The study sought to answer an important policy question. ***Can courts effect change by mandating men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence into batterer treatment?*** This question dictates both who is to be studied and how. Specifically, it must include *all* men mandated into counseling whether or not they attended and/or completed treatment. It was also understood that men might not be

mandated into counseling but may go on their own. Therefore, the study had to be able to analyze for treatment assigned as well as treatment received.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study used a classical experimental design whereby men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence were randomly assigned into an experimental versus control condition. The study took place in Broward County (an area encompassing Fort Lauderdale, Florida) in the two courts exclusively charged with handling domestic violence cases in that jurisdiction. In each court, upon being sentenced, the judges would, based on the random assignment, order the men into either the control or experimental conditions.

Men placed in the control group were sentenced to one-year probation. Men placed in the experimental condition were sentenced to one-year probation and a six-month batterers' intervention program. At the time of sentencing, the judge would refer the defendant into one of five county certified batterers' treatment programs. Each program used the Duluth Model. As already noted, the Duluth Model is based on a feminist cognitive psycho-educational approach.

The batterers were interviewed at time of sentencing and again six months later. Victims were interviewed at time of sentencing, and six and twelve-months post-sentencing. Probation records were used to track the defendants for one-year post-sentencing.

Sampling Frame

All men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence and sentenced to one-year probation during the period of May 1, 1997 through September 30, 1997 in Broward County were included in the study. Note that the terms “convicted” or “adjudicated” have legal significance. The population we used included men who had either (1) pled guilty or no contest to domestic violence battery charges or who were found guilty after trial and were placed on probation, or (2) persons placed on probation, whether adjudicated guilty or not, for the offense of domestic violence battery, or (3) persons found guilty of or placed on probation for crimes of domestic violence. In fact, the vast majority of defendants (96%) pled no contest to the charges. For ease of use, throughout this report we refer to this entire group of men as those adjudicated or convicted of a misdemeanor domestic violence charge.

During this five-month period, all domestic violence cases were included in the sample where they involved a male defendant and a female victim both of whom were or had been involved in a romantic relationship. Violations of Probation and Violations of Injunctions were not included in the sampling frame. The only misdemeanor domestic violence cases processed during this time in this jurisdiction that were excluded from our study were those where:

- either defendant or victim did not speak either English or Spanish;
- either defendant or victim were not 18 years of age or older;
- the defendant was severely mentally ill; or
- at the time of sentencing, the judge allowed the defendant to move to another jurisdiction and serve his probation through mail contact.

All individuals not meeting the above exclusions were included in the experiment. While individuals could consent or withhold their consent in regards to being interviewed for the study, their consent was not thought necessary in order to place them into the batterer treatment program. This was based on the fact that Florida statute required judges, upon convicting for misdemeanor domestic violence, to sentence defendants into a six-month batterers' treatment program unless the judges made a note on the record as to why this treatment was not appropriate.¹ Therefore, all cases meeting the above criteria would have otherwise been mandated into the batterers' treatment program had it not been for this experiment. In terms of the research design, this means that all individuals were included in the study and not merely those who agreed to be placed in the study.

During this five-month period, 446 individuals were placed in the sample. Forty-two cases were later excluded because they did not meet the above criteria. A listing of the reasons for these exclusions indicates that the majority involved family members (n=25) rather than individuals who were or had been involved in a romantic relationship. Of these family relationships, the majority were brother to sister (n=11) and son to mother (n=4). Another four cases were omitted from the sample because they involved male defendants and victims (n=3) or because it involved a female defendant and a male victim (n=1). Three cases involved a violation of injunction and in another three the defendant was given a jail sentence rather than probation. In five cases the charges were dropped, in

¹ Florida State Statute 741.281 reads, "If a person is found guilty of, has had adjudication withheld on, or has pled nolo contendere to a crime of domestic violence, as defined in s. 741.28, that person shall be ordered by the court to a minimum term of 1 year's probation and the court shall order that the defendant attend a batterers' intervention program as a condition of probation. . . . The court must impose the condition of the batterers' intervention program for a defendant placed on probation or pretrial diversion under this section, but the court, in its discretion, may determine not to impose the condition if it states on the record why a batterers' intervention program might be inappropriate." .

one the individual was allowed to move out of the jurisdiction and in another case the individual was deemed severely mentally ill and therefore inappropriate for the study.

Random Assignment Process

After each defendant was adjudicated, but before he was sentenced, the judges would read or refer to their court order explaining the need for an experiment to study the effects of batterers' programs in reducing future violence. (See Appendix Three for the judges' court order following random assignment and thereby implementing the experimental design.) The judges would then follow the random assignment process and place the defendants into either the control (one year probation) or experimental (one year probation and six months treatment at a batterers' intervention program) groups. Random assignment was based on the court docket number assigned to the case - a number randomly generated by the court computer. The defendant was placed in the experimental condition if his court docket number ended in an even number; control condition if the last digit was odd. This method was thought to be superior to the use of a random numbers generator for two reasons. First, due to financial constraints, a person from the research team could not be present in both courtrooms at all times when a defendant might be sentenced. This process therefore allowed the judges to quickly implement the random assignment process. Just as critical, though, this method also allowed the researchers to know when departures from the random assignment process occurred in the course of the experiment.

Experimental and Control Condition

All individuals convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence - both those in the control and those in the experimental groups - were given a one-year sentence under probation supervision. Those who were assigned to the experimental group were given the additional mandate of attending a six-months batterers' program. As with all conditions of probation, the county's probation office was charged with monitoring the individuals' progress in meeting the judges' sentence.

The judges' sentence included the particular batterer intervention center that the defendant was ordered to report to once he began probation. The specific referral was based on the treatment center closest to the individual's home or work. However, the defendant could, upon being referred by the judge to one or the other center, easily request and attend a different center. This could be done at time of sentencing or any time subsequently.

The five batterer intervention programs receiving referrals from the court had all passed the county's certification procedures. Though the state also had a separate certification procedure, the county had previously decided to continue with their certification requirements.² (Appendix One provides the certification criteria for county and state as well as a comparison between the two procedures for certification.)

Of note, depending upon the information the judges had, he might at the time of sentencing require an alcohol or drug evaluation, order random alcohol or drug testing or, alternately, mandate the man into alcohol or drug counseling. The experiment did not change this aspect of the judges' sentencing discretion. The judges continued to make

² In discussing batterers' interventions programs, Florida State Statute 741.281 notes, "It is preferred, but not mandatory, that such programs be certified."

independent decisions regarding the need for alcohol or drug evaluation, monitoring or treatment without regard to whether the individual was mandated into experimental or control conditions. In this manner, the two groups could receive exactly the same kind and amount of supervision and monitoring save for the introduction of the batterer treatment for those assigned into the experimental group.

Outcome Measures

In an effort to capture the true amount of change in individuals undergoing court-mandated counseling, the researcher included various measures from several different sources. The batterer was interviewed at time of sentencing and again six months after sentencing. The victim was interviewed at sentencing and six and twelve months post-sentencing. Standardized measures were used whenever possible since they have a known reliability. Additionally, the researcher always attempted to use several different measures for each particular phenomenon so as to provide further checks on the validity of the information provided.

Many in the field have recently urged researchers to clearly specify the underlying theories driving their experimental study (Berk et al., 1985; Boruch, 1997; Petrosino, forthcoming). This model of research builds knowledge within the discipline in addition to answering the policy question at hand. Therefore, while we were ultimately looking at whether or not court-mandated counseling for men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence was effective in reducing their likelihood of future violence (in terms of frequency and/or severity), we were also looking to expand the knowledge base in the area of domestic violence. As such, several different theoretical underpinnings guided the information collected on our surveys and interviews. These assumptions included:

- Measuring the offenders' perceptions of the proper roles of women, the correctness of wife battering, whether the behavior that brought them to court should be considered criminal and who was responsible for this instant incident.

There are a number of studies indicating that men who batter hold more traditional views about woman and their proper roles (Alexander, Moore and Alexander, 1991; Saunders, Lynch, Grayson and Linz, 1987; Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart, 1994). The cognitive behavioral approach underlying most batterer treatment programs - including the Duluth Model - is based on the assumption that educating men about the illegitimacy of using violence to gain control over women will lead to changes in their attitudes. Changed attitudes will then lead to changed behaviors. These questions therefore serve as a measure of the program's effectiveness in changing the attitudes of batterers.

Our hypothesis is that men who are mandated into and/or complete the batterer program will demonstrate changes in their attitudes towards women and the correctness of using violence to gain control when compared to those in the no treatment control group.

- Testing the underlying theory arising from the meta-analyses of the Minneapolis Experiment and Spouse Abuse Abatement Programs (SARPs) that stake in

conformity variables explain when an intervention is effective in reducing the likelihood of subsequent violence.

Here we were guided by the findings that an intervention might mean different things to different offenders (Berk, Campbell, Klap and Western, 1992; Sherman, Smith, Schmidt and Rogan, 1992). As such, we felt it important to study whether men who demonstrated high stake in conformity performed better than those with low stake in conformity in terms of the outcome variables.

Our hypothesis is that men with high stake in conformity will have a lower likelihood of recidivating than offenders with low stake in conformity for each of the two groups.

Given the above hypotheses, we collected a wide array of information from offender self-reports, victim interviews and official measures. This information included:

First Coding of Probation Records: Probation records were coded at the time that the individual was sentenced. The information collected by Probation came from their interview with the defendant as well as information from the police report and a separate check on his criminal record done through the National Crime Information Center. Research assistants coded for defendant demographics (e.g., date of birth, race, birthplace etc.), stake in conformity variables (e.g., marital status, owns/rents residence,

number of years county resident, employment status, length of employment, educational level etc.), criminal record (e.g., number of adult misdemeanor or felony arrests or convictions, number of juvenile misdemeanor or felony arrests, number of prior domestic violence arrests, etc), incident-related variables (e.g., evidence of alcohol or drug use, injury, assailant taken into custody etc) and sentence outcome (e.g., how adjudicated and programs ordered into).

Defendant Interviews at Time of Sentencing and Six Months Later: The defendant interviews asked questions to assess the defendant's stake in conformity including those dealing with his relationship to the victim (their marital status, years together, children present in home, how many were his versus hers, etc.), his employment (what he does, how long he has done it, how many months within the last twelve he has been without a job, etc.), his residential stability and his relationship to others (e.g., do they regularly see his extended family, her extended family, his friends, neighbors etc.).

Included in these interviews were questions from an abbreviated version of the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale (Greenwald and Satow, 1970). This standardized measure assesses how likely respondents are to answer questions in a socially desirable manner so as to portray themselves in a positive light. Questions were also asked from the Shortened Attitudes Towards Women Scale (Spence, Helmreich and Stapp, 1973) and the Inventory of Beliefs About Wife Beating (IBWB) (Saunders et al., 1987). The first measures the offender's perception of the proper roles of women on a continuum of traditional to less traditional while the IBWB measures the offender's belief about the correctness of controlling women through physical force. We also included

questions dealing with offenders' perceptions of the fairness of the criminal justice process they had just been through, who they believed was responsible for the instant offense that brought them to court and whether they felt coerced into the batterer's program.

To capture defendant's self-reported use of verbal, physical and sexual abuse and the injury accruing from these acts, we included the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale. The original Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) was criticized for failing to measure the context, consequences and outcomes of violent acts. Specifically, critics noted that the CTS did not consider verbal abuse and controlling behaviors, assumed an equivalence of violent acts (e.g., kicking a woman in the shins was the same as kicking a pregnant woman in the abdomen), failed to measure the injury sustained and did not distinguish violent behavior by women that was reactive rather than proactive (Browning and Dutton, 1986; Currie, 1998; Gelles, 1985; Kurz, 1991). In response, Straus revised his Conflict Tactics Scale to answer to many of the criticisms of the CTS. As such, the revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2) is twice as long as the CTS. They revised the wording to increase clarity, better distinguish between minor and severe acts within each scale, include measures of sexual coercion and include measures on the resulting injury (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy and Sugarman, 1996).

Victim Interviews at Time of Sentencing and Six and Twelve Months Later:

The victim interviews were similar to the defendants though most of the questions asked the victim to provide information about the offender (his use of alcohol and drugs, his standing on the revised Conflict Tactics Scale, etc.) and his relationship with her. However, we also asked the woman to provide information on her work history (to

measure her economic dependence on him), who she regularly spent time with (so as to assess social isolation), whether she had spoken with family, friends, and neighbors about her relationship with the offender and, if she had, if they were critical of her or her partner's actions in the particular incident leading to this court case (to measure whether there was support for her among her peer group). Similar to the offender's interviews, we asked her about the history of violence in her home of origin. Regarding the particular incident bringing the offender to court, we asked the woman whether she thought what he did should be considered a crime, who she viewed as responsible for the event, how likely it was that he would engage in physical force again, how safe she felt with him and whether she thought he could quit being violent with and without counseling.

Final Coding of Probation Records: The probation reports provided information on the offender's behavior in the community for the year while under supervision. As such, these records followed his residential and employment history. Necessarily, it also followed his criminal history (violations of probation, new arrests and new convictions) through Probation's monitoring of any new arrests and convictions for the offender in and outside of this county.

We also collected information on the offender's compliance with the special terms of his probation as set by the judge. If he had been sentenced to random alcohol or drug testing or supervision, we collected information on how often the monitoring took place and its findings. In a similar manner, we were told by Probation that they monitored the offender's compliance with the batterer program through monthly reports regarding the defendant's attendance and progress provided by these programs. We coded for the

number of these reports as well as the information they provided (punctuality, participation, attitude and progress).

To capture the amount of monitoring and supervision the offenders were provided while under probation supervision, we also collected the number of probation meetings they attended, missed and rescheduled as noted in the probation records. Additionally, we collected the number of months the men were out in the community under probation supervision free from problems, not coming into probation though not violated and violated though still in the community but not under probation supervision. (A man might still be in the community even though he had been violated and was therefore no longer actively under probation's supervision.)

Appendix Two provides all the survey instruments and coding forms used to collect this information.

CHAPTER FOUR

EXPERIMENTAL INTEGRITY

Many persons working with experimental designs note how they are more difficult to implement than other types of research (Berk, Boruch, Chambers, Rossi and Witte, 1985; Petersilia, 1989; Devine, Wright and Joyner, 1994). Given the many problems inherent in running an experiment, it becomes imperative to separately address the question of the integrity of the experiment as implemented. We take Dr. Robert Boruch's caution, "Chartas meas omnes in tabulam ponam" (Latin for "I'll put all my cards on the table") to heart and fully delineate the many ways in which this experiment both achieved and failed to achieve its objectives. The reason for such a full elaboration is twofold. The reader needs to have this information so that they can know the limitations of the results as reported. Additionally, in fully disclosing the limits of our study we are hoping that others will learn from our mistakes and design and implement stronger experiments. As Boruch has noted, "No randomized field test is perfectly run, just as services are never perfectly provided. Mistakes ought to be expected and, when understood, exploited: They are a vehicle for building new knowledge" (Boruch, 1997: 234).

Sampling Frame and Statistical Power

Sample Size: As stated previously, all men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence and sentenced to one-year probation during the period of May 1, 1997 through September 30, 1997 in Broward County were included in the study. When we originally designed the study, we were told by Probation that we could expect 200 men meeting our

criteria monthly. We therefore anticipated a sample size of 600 men (300 in control and 300 in experimental groups). Instead we found that approximately 90 men monthly met our criteria and could be included in the sample. Just as an aside, it is interesting to note that Boruch quotes an anonymous source that notes, "As soon as the contract is signed, or the grant is awarded, the size of the target group available for the experiment drops in half" (Boruch, 1997: 71). In fact, our mistake of overestimating the number of cases that would be considered eligible for the study seems to be a common occurrence in the running of an experiment (see for instance Petersilia, 1989; Boruch, Dennis and Carter-Greer, 1988; Devine, Wright, and Joyner, 1994).

Statistical Power. When making our calculations of sample size and power for the Broward Experiment we must make some assumptions about the magnitude of effect of treatment by the batterers' intervention programs. Effect size measures the influence of treatment by comparing differences in the treatment and control groups to the standard deviations of their differences (Cohen, 1970). Even with the reduced sample size of 404 men, power analysis indicates that there is very little likelihood that we would falsely accept the null hypothesis of a no difference finding if in fact there were differences in outcomes between the two groups. Davis and Taylor (Davis and Taylor, 1998 cited in 1999) found a treatment effect size of .287 in their experiment of court-mandated counseling. With a sample size of 404, this provides a power for our experiment of .98. Therefore, based on what seems to be a rather conservative effect size (Davis and Taylor note even larger effect sizes in their literature review), our study, even under the most rigorous standards, seems to provide a fair test of whether court-mandated treatment

reduces the likelihood of future violence in men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence.

Random Assignment

Outcome of Random Assignment: If assignment of men into the experimental and control groups was completely random we would expect a 50/50 percentage split of men into the two groups. A one-sample t-test of all the pre-assignments to the two groups based on the last digit of the court docket number shows that 238 men (53.4%) were assigned into the experimental group and 208 men (46.6%) to the control group. This split of cases does not differ from chance ($t=1.40$, $p>.05$). However, 42 of these cases were dropped from the sample because they failed to meet the criteria for inclusion (see Chapter Three, Sampling Frame). This left 216 men (53.5%) in the experimental group and 188 men (46.5%) assigned into the control condition. Again, there was no significant difference from chance if all men had been assigned to the correct condition ($t=1.42$, $p>.05$). Therefore, the court docket number was indeed randomly generated.

There is an important caveat. In 390 of the 404 cases (96.5%) the judges followed the rules of random assignment and placed the men in the groups as dictated by the last digit of their court number. However, in 14 cases (3.5%) the judges overrode the random assignment. This rate of misassignment, although not the lowest (see Dunford's rate of 2.7%), is definitely one of the lowest and well within the 0 to 10% range noted by Boruch as acceptable (Boruch, 1997).

In each of the fourteen misassigned cases, the judge overrode the initial assignment into the control (no-treatment) group and instead placed the man into the

experimental condition. As Table Six indicates, this led to a 56.9% to 43.1% split between the experimental (n=230) and control (n=174) groups. The likelihood of a random split of this magnitude is very low ($t=2.81$, $p<.01$). Therefore, additional analysis is necessary to determine whether the men who were moved from the pre-assigned control group to the experimental group differed significantly from other men in the control group.

Table Six
Actual experimental assignment by preassigned group

		Pre-assigned Group		Total
		Control	Experimental	
Actual Assignment	Control Group	174 92.6%	0 0.0%	174 43.1%
	Experimental Group	14 7.4%	216 100.0%	230 56.9%
Total		188 46.5%	216 53.5%	404 100%

Analysis of Misassignments: As previously noted, the fourteen misassignments were all in the same direction. They always involved men who had originally been assigned into the control condition but the judge overrode random assignment and instead placed them into the experimental group. Based on our courtroom observation, we believe that this situation almost always occurred after the victim pleaded with the judge to place the defendant into the batterer program. Typically, an attorney also accompanied the woman.

Table Seven compares the fourteen misassigned cases to the remaining 174 control cases on the information available to Probation and the Court at the time the offender was sentenced. The table is broken down into the following categories of variables: (1) offender demographics; (2) stake in conformity variables; (3) criminal record;

and (4) incident related. It must be noted that these results are only suggestive due to the small number of cases that were misassigned and the fact that some of these cases had missing information.

Table Seven
Comparison of the 14 Misassigned Cases and the Control Group

			Misassigned Cases (n=14)			Control Group (n=174)			
Offender Demographics			% or mean	SD	Valid N	% or mean	SD	Valid N	
	Age	Years	34.3	11.6	13	33.9	8.5	173	
	Race	White	61.5		8	57.3		98	
		Black	23.1		3	33.9		58	
		Hispanic	15.4		2	5.3		9	
		Other	0		0	3.5		6	
Stake in Conformity									
	Married	% Yes	61.5		13	47.1		170	
	County resident	Months	173	173	11	160	150	139	
	State resident	Months	232	235	11	198	158	134	
	Home ownership	% Yes	40.0		10	31.9		138	
	Education	0-24 scale	12.0	1.6	11	12.3	2.2	144	
	Employed	% Yes	72.7		11	75.6		165	
	Type of work*	Service		0.0		0	11.4		13
			Laborer-unskilled	0.0		0	14.0		16
			Operatives-semi-skilled	12.5		1	20.2		23
			Craft worker - skilled	25.0		2	22.8		26
			Office & clerical	37.5		3	10.5		12
			Sales	0.0		0	7.0		8
			Technicians	0.0		0	1.8		2
			Professional	12.5		1	2.6		3
	Officials & Managers	12.5		1	9.6		11		
Employed	Months	6.0	--	1	36.9	48.9	19		
Income	Monthly	1460	537	5	1784	1550	79		
Prior Criminal Record									
	Arrest Felony	Number	.09	.30	11	.30	.98	157	
	Arrest Misdemeanor	Number	.73	1.10	11	.94	1.94	158	
	Conviction Felony	Number	.09	.30	11	.22	.89	157	
	Conviction Misdemeanor	Number	.36	.81	11	.57	1.41	157	
	Juvenile arrests	Number	.00	--	11	.02	.18	154	

	Prior prison Sentences	Number	.00	--	11	.14	.55	155
	Prior jail sentences	Number	.64	1.03	11	1.01	1.88	155
	First arrest for DV	% Yes	81.8		11	84.1		157
Incident related								
	Alcohol noted	% Yes	0.0		7	22.6		124
	Drugs noted	% Yes	0.0		6	2.5		120
	Victim injuries*	% Yes	100.0		8	72.8		147
	Black & blues	% Yes	50.0		8	57.9		107
	Cuts & bruised (stitches)	% Yes	0.0		8	4.7		107
	Cut & bruised (No stitches)	% Yes	0.0		8	6.5		107
	Burns	% Yes	0.0		8	0.9		107
	Gun shot	% Yes	0.0		8	0.0		107
	Broken bones	% Yes	0.0		8	2.8		107
	Other injuries	% Yes	0.0		8	6.5		107
	Hospitalization	% Yes	0.0		8	7.9		107

Notes: * p<.10
 ** p<.05

As Table Seven indicates, there are no significant differences between the misassigned cases (those individuals who should have been assigned into the no treatment control group but instead were assigned into the experimental group) and those assigned into the control group. However, two variables showed a tendency towards significance of $p < .10$. The cases involving the misassigned individuals were more likely to result in visible victim injuries. Additionally, individuals from the misassigned group demonstrated higher occupational status with fewer hired in the service or unskilled labor ranks.

Overall, we suggest that the 14 misassigned cases do not pose a threat to the internal validity of the results from this experiment. Still, we proceed with a comparison of the experimental and control groups as assigned to further test that the two groups were comparable prior to the experimental intervention.

Analysis of Equivalency of Experimental and Control Groups: Table Eight provides a comparison of the two groups on all information that Probation and the Courts had at time of adjudication. As the table indicates, there were no significant differences between individuals assigned to the control and those assigned to the experimental groups on variables associated with offender demographics, stake in conformity, criminal record and instant incident with one exception.

**Table Eight
Comparison of Experimental and Control Groups**

			Control Group (n=174)			Experimental Group (n=230)			
Offender Demographics			% or mean	SD	Valid N	% or mean	SD	Valid N	
	Age**	Years	33.9	8.5	173	35.9	10.3	229	
	Race	White	57.3		98	56.0		126	
		Black	33.9		58	37.3		84	
		Hispanic/ Other	8.8		15	6.7		15	
Stake in Conformity									
	Married	% yes	47.1		170	42.8		222	
	County resident	Months	160	150	139	149	137	193	
	State resident	Months	198	158	134	180	152	179	
	Home ownership	% Yes	31.9		138	34.1		182	
	Education	0-24 scale	12.3	2.2	144	12.0	2.3	190	
	Employed	% Yes	75.6		165	68.9		219	
	Type of work	Service		11.4		13	12.9		18
		Laborer-unskilled		14.0		16	15.8		22
		Operatives-semi-skilled		20.2		23	18.7		26
		Craft worker - skilled		22.8		26	20.1		28
		Office & clerical		10.5		12	8.6		12
		Sales		7.0		8	11.5		16
		Technicians		1.8		2	0.7		1
		Professionals		2.6		3	5.8		8
	Officials & Managers		9.6		11	5.8		8	
Employed	Months	36.9	48.9	19	91	193	30		
Income	Monthly	1784	1550	79	1771	1350	90		

Prior Criminal Record								
	Arrest Felony	Number	.30	.98	157	.52	1.54	219
	Arrest Misdemeanor	Number	.94	1.94	158	1.01	2.14	218
	Conviction Felony	Number	.22	.89	157	.27	.82	217
	Conviction Misdemeanor	Number	.57	1.41	157	.45	1.18	215
	Juvenile arrests	% Yes	.02	.18	154	.01	.12	216
	Prior prison sentences	Number	.14	.55	155	.10	.45	216
	Prior jail sentences	Number	1.01	1.88	155	1.09	1.67	213
	First arrest for DV	% Yes	84.1		157	85.9		
Incident related								
	Alcohol noted*	% Yes	22.6		124	32.3		155
	Drugs noted	% Yes	2.5		120	4.2		144
	Victim injuries	% Yes	72.8		147	74.5		192
	Black & blues	% Yes	57.9		107	48.3		145
	Cuts & bruised (stitches)	% Yes	4.7		107	2.8		145
	Cut & bruised (No stitches)	% Yes	48.6		107	54.2		144
	Burns	% Yes	0.9		107	0.0		145
	Gun shot	% Yes	0.0		107	0.7		145
	Broken bones	% Yes	2.8		107	0.7		145
	Other injuries	% Yes	6.5		107	11.7		145
Hospitalization	% Yes	7.9		107	6.3		145	

Notes: * p<.10
 ** p<.05

As Table Eight indicates, the only variable that significantly distinguished the experimental from the control group was the offender's age. Specifically, the control group, averaging 33.9 years of age, was two years younger than the experimental group, averaging 35.9 years of age. Age is a factor that has consistently been found to negatively relate to spouse abuse and recidivism in the domestic violence research literature (Edleson et al., 1985; Hamberger and Hastings, 1990; Hotaling and Sugarman, 1986). Therefore, our finding that the control group is significantly younger than those in the experimental group should make it easier to disprove the null hypothesis of a no

treatment difference. (In other words, this difference between those in the experimental and control groups should make it easier to find treatment effectiveness.)

Survey Response Rates

As noted, the study relied on information provided by both the batterers and their victims. We coded each offender's probation folder at time of adjudication and again one year later after they had completed their time on probation. In this endeavor, we encountered some of the problems that researchers typically find when conducting experiments. Additionally, we experienced problems that seemed unique to our study.

We have previously discussed the fact that individuals did not have to volunteer to be part of the experiment though they had to consent before we could interview them. Though all defendants meeting sample criteria were included in the sample, not all defendants and their victims consented to be interviewed. Other experimental studies conducting research in this area have noted that most of their non-response was due to failure to locate the individuals in the experiment (Davis et al., 1999). While a large percentage of our victim non-response was due to problems in tracking the victims, a high percentage of defendant non-response was due instead to their refusal to be interviewed.

We worked out of the probation office so as to have access to these probationers after their monthly meeting. However, there were a few probation officers who were hostile to our study. On more than one occasion, we would begin talking with the men about the interview when a probation officer would tell the individual that he did not have to agree to be interviewed by us. (It needs to be noted that we always began interviews with this information and had defendants sign consent forms prior to starting an interview.)

News of these incidents spread and, consequently, it became increasingly difficult to gain consent from defendants to be interviewed. For this reason, we decided against continuing to place tremendous amounts of our resources to interview defendants for the final interview at twelve months post-adjudication. Our response rates for defendant surveys was as follows:

1st defendant interview at time of adjudication	80% (n=321)
2nd defendant interview six months post-adjudication	50% (n=203)

Sample attrition analysis investigates whether there are differences between the types of defendants who responded to the survey in the experimental versus control groups. In this way, it attends to whether those who responded to the survey were equivalent. Analysis conducted indicates that there was no difference in the response rates of defendants at Time 1 ($\chi^2 = .01$, $df=1$, $p > .05$) and Time 2 ($\chi^2 = 1.70$, $df=1$, $p > .05$) indicating equivalency of response rates between men in the experimental and control conditions.

Opposition to our experiment also hurt our efforts at obtaining high victim response rates. When we worked out of the courtroom at time of adjudication, we were able to interview most of the victims who were present for the proceedings. (Only approximately 6% of victims refused to be interviewed when asked during our time at the courthouse.) Where the victim did not accompany the defendant to court, we would try to call them using the telephone number noted in the police reports. However, if a woman moved following the incident and did not leave a forwarding number, it became very difficult to

contact her. Since the prosecutor's office was opposed to the study, and the victim advocates were located within this office, we could not expect their office to work with us to track victims. The following represents our victim response rates:

1st victim interview at time of adjudication	49% (n=199)
2nd victim interview six months post-adjudication	30% (n=122)
3rd victim interview twelve months post-adjudication	22% (n=87)

Again, sample attrition analysis of the victim interview was conducted in order to ascertain whether there are differences in response rates between victims whose partners were assigned into the experimental group and those whose partners were assigned into the control group. The analysis showed no significant differences between the response rates of these two groups at Time 1 ($\chi^2 = .77$, $df=1$, $p > .05$), Time 2 ($\chi^2 = .07$, $df=1$, $p > .05$) and Time 3 ($\chi^2 = .72$, $df=1$, $p > .05$). Therefore, this indicates equivalency of response rates between women in these two conditions.

While such low response rates are typical when working with victims of domestic violence (Hirschel and Hutchinson, 1992; Palmer et al., 1992; Steinman, 1991; Tolman and Weisz, 1996), there is no doubt that this presents a serious limitation to our study. Research consistently indicates that men under-report the amount of violence against their victims (Edleson and Brygger, 1995; Harrell, 1991; Straus, 1977-1978). In a similar manner, official measures also undercount the true amount of physical, sexual, verbal and psychological abuse that she may be experiencing since only a small percentage of all

domestic assaults end up being reported to the authorities (Dutton, 1987). Therefore, women's accounts are probably the best measure of his continued abuse.

Further complicating the matter is the fact that the victims who responded to our questions cannot be assumed to be representative of all victims in the study. As Graham and Donaldson note (1993), where attrition is due to respondents' inaccessibility (as is the case with victims of domestic violence) it poses a serious threat to both the internal and external validity of the study. In fact, Sullivan and her colleagues' study (1996) of victims of domestic violence lend credence to this concern. In a comparison of those victims who were more and less difficult to contact, she found, "Not surprisingly, the women who were easier to locate were more likely to be white, were more highly educated, were more likely to have access to cars, were less depressed, and had experienced less psychological and physical abuse compared to the women who were more difficult to find" (Sullivan, Rumpitz, Campbell, Eby and Davidson, 1996: 273). Though the low victim response rate is a serious limitation of this study, we triangulated by collecting information from multiple sources. To the extent that findings indicate similar conclusions, we can have greater faith in the results from each separate measure (Babbie, 1998)

As one would expect, it was much easier to track defendants' progress through the use of official measures. We were able to code all the probation folders at the time that defendants were sentenced. At twelve months post-adjudication, we were able to code 403 of the 404 probation folders. (Probation was unable to locate one of the folders.) As a further check, we also ran each defendant's name against the computerized files from the county's sheriff's office providing all arrests for defendants in their county. We found

that 92 men (24%) were rearrested during the follow-up period for crimes ranging from littering to motor vehicle infractions to domestic battery and false imprisonment.

Integrity of Experimental and Control Conditions

As already noted, at time of sentencing the judges had the ability to order the offenders to be evaluated for alcohol abuse or drug use, randomly tested for alcohol or drug use and/or mandated into an alcohol or drug treatment program. Since the only intervention being tested in this study was the court-mandated batterers' treatment program, we had to continue to allow the judges their discretion in ordering men into these other monitoring and/or treatment programs.

The literature provides examples where knowledge of the experiment changed the control condition (Petersilia, 1989). Babbie (1998) speaks specifically about the problem of "compensation" as a threat to internal validity. He defines it as, "In experiments in real-life situations, subjects in the control group are often deprived of something considered of value. In such cases, there may be pressures to offer some form of compensation. For example, hospital staff might feel sorry for medical control group patients and give them extra "tender loving care." In such a situation, the control group is no longer a genuine control group" (Babbie, 1998: 243).

In this case, judges' discretion in mandating alcohol or drug monitoring (through a court-ordered evaluation) or treatment for men in the sample provided one possible way that the control condition might be changed to more closely approach the experimental condition and thereby confound the experimental design. Specifically, judges could have used their discretion to assign men placed in the control (no treatment) condition into

alcohol or drug evaluation, testing or treatment in an effort to compensate for the reduced level of treatment that they were now receiving by not being placed into the batterer programs. To test this possibility, Table Nine provides a comparison of the likelihood of judges to assign the men in each of the two groups into alcohol or drug evaluation, testing or treatment.

Table Nine
Alcohol or Drug Evaluation, Testing or Treatment Ordered for Each Group

		Actual experimental assignment		Total
		Control group (n=174)	Experiment group (n=230)	
Programs ordered: Alcohol/Drug Evaluation	No	155 90.1%	211 92.5%	366 91.5%
	Yes	17 9.9%	17 7.5%	34 8.5%
Programs ordered: Alcohol/Drug Testing	No	141 82.0%	178 78.1%	319 79.8%
	Yes	31 18.0%	50 21.9%	81 20.2%
Programs ordered: Alcohol/Drug Treatment	No	166 96.5%	215 94.3%	381 95.3%
	Yes	6 3.5%	13 5.7%	19 4.7%
Total		172 43.0%	228 57.0%	400 100.0%

Approximately 10% of the men in the study were required to undergo alcohol and/or drug evaluation. In Table Nine, there were no significant differences between the experimental and control groups on the likelihood of the men being ordered to undergo evaluation for alcohol or drugs ($\chi^2 = 0.74$, $df=1$, $p>.05$). The judges ordered a somewhat larger number of men in the study to undergo random testing for alcohol and/or drug use (approximately 20%). Again the table indicates that there were no significant differences

between the two groups in the judges' likelihood to mandate them to be randomly tested for alcohol or drugs ($\chi^2 = 0.93, df=1, p>.05$). Finally, there were also no significant differences in the judges' likelihood to order men into alcohol and/or drug treatment. Our analysis indicates that 5.7% of the experimental group and 3.5% of the control group were ordered into alcohol and/or drug treatment programs ($\chi^2 = 1.06, df=1, p>.05$). In all, our results indicate that the judges equivalently assigned alcohol and/or drug evaluation, supervision and treatment programs to men in the experimental and control groups.

Table Ten
Comparison of Probation Supervision for Control and Experimental Groups

Probation variables:			Control Group			Experimental Group		
			% or mean	SD	Valid N	% or mean	SD	Valid N
	# Mths not coming to probation and not violated	Months	0.8	1.3	173	0.8	1.4	229
	# of Probation meetings scheduled	Number	8.7	4.3	173	8.2	4.3	227
	# of Probation meetings attended	Number	7.6	4.1	173	7.1	4.3	227
	# of Probation meetings missed	Number	1.1	1.5	173	1.1	1.3	227
	Months with Written Mthly Repts	Number	8.2	3.6	173	7.5	3.9	227
	Alcohol/Drug testing done	% Yes	19.1		173	18.9		227
	Number times Alcohol/Drug Testing	Number	2.0	1.0	33	2.0	0.9	43

The results in this section suggest that the judges strongly followed the procedures of random assignment of men to experimental and control conditions. When they were called upon to assign men to the control group, they did not seek to add additional programs to replace the batterer intervention program that the experimental group was mandated to receive.

In a similar manner, probation officers could theoretically have supplied more monitoring to those batterers placed in the control condition so as to compensate for their decreased monitoring and/or treatment in the batterers' programs. We compared the two groups on the number of months they were not reporting to Probation and were not violated, the number of probation meetings scheduled, missed and rescheduled, the number of months there were Written Monthly Reports for each probationer, whether they had alcohol or drug testing done and the number of times they were alcohol or drug tested.

Table Ten provides a comparison of these variables for each of the two groups. None of these comparisons were significant or showed a tendency towards significance. Therefore, there is no reason to conclude that the two groups were treated differently by Probation.

Potentially, there is an alternative possibility, that Probation may not have sufficiently monitored the attendance of men placed into the experimental condition (court-mandated spouse abuse abatement program). Men placed into counseling would not necessarily have been sanctioned for failing to comply with the court-mandate. This would render the results from this experiment moot since it had not allowed a true test of the efficacy of court-mandated counseling. To test for this possibility, we looked at men

placed into the experimental group and their attendance history in terms of whether they were subsequently violated. Our results indicate that in instances where men failed to attend any batterers' intervention sessions, 89% (n=70) were violated on one or more occasions. Furthermore, of the nine individuals (11%) who did not attend all twenty-six batterers' intervention sessions and were not violated, four missed only one session and one missed only two sessions. Therefore, our analyses indicate that Probation adequately monitored and sanctioned these men to ensure compliance with the court-mandated spouse abuse abatement program.

Finally, there is the possibility that men court-mandated into a batterers' intervention program may not complete or even attend any of the sessions. In other words, the batterers will self-select themselves into being "program completers" versus "program drop-outs." This selection, though, did not concern us in that we were evaluating the efficacy of court-mandated counseling as it is realistically, as opposed to theoretically, implemented and run. Probation was charged with monitoring compliance with all court orders for probationers. As we have seen, sanctions were applied when a batterer failed to fulfill the conditions of his probation. Therefore, men self-selecting in or out of treatment does not decrease the validity of the experiment we designed to answer the question, "Can courts effect change by mandating men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence into batterer treatment?" As such, we believe that this site provided the most that a jurisdiction could be realistically expected to provide in order to ensure compliance with an order to attend a spouse abuse abatement program.

Overview of the Integrity of Experimental Design

The results of our analyses indicate that random assignment was successful in ensuring that the experimental and control groups were comparable prior to the implementation of the treatment. Furthermore, our analyses indicates that there is no reason to believe that the two groups did not continue to receive the same amounts and kinds of monitoring, supervision and treatment throughout the test period with one exception. Specifically, the experimental group was mandated to receive the batterers' treatment program while the control group was not. We now turn to the question of treatment efficacy for those mandated to attend a batterers' intervention program.

CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS

Chapter Four demonstrated that age was the only significant difference between the experimental and control groups prior to implementation of the intervention. The control group was two years younger, on average, than those assigned into the experimental group. No other differences were evident between the experimental and control groups at time of sentencing. This, therefore, establishes that the groups were comparable prior to the implementation of the experimental treatment.

Additionally, the analyses indicated that the judges did not "circumvent" the random assignment by placing those in the control (no treatment) group into other programs that would provide alternative forms of monitoring, supervision or treatment to these offenders. Nor did Probation "compensate" by providing batterers placed into the control group with additional supervision or monitoring. Therefore, the two groups continued to be comparable in terms of monitoring and supervision with one exception: those placed in the experimental group were court-mandated to attend a batterers' intervention program at one of five sites.

Below we provide a profile of batterers in our sample followed by a profile of their victims. We then proceed with information regarding treatment delivery for those in the experimental group. We next turn our attention to analyzing group performance measures beginning with the batterers' self-reports followed by victim reports. We conclude with our analyses of outcomes for the two groups using official measures.

Batterer Profile

The typical offender was 35 years old (SD=10) ranging from 19 to 71 years. In terms of a racial or ethnic breakdown, 57% were White, 36% Black and 6% Hispanic. Almost equal amounts said they were married (45%) or single (43%) with another 13% reporting being separated or divorced.

In terms of variables related to their stability, most of the men were long-term county residents averaging 160 months (SD=142). Only 25% reported that they failed to complete high school and 9% said that they had graduated college. Most of the men rented (67%) as compared to owning (33%) their own homes. Seventy-two percent reported being employed at the time of sentencing with most of these saying that they were at this place of employment for two years or less. Forty-seven percent of the men reported working in an unskilled or semi-skilled position. However, 8% of the men reported working as officials and managers. The wide range in these batterers' monthly income is consistent with this finding. For those working, their salary ranged from a low of \$250 to a high of \$10,000 per month with an average income of \$1777 per month.

A large number of the men had a criminal record prior to this instant offense. Forty percent of the sample had one or more misdemeanor arrests (averaging about 0.9 misdemeanor offenses per individual) and 20% had one or more felony arrest (averaging 0.3 prior felony arrests per offender). Additionally, though fewer in number, there were a substantial numbers of convictions and incarcerations in jail (44% of the men had one or more jail stays) and prison (7% of the men had one or more imprisonment). Finally, for 85% of the men in the sample, this was their first domestic violence arrest.

Turning our attention to the instant offense, police reports noted approximately 28% of the instant incidents involved alcohol and another 3% involved drugs. Police reports also noted victim injuries in 74% of the cases. Of incidents with injuries, these incidents consisted most often of black and blue marks (58%) though 8% were severe enough to require hospitalization of the victim. Men were taken into custody 99% of the time.

The reader can get a bearing on the profile of the typical batterer in our sample by referring back to Table Eight and looking at information on the control subjects (which were statistically equivalent to the experimental group).

Victim Profile

A profile of the women involved in this study is drawn from women's responses to the victim survey at time of adjudication. The typical victim was 34 years old (SD=9) ranging from 18 to 63 years of age. Comparing his age to her age, women averaged two years younger than men (SD=6) with these differences ranging from her being 23 years younger to 14 years older. About 53% of women reported that the defendant was their husband and 37% said he was their live-in boyfriend. Victims reported the average length of their relationship with the defendant as 7 years (SD=7).

About 23% of women reported that they had less than a grade 12 education, and about 10% had graduated from college. Forty-seven percent said they were employed full-time, 19% reported part-time employment, 11% said they were a homemaker and approximately 3% said they were unemployed and looking for a job. Of those who were working, 63% reported they were in unskilled or semi-skilled positions. Yet there were almost 20% who reported they were in professional or managerial positions. This finding

suggests that the victim sample included the range of women in the sample. However, we suspect that higher occupational status women were over-represented in our victim sample. We say this because 90% of the time these women reported that their husband or boyfriend was working. This is substantially higher than the 72% of men who reported they were working at the time of sentencing.

Treatment Delivery Measures

**Table Eleven
Attendance at Batterer’s Program: Number of Missed Sessions**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Missed sessions	0	56	13.9	28.9
	1	32	7.9	16.5
	2	28	6.9	14.4
	3	34	8.4	17.5
	4	25	6.2	12.9
	5	9	2.2	4.6
	6	2	0.5	1.0
	8	2	0.5	1.0
	13	1	0.2	0.5
	24	1	0.2	0.5
	26	4	1.0	2.1
	Total	194	48.0	100.0
	Not applicable	181	44.8	
Missing	29	7.2		
Total	404	100.0		

The men were usually assigned to attend 26 group counseling sessions (97 %) although this ranged from 8 sessions (1 individual) to 50 sessions (1 individual). If a man missed a session, he was required to make up that class. Table Eleven shows that most men went to the vast majority of sessions when they were mandated into counseling.

Almost 29% made all their sessions without missing any of them and approximately 95% missed five or fewer sessions.

Of the 230 men placed into the batterers' program, information on the reason for their discharge was available from the probation folders in 67% (n=154) of the cases. Table Twelve shows that, where information is available, approximately three-quarters of the sample completed the counseling program.

Table Twelve
Reason for Discharge from Counseling Program

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Reason for discharge	Completed program	115	74.7
	Terminated - too many absences	31	20.1
	Terminated - violation of probation	2	1.3
	Terminated – noncompliant	5	3.2
	Other reason	1	.6
Total		154	100.0

The batterers' treatment programs were supposed to provide Probation with monthly reports indicating each man's attendance, attitude towards the group, and an independent evaluation of their performance in the weekly sessions. These reports were then to go into the batterers' probation folders. Our information comes from these folders. The qualitative assessment of their progress indicates that the programs described the men as having made satisfactory or rapid progress in their group counseling sessions (see Table Thirteen). The reliability of this estimate, however, is questionable given that a low number of reports (n=75 of 216) were available in the folders.

Table Thirteen
Progress As Per Monthly Batterer Program Form

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Level of progress	Little	5	1.2	6.7
	Slow	12	3.0	16.0
	Satisfactory	34	8.4	45.3
	Rapid	24	5.9	32.0
	Total	75	18.6	100.0
	Not applicable	316	78.2	
	Missing	13	3.2	
Total		404	100.0	

Experimental and Control Groups' Standing on Outcome Measures

A number of standardized scales were used in the offender and victim interviews to assess the outcomes of the experimental intervention. These included an abbreviated version of the Inventory of Beliefs about Wife Beating and Attitudes Towards Women. Additionally, we asked whether the batterer believed that the offense should be considered criminal, whether he thought he was responsible for the instant offense and how likely he was to engage in physical abuse again. We also used the revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2) to assess his self-reported use of verbal, physical or sexual abuse within the previous six months. Information on the CTS2 has previously been supplied (see Chapter Three, Defendant Interviews) and therefore will not be discussed here. The truthfulness of his responses was gauged using the shortened version of the Crowne-Marlow Social Desirability Scale.

A parallel interview was developed for the victims asking them about the batterer's behavior and their beliefs about who was responsible and whether they thought another physical incident was likely. The study design asked offenders questions about self-

reported partner abuse at time of sentencing and six months post-sentencing. Victim surveys were to be administered at time of sentencing, six months, and one-year post-sentencing. The information of survey data presented in this chapter analyzes differences between the experimental group and control group at each point of time, and then looks to see whether there were changes over time.

This chapter also reports on official indicators of violation of parole (VOP), arrest, and violent arrest (including domestic violence arrest) at one-year post-sentencing. We investigate whether there are differences between the experimental and control groups and whether attending batterers' intervention programs significantly impacts for each outcome.

We now turn to the results of this experiment. We begin by looking at offender's attitudes toward wife beating and women.

Offender Attitudes

The Defendant's First Interview typically took place at time of adjudication in the courthouse. Defendant's Second Interview was conducted at Probation at least six months post-adjudication. At the time of their second interview, 30% (n=35) of these batterers had concluded their entire counseling program. More importantly, our sample had completed an average of 22 of the 26 mandated counseling sessions. This means that these men had already received approximately 85% of the intended "dosage" of counseling. The first and second interviews looked at defendants' veracity, attitudes, beliefs and their self-reported continuing abusive behavior.

Social Desirability Scale: As stated, to check for significant differences in offenders answering truthfully, we included eight items from the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale. The shortened social desirability scale assesses the extent to which respondents are less than truthful in an effort to present themselves in a positive light. The scale ranges from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4). Items were recoded during analysis so that responses indicating a pro-social response would receive a higher number. The results of the test fall at a neutral level indicating that men's responses were relatively truthful. Further, based on standings at time of sentencing (Time 1), we failed to find significant differences between the experimental and control groups in their scores on the scale ($t=-1.4$, $df= 288$, $p>.05$). The experimental group averaged 2.3 (SD = 0.3) and the control group 2.2 (SD = 0.3).

Beliefs About Wife Beating: We compared defendants' responses on eleven items pulled from a thirty-item Inventory of Beliefs About Wife Beating (IBWB). These questions provided the respondent's view of the appropriateness of wife battering and the correctness of the government intervening when such incidents came to light. The scale ranges from 1 indicating that wife-beating is viewed as acceptable behavior to 2 indicating that wife-beating is viewed as wholly unacceptable. We compare the two groups at time of sentencing and six-months post-sentencing.

As Table Fourteen indicates, approximately half of the men view wife-beating as an acceptable behavior in various situations. The results of this study suggest that there were no differences between the experimental and control groups in their beliefs about

wife beating at Time 1 or Time 2. T-tests, looking at individual differences, also suggest that offenders' beliefs did not change over time ($t=0.9$, $df=168$, $p>.05$).

Table Fourteen
Comparison of Offenders' Beliefs Regarding Wife Beating
for Control and Experimental Groups

Group	Time 1			Time 2			Difference		
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N
Control	1.54	.04	126	1.59	.13	90	.04	.14	80
Experimental	1.54	.05	165	1.57	.14	103	.02	.13	90

Attitudes Towards Women: As previously noted, the Duluth program is a highly structured cognitive behavioral program provided to batterers within a feminist framework. A number of studies indicate that men who batter hold more traditional views about woman and their proper roles (see Chapter Three, Outcome Measures). The cognitive behavioral approach is based on the assumption that educating men about women's historic subservience and their male privilege will lead to changes in their attitudes towards women and this, in turn, will lead to changes in their behavior.

The shortened Attitude Towards Women (ATW) scale measures male perceptions of the appropriate roles for women scaled from traditional to liberal. These were coded for analysis as agree (2) and disagree (1) with agreement indicating greater support for liberal roles. We report the average value across ATW items at Time 1 and Time 2 in Table Fifteen.

As the table indicates, there were no differences between the control and experimental groups at Time 1 or at Time 2. Furthermore, these attitudes did not change over time ($t=-0.6$, $df=170$, $p>.05$). Again, results from these analyses indicate that men's

attitudes towards women did not significantly change for those court-mandated into the batterers' intervention programs in comparison to the no-treatment control group.

**Table Fifteen
Comparison of Offenders' Attitudes Towards Women
for Control and Experimental Groups**

Group	Time 1			Time 2			Difference		
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N
Control	1.49	.02	128	1.41	.16	90	-.10	.15	81
Experimental	1.50	.06	166	1.42	.18	103	-.08	.18	91

Attitudes Towards Treating Domestic Violence As A Crime: Offenders were asked whether the domestic violence incident that brought them to court should be treated as a crime. Response categories were yes (2) and no (1). Table Sixteen shows the responses for the two groups at time of sentencing and six months after sentencing.

**Table Sixteen
Comparison of Offenders' Attitudes Towards Treating Domestic
Violence as Crime for Control and Experimental Groups**

Group	Time 1			Time 2			Difference		
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N
Control	1.26	.44	133	1.34	.54	90	0.00	.47	82
Experimental	1.27	.45	174	1.34	.48	100	0.06	.46	92

As Table Sixteen indicates, there were no significant differences between the groups on their view about whether the instant offense that led them to court should be viewed as criminal. Each group's view on this matter also failed to change over time.

Attitudes About Partner's Responsibility for the Instant Offense: Offenders were asked to rate the responsibility of their wife or girlfriend for the occurrence of the instant incident. Response categories were not at all responsible (1), somewhat responsible (2), equally responsible (3), and completely responsible (4). Table Seventeen shows the offenders' responses.

Table Seventeen
Comparison of Offenders' Attitudes About Partner's Responsibility for Instant Offense for Control and Experimental Groups

Group	Time 1			Time 2			Difference		
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N
Control	2.68	.93	132	2.83	.96	89	0.16	1.03	81
Experimental	2.82	.95	176	2.61	1.00	103	-0.21	1.10	96

As the table indicates, there were no significant differences between the experimental and control groups at Time 1 or Time 2. The offenders tended to say that their partners were equally responsible with the average closer to 3 (offender views his partner as equally responsible) than to 2 (offender views his partner as somewhat responsible). There was, however, a significant difference over time ($t=2.3$, $df=175$, $p<.05$). Whereas, those in the control group tended to view their partners as increasingly responsible over time, those in the experimental condition reported a slight decrease in their perception of their partner's responsibility for the instant offense six months after sentencing. This suggests that men in the experimental condition were more likely to take responsibility for the incident. However, it needs to be noted that even with this increased awareness, those in the experimental group were still viewing their partners as more than "somewhat responsible" but less than "equally responsible."

Self-Reported Likelihood to Hit Partner Again Within Next Year: Offenders were asked to rate the likelihood that they would hit their partner again within the next year. Response categories ranged from zero to one hundred shown in increments of 10% and labeled with anchors of no chance (0%), 50/50 chance (50%), and sure to happen (100%). Table Eighteen shows the offenders' reports on the likelihood of their hitting their wife or girlfriend again. The differences noted in the table take into account situations when the offenders no longer have contact with their wife or girlfriend.

Table Eighteen
Comparison of Offenders' Self-Reported Likelihood to Hit Their Partners Again for Control and Experimental Groups

Group	Time 1			Time 2			Difference		
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N
Control	6.7	17.9	128	1.9	8.4	85	-4.5	18.0	75
Experimental	4.0	12.6	176	3.8	14.4	99	0.6	16.5	96

As the table indicates, there were no significant differences in men's perceptions of their likelihood that they will hit their partner for the experimental and control groups and comparing Time 1 to Time 2. Note that there are wide variations in offenders' estimates of the likelihood of hitting their wife or girlfriend at both points in time. This variation is evident in the large standard deviations relative to the size of the means. There also is a marginally significant difference over time as the control group states that there is a much lower likelihood (about 45 % lower than at Time 1) that they will hit their partner than the experimental group whose responses did not change substantially. A t-test suggests this difference, though not significant, is tending towards significance ($t=-1.9$, $df=169$, $p<.06$).

While this finding may at first seem like a failing on the part of those in the experimental group, these results may really be indicating improvement on the part of those mandated into counseling. Specifically, the results may suggest that men who undergo counseling become more aware of the danger that they present to their partner whereas those in the control group continue to over-estimate the extent that they are no longer a risk to their wives and girlfriends. However, caution is necessary in that the findings reported showed only a tendency rather than significance.

Victim Attitudes

Beliefs About Wife Beating: The women were also asked to respond to the Inventory of Beliefs About Wife Beating (IBWB) at his time of sentencing. These questions provided the women's' views of the appropriateness of wife battering and the correctness of governmental intervention.

**Table Nineteen
Comparison of Women's' Beliefs Regarding Wife Beating
for Control and Experimental Groups**

Group	IBWB		
	Mean	SD	N
Control	1.90	.09	85
Experimental	1.88	.14	110

As Table Nineteen shows, there were no differences between the experimental and control groups in women's' beliefs about wife beating ($t=-.71$, $df=193$, $p>.05$). Note that the vast majority of women's scores indicate that they view wife beating in most all

contexts as inappropriate behavior contrary to what was said by the offending men (see Table Fourteen).

Attitudes Towards Women: The Attitude Towards Women (ATW) scale measures perceptions of the appropriate roles for women scaled from traditional to liberal. These were analyzed as agree (2) and disagree (1) with a higher value indicating greater support for liberal roles. The results of the ATW items for women across groups are reported in Table Twenty.

Table Twenty
Comparison of Women's' Attitudes Towards Women
for Control and Experimental Groups

Group	ATW		
	Mean	SD	N
Control	1.87	.15	85
Experimental	1.87	.15	110

The victims' reported a score indicating a liberal view of women's roles. There were no differences in women's' attitudes about the appropriate role for women between the control and experimental groups ($t=0.1, df=193, p>.05$). Comparing these results to Table Fifteen, women reported far more liberal opinions about attitudes towards women's' roles than had been reported by the men.

Attitudes Towards Treating Domestic Violence As A Crime: Victims were asked about the domestic violence incident that brought them to court and to consider whether it should be treated as a crime. Response categories were yes (2) and no (1).

Table Twenty-one shows the responses for the experimental and control groups at time of sentencing.

Table Twenty-one
Comparison of Victims' Attitudes Towards Treating Domestic Violence as Crime for Control and Experimental Groups

Group	Treat DV as crime		
	Mean	SD	N
Control	1.58	.50	86
Experimental	1.55	.50	103

As Table Twenty-one indicates, there were no significant differences in victims' perceptions of whether the instant offense that brought them to court should be viewed as criminal. About 57% of women felt the offense should be viewed as a crime. Comparing this result to Table Sixteen, we see that women (57%) are substantially more likely than men (26%) to perceive the event as criminal.

Attitudes About Partner's Responsibility for the Instant Offense: Recall that men were asked to rate the responsibility of their wife or girlfriend for the occurrence of the instant incident. Women were asked to rate their own responsibility for the incident. Response categories were not at all responsible (1), somewhat responsible (2), equally responsible (3), and completely responsible (4). Table Twenty-two shows the victims' responses.

The victims rated their level of responsibility for the instant offense as falling between not at all responsible (1) and somewhat responsible (2) whereas men rated the women as almost equally responsible (see Table Seventeen). There were no significant

differences in women's' perceptions of responsibility between the experimental and control groups ($t=.03$, $df=196$, $p>.05$).

**Table Twenty-two
Comparison of Victims' Attitudes About Partner's Responsibility for
Instant Offense for Control and Experimental Groups**

Group	Own responsibility		
	Mean	SD	N
Control	1.69	.83	86
Experimental	1.69	.85	103

Likelihood Partner Would Hit Them Again Within Next Year: Victims were asked to rate the likelihood that their partner would hit them again within the next year. Response categories were the same as the offender question ranging from zero to one hundred shown in increments of 10%. Table Twenty-three shows the victims' opinions on the likelihood of their partner hitting them again. The differences noted in the table take into account situations when the offenders in contact with their wife or girlfriend.

**Table Twenty-three
Comparison of Victims' Perception of Likelihood Their Partners
Will Hit Them Again for Control and Experimental Groups**

Group	Time 1			Time 2			Difference		
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N
Control	19.4	28.4	86	9.5	22.5	52	-7.0	32.0	47
Experimental	21.4	28.4	105	14.0	24.2	65	-9.1	32.0	61

Table Twenty-three shows that there were no significant differences in victims' perceptions of the likelihood that their partner will hit them between the experimental and

control groups at Time 1, Time 2, or in the difference over time. Victims provide higher ratings than offenders on the likelihood that they would be hit again (see Table Eighteen).

The results in Twenty-three also appear to indicate that there were improvements in victims' perceptions of the likelihood of their being hit again. A one sample t-test showed that there was an average 8% drop in the perceived likelihood of the victim being hit again. A 95% confidence interval on this estimated drop suggested that the drop might be as much as 14% and as little 3% ($t=-2.9$, $df=108$, $p<.05$). Note that these results at time 2 and for change between Time 1 and Time 2 are only for victims that are still living with the offender. And, again, there are no differences over time between the two groups.

Self-Reports on Continued Physical Abuse

So far in this chapter we have examined the attitudes of offenders and victims. Next, we examine the self-reports of offenders and victims on the reoccurrence of psychological and physical abuse in their relationship. We used the revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2) as a measure of verbal, physical and sexual abuse in a relationship. Since the scale has previously been presented (see Chapter Three, Defendant Interviews), we will not discuss it great detail. Suffice it is to say that the CTS2, in comparison to the CTS, looks to enhance specificity and clarity of items thereby improving the measure's reliability and validity (Straus et al., 1996).

The CTS2 was used in the offender and victim surveys. We estimated average responses for negotiation, psychological abuse, physical abuse, sexual coercion and injury. Response categories were coded using a normalized scale of never (0), one (1), two to five (2), and six or more (3).

Offenders' Standing on the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale: Table Twenty-four shows the results from the offender surveys. We find that there are no significant differences ($\alpha = .05$) on any of the CTS2 scales between the experimental and control groups when we compare information in the offender surveys at Time 1 or Time 2. Additional tests (means not shown) of the differences of the five scales of the CTS2 over time suggest that there were no significant differences over time. These results indicate that the offenders' self-reported abusive behavior did not change over time.

**Table Twenty-four
Offenders' Responses to the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale
for Control and Experimental Groups**

Mean (N) Scale	Time 1		Time 2	
	Control	Exp	Control	Exp
Negotiation	2.11 (117)	2.08 (153)	1.58 (87)	1.68 (90)
Psychological	.88 (117)	.83 (155)	.41 (82)	.30 (93)
Physical	.27 (115)	.25 (143)	.06 (82)	.03 (90)
Sexual coercion	.11 (113)	.10 (154)	.07 (85)	.04 (88)
Injury	.16 (123)	.16 (159)	.06 (86)	.02 (94)

Note: Response categories were 0=Never, 1=1, 2=2-5, 3=6+

Victims' Standing on the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale: Table Twenty-five reports the results from the offender surveys. As described in Chapter Three, there were three victim surveys and two offender surveys. Victims reported no differences on any of the CTS2 scales between the experimental and control groups comparing information from surveys at time of sentencing (Time 1), six months later (Time 2), or one year later

(Time 3). Tests (means not shown) of the differences of the CTS2 over time suggest that there were no significant differences over time. These women's reports are another indicator that the offenders' abusive behavior did not differ between the experimental and control groups and that it did not change over time. Comparing Tables Twenty-four and Twenty-five, we find that women reported higher levels of being abused than reported by the men on the physical abuse and injury subscales.

**Table Twenty-five
Comparison of Victims' Responses to the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale
for Control and Experimental Groups**

Mean (N)	Time 1		Time 2		Time 3	
	Control	Exp	Control	Exp	Control	Exp
Negotiation	1.77 (81)	1.75 (98)	1.99 (45)	1.86 (54)	1.82 (34)	1.86 (36)
Psychological	1.23 (79)	1.43 (102)	.84 (45)	1.00 (56)	0.95 (35)	0.97 (34)
Physical	.62 (80)	.65 (98)	.13 (42)	.11 (55)	.14 (33)	.15 (35)
Sexual coercion	.21 (78)	.17 (97)	.06 (44)	.05 (57)	.03 (35)	.13 (36)
Injury	.37 (84)	.43 (103)	.02 (45)	.06 (58)	.09 (35)	.08 (36)

Note: Response categories were 0=Never, 1=1, 2=2-5, 3=6+

Offenders' Self-Reported Prevalence of Severe Physical Abuse

Dependent Variable: In line with Straus et al.'s (1996) suggestion that the revised Conflict Tactics Scale measures severe violence and minor violence, we combined information from the three subscales on physical assault, sexual coercion and injury to assess the prevalence of severe physical abuse. Severe physical abuse included items from physical assault such as used a knife or gun on my partner, choked my partner, beat

up my partner, and more items; and items from sexual coercion such as used force to make my partner have sex; and items from the injury scale such as she went to a doctor because of a fight we had. Minor physical abuse items included items such as grabbed my partner, slapped my partner; minor sexual abuse items included items such as made my partner have sex without a condom; and minor injury was measured using items such as my partner had a sprain, bruise, or cut because of a fight with we had.

We summed the scores on these three subscales to determine the prevalence of men's physical abuse towards their partners within the last six months. Prevalence of offenders' and victims' reports refers to whether or not respondents reported any level of physical abuse by the offender (1=yes and 0=no) on any of the severe physical abuse items on the subscales (see Straus et al., 1996: 308-309).

The results indicated that men self-reported severe physical abuse against 8% of women (N=159) compared to victims' reported prevalence of 14% (N=96). This finding that women reported a greater prevalence of severe physical violence than their partners is consistent with previous research on physical abuse using the original CTS (Browning and Dutton, 1986; Edleson and Brygger, 1995; Harrell, 1991; Straus, 1977-78). Comparing information where both individuals completed the second survey, we find that women and men agreed on self-reported severe physical abuse about 79% of the time. This result should be viewed with some caution because it is based on only 45 surveys.

Looking at so-called minor physical abuse, we found that men self-reported a prevalence of 30% while victims reported 32%. The inter-rater reliability for minor violence was lower at only 49% based on 51 comparable surveys at time 2.

Additional analysis showed that when any physical abuse was self-reported that 27% of men and 38% of victims said that both minor abuse and severe physical abuse occurred. Because there is a large overlap between minor and severe physical for victims, we choose to focus on severe physical violence in subsequent analyses in this report.

While there were no significance differences on the subscales of the CTS2 for men or women between experimental and control group, the important question is whether men's' self-reported use of severe physical abuse is related to the experimental assignment, domestic violence counseling or stake in conformity variables. An analysis of this issue was conducted using the information from the defendant's second survey six months post-sentencing. We will briefly describe the independent and control variables before moving to a logistic regression model to predict men's' severe physical abuse.

Independent and control variables: The meta-analyses of the Minneapolis and SARP experiments indicated that criminal justice interventions might be mediated by variables related to an offender's stake in conformity. Therefore, we next investigated the impact of the experimental intervention while controlling for stake in conformity variables. Information was collected from the probation folders on the batterer's employment status (number of months employed in his current job), his residential stability (the number of times he moved while under probation supervision), marital status, and his age (calculated based on his year of birth).

A man could be mandated to attend the batterers' intervention program and not attend some or all of the sessions. Alternately, a batterer might have been placed in the

control (no treatment) group and attend counseling on his own. Therefore, we needed to include independent variables from the experimental manipulation to examine group assignment as well as treatment received. Towards those ends, we included the following variables: group assignment (experimental versus control) and the number of domestic violence sessions attended. We also included an interaction term of group assignment by number of domestic violence classes. The interaction term is important because the men were mandated to go to classes. Essentially the interaction term assesses mandatory attendance.

The information necessary to conduct this analysis came from the probation folders and was available for the majority of cases (97%). First we present frequency distributions on variables in the model before moving to the logistic regression model. The independent variables for group assignment are coded as control group (0) and experimental group (1).

The number of domestic violence classes attended varied from a minimum of zero to a maximum of 50. When a man was ordered to attend classes, he most always was ordered to attend 26 sessions (there were only a few exceptions). Of those mandated into counseling, eventually approximately two-thirds attended all of the sessions and about 13% attended no classes. Of the control group, 97% attended no classes while 3% (N=5) did.

Dummy variables were created to assess marital status examining married (44.6%) (coded as 1) versus others (coded as 0), and divorced or separated (12.8%; coded as 1) versus others (coded as zero). Year of birth varied from 1926 to 1978 with the average age of the defendant being 35 (SD=10).

Offenders' reports of severe physical abuse: Table Twenty-six shows the number of times that that these men moved while under probation. The mean number of moves was 0.8 (SD=1.2). The most common value was zero as the majority of men did not move during this time. The distribution is somewhat skewed (1.7) but not so severely that it would need to be normalized for analysis in logistic regression.

**Table Twenty-six
Number of Residential Moves While Under Probation Supervision**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Number of moves	0	213	52.7	57.3
	1	80	19.8	21.5
	2	39	9.7	10.5
	3	22	5.4	5.9
	4	13	3.2	3.5
	5	3	.7	.8
	6	1	.2	.3
	7	1	.2	.3
	Total	372	92.1	100.0
	Missing	32	7.9	
Total		404	100.0%	

Table Twenty-seven shows the number of months that these men were working while under probation. The range is from zero to fourteen (some men were on probation for fourteen months). The mean number of months employed was 6.8 (SD=4.3). The most common values were eleven and twelve months. The distribution is normally distributed.

**Table Twenty-seven
Number of Months Employed While Under Probation Supervision**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Number of months Employed	0	40	9.9	10.8
	1	24	5.9	6.5
	2	16	4.0	4.3
	3	31	7.7	8.3
	4	15	3.7	4.0
	5	13	3.2	3.5
	6	20	5.0	5.4
	7	27	6.7	7.3
	8	28	6.9	7.5
	9	32	7.9	8.6
	10	21	5.2	5.6
	11	43	10.6	11.6
	12	43	10.6	11.6
	13	18	4.5	4.8
	14	1	.2	.3
Total		372	92.1	100.0
Missing		32	7.9	
Total		404	100.0%	

The result of a logistic regression model predicting men's self-reported prevalence of severe physical abuse is shown in Table Twenty-eight. This model should be taken as suggestive because of a weak model fit. Additionally, the sample of men for this analysis do not include men who had already been violated on probation or were no longer showing for their probation appointments. The method of data collection was such that interviews were collected at probation and these individuals would not be reporting.

These results suggest that age of the defendant and lack of residential stability were significant predictors of offenders' self-reported prevalence of severe physical abuse against their partners. Younger men and those who moved more self-reported greater prevalence of severe physical abuse. There are no differences based on experimental assignment, attendance in domestic violence classes, or the interaction of group by

domestic violence classes. Marital status and employment also were not significant predictors of physical abuse.

Table Twenty-eight
Logistic Regression Model of Offenders' Reports of the
Prevalence of Severe Physical Violence

Variable	B	R
Assigned to experimental group	-.626	
Number of DV Classes Attended	-.035	
Group x DV classes	.061	
Age	-.083**	-.14
Married	-.130	
Divorced or separated	-.117	
Number of moves	.443**	.19
Months employed	-.037	
Intercept	.091	
Model Chi-square=12.4, p<.14 N=164 * p<.10 ** p<.05		

There are two competing explanations for the results in this table. First is that the batterers' program is ineffective in changing the levels of severe physical abuse of men mandated to attend. Second is that the CTS2 is not adequately measuring the prevalence of violence of these men. The CTS2 grows out of the CTS, which is a standardized measure with known reliability and validity. Therefore, it seems more reasonable to assert that attendance in domestic violence classes is not effective in reducing the level of physical abuse.

Victims' Reported Prevalence of Severe Physical Abuse

Victims' reports of severe physical abuse: The result of a logistic regression model of victims' reports predicting severe physical abuse is shown in Table Twenty-nine. This model should also be taken as suggestive because of a weak model fit.

Table Twenty-nine
Logistic Regression Model of Victims' Reports
of the Prevalence of Severe Physical Violence

Variable	B	R
Assigned to experimental group	-1.145	
Number of DV Classes Attended	.476	
Group x DV classes	-.460	
Age	-.084**	-.14
Married	-1.354**	-.11
Months employed	-.128*	-.06
Intercept	2.909	
Model Chi-square=8.7, $p < .19$ N=89 * $p < .10$ ** $p < .05$		

Because of a very small N, divorced/separated and number of moves were also dropped from the model. These results indicate the primacy of stake in conformity variables. Age and marital status of the offender were significant predictors of victims' reports on the prevalence of severe physical abuse. Employment, though not significant, demonstrated a tendency to relate to severe physical violence. Specifically, younger men, not being married, and fewer months worked by the offender while on probation were associated with greater reports of severe physical abuse. Similar to the offender model,

there are no differences based on experimental assignment, attendance in domestic violence counseling classes, or the interaction of group by domestic violence classes.

Note that it is necessary to qualify the findings in this table as tentative because of the small number of victim reports. Next, we examine the offenders' behavior using official reports of violations of probation and arrest.

Official Reports

Violations of Probation: We collected information from the probation folders to assess if defendants were violated during their one year on probation and if so, the reason(s) for violation. The reasons for violation of probation (VOP) in this sample included: failure to report to probation; failure to pay for cost of supervision; use of controlled substances (or testing positive); failure to attend or enroll in a substance abuse program; failure to attend or enroll in a domestic violence program; violations of other conditions of probation; failure to complete other court ordered program(s); additional domestic violence arrest or other arrest; additional convictions and other reasons.

As Table Thirty indicates, 46% of the men were violated on one or more occasions during their year on probation. The average number of VOPs was 2.1 (SD=1.0). Almost one-third of the men faced *more* than one violation during their one year on probation. A crosstabular analysis shows that approximately 45% of men (78 of 173) in the control group and 48% (109 of 227) in the experimental group were violated from probation on one or more occasion. There is no significant difference in the percentage of VOPs between the control and experimental groups ($\chi^2 = 34$, $df=4$, $p>.05$).

One of the possible reasons for VOP was a failure to attend a batterers' intervention program. Only those in the experimental group could be subjected to this requirement. As such, we must examine whether those mandated into counseling were violated for the sole reason of failing to attend counseling. If such a finding was true, men in the experimental group should not be compared to men in the control group. While the VOP rate was high, we found only one case where the violation was solely because of a failure to attend the batterer intervention program. Therefore, comparison between control and experimental groups on VOPs does not appear to be unfair. Those in the court-mandated group do not face a realistically increased likelihood of violation for this sole additional criterion.

Table Thirty
Violations of Probation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Number of VOPs	1	66	16.3	35.3
	2	57	14.1	30.5
	3	46	11.4	24.6
	4	16	4.0	8.6
	5	2	0.5	1.1
	Total	187	46.3	100.0
	Zero	217	53.7	
Total		404	100.0%	

A logistic regression analysis was performed to investigate the impact of the experimental intervention while controlling for stake in conformity variables. These are the same variables that we used in estimating self-reports of severe physical abuse. The experimental intervention is modeled by estimating the impact of group assignment, whether he went to domestic violence classes, and an interaction effect which models

group assignment by domestic violence classes (mandatory attendance). A number of other models may have been estimated to predict violation of probation, particularly using variables from the defendant interviews, but we limited our analysis in this report to variables where we have near complete information. The results of this analysis are presented in Table Thirty-one.

Table Thirty-one
Logistic Regression Model Predicting Violation of Probation

Variable	B	R
Assigned to experimental group	2.841**	.16
Number of DV Classes Attended	-.303**	-.16
Group x DV classes	.176**	.11
Age	-.044**	-.11
Married	-1.214**	-.17
Divorced or separated	-.434	
Number of moves	.360**	.13
Months employed	-.225	-.26
Intercept	2.981	
Model Chi-square=157.0, p<.001 N=361 * p<.05 ** p<.01		

The logistic regression model estimates the structural relationships between variables with the beta coefficients representing the log odds for each variable. The R statistic, analogous to a standardized beta in OLS regression, is an indicator of the importance of a variable for the model. We will discuss the patterns in this table and then present the probabilities and log-odds ratios for some hypothetical situations.

The results of the logistic regression model of violation of probation suggest that being in the experimental makes a difference. First, group assignment increases the log

odds of VOP by a factor of about 2.8 times. In other words, those assigned to the experimental group, all things equal, are 2.8 times more likely to be violated while on probation in comparison to those placed into the control condition. Second, there is an inverse relationship between the number of domestic violence classes and VOP. That is, the more classes attended, the less likely the man is to be violated on probation. And third, the positive coefficient for the interaction effect indicates that mandatory attendance of domestic violence classes somewhat offsets the estimated benefit of these classes. To help clarify, we will discuss these variables in more detail when we present some scenarios on VOP.

The importance of stake in conformity variables in predicting successful completion of probation is clear. Looking at the R statistic, the number of months employed is the most important factor in prediction violation of probation. Residential stability, age, and marital status are also significantly related to VOP. A man who moves is more likely to be violated on probation. Younger men are more likely than older men to be violated on probation. And, married persons are less likely to be violated on probation.

The information in Table Thirty-one can be used to estimate the probability that a man will be violated on probation. As an example, we will calculate the likelihood of a violation of probation for a man who is in the experimental group, goes to all of the mandatory domestic violence sessions, is married, age 35, with high residential stability (no moves) and worked his entire time on probation. We will use the estimated coefficients from Table Thirty-one to predict the likelihood that he will be violated on probation in Table Thirty-two. We change the coefficients to calculate probabilities

changing whether he is in the experimental or control group, the number of sessions he attended, and the number of months that he worked.

Looking at Table Thirty-two, Cells A, B, and C vary the number of domestic violence classes attended (26, 20, 0) for a man in the experimental group who worked all twelve months while on probation. (We used 0 and 26 classes as the range of classes attended and also included 20 classes since this was a clear break point between those men who attended classes and those men who did not go to counseling.) This is similar to cells G, H, and I though these are men in the control group. Cells D, E and F again vary the number of domestic violence classes attended (26, 20 and 0) for men in the experimental group who were not employed throughout their probation. Alternately, cells J, K and L are control men attending varying amounts of counseling who were unemployed throughout their time on probation.

The estimated probabilities of violation of probation for each cell allow us to assess the benefits of counseling and the relative importance of other variables. There are many other combinations of cells that the reader may estimate choosing their own criteria on each of the variables. (For instance, the relative impact of the batterer program for employed versus unemployed men in the experimental group and whether this is similar in comparison to employed versus unemployed men in the control group.)

Let's begin by looking at the scenario of a man who was mandated to attend a batterers' program, attended all of the sessions, is married, age 35, has not moved during his time on probation though he has worked throughout this time. Cells A suggest that the man described above has an estimated probability of .048, or about a 5% chance, of violation of probation. We now compare to cells G profiling a man with the same characteristics

except he was assigned into the no treatment control group. This man is predicted to have an extremely low chance of VOP at .0001. More likely, the man assigned to the control (no treatment) group would not have voluntarily gone to any domestic violence classes. Therefore, we compare Cells A (a 35 year old man, married, employed with high residential stability who was mandated into counseling and attended all sessions) with Cells I (a batterer with the same characteristics who was placed into the control group and therefore attended no counseling sessions). Here we see the only situation in which the experimental group has a lower probability of a violation in comparison to the control group. Specifically, the man represented by Cells A has a 5% likelihood of violation in comparison to an 8% probability for the man placed in the control group. This is not a substantial difference. Comparisons between those in the experimental and control groups indicate that this is the only situation where those in the experimental group have a decreased likelihood of violating.

The table can also be used to compare the impact of the number of domestic violence classes attended for each of the two groups. For instance, for the experimental group, the probability of VOP is predicted to increase if he goes to fewer sessions. Dropping the number of classes from 26 to 20 suggests an increase from 5% (.048) to about 21% (.207). If the man instead attends none of the domestic violence sessions, the probability of a violation of probation is expected to increase to about 59%. Similarly situated men who were assigned instead into the control group (cells G, H, I), would be expected to have a very low probability of VOP if they attend the batterer program and a relatively low VOP probability of about 8% even if they attended no domestic violence classes.

Table Thirty-two
Estimated Probabilities of Violation of Probation According to
Treatment Assignment and Batterer Characteristics

Variables											
Cell	Group	DV Classes	Group by DV classes	Married	Div/Sep	Age	Number of moves	Months worked	Constant	E	Estimated probability VOP
A	Exp	26	26	Yes	No	35	Zero	12	2.98	.0505	.048
B	Exp	20	20	Yes	No	35	Zero	12	2.98	.261	.207
C	Exp	0	0	Yes	No	35	Zero	12	2.98	1.445	.591
D	Exp	26	26	Yes	No	35	Zero	0	2.98	.7513	.4290
E	Exp	20	20	Yes	No	35	Zero	0	2.98	1.6291	.6196
F	Exp	0	0	Yes	No	35	Zero	0	2.98	21.499	.9556
G	Control	26	0	Yes	No	35	Zero	12	2.98	.0001	.0001
H	Control	20	0	Yes	No	35	Zero	12	2.98	.0002	.0002
I	Control	0	0	Yes	No	35	Zero	12	2.98	.0843	.0778
J	Control	26	0	Yes	No	35	Zero	0	2.98	.0005	.0005
K	Control	20	0	Yes	No	35	Zero	0	2.98	.0029	.0029
L	Control	0	0	Yes	No	35	Zero	0	2.98	1.2548	.5565

Let's look now at what is expected to happen if the men were not working during this period. We find substantial changes in the probability of VOP for men in the experimental group (cells D, E, and F) at 43% for men who attended all the batterers' intervention sessions, jumping to 62% at 20 domestic violence sessions, and extremely high at 96% if they attended no sessions. (Note, however, that there were no men who were unemployed the whole time and who fully attended the complete batterers' intervention program.) This pattern is not found to the same extent for men in the control group (cells J, K, L) as they have very low predicted probabilities of VOP if they are attending domestic violence sessions, and a 56% VOP rate if they do not attend.

It is recommended that the reader take some time to review Table Thirty-two at length and compare the likelihood of a violation of probation amongst various types of batterers (e.g., those in the control versus experimental groups, those employed versus unemployed, etc.). The results in this table suggest that assignment to a batterers' program increases the likelihood of being violated. Furthermore, the only thing that can overcome this greater likelihood is if the batterer attends *all* the domestic violence classes. Next we examine these same variables to assess their effects on rearrests.

Rearrests: We obtained information on rearrests for the time the men were on probation from probation folders and from the county's Sheriff's Office using their crime control records. We were able to obtain information on the number of rearrests and type of arrests. Table Thirty-three shows a cross-tabulation of men rearrested by the experimental assignment.

Table Thirty-three
All Rearrests By Experimental Assignment

		Preassigned Group		Total
		Control	Experimental	
Arrested	Yes	41 23.7%	55 24.2%	96 24.0%
	No	132 76.3%	172 75.8%	304 76.0%
Total		173 100.0%	227 100.0%	400 100%

As the table indicates, about 24% of the men in the study were rearrested on one or more occasions while they were on probation. At a bivariate level, there were no significant differences in likelihood of a future arrest between the experimental and control groups.

A logistic regression was estimated using the same variables used in the analysis of violation of probation. Table Thirty-four indicates that attending domestic violence classes had a significant impact on rearrest. However, assignment to the experimental group was not significant in predicting the likelihood of a future rearrest. Instead, the number of domestic violence classes, the intervention between group assignment and domestic violence classes, and some of the stake in conformity variables were related to rearrest. While marital status and residential stability were not related to a rearrest, age and employment were. Specifically, younger men were more likely to face an arrest during their one year on probation. Additionally, the number of months employed significantly reduced the likelihood of an arrest. In fact, the logistic regression indicated that employment was the most important factor accounting for variation in a rearrest in this model.

As we did with violations of probation, we present estimates that men in different situations would be rearrested during their one year in the community. Table Thirty-five presents several different scenarios to illustrate the logistic regression model of rearrest for a number of scenarios. Cell A depicts a man in the experimental group who attended all classes, was married, age 35, with high residential stability and who worked all 12 months while on probation. According to our estimates, he faces a 7% likelihood of rearrest. Compare this to cell I for a man with all of the same characteristics except that he was assigned into the control group and therefore attended none of the domestic violence classes (9% likelihood of rearrest). As can be seen, these men have near equal probabilities of rearrest.

**Table Thirty-four
Logistic Regression Model Predicting Rearrests**

Variable	B	R
Assigned to experimental group	.529	
Number of DV Classes Attended	-.154*	-.10
Group x DV classes	.125*	.09
Age	-.032*	-.07
Married	.069	
Divorced or separated	.022	
Number of moves	.084	
Months employed	-.161**	-.22
Intercept	.616	
Model Chi-square=42.2, p<.001 N=361 * p<.05 ** p<.01		

A review of the table indicates that there are significant differences in the probability of rearrest based on attendance in the batterers' program but it appears that these come with a substantial price to the probation system. A man in the experimental

group who attends 20 classes is twice (2.2 times) as likely to be rearrested than a man who attends all 26 classes (all other factors held equal in cells A and B). The ratio is calculated as the probability for cell B divided by the probability for cell A. The ratio for rearrest is about eleven times higher if he attends no classes than those attending all domestic violence classes.

Looking at cells G, H, and I we do not see the dramatic benefits of attending the batterers' intervention programs. Men who are *not* required to attend a domestic violence counseling have lower rearrest rates than men who are required to attend, all other factors held equal. Attendance does significantly reduce the probability of rearrest for men who voluntarily go to a batterers' intervention program (dropping from 9% with no classes to near zero for attending all 26 classes). While the same is true for those in the experimental group (attendance reduces their probability of rearrest), just by virtue of being court-mandated into counseling, they begin with a higher likelihood of failure. This can only be overcome by attendance. In other words, for men in the experimental group, there is about a 73% difference in likelihood of rearrest comparing cells A (7% rearrested) and C (80%) simply because, in Cell C, he was in the experimental group and he refused to go to sessions. The similar man in the control group who was not required to attend was only predicted to be arrested in about 9% of cases.

Note that it is stake in conformity variables that lead to the largest amount of variation in likelihood of re-arrest. To illustrate this point, take a look at a defendant in cell B who is assigned to counseling, has high stake in conformity and attends some but not all of his sessions. If you compare his rate of re-arrest with the rate of a similarly situated (on stake in conformity variables) man in cell I who is assigned into the control group, we

see a difference of 16% versus 9%, respectively, in their likelihood of being re-arrested. Notice that the man in this instance who was assigned to counseling is expected to have a higher likelihood of re-arrest than a comparable man who was not assigned into this treatment program. Next, comparing this high stake in conformity man (full employment) assigned to the experimental group who completes some but not all of his counseling (cell B) with a low stake in conformity man (no employment) assigned to the experimental condition who completes a similar amount of sessions (cell E) we see a difference in likelihood of re-arrest of 16% versus 57% respectively.

These comparisons indicate two primary findings from our study. First, where the court assigns counseling and the individual fails to attend most or all of the sessions, there is an increased likelihood of re-arrest when compared to a similarly situated man who was never assigned counseling. Second, the above comparisons indicate the primacy of employment over attendance in predicting re-arrest amongst men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence (see Table Thirty-four).

In summary, for those assigned to the batterers' intervention program, attending these classes can significantly reduce their likelihood of a re-arrest. The same is true with those placed into the control (no treatment) group. However, when comparing similarly situated men (in terms of marital status, employment, residential stability and age) from the experimental and control groups, we see that those in the control group almost always fare better than those in the experimental group on rearrests.

It is important to note, however, that while attending classes may reduce the likelihood of re-arrest, this reduction will be modest (significant though not always substantial). There were larger differences in re-arrest based on stake in conformity

Table Thirty-five
Estimated Probabilities of Rearrests According to
Treatment Assignment and Batterer Characteristics

Variables											
Cells	Group	DV Classes	Group by DV classes	Married	Div/Sep	Age	Number of moves	Months worked	Constant	e	Estimated probability Rearrest
A	Exp	26	26	Yes	No	35	Zero	12	.616	.0756	.0703
B	Exp	20	20	Yes	No	35	Zero	12	.616	.1898	.1595
C	Exp	0	0	Yes	No	35	Zero	12	.616	4.0886	.8035
D	Exp	26	26	Yes	No	35	Zero	0	.616	.5196	.3420
E	Exp	20	20	Yes	No	35	Zero	0	.616	1.3055	.5663
F	Exp	0	0	Yes	No	35	Zero	0	.616	28.1233	.9657
G	Control	26	0	Yes	No	35	Zero	12	.616	.0017	.0017
H	Control	20	0	Yes	No	35	Zero	12	.616	.0044	.0044
I	Control	0	0	Yes	No	35	Zero	12	.616	.0941	.0860
J	Control	26	0	Yes	No	35	Zero	0	.616	.0120	.0018
K	Control	20	0	Yes	No	35	Zero	0	.616	.0301	.0292
L	Control	0	0	Yes	No	35	Zero	0	.616	.6474	.3930

variables (e.g., employment). While many people may assert that the State cannot control stake in conformity variables (for instance, whether or not a man is employed), the same counter would seem to apply to getting these men to attend the domestic violence sessions. Specifically, the State mandated domestic violence intervention and then monitored and sanctioned when men failed to comply (unlike the situation in Harrell's site). Despite all of this, Probation was still unable to get all of the men to complete their sessions. Again, we recommend that the reader spend some time playing with various combinations of factors for men in the experimental and control groups using the table to assess probabilities.

There are a large number of different tables that could be produced to show different combinations of variables and the predicted likelihood of re-arrest but concerns about space preclude such an approach. In presenting these combinations of variables, it is important to note that there is an effect where the number of domestic violence classes attended leads to a reduction in the likelihood of rearrest. However, it is critical to bear in mind that mandating classes is also associated with higher rates of rearrest for men who are required to take these classes. We need to look at the specific circumstances of these men, as mandating batterers' interventions spouse abuse abatement programs led to higher likelihood of rearrest for some men (compare Cells C and I). Next we examine types of rearrest.

Violent crimes: Information was collected on the types of rearrest while on probation (see Appendix Two for survey instruments). We assess the prevalence of arrests for violent crimes (stalking, domestic battery, non-domestic battery, false

imprisonment) and domestic violence over the one year period. It is important to note that men might be rearrested for a domestic assault and it could be called a battery or assault. With that in mind, we found the prevalence (one or more arrests) of rearrest was about 7.7% for violent crime and approximately 5.3% for domestic battery.

Table Thirty-six
All Violent Crime Rearrests By Experimental Assignment

		Preassigned Group		Total
		Control	Experimental	
Rearrested Violent Crime	Yes	12 6.9%	19 8.4%	31 7.7%
	No	161 93.1%	208 91.6%	369 92.3%
Total		173 100.0%	227 100.0%	400 100%

Crosstabular analyses were used to examine if the relatively rare prevalence of rearrests for violent crime were related to experimental assignment and to attendance in domestic violence group counseling. Tables Thirty-six indicates that 6.9% of the control group and 8.4% of the experimental group were rearrested for a violent crime on one or more occasion during their year on probation. This difference between groups was not found to be significant ($\chi^2 = 28, df=1, p>.05$). Furthermore, Thirty-seven indicates that attending the domestic violence classes does not significantly lessen the likelihood of a violent arrest ($\chi^2 = 1.4, df=1, p>.05$).

**Table Thirty-seven
All Violent Crime Rearrests By Attended Counseling**

		Attended DV Classes		Total
		Yes	No	
Rearrested Violent Crime	Yes	12 6.1%	19 9.3%	31 7.7%
	No	184 93.9%	185 90.7%	369 92.3%
Total		196 100.0%	204 100.0%	400 100%

Tables Thirty-eight indicates that 5.8% of the control group and 4.8% of the experimental groups were rearrested one or more times for a new domestic violence offense during their one year on probation. Again, this difference was not found to be significant ($\chi^2 = 19, df=1, p>.05$). And Thirty-nine shows that attendance at the batterers' intervention program does not significantly reduce the likelihood of a domestic violence arrest ($\chi^2 = 1.05, df=1, p>.05$).

**Table Thirty-eight
All Domestic Violence Rearrests By Experimental Assignment**

		Preassigned Group		Total
		Control	Experimental	
Rearrested Domestic Violence	Yes	10 5.8%	11 4.8%	21 5.3%
	No	161 94.2%	216 95.2%	389 94.7%
Total		173 100.0%	227 100.0%	400 100%

**Table Thirty-nine
All Domestic Violence Crime Rearrests By Attended Counseling**

		Attended DV Classes		Total
		Yes	No	
Rearrested Domestic Violence	Yes	8 4.1%	13 6.4%	21 5.3%
	No	188 95.9%	191 93.6%	379 94.7%
Total		196 100.0%	204 100.0%	400 100%

Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to test the efficacy of court-mandated counseling for domestic violence offenders. The results presented in this chapter have shown that there were not clear and demonstrable effects of counseling on the offenders' attitudes, beliefs and behaviors. The analysis of attitudinal data from the offender failed to show changes in his attitudes at six months post-sentencing. Analysis of self-reported and victim-reported psychological and physical abuse, using the revised Conflict Tactics Scales, suggested that his behavior had not changed over time. Of note, there was still evidence of severe physical abuse at six months post-sentencing.

Looking at official reports, there was some evidence that men assigned into the counseling programs were more likely to be violated on probation. However, multivariate analysis of rearrest data failed to show a substantive effect of counseling on reducing rearrests. Bivariate analysis of violent crimes and domestic violence arrests found no effects of experimental assignment or of attending counseling. The results in this chapter suggest that stake in conformity variables may have an impact on severe physical abuse and rearrest.

The lack of a substantive impact of counseling and the importance of stake in conformity variables need to be discussed. In the following chapters we will discuss the results of the Broward Experiment to show how it fits into the literature on domestic violence.

CHAPTER SIX

THE ENVIRONMENT IN WHICH THE EXPERIMENT TOOK PLACE AND ITS LIMITATIONS

This chapter discusses the environment in which the Broward Experiment took place. The design and implementation of a randomized experiment in a criminal justice setting requires cooperation from a large number of individuals across several different agencies. Below we speak about the politics that surrounded the Broward Experiment throughout the time that it ran. The resistance that the principal investigator encountered and the decisions that she made are all discussed. This leads logically to a discussion on the limitations of this study as it was designed and implemented.

The Environment Surrounding the Broward Experiment

In 1996, the principal investigator went to speak with Judge Geoffrey Cohen, one of the two domestic violence judges in Broward County,³ about the possibility of implementing an experiment to test the effectiveness of court-mandated counseling. At this first meeting, even before she had the opportunity to speak about why she had come, the judge began talking about an expert who had given him a listing of studies that “proved” the efficacy of counseling for men convicted of domestic violence. He candidly admitted that his experience as judge in a domestic violence court had led him to be less confident that treatment worked than had been this expert. His question to the principal

³ It was understood at that time that the other domestic violence judge was moving to another court and that a new judge would be replacing him.

investigator was whether his jurisdiction was doing something different since it was not experiencing this overwhelming success with treating batterers.

This question gave the principal investigator a wonderful opportunity to discuss evaluation research and how not all studies' results should be given equal weight (Sherman et al., 1997). Some research designs are more rigorous than others and, as such, we have increased confidence in the more rigorous designs. But first the principal investigator borrowed the list of studies and did some research of her own. She investigated each study, paying close attention to the rigors of its design. Several weeks later she returned to the judge's chamber and spoke about each study and its limitations. Before she could discuss very many studies, the judge demonstrated his savvy and began volunteering limitations on his own. Now more than ever, he wanted to know how we could test the efficacy of batterers' treatment programs.

The principal investigator discussed the need for a classical experimental design and the benefits from this type of study. Though at first hesitant about implementing random assignment, once the judge understood why other methods could not rule out competing explanations, he committed to the experiment. When the new domestic violence judge came on the bench (Judge Alfred Horowitz), he quickly understood why nothing less than an experimental design would adequately answer the question that concerned both judges.

The Broward Experiment proposed using a classical experimental design to test the efficacy of court-mandated counseling for men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence. As such, *all* men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence in Broward County during a five-month period meeting minimum criteria would be placed into either

experimental (one-year probation supervision and six months court-mandated counseling) or control (one-year probation supervision) conditions.

After establishing relationships within the criminal justice community, we then sought funding from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to implement this study. Before writing the grant application, we began to build partnerships in the community. As word of our proposed research study spread, only the prosecutor's office opposed the study. Their position was that random assignment was unethical. This opinion was based on their belief that victims whose husbands or boyfriends were not assigned into court-mandated counseling (the control group) would be at greater risk of being victimized.

In meetings with the State Attorney and the head prosecutor of the Domestic Violence Unit, we were led to believe that while they were opposed to this study, they would not necessarily actively fight it if the judges proceeded. Their statement was that they were against random assignment of court dispositions but would not throw themselves on the "sword of Damocles."⁴ Later we realized that it would have been better to have full support from all parties. At the time, though, we decided that we could live with the prosecutor's decision to passively oppose the research and so we proceeded. We received the grant award and began the study.

On the first day of random assignment, the prosecutor's office called in the media to tell them about the experiment underway. When the newspapers finally called the Principle Investigator, they had already heard quite a lot about the experiment. Their questions indicated that they viewed the experiment as anti-victim. One reporter even

⁴ It appears that the State Attorney had his Greek metaphors somewhat mixed. Damocles sat at a banquet with a sword suspended over his head by a single hair to show him the perilous nature of his happiness. On the other hand, Roman warriors would throw themselves on the sword rather than risk defeat in battle.

saw parallels to the experiments conducted in Nazi Germany. In each case, we tried to explain that we were doing this on *behalf* of victims. That we should not continue to assume that court-mandated counseling was effective in reducing future violence until that assumption had been rigorously tested. To our surprise, the reporters wrote articles that were not sensational and fairly described the study underway. Even more surprising, the editorial board of the largest newspaper in the area read the grant application and came out in full support of our research.

But while the press was quieted, other problems loomed. Within the courthouse, the researchers worked within a hostile environment. Those in the prosecutor's office (which included the victim advocates) felt that our experiment was placing victims in danger. Given this belief, it is understandable that we would be greeted with a great deal of antagonism. Instead of having their help in tracking victims who had not shown up in court when the defendant appeared, we were left trying to call them on the phone.

Additionally, the visible opposition to the project led many who had previously supported the research to take a step back from our project. While they did not actively oppose the research, their lack of support (which they had previously committed to and upon which we were relying) strained our resources. The literature is replete with examples where agency staff intentionally or unintentionally, actively or passively, sabotaged an experiment (Boruch, 1997; Devine et al., 1994). Whether these efforts were done to protect the agency's interests or because staff thought it would protect those of their client's, there is no way of knowing. In the case of the Broward Experiment, the form staff resistance took was to make it difficult for the research team to gain access to defendants, victims and official records. While it was understood from the beginning that

the Prosecutor's Office would not be assisting our efforts in running the experiment, what took us by surprise was the Domestic Violence Probation Unit's distancing themselves from us once the controversy surrounding the study became known.

In fact, before the experiment became controversial, a few of the Probation Officers (POs) had told us quite frankly that they opposed the study since they believed that it put victims whose partners were assigned the control group at greater risk. This belief continued despite our repeated attempts to point out that this was an assumption that needed to be tested. However, both the number of POs and their intensity of feelings in opposition to the study seemed to grow once the study became ensnared in controversy. Some of the POs made it difficult to gain access to defendants when it was time for interviews. The same POs also made obtaining the probation folders of the men in our sample much more difficult than it had to be.

As noted elsewhere, "The heart of the program-research conflict is that researchers are interested in knowing whether a program worked whereas program people are interested in showing that the program worked: in that subtle distinction lies a world of pain" (Devine, Wright and Joyner, 1994: 32). On the one hand, what is especially interesting about the Broward Experiment is the fact that Probation was never being evaluated by the experiment. The court-mandated counseling programs were run outside of Probation by persons not connected to that office. Therefore, these POs' strong and negative reactions to the experiment and the research team did not fit the usual pattern.

On the other hand, much of the research was conducted out of their office (so that we could have access to the probationers for purposes of interviewing them). Their office space was already cramped without the addition of one or two research assistants

working on an experiment. Additionally, it was Probation's responsibility to provide all the probation folders needed to track these offenders for their one-year period out in the community. No doubt, they probably felt that they had enough to do without having to provide us with these records for our study. Finally, since we worked in the Probation Office for over a year, it is also possible that some POs might have felt threatened that we were going to evaluate their performance.

At the same time, it is important not to overstate the case. At no point in time were all POs actively hostile to the experiment. Throughout our tenure in their office, there were always POs who were helpful and supportive of the research endeavor. And towards the end an unspoken understanding seemed to be reached that the research team was not going to go away without the data that we had come to collect. The situation we experienced in this office speaks to the wisdom of Garner and Visher's warning that experiments, in order to be successful, require the consent of mid-level managers as well as the top administrators.

We continued to move forward with our research knowing that the prosecutor's office was committed to appealing the judges' decision. Pro bono counsel was arranged and all assumed that the university would serve as *amicus curie* (friend of the court) on the brief. When the university refused, noting that approval by their Institutional Review Board did not mean the university approved of the study, we began speaking with prominent professional organizations, state and federal agencies, and influential persons requesting that they read the grant proposal and, if supportive, serve as *amicus*. Our position was simple. Contrary to the prosecutor's claim, the judges argued that it was within their discretion to place sentenced defendants in a control group on a random

basis. Additionally, we all argued that it was unethical to mandate an intervention that had not been rigorously tested such that we understood the possible positive *and* negative consequences of the treatment. In all, over forty organizations and numerous individuals were contacted. Though many associations were supportive of our research and offered help in various ways, only one – the American Society of Criminology – stepped forward and agreed to serve as a friend of the court for this case.

In a surprising legal twist, we learned after the fact that the State Attorney appealed the actions of the judges in two cases where defendants were placed on probation but not ordered to participate in batterer intervention counseling as a condition of their probation. Both these cases had been decided eight days earlier. The circuit court, acting in their appellate capacity, ruled in favor of the prosecutor disapproving of the trial courts' use of random assignment. The appellate court did not remand for resentencing but merely reversed the decisions of the trial judges. Since neither the researcher nor the judges were a party of record, none of us had been notified of the filing of notices of appeal, received the State's brief, or was given the opportunity to respond in a court of law.

The judges' position was that in the absence of specific direction to re-sentence or remand, they had no authority or jurisdiction to re-sentence the remaining defendants. The judges denied the State's Emergency Motion to Comply with the Mandate of the circuit Court and/or Motion to Impose Counseling. After failing in its efforts to compel the trial court to re-sentence the defendants, the State filed an Emergency Motion to Enforce the Mandate by which it requested the appellate court to compel the trial judges to re-sentence all defendants placed in the control group. The court denied the motion and subsequently dismissed the State's Petition for a Writ of Mandamus.

By this time, one of the defendant's term of probation had expired, and most of the men in our sample had completed or were close to completing their one year period of probation. Therefore, the adverse appellate decision had no effect on the experiment.

During this time period, a man who had pled no contest to a domestic battery offense in this county brutally murdered his wife in front of his children and neighbors. Since the man had not been in our sample, he had been placed on probation and into the court-mandated counseling program. While this incident did not prove that court-mandated counseling was ineffective, it did speak loudly to the need to conduct rigorous research to determine this treatment's impact on rates of recidivism. Other than those involved in the experiments, however, no one made that connection. At that point, more than ever before, those of us involved in the experiment knew just how much was at stake. While a death of any victim of domestic violence is a tragedy, we were sure that had the husband been in the control group (and therefore not mandated into counseling) the murder would have been blamed on the experiment and the judges would have been crucified in the local media.

In all, even though we never knew from day to day if the experiment would be closed down, we continued going to the courthouse and to probation, and interviewing offenders and their victims. We were probably more surprised than anyone that we had been able to continue for the full seventeen months and complete the experiment. However, we paid a heavy toll to complete the experiment. The hostility that the research assistants were subjected to in the courthouse and in probation, along with the uncertainty from day to day regarding whether the experiment would be continued, led to low morale. This, in turn, led to high staff turnover. The Principal Investigator was almost constantly

engaged in training personnel because of this high staff turnover. She also found it necessary to have frequent staff meetings in order to boost spirit amongst the research assistants. Everyone on the research team was continually involved in efforts to educate agency personnel about the need for randomized experiments so as to minimize misunderstandings regarding our study and facilitate data collection efforts. For seventeen months, we learned and re-learned the same hard lesson --- that we had little control over events that affected the status of our experiment.

As Boruch has said, "No design for a randomized field test can anticipate all the issues or obstacles that may emerge in its execution. . . . The main lessons from these and other experiences is that the possibility of failure is real" (Boruch, 1997: 166,184)

Limitations of the Study

There is no doubt that the controversy surrounding the study impeded the research in many ways. It lowered response rates for both victims and defendants. It led to the primary researcher having to spend more time on the politics of the experiment (e.g., calling individuals and associations to enlist them to serve as amicus on the upcoming court case). It led to high staff turnover on the project. Undoubtedly, the researcher's own inexperience in implementing and running an experimental design also led to some errors being made that a more experienced researcher might have been able to avoid. Below we list some of the important limitations of the study. Our frank discussion of these limitations is meant to provide the reader with an understanding of the parameters of this research. Additionally, we hope that others will use this knowledge to build stronger experimental designs.

Low Victim Response Rates: One important limitation to this study was the low victim response rate. Since the prosecutor's office was opposed to this study, we were not able to use their victim advocates to get victim contact information. Therefore, we had no choice but to rely on women who came to court when their batterer was being tried. In a little less than half the cases, the victim never showed in court. When this happened, the only means at our disposal was to use the telephone number (if there was one) listed in the police reports. Since the incident might have happened weeks before the defendant's appearance in court, many of these numbers were no longer valid. We found that once the woman was lost to the study, she could not easily be found. We searched updated telephone listings. We sent out letters asking that they contact us. We asked victim advocates from many different police agencies in the area to see if they knew how we could locate these women. Our response rates indicate the futility of the many approaches we tried.

Because we had access to the largest pool of victims at the courthouse during adjudication, we achieved our largest survey response rate there (49% or 199 victims). Still we had to deal with actions taken by various courthouse personnel aimed at thwarting the study. So, for instance, we would begin speaking with a victim about the interview when one of the assistant prosecutors would come over to the woman and explain that we were the reason that the judge was not placing her partner into counseling. That it was our study that was responsible for placing her in danger. Even when a woman had already consented to be interviewed, there was never a time when she did not withdraw her consent after such an exchange.

Though we asked for follow-up information (telephone numbers and addresses where she could be reached) at the conclusion of the first interview, we found many of the women suspicious and reluctant to provide us with correct information.⁵ In the second interview response rates dropped to 30% (n=122) and dropped again to 22% (n=87) for the third and final interview.

As has already been noted, research indicates that offenders underreport their abusive behavior. Additionally, official reports capture only a small fraction of this abuse. Research consistently indicates that the victim is the best source for information on his abuse of her. The importance of getting and keeping victims in the experiment is critical. Palmer and her colleagues conducted an experiment testing the efficacy of court-mandated counseling. Despite the fact that she interviewed victims, her study reported only on official measures. She ends her study noting, "In measuring outcome, it is essential to engage the victimized partners of the men" (Palmer et al., 1992: 282).

Though other studies have found similar problems with retaining victims of domestic violence (Graham and Donaldson, 1993; Rumptz, Sullivan, Davidson and Basta, 1991; Steinman, 1991), there is no question that the low victim response rate presents a serious limitation to our study. Through intensive tracking procedures, Sullivan and her colleagues were able to retain 97% of the victims of domestic violence for a two-year follow-up period (Sullivan et al., 1996). However, they found that those victims who were more easily followed ". . . were more likely to be white, were more highly educated, were more likely to have access to cars, were less depressed, and had experienced less

⁵ It must be noted that about two dozen women called or wrote us to tell us that they appreciated that we were doing research on domestic violence. We had many more women who refused to take payment for the interview insisting, instead, that we put it back in our research fund so as to help other women.

psychological and physical abuse compared to the women who were more difficult to find" (Sullivan, Rumptz, Campbell, Eby and Davidson, 1996:273).

There is reason to believe that the women interviewed were not representative of all the women in our study. Our analyses indicated that women with more stake in conformity (higher occupational status, partner more likely to be employed) seemed to be overrepresented amongst women in the interviews. As Graham and Donaldson note (1993), where attrition is due to respondents' inaccessibility (as is the case with victims of domestic violence), it poses a serious threat to both the internal and external validity of the study. Specifically, loss of contact with the victims compromised the statistical power. But more importantly, it also introduced bias in estimating the differences based on victim reports in outcome measures between men in the control and experimental groups.

While this is a serious limitation, the fact is that we used multiple sources of information on his abuse of her in an effort to triangulate. We utilized offender self-reports and official measures in addition to victim reports. Undoubtedly, each carries with them their own sets of limitations. However, as noted by Babbie (1998), to the extent that all indicate similar findings (as they do), we have greater confidence in each measure.

Timing of Defendant Interviews: The defendants were originally to be interviewed at time of adjudication and at six and twelve months post-adjudication. We worked out of the courtroom to interview victims and defendants after they were adjudicated. We were able to obtain a 80% (n=321) defendant response rate at this stage. We had counted upon Probation to provide us with access to the defendants in order to conduct the second and third interviews. When the relationship became strained,

we stationed research assistants in Probation all day and every day in an effort to catch the men before or after their monthly appointments. As has already been noted, it became increasingly difficult to interview the batterers. In our second interview at six months post-adjudication we obtained a 50% (n=203) response rate. Due to the circumstances, we decided to desist and place our efforts elsewhere.

To the extent that these men were interviewed at or near six-months post-adjudication, it is possible that they had not completed their six-month batterers' treatment program. This means that analyses of the data from the men may be less likely to find differential outcomes since the full treatment may not have occurred for all the men interviewed. While this is somewhat problematic, we do not view it as being a major limitation to the study. As we previously noted, at the time of their interview, 30% (n=35) of these batterers had concluded their entire counseling program. Additionally, the men in the sample averaged having completed 22 of the 26 mandated counseling sessions (85% of the intended dosage of counseling) at the time of the second interview. Therefore, we would expect to see some difference in outcomes at this point - especially since we used a myriad of different measures to capture any changes in his attitudes and beliefs. Instead, there is great consistency with little deviation. Whether comparing the men in the experimental and control groups at Time 1 (adjudication) or Time 2 (six-months post-adjudication) or looking at whether there were changes over time, we continue to see few significant differences.

Additionally, we note once again that we engaged in extensive triangulation. We collected information from multiple sources. Each has its limitations. But all show similar findings. The batterers' programs did not seem to change the men's attitudes, beliefs or

self-reported use of psychologically, physically or sexually abusive behavior. The victim reports reflect this, as do official measures of rearrest.

The Random Assignment Process Could Have Been Manipulated: Many note the importance of the researcher having exclusive control over the random assignment process to ensure that it cannot be manipulated by those involved in the experiment (Berk, Smyth and Sherman, 1988; Devine et al., 1994; Petersilia, 1989). While the process we established for randomly assigning cases was clear and easy to implement, it could conceivably have been manipulated. Those in the courthouse knew the arrangement – odd numbered cases were sent to the control group and even to the experimental group. Since defendants and their counsel could anticipate their assignment, there is the possibility that it may have influenced their behavior. For instance, it may have made a defendant looking at being placed into the control condition more likely to plead and take one year probation rather than take the chance of going to trial and, if he was convicted and the experiment was no longer running, having to take one year probation and six-months court-mandated counseling.

While this occurrence is a distinct possibility, all of our analyses indicated that the random assignment was successful. The men in the experimental and control groups did not differ in any significant manner on a wide range of variables save that of the control group being younger. Still, it is best to heed the recommendation of more experienced researchers and ensure the independence of the random assignment process.

Summary

The study contains some important limitations. Largest amongst these is the low victim response rate. Our analyses pointed to the strong possibility that women with higher stake in conformity were overrepresented in our victim interviews. Also of note, some of the men may have been interviewed before they completed the full 26 weeks of the batterers' intervention program. This may have diluted the estimate of treatment effectiveness though, to the extent that men had completed an average of 85% of their sessions at the time of the survey, the negative consequences are minimized. However, while both are limitations, the consistency of findings across sources used in this research indicates that the study's results were not compromised.

Undoubtedly, every methodology has its limitations. No study, whether pre-, quasi- or experimental, is without its faults. And once these designs are implemented in a real life-setting, more problems appear. But while noting limitations are critical to accurate reporting of research, it is also important to note some of the successes of this study so its strengths can be assessed.

All men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence in this large urban jurisdiction were included in the study. This is true of *all* men with very few and carefully limited exceptions (see Chapter Three, Sampling Frame). As such, one can infer that there is high generalizability to other jurisdictions mandating counseling for men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence. This study, therefore, has high external validity.

Additionally, measures were collected throughout the time the study ran to measure the integrity of the experiment as it was implemented. We collected information on deviations from the random assignment process. As the analyses indicated, we had a

fairly low misassignment rate (3.5%). And we investigated ways in which the differences between experimental and control groups in the treatments received could have been compromised. Our analyses indicated that the judges did not mandate extra programs for men assigned into the control condition. Additionally, the probation officers did not compensate by providing control men with extra supervision. This means that the study has high internal validity.

Therefore, we can say that the experimental and control groups were comparable prior to the implementation of the experimental stimulus. Furthermore, they continued to receive similar handling throughout the experiment with the one exception that the experimental group was mandated into the batterers' intervention program. Any differences observed between the experimental and control groups can be assumed to be due to the intervention. Finally, power analysis indicated that we used a sufficiently large number of cases. If there were truly differences between these groups, our analyses should have been able to detect them.

CHAPTER SEVEN

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The final chapter provides a summary of the results of the Broward Experiment. These results are examined vis-à-vis other studies conducted to date to place them within a larger context of research on batterers. Growing out of our findings, are recommendations for future research directions.

Summary of Findings

Offender Surveys: We used offender surveys to compare men in the experimental and control group. Our comparisons looked at differences between groups at time of adjudication (Time 1), six-months post-adjudication (Time 2) and changes between Time 1 and Time 2. No differences maintained between the groups in their beliefs about wife beating and the appropriateness of the government intervening when it occurs, their attitudes regarding the proper roles of women, and their self-reported likelihood of hitting their partners again within the next six months. The only change noted in all of our comparisons was a small but significant change in the men's view of how responsible their partners were for the instant offense that led them to court. Specifically, over time, those in the control group viewed their partners as increasingly responsible. In comparison, in the six-months following adjudication, those in the experimental group saw the woman as a bit less responsible. However, it needs to be noted that, even with this change, the men in the experimental group still viewed their partners as "somewhat" to "equally" responsible for the incident.

As previously discussed (see Chapter Three, Outcome Measures), there are a number of studies indicating that men who batter hold more traditional views about woman and their proper roles. The cognitive behavioral approach is based on the assumption that educating men about the incorrectness of the use of verbal, physical or sexual control over their partners will lead to changes in their beliefs ultimately leading to changes in their behaviors. The results from these analyses seem to indicate that men's beliefs about the legitimacy of wife beating and their attitudes regarding the proper roles for women to play has not significantly changed for those court-mandated into the intervention programs in comparison to the no-treatment control group.

Using the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale, we found no differences at Time 1, Time 2 or changes over time between the experimental and control groups in their self-reported use of psychological, physical and sexual abuse. Thirty percent of the men self-reported using minor physical violence (which includes grabbing or slapping their partner). Eight percent of the men self-reported using severe physical violence against their partner (this includes using a knife or gun, choking or beating up their partner). We regressed treatment assignment, treatment received (number of domestic violence classes attended) and stake in conformity variables (marital status, residential stability and employment) on men's self-reported use of severe physical violence. Consistent with the analysis of attitudes and beliefs, the results indicated that neither assignment to a batterers' program nor attending the classes were significant in explaining severe physical violence. Instead, stake in conformity variables were important in accounting for this variation. Specifically, younger men lacking residential stability were significantly more likely to self-

report acts of severe physical violence against their partners than their older more residentially stable counterparts.

Victim Surveys: The victim interviews clearly indicated that these women do not believe that their partners have the right to beat them. Victims also viewed themselves as much less responsible for the instant incident that brought their partners to court. Not surprisingly, they held more liberal views of the proper roles of women than their partners. While their ratings of the likelihood that their partners would hit them again within the next six months were higher than had been the men's self-ratings (20% versus 5%), it was still viewed as only a remote possibility.

Fourteen percent of the women reported an act of severe physical violence occurring during the follow-up period. Regressing treatment group assigned, treatment received and stake in conformity variables on the dependent variable we once again see the primacy of stake in conformity variables in predicting recidivism amongst batterers. Specifically, offender's age and marital status achieved significance while his employment, though not significant, demonstrated a strong tendency to relate to her reports of his use of severe physical violence. That is, women involved with younger unemployed men who were not married to them were more likely to report one or more incidents of severe physical violence.

Official Measures – Violations of Probation: Comparisons between men assigned into the experimental and control groups would be unfair where one group could be violated for reasons that did not apply to the other group. This would seem to be the

case to the extent that men in the experimental group could be violated for failing to attend the batterers' program (a condition of probation that did not apply to those in the control group). However, analysis indicated that, while probationers may have been revoked for failing to attend treatment, in all cases save one, this was one of several reasons listed in their revocation. In other words, it does not seem that, realistically, men were violated on probation for exclusively failing to attend the domestic violence classes. Then again, beside that one individual who was violated exclusively for failing to attend the batterers' program, there may not have been anyone else who successfully completed all other mandates of probation but failed to attend the domestic violence classes. In other words, if a man was going to violate one condition of his probation, he was probably going to violate several of his conditions of probation.

Whatever the reason, it does seem that a comparison between those placed in experimental and control groups on violation of probation (VOP) is fair. Our data indicated that 48% of the experimental group and 45% of the men in the control group were violated one or more occasions during their year on probation. This difference between groups was not significant. Once again, we regressed treatment assigned, treatment received and stake in conformity variables on violations. For the first time in our analyses, results indicated that assignment to treatment, number of classes attended and the interaction term were significant in explaining variation in VOPs. Additionally, two stake in conformity variables - marital status and residential stability - were also predictive of a violation. Specifically, those who were not married and who had less residential stability (more moves during their year on probation) were more likely to be violated.

What is surprising is the direction of the relationship as it pertains to the treatment variables. Assignment to the experimental group made it significantly *more* likely, all things being equal, that the man would be violated on probation. But this increase in likelihood of violation does not seem to be due to increased monitoring since we earlier found no significant differences in Probation's monitoring between groups. Countering this increased likelihood of violation for those assigned into the experimental group, the regression equation indicated that attending the domestic violence classes reduced the likelihood of violation. However, the reduced effect of attending classes has to be understood as a discounted effect because domestic violence classes were mandatory. We estimated the interaction effect of experimental group by attending classes and clearly found an increased likelihood of violation on probation when classes were mandatory.

Logistic regression allows us to measure the effect of a *single* factor (e.g., group assignment) on an outcome (violation on probation) while controlling for all other variables. However, the men in our sample came as complete packages. As such, each man represented many different variables. Therefore, to make these numbers more meaningful, we provided a table with the estimated probabilities of being violated for men representing different combinations of variables.

Table Thirty-two varied group assignment (experimental versus control), domestic violence classes attended (0, 20 and 26) and employment (employed versus unemployed for the 12 months on probation). The table clearly indicates that employed probationers are much less likely to be violated than unemployed probationers. Additionally, attending more domestic violence classes – whether one is in the experimental group or the control group – is associated with a lowered likelihood of being violated. Interestingly, the men

assigned to the batterers' treatment program have a *higher* likelihood of being violated in comparison to the control (no treatment) group in every comparison except where they have attended all the treatment sessions. And even in this scenario, the difference is not substantial. (Compare the men represented by Cells A to Cells I. There is a 5% versus 8% likelihood of being violated.) More realistically, compare the man represented by Cells B (a fully employed married man assigned to the experimental group who attended 20 sessions) to the man in Cells I (a fully employed married man assigned to the control group who attended no domestic violence classes). The man mandated into the batterers' treatment program has a 21% likelihood of being violated in comparison to the man assigned no treatment who has a 8% likelihood. Clearly, assignment to the batterers' intervention program is associated with more violations unless it is offset by attendance at *all* of the sessions.

There may be those who say that this just proves that we need to utilize every legal means to get these men to attend the batterers' programs. However, it must be remembered that even if they attended all the sessions they now would have approximately the same likelihood of being violated as a man in the control group who had not been mandated to go to counseling and therefore did not attend any sessions. And, where they do not attend all the sessions, their likelihood of a violation, relative to a comparable man in the control condition, increases. In other words, we found an increased likelihood of rearrests where men assigned to counseling failed to attend.

Additionally, this charge to throw the full force of the law at the man who does not attend all of his treatment sessions seems to beg the question. In this jurisdiction, unlike those observed by Harrell (1991) and Palmer and her colleagues (1992), men were

monitored and sanctioned. Still men self-selected into treatment completers and treatment dropouts.

Official Measures – Rearrests: Twenty-four percent of men in both the experimental and control groups were rearrested on one or more occasions during their one year on probation. A logistic regression equation was developed using treatment assigned, treatment received and stake in conformity variables to predict rearrest. The results indicated that assignment to the experimental group was not significantly related to likelihood of being rearrested. However, attending domestic violence classes (treatment received) and the interaction between group assignment and treatment received were significant. Additionally two stake in conformity variables, employment and age, were also significant in predicting rearrests. In fact, the logistic regression indicated that employment was the most important factor accounting for variation in rearrest in our sample of batterers.

Table Thirty-five provides examples of different types of men in the sample. Again, we begin by taking the best case scenario. We compare a man represented by Cells A (a married fully employed man assigned into the treatment group who attended all the sessions) with one represented by Cells I (a married fully employed man assigned into the control group who attended none of the sessions). The man in the experimental group, under the best situation, has a 7% likelihood of being arrested while on probation. Alternately, the man assigned into the control group has a 9% likelihood of rearrest. Again, this difference is not substantial. What is more, in most other scenarios we see how assignment into mandatory counseling leads to a *higher* likelihood of rearrest.

Compare the man represented in Cells B (a married fully employed man assigned into the treatment group who attended 20 of the counseling sessions) with Cells I. The man in the experimental group faces a 16% likelihood of rearrest while the man in the control group faces a 9% likelihood.

In summary, whether we survey offenders and ask them to self-report, interview victims or use official measures, the results consistently indicate that mandating men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence into a batterers' intervention program, at least as applied in Broward County, Florida, does not significantly reduce his likelihood of future abuse. However, stake in conformity variables (employment, age, marital status and residential stability) were related to outcomes though no one variable was found to consistently relate in all situations. We next look at how these results relate to other studies conducted in this area.

Study's Findings vis-à-vis Other Studies

Overall, no significant differences maintained between men assigned into the experimental and control groups in their self-reported or victim reported measures of violence. Official measures indicated similar findings though the amount of information allowed us a more detailed breakdown of what this 'no difference' finding might mean. This analysis indicated that for those mandated to counseling who attended all the sessions, they were a bit less likely to reoffend. However, for those mandated into treatment who chose not to attend all the sessions, there was an increased likelihood of future abuse. Importantly, but not surprisingly, treatment completion was found to relate to stake in conformity variables.

Our results can be viewed as consistent with much of the recent research on batterers. Harrell's (1991) quasi-experimental design testing the efficacy of court-mandated counseling found higher rates of recidivism amongst the experimental group. She also noted that no real sanctions applied for men who were mandated but did not attend counseling in the jurisdiction out of which she ran her study. What we believe is happening in our study's results can easily be applied to explain Harrell's findings. Where men are mandated into counseling and do not complete the program, we would predict an increased likelihood of future abuse.

Similarly, Dunford (forthcoming) found no differences between his experimental and control groups in their rates of recidivism. Again, these findings are quite consistent with our results. Though Dunford does not report on rates of program completion for men assigned into the batterers' treatment groups, we would assume that it is quite high. The study was done out of a naval base with the full cooperation of the Navy. As such, the men probably did not have much opportunity not to attend a batterers' programs that had been mandated. We would therefore expect, consistent with our findings, that men mandated into counseling who complete these programs will have equivalent rates of recidivism relative to a no treatment control group. Interestingly, the parallels between the Dunford study and ours are even more striking. Similar to our study, he found the experimental group (who we are assuming completed their program) to have a small, though not significant, decrease in their rates of recidivism in comparison to the control group.

Davis, Taylor and Maxwell (1999) report finding an effect for treatment assignment. Specifically, men assigned to court-mandated counseling did better than those assigned

to a community service group. However, Davis and Taylor (1998) previously presented findings indicating that men assigned to the court-mandated counseling group who went to all their sessions and those who went to few or none of their sessions did not differ on measures of recidivism. This, then, would speak to something other than court-mandated counseling effecting recidivism. To the extent that duration and quality of supervision may have varied between these groups, this may account for their findings of significance.

While there are many studies indicating the efficacy of spouse abuse abatement programs (see Chapter Two), our experiment found results to the contrary. This, though, is not terribly surprising. As Boruch noted, "A related stream of relevant empirical work over the last 15 years suggests that nothing improves the chances of apparently successful innovation as much as lack of experimental control. Marked enthusiasm for an innovation is negligible in reports on controlled trials. Declarations that a program is successful are about four times more likely in research based on poor or questionable evaluation designs as in that based on adequate ones" (Boruch, 1997: 69). This observation holds for experiments conducted within criminal justice settings. Logan (1972) reviewed one hundred research studies in crime and delinquency. He found that the effectiveness of an intervention was inversely related to the rigor of the research design.

The Broward Experiment focussed on the treatment efficacy of court-mandated counseling. But it also looked to further clarify findings from a larger multi-site experiment. Minneapolis and the Spouse Abuse Abatement Programs indicated varied results on arrest's effectiveness in reducing recidivism amongst men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence. These disparate findings led to several meta-analyses. The findings

from these analyses, though far from conclusive, may be indicating that an intervention may have very different effects on different types of offenders (Berk et al., 1992; Sherman et al., 1992). The researchers speculated that the effectiveness of an arrest in reducing future offenses was mediated through stake in conformity variables. Specifically, men who had high stake in conformity were more likely to be deterred from reoffending following an arrest. Conversely, men with low stake in conformity had higher rates of recidivism upon being arrested.

Our results supply further support for this hypothesis. Tables Thirty-two and Thirty-five, provided probabilities of a VOP or arrest for various types of offenders (e.g., those in the experimental versus control group, those attending all versus none of the counseling program, those employed versus unemployed). The tables indicated that for men who were sent to the batterers' programs and who completed all the sessions, their rates of recidivism were a bit less than those who had been placed into the control (no treatment) condition. However, for those mandated into counseling who did not attend all the sessions, they faced an increased probability of an arrest relative to the control group. And, as has already been noted, treatment completion was highly related to stake in conformity variables.

The implications seem clear. Whether we are discussing an arrest or being mandated into treatment, we cannot continue to assume that the impact will be the same for all batterers. For those with low stake in conformity, the sanction may not serve to reduce the future likelihood of reoffending. However, for those with high stake in conformity, sanctioning their behavior, whether through arrest or mandating counseling, will most likely lead to a decrease in future assaults. It is as Ford and Regoli noted,

“Mandated counseling appears to be a successful rehabilitative treatment for up to 80% of the assailants in the Indianapolis experiments. Those who received no counseling, however, were equally likely to desist for the 6-month follow-up period. The point, then, is that *any* intervention helps, not necessarily counseling” (Ford and Regoli, 1993: 157).

Lessons Learned From the Broward Experiment

Having developed, implemented and completed an experiment, we would like to briefly reflect upon some of the more important lessons we have learned in running an experiment in a criminal justice setting. We now see clearly that three factors were necessary which were lacking in the Broward Experiment. These three fundamentals to running a good experiment include:

The need for support from all agencies involved in the experiment: As discussed in Chapter Six, we worked within a hostile work environment. While this did not affect assignment integrity (because both judges involved in the study were solid in their support of the experiment), it did significantly impact upon our access to defendants and victims when we attempted to interview them. The literature provides ample examples of studies where agencies originally agreed to an experiment and then reneged on their support. Despite the possibility of agencies dropping their support after initially agreeing, we believe that the researcher must at least begin in an experimentally supportive environment. To do otherwise will mean that researchers may end up spending the majority of their time fighting battles rather than running an experiment.

The need for adequate funding to support the experiment: As reported by many researchers, experiments are labor intensive. This is because they typically require longitudinal designs. Tracking respondents, especially those who are difficult to reach, over time will necessarily require more funding than a quasi-experimental cross-sectional design. While experiments are more expensive, their greater internal validity provides a rigorous test of a specific intervention.

The researcher's need for a full understanding of the literature on both experiments and longitudinal follow-up of difficult to track respondents: In the Broward Experiment, the researcher was well-versed in the literature on responses to domestic violence. Without consciously thinking about it, she assumed that what she had learned in graduate school on experiments and longitudinal designs would be sufficient to run this study. What she failed to appreciate was the fact that there is a rich literature on experiments and longitudinal designs (especially with difficult to track subjects). This exists because so many before her had noted the difficulties with running experiments and tracking difficult to locate respondents. There is no doubt that this literature would have been helpful had the researcher explored it prior to implementing the design.

Recommendations

The Broward Experiment and its results lead to several recommendations.

The Need to Replicate The Broward Experiment: Whenever an experiment is implemented and run at one site, persons must ask whether that site provided a good test

of the program being evaluated. As Boruch notes, "Programs do not function in isolation; rather, they function in the context of a network of services in the broader community. Such contextual factors play a potentially important role because the effectiveness of an intervention cannot be isolated from the specific environmental context in which it was effective" (Boruch, 1997: 181).

It would seem that Broward provided a fair test of a court-mandated counseling program. Others have noted that court-mandated batterer programs cannot be expected to have much impact if the men are not sanctioned when they fail to attend (Harrell, 1991). Therefore, there has to be coordination between Probation and the programs to ensure that the men are attending their classes. In Broward County, Probation monitored the men's attendance at these programs. While approximately one-third of the men failed to attend the batterers' program, 100% of these men were violated for one or more conditions of probation. And 71% of the men were specifically violated for failing to attend their counseling. In all, it seems that Probation monitored and revoked where men did not complete the batterers' program.

Five experiments have now been conducted on the question. All used different population frames, sampling procedures and criteria of success and failure. One has found treatment efficacy (Palmer et al., 1992) while three have failed to find treatment efficacy (Ford and Regoli, 1993; Dunford, Forthcoming; Feder and Forde, 2000). The remaining study (Davis et al., 1999) found effectiveness for treatment assignment but not for treatment dosage. The importance of the question, "Does court-mandated counseling reduce recidivism amongst men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence" would seem to necessitate that this study be replicated elsewhere.

One final note, there have been a number of researchers who have recently criticized court-mandated counseling as presently packaged. They charge that these programs are bound to fail to the extent that they only address one aspect of this multi-problematic population (Klein, 1997; Stith, Crossman and Bischof, 1991). Many working with this clientele have previously noted that these men present multiple problems including alcohol abuse (Gondolf, 1995), chemical dependency (Hamberger and Hastings, 1990; Roberts, 1987) and signs of psychopathology or personality disorders (Hamberger & Hastings, 1988). The criticism is that one treatment cannot possibly address the range of problems this population presents (Gondolf, 1995; Harrell, 1991; Stith, Crossman & Bischof, 1991). These complaints sound eerily familiar to the criticisms offered years ago about evaluations of rehabilitation programs. That is, some might say "We never *really* tried them and they never really worked."

Undoubtedly, there are many who might argue that there is more that can be done in terms of treatment, supervision and monitoring. However, Broward County probably does as good a job, if not better, than most jurisdiction presently mandating counseling for men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence. Our intent was to evaluate the efficacy of a program as it is truly delivered and received. On that score we feel we succeeded.

The Need to Replicate Using An Experimental Design: It is necessary to use an experimental design to evaluate the effectiveness of court-mandated counseling. As noted by Dunford (forthcoming), using anything less rigorous may lead to erroneous conclusions about the efficacy of court-mandated counseling. We can use the results from

this study to demonstrate the need to replicate the (in)effectiveness of domestic counseling.

Had we not had a control (no treatment) group we could have only looked at the rates of recidivism of those assigned into the experimental group. Whichever source of information we look at, the rates are consistently lower than they had been prior to the intervention (where 100% of the men had offended on one or more occasion). This is true whether we looked at self-report use of minor (30%) or severe (8%) abuse, victim reported rates of minor (32%) or severe (14%) abuse or official rates of rearrest (24%). In the worse case scenario (victim reports of minor abuse), two-thirds of the men show improvement. In the best scenario (men's self-reports of severe violence), 90% of the men show improvement. These rates are both very good and very consistent with many of the studies reviewed earlier (see Chapter Two). However, these rates mean little unless compared to a true no treatment control group. It is only when we make this comparison that we see that men in the two groups performed equally well in terms of the outcome measures. Clearly, court-mandated counseling seems to have no additional positive effect on reducing recidivism.

Some people may continue to object on ethical grounds to the use of an experimental design to answer the question. Now more than ever this argument runs hollow. As Dunford noted in his conclusion, "The risks of conducting randomized experiments to assess interventions for men who batter are likely to be fewer than the consequences of failing to do so" (Dunford, forthcoming: 29). And as eloquently stated by Oakley (forthcoming), "Progress towards more sustained use of experimental research in social settings is also likely to be driven by the lesson that social interventions, just like

medical ones, may do more harm than good. As the methodologist Donald Campbell argued (1988), choosing social policy interventions on the basis of well-designed experimental tests is a pre-requisite of a democratic and equitable society” (Oakley, forthcoming: 13).

As Saunders (1988) has noted, knowledge gained from scientific research may take a long time to acquire. However, using anything less to guide policy may lead to counterproductive actions. The importance of this question demands nothing less than such a rigorous evaluation.

The Need to Better Retain Victims Throughout the Experiment: Again, we view this study’s largest limitation as being the low victim response rate. We will not review, yet again, the need for high victim response rates when conducting research in the area of domestic violence (see Chapter Four, Survey Response Rates). Suffice it is to say that there are methods that have been utilized (see Rumpitz, Sullivan, Davidson and Basta, 1991; Sullivan et al., 1996) that indicate that it is possible to keep victims in an experiment over lengthy periods of time. It requires more intensive tracking, larger expenditures of compensation for interviews and more cooperation from the agencies dealing with victims (Boruch, 1997; Sullivan et al., 1996). But it is critical for unbiased estimates of the treatment’s efficacy in comparison to the control group.

In conclusion, we hope that others decide to replicate this study and put this policy question to the test. We have been candid in our discussions with the hope that others learn from our mistakes and build better and stronger experiments. Repeating the sage advice given by Boruch, “No randomized field test is perfectly run, just as services are

never perfectly provided. Mistakes ought to be expected and, when understood, exploited: They are a vehicle for building new knowledge" (Boruch, 1997: 234).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, David & McCormick, Andrew. (1982). Men unlearning violence: A group approach based on the collective model. In Maria Roy (Ed.), The Abusive Partner: An Analysis of Domestic Battering, (pp. 170-197). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.
- Alexander, Pamela, Moore, Sharon & Alexander, Elmore. (1991). What is transmitted in the intergenerational transmission of violence? Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53, pp. 657-668.
- Babbie, Earl. (1998). The Practice of Social Research. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Beninati, Joseph. (1989). Pilot project for male batterers. Social Work With Groups, 12(2), pp. 63-74.
- Berk, Richard; Berk, Sarah & Newton, Phyllis. (1984). Cops on call: Summoning the police to the scene of spousal violence. Law and Society Review, 18(3), pp. 479-498.
- Berk, Richard, Boruch, Robert, Chambers, David, Rossi, Peter & Witte, Ann. (1985). Social policy experimentation: A position paper. Evaluation Review, 9(4), pp. 387-429.
- Berk, Richard, Smyth, Gordon & Sherman, Lawrence. (1988). When random assignment fails: Some lessons learned from the Minneapolis Spouse Abuse Experiment. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 4(3), pp. 209-223.

- Berk, Richard, Smyth, Gordon & Sherman, Lawrence. (1988). When random assignment fails: Some lessons learned from the Minneapolis Spouse Abuse Experiment. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 4(3), pp. 209-223.
- Berk, Richard, Campbell, Alec, Klap, Ruth, & Western, Bruce. (1992). The deterrent effect of arrest in incidents of domestic violence: A Bayesian analysis of four field experiments. American Sociological Review, 57(5), pp. 698-708.
- Boruch, Robert. (1997). Randomized Experiments For Planning and Evaluation. Sage Publications: Thousands Oaks, California.
- Boruch, Robert, Dennis, Michael & Carter-Greer, Kim. (1988). Lessons from the Rockefeller Foundation's Experiments on the Minority Female Single Parent Program. Evaluation Review, 12(4), pp. 396-426.
- Brisson, Norman. (1981). Battering husbands: A survey of abusive men. Victimology: An International Journal, 6, 338-344.
- Browning, James & Dutton, Donald. (1986) Conflict Tactics Scale: Using couple data to quantify the differential reporting effect. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48(2), 375-379.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1998). Violence by Intimates. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
- Cadsky, Oto, Hanson, R. Karl, Crawford, Michael and Lalonde, Coralie. (1996). Attrition from a male batterer treatment program: Client-treatment congruence and lifestyle instability. Violence and Victims, 11(1), pp. 51-64.
- Campbell, Donald and Stanley, Julian. (1963). Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally.

- Chalk, Rosemary and King, Patricia. (1998). Violence in Families: Assessing Prevention and Treatment Programs. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Chen, Huey-tsyh, Bersani, Carl, Myers, Steven & Denton, Robert. (1989). Evaluating the effectiveness of a court sponsored treatment program. Journal of Family Violence, 4(4), pp. 309-322.
- Cromwell, Nancy and Burgess, Ann. (1996). Understanding Violence Against Women. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Currie, Dawn. (1998). Violent men or violent women? Whose definition counts. In Raquel Kennedy Bergen (Ed.), Issues in intimate violence (pp. 97-111), Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publishers.
- Davidson, Terry. (1977). Wifebeating: A recurring phenomenon throughout history. In M. Roy (Ed.), Battered women: A psychosociological study of domestic violence (pp. 2-23). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Davis, Robert, Taylor, Bruce & Maxwell, Chris. (1999). Does Batterer Treatment Reduce Violence? A Randomized Experiment in Brooklyn. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, Final Report.
- Davis, Robert & Taylor, Bruce. (1999). Does batterer treatment reduce violence? A synthesis of the literature. Women & Criminal Justice, 10(2), pp. 69-93.
- Davis, Robert & Taylor, Bruce. (1998). A Randomized Experiment of the Effects of Batterer Treatment: Six and Twelve Month Longitudinal Research Findings. American Society of Criminology, Washington, D.C.

- DeMaris, Alfred & Jackson, Jann. (1987). Batterers' reports of recidivism after counseling. Social Casework: The Journal of Contemporary Social Work, October, pp. 458-465.
- DeMaris, Alfred. (1989). Attrition in batterers' counseling: The role of social and demographic factors. Social Service Review, pp. 142-154.
- Deschner, Jeanne & McNeil, John. (1986). Results of anger control training for battering couples. Journal of Family Violence, 1(2), pp. 111-120.
- Deschner, Jeanne, McNeil, John & Moore, Marcia. (1986). A treatment model for batterers. Social Casework, pp. 55-60.
- Devine, Joel, Wright, James & Joyner, Laurie. (1994). Issues in implementing a randomized experiment in a field setting. New Directions for Program Evaluation, 63(fall), pp. 27-40.
- Dobash, Russell, Dobash, Rebecca, Cavanagh, Kate and Lewis, Ruth. (1996). Re-Education programmes for violent men – an evaluation. Research Findings, 46, pp. 1-4.
- Dunford, Franklyn. (Forthcoming). The San Diego Navy Experiment: An assessment of interventions for men who assault their wives. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology.
- Dutton, Donald. (1984). Interventions into the problem of wife assault: Therapeutic, policy and research implications. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 16(4), pp. 281-297.
- Dutton, Donald. (1986). Wife assaulter's explanations for assault: The neutralization of self-punishment. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 18(4), pp. 381-390.

- Dutton, Donald. (1986). The outcome of court-mandated treatment for wife assault: A quasi-experimental evaluation. Violence and Victims, 1(3), pp. 163-175.
- Dutton, Donald. (1987). The criminal justice response to wife assault. Law and Human Behavior, 11(3), 189-206.
- Dutton, Donald. (1987). Wife assault: Social psychological contributions to criminal justice policy. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), Family process and problems: Social psychological aspects (pp. 238-261). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dutton, Donald. (1988). Research advances in the study of wife assault: Etiology and prevention. Law and Mental Health, 4, 161-220.
- Dutton, Donald & McGregor, Barbara. (1991). The symbiosis of arrest and treatment for wife assault: The case for combined intervention. In M. Steinman (Ed.), Woman Battering: Policy Responses, (pp. 131-154). Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing Company.
- Dutton, Donald, Bodnarchuk, Mark, Kropp, Randall, Hart, Stephen & Ogloff, James. (1997). Wife assault treatment and criminal recidivism: An 11 Year follow-up. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 41(1), pp. 9-23.
- Edleson, Jeffrey, Eisikovits, Zvi, & Guttman, Edna. (1985). Men who batter women: A critical review of the evidence. Journal of Family Issues, 6(2), pp. 229-247.
- Edleson, Jeffrey, Miller, David, Stone, Gene & Chapman, Dennis. (1985). Group treatment for men who batter. Social Work Research and Abstracts, 21(3), pp. 18-21.

- Edleson, Jeffrey & Grusznski, Roger. (1988). Treating men who batter: Four years of outcome data from the Domestic Abuse Project. Journal of Social Service Research, 12(1/2), pp. 3-22.
- Edleson, Jeffrey & Syers, Maryann. (1991). The effects of group treatment for men who batter: An 18 month follow-up study. Research on Social Work Practice, 1(3), pp. 227-243.
- Edleson, Jeffrey & Brygger, Mary. (1995). Gender differences in reporting of battering incidences. In Sandra Stith & Murray Straus (Eds.), Understanding partner violence: Prevalence, causes, consequences and solutions, (pp. 45-50). Minneapolis, MN: National Council of Family Relations.
- Farley, Dennis & Magill, Judith. (1988). An evaluation of a group program for men who batter. Social Work With Groups, 11(3), pp. 53-65.
- Farrington, David. (1983). Randomized experiments on crime and justice. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (Eds.), Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of the Research (Vol. 4). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. (pp. 257-308).
- Feazell, Carann, Mayers, Raymond & Deschner, Jeanne. (1984). Services for men who batter: Implications for programs and policies. Family Relations, 33, pp. 217-223.
- Feder, Lynette. (1997). "Domestic violence and police response in a pro-arrest jurisdiction." Women and Criminal Justice, 8(4), 79-98.
- Ford, David & Regoli, MaryJean. (1993). The criminal prosecution of wife assaulters. In Z. Hilton (Ed.), Legal Responses to Wife Assault: Current Trends and Evaluation, (pp. 127 -164). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gelles, Richard. (1985). Family violence. Annual Review of Sociology, 11, pp. 347-367.

- Gelles, Richard & Straus, Murray. (1985). Violence in the American family. In A. Lincoln & M. Straus (Eds.), Crime in the family (pp. 88-110). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Goolkasian, Gail. (1986). Confronting domestic violence: The role of criminal court judges. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Gondolf, Edward. (1987). Evaluating programs for men who batter: Problems and prospects. Journal of Family Violence, 2(1), pp. 95-108.
- Gondolf, Edward. (1987). Seeing through smoke and mirrors: A guide to batterer program evaluations. Response, 10(3), pp. 16-19.
- Gondolf, Edward. (1987). The gender warrior: Reformed batterers on abuse, treatment and change. Journal of Family Violence, 2(2), pp. 177-191.
- Gondolf, Edward. (1991). Pre-program attrition in batterer programs. Journal of Family Violence, 6(4), pp. 337-349.
- Gondolf, Edward. (1991). A victim-based assessment of court-mandated counseling for batterers. Criminal Justice Review. 16(2), pp. 214-226.
- Gondolf, Edward. (1997). Batterer programs: What we know and need to know. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12(1), pp. 83-98.
- Gondolf, Edward. (1997). Batterer programs: What we know and need to know. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12(1), pp. 83-98.
- Gondolf, Edward. (1998). Do batterer programs work? A 15 month follow-up of multi-site evaluation. Domestic Violence Report, 3(5), pp. 65-80.

- Graham, John and Donaldson, Stewart. (1993). Evaluating interventions with differential attrition: The importance of nonresponse mechanisms and use of follow-up data. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78(1), pp. 119-128.
- Greenwald, Herbert & Satow, Yoichi. (1970). A short social desirability scale. Psychological Reports, 27, pp. 131-135.
- Grusznski, Roger & Carrillo, Thomas. (1988). Who completes batterer's treatment groups? An empirical investigation. Journal of Family Violence, 3(2), pp. 141-150.
- Hamberger, Kevin & Hastings, James. (1988). Skill training for treatment of spouse abuse: An outcome study. Journal of Family Violence, 3(2), pp. 121-130.
- Hamberger, L. Kevin & Hastings, James. (1988). Characteristics of male spouse abusers consistent with personality disorders. Hospital and Community Psychiatry, 39(7), pp. 763-770.
- Hamberger, L. Kevin & Hastings, James. (1989). Counseling male spouse abusers: Characteristics of treatment completers and dropouts. Violence and Victims, 4(1), pp. 275-286.
- Hamberger, L. Kevin & Hastings, James. (1990). Recidivism following spouse abuse abatement counseling: Treatment program implications. Violence and Victims, 5(3), pp. 157-170.
- Hamberger, L. Kevin & Hastings, James. (1993). Court-mandated treatment of 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 Publications.
- Harrell, Adele. (1991). Evaluation of Court-Ordered Treatment for Domestic Violence Offenders: Final Report. Washington, DC: Institute for Social Analysis.

- Harris, Jane. (1986). Counseling violent couples using Walker's model. Psychotherapy, 23(4), pp. 613-621.
- Healey, Kerry, Smith, Christine & O'Sullivan, Chris. (1998). Batterer Intervention: Program Approaches and Criminal Justice Strategies. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
- Hilberman, Elaine. (1980). Overview: The "wife-beater's wife" reconsidered. American Journal of Psychiatry, 137(11), pp. 1336-1347.
- Hirschel, J. David & Hutchinson, Ira. (1992). Female spouse abuse and the police response: The Charlotte, North Carolina Experiment. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 83(1), pp. 73-119.
- Hirschel, J. David, Hutchison, Ira, & Dean, Charles. (1992). The failure of arrest to deter spouse abuse. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 29(1), pp. 7-33.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, Amy & Stuart, Gregory. (1994). Typologies of male Batterers: Three subtypes and the differences among them. Psychological Bulletin, 116(3), pp. 476-497.
- Hotaling, Gerald and Sugarman, David. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of knowledge. Violence and Victims, 1(2), pp. 101-124.
- Jennings, Jerry. (1987). History and issues in the treatment of battering men: A case for unstructured group therapy. Journal of Family Violence, 2(3), pp. 193-213.
- Johnson, John & Kanzler, Dianne. (1993). Treating domestic violence: Evaluating the effectiveness of a domestic violence diversion program. Studies in Symbolic Interaction, 15, pp. 271-289.

- Klein, Andrew. (1997). Batterers' Treatment. National Bulletin on Domestic Violence Prevention, 3(3), pp. 1-3.
- Kurz, Demie. (1991). Corporal punishment and adult use of violence: A critique of "Discipline and Deviance". Social Problems, 38(2), pp. 155-161.
- Langan, Patrick, & Innes, Christopher. (1986). Preventing domestic violence against women. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Leigh, Gillian, Ogborne, Alan & Cleland, Patricia. (1984). Factors associated with patient dropout from an outpatient alcoholism treatment service. Journal of Studies on Alcoholism, 45(4), pp. 359-362.
- Lindquist, Carol, Fessenden-Telch, Christy & Taylor, John. (1983). Evaluation of a conjugal violence treatment program: A pilot study. Behavioral Counseling and Community Interventions, 3(1), pp. 76-90.
- Miller, Ted, Cohen, Mark & Wiersema, Brian. (1996). Victim Costs and Consequences: A New Look. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Neidig, Peter, Friedman, Dale, & Collins, Barbara. (1985). Domestic conflict containment: A spouse abuse treatment program. Social Casework: The Journal of Contemporary Social Work, April, pp. 195-204.
- Neidig, Peter, Friedman, Dale, & Collins, Barbara. (1986). Attitudinal characteristics of males who have engaged in spouse abuse. Journal of Family Violence, 1(3), pp. 223-232.
- Orwin, Robert, Sonnefeld, L. Joseph, Garrison-Mogren, Roberta & Smith, Nancy Gray. (1994). Pitfalls in evaluating the effectiveness of case management programs for

- homeless persons: Lessons from the NIAAA Community Demonstration Program. Evaluation Research, 18(2), pp. 153-207.
- Palmer, Sally, Brown, Ralph, & Barrera, Maru. (1992). Group treatment program for abusive husbands: Long-term evaluation. American Journal of Orthopsychiatric Association, 62(2), pp. 276-283.
- Pence, Ellen. (1983). The Duluth Domestic Abuse Intervention Project. Hamline Law Review, 6, pp. 247-275.
- Petersilia, Joan. (1989). Implementing randomized experiments: Lessons from BJA's Intensive Supervision Project. Evaluation Review, 13(5), pp. 435-458.
- Petrosino, Anthony Joseph. (Forthcoming). Answering the why question: The causal-model approach. Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation.
- Phillips, E. Lakin. (1987). The ubiquitous decay curve: Service delivery similarities in psychotherapy, medicine and addiction. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18(6), pp. 650-652.
- Pirog-Good, Maureen & Stets-Kealey, Jan. (1985). Male batterers and battering prevention programs: A national survey. Response, 8, pp. 8-12.
- Pirog-Good, Maureen & Stets, Jan. (1986). Programs for abusers: Who drops Out and what can be done. Response, 9(2), pp. 17-19.
- Roberts, Albert. (1982). A national survey of services for batterers. In Maria Roy (Ed.), The Abusive Partner: An Analysis of Domestic Battering, (pp. 230-243). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.
- Rosenbaum, Alan. (1986). Group treatment for abusive men: Process and outcome. Psychotherapy, 23(4), pp. 607-612.

- Rosenfeld, Barry. (1992). Court-ordered treatment of spouse abuse. Clinical Psychology Review, 12, pp. 205-226.
- Rumptz, Maureen, Sullivan, Cris, Davidson, William & Basta, Joanna. (1991). An ecological approach to tracking battered women over time. Violence and Victims, 16(3), pp. 237-244.
- Rynerson, Barbara & Fishel, Anne. (1993). Domestic violence prevention training: Participant characteristics and treatment outcomes. Journal of Family Violence, 8(3), pp. 253-266.
- Saunders, Daniel, Lynch, Ann, Grayson, Marcia, & Linz, Daniel. (1987) The Inventory of Beliefs about Wife Beating: The construction and initial validation of a measure of beliefs and attitudes. Violence and Victims, 2(1), 39-55.
- Saunders, Daniel. (1988). Wife abuse, husband abuse or mutual combat? A feminist perspective on the empirical findings. In Kersti Yllo and Michele Bograd (Eds.), Feminist perspectives on wife abuse (pp. 90-113), Newbury Park, California: Sage Publishers.
- Saunders, Daniel. (1995). Prediction of wife assault. In Jacqueline Campbell (Ed.), Assessing dangerousness: Violence by sexual offenders, batterers and child abusers (pp. 68-95). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Saunders, Daniel. (1996). Interventions for men who batter: Do we know what works? In Session: Psychotherapy in Practice, 2(3), pp. 81-93.
- Saunders, Daniel & Hanusa, Donald. (1986). Cognitive-behavioral treatment of men who batter: The short-term effects of group therapy. Journal of Family Violence, 1(4), pp. 357-372.

- Saunders, Daniel & Parker, Jennifer. (1989). Legal sanctions and treatment follow-through among men who batter: A multivariate analysis. Social Work Research and Abstracts, 25(3), pp. 21-29.
- Shepard, Melanie. (1992). Predicting batterer recidivism five years after community intervention. Journal of Family Violence, 7(3), 167-178.
- Sherman, Lawrence, Smith, Douglas, Schmidt, Janell & Rogan, Dennis. (1992). Crime, punishment, and stake in conformity: Legal and informal control of domestic violence. American Sociological Review, 57(5), pp. 680-690.
- Sherman, Lawrence, Gottfredson, Denise, MacKenzie, Doris, Eck, John, Reuter, Peter and Bushway, Shawn. (1997). Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising? Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice.
- Shupe, Anson, Stacey, William & Hazlewood, Lonnie. (1987). Violent men, violent couples. Massachusetts: DC Heath and Company.
- Snyder, Douglas & Scheer, Nancy. (1981). Predicting disposition following brief residence at a shelter for battered women. American Journal of Community Psychology, 9(5), 559-566.
- Sonkin, Daniel Jay. (1988). The male batterer: Clinical and research issues. Violence and Victims, 3(1), pp. 65-79.
- Spence, Janet, Helmreich, Robert & Stapp, Joy. (1973). A short version of the Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS). Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 2(4), pp. 219-220.
- Steer, Robert. (1983). Retention in drug-free counseling. The International Journal of the Addictions, 18(8), pp. 1109-1114.

- Steinman, Michael. (1991). Coordinated criminal justice interventions and recidivism among batterers. In M. Steinman (Ed.), Woman Battering: Policy Responses (pp. 221-236). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing.
- Straus, Murray. (1977-78). Wife beating: How common and why? Victimology: An International Journal, 2, 443-458.
- Straus, Murray. (1991). Conceptualization and measurement of battering: Implications for public policy. In M. Steinman (Ed.), Woman Battering: Policy Responses, (pp. 19-47). Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing.
- Straus, Murray & Gelles, Richard. (1986). Societal change and change in family violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48(August), pp. 465-479.
- Straus, Murray, Hamby, Sherry, Boney-McCoy, Sue and Sugarman, David. (1996). The revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. Journal of Family Issues, 17(3), pp. 283-316.
- Sullivan, Cris, Rumpitz, Maureen, Campbell, Rebecca, Eby, Kimberly & Davidson, William. (1996). Retaining participants in longitudinal community research: A comprehensive protocol. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 32(3), pp. 262-276.
- Syers, Maryann & Edleson, Jeffrey. (1992). The combined effects of coordinated criminal justice intervention in woman abuse. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7(4), pp. 490-502.

- Tjaden, Patricia and Thoennes, Nancy. (1998). Prevalence, Incidence and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings From the National Violence Against Women Survey. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
- Tolman, Richard & Bennett, Larry. (1990). A review of quantitative research on men who batter. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5, 87-118.
- Tolman, Richard & Gauri Bhosley. (1991). The outcome of participation in a shelter-sponsored program for men who batter. In D. Knudsen & J. Miller (Eds) Abused and Battered: Social and Legal Responses to Family Violence (pp. 113-122). NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Waldo, Michael. (1987). Also victims: Understanding and treating men arrested for spouse abuse. Journal of Counseling and Development, 65(6), pp. 385-388.
- Weisburd, David. (1993). Design sensitivity in criminal justice experiments. In Michael Tonry (Ed.), Crime and Justice: A Review of Research (Vol 17). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Widom, Cathy Spatz. (1992). The Cycle of Violence. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
- Wierzbicki, Michael & Pekarik, Gene. (1993). A meta-analysis of psychotherapy dropout. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 24(2), pp. 190-195.

APPENDIX ONE

COUNTY AND STATE CERTIFICATION FOR

BATTERERS' INTERVENTION PROGRAMS

**BROWARD COUNTY
HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT
HEALTH CARE MANAGEMENT DIVISION**

**MINIMUM STANDARDS AND APPLICATION PROCEDURES
BATTERERS' INTERVENTION PROGRAMS**

**BROWARD COUNTY HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT
HEALTH CARE MANAGEMENT DIVISION**

**ADULT BATTERERS' INTERVENTION PROGRAMS
MINIMUM STANDARDS**

INTRODUCTION

Domestic violence is a widespread problem with potentially lethal consequences to victims and the community in which they live. It is defined in F.S. 741.28 (1997) as "any assault, aggravated assault, battery, sexual assault, sexual battery, aggravated battery, stalking, aggravated stalking, kidnapping or false imprisonment, or any criminal offense resulting in physical injury or death of one family member by another who was residing in the same single dwelling unit."

Historical Perspective

In 1994, Broward County established the Domestic Violence Court, after careful study and evaluation. This comprehensive and integrated approach toward responding to the issue of domestic violence incorporated the efforts of a diverse group of community agencies, organizations, and individuals. Included in the development of this court were the judiciary, Office of the State Attorney, Office of the Public Defender, the Clerk of the Court, the law enforcement community, various governmental agencies, and a number of community-based organizations. The two judges assigned to preside over this court have received extensive specialized training in this area. Since the inception of the Domestic Violence Court, the number of domestic violence homicides has decreased by 63%, as compared to homicides in the general population, which decreased by 20%.

Additionally, Broward County has evidence of the commitment and involvement of other branches of the criminal justice system. For example, the law enforcement agencies are mandated by law to utilize a "pro-arrest" policy when responding to complaints of domestic violence. The Broward State Attorney's Office has established its own Domestic Violence Prosecution Unit, while The Division of Probation also has their own domestic violence unit.

In 1996, The Department of Corrections established the "Minimum Standards for Batterers' Intervention Programs," which have been adopted and subscribed to by Broward County providers. These standards include the utilization of uniform instruments and documents, including assessment tools, termination summaries, and victim contact forms. In addition, the standards for certification outline and detail the prerequisite credentials for facilitators and assessors, program specifics and content, as well as policy goals and participant fees. The certification approach is comprehensive, though it is limited in its approach to the evaluation of program effectiveness and efficiency.

Broward County has been providing monitoring and review of providers since the inception of the Domestic Violence Court. In 1997, the responsibility for the oversight of batterers' intervention programs was delegated to the Health Care Management Division of the Human Services Department of Broward County. The Division, in turn, has

contracted with Henderson Mental Health Center, Inc. to provide the monitoring, assessment, and evaluation services. Henderson Mental Health Center, Inc. has made the commitment to provide adequate resources to support this program, including, but not limited to, financial support, material and equipment needs and personnel. A Program Evaluator has been hired on a part-time basis to provide these services. The Program Evaluator meets monthly with the Health Care Management Division of the Human Services Department, as well as quarterly with the judges who preside over the Domestic Violence Court.

The Program Evaluator is an expert in the area of program evaluation and quality improvement, as well as in the accreditation and certification of organizations. This individual meets regularly with providers of batterers' intervention services and participates in the Broward Council on Domestic Violence. Monitoring activities regarding the compliance with the minimum standards occur on an ongoing basis and are reported to the Health Care Management Division of the Human Services Department as well as to the judiciary. The Program Evaluator will provide oversight and appraisal of organizations who are currently approved to provide batterers' intervention services, as well as those agencies who seek to become approved providers.

An extensive literature review has been conducted regarding the efficacy and effectiveness of batterers' intervention programs, as well as state standards established across the country. Broward County has developed the following standards, reflecting a comprehensive set of "best practice" models. These procedures incorporate the minimum standards established by The Department of Corrections, but exceed their expectations, particularly in the area of accountability, evaluation, and monitoring.

Definitions

For the purpose of this application packet, the following are definitions of terms used throughout the application packet:

"Assessor" is a person licensed or license eligible under F.S. Chapters 490, 491, or 498 and who is certified to perform the uniform assessment for those perpetrators ordered by the court to a batterers' intervention program;

"Batterer" refers to a person who commits an act of domestic violence;

"BIP" refers to the batterers' intervention program;

"Domestic Violence" is defined in F.S. 741.28, (1995), as "any assault, aggravated assault, battery, sexual assault, sexual battery, stalking, aggravated stalking or any criminal offense resulting in physical injury or death of one family or household member by another who is or was residing in the same single dwelling unit."

"Facilitator" means a batterers' intervention group leader;

"Family or household member" is defined Section 741.28, Florida Statutes (1995) as "spouses, former spouses, persons related by blood or marriage, persons who are presently residing together as if a family or who have resided together in the past as if a family, and persons who have a child in common regardless of

whether they have been married or have resided together at any time." For the purposes of this program, however, "family or household member" is restricted to spouse, ex-spouse, cohabitant, or former cohabitant who lived or live together as a couple;

"Monitor" is the agent of The Division of Human Services, Health Management Division trained and authorized to conduct monitoring of both the administrative and programmatic components of the batterers' intervention programs.

"Perpetrator" refers to a person who commits an act of domestic violence;

"Program" refers to a batterers' intervention program;

"Provider" means an entity or individual who provides batterers' intervention programs;

"Supervisor" means one who meets all facilitator requirements and supervisor criteria established by these standards and provides oversight, guidance, and evaluation to a trainee;

"The Division" means the Broward County Department of Human Services, Health Care Management Division;

"Trainee" means an individual in the process of becoming certified as a facilitator as required by these standards;

"Victim" means the family or household member against whom the perpetrator committed, or is committing, domestic violence. "Victim," "partner," and "survivor" are used interchangeably. These terms reflect the perspective of battered persons and the attitudes of society, service providers, and those who give support;

"Victim liaison" means a person who is on the program's staff or who contracts with the program to contact the victim.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

These guidelines are designed to meet the needs of victims and batterers, and in so doing, the entire community. Programs shall be developed where there are domestic violence centers and where economic, medical, psychological, and other support services are available to domestic violence victims. It is recognized that everyone in a community has an important role to play in the elimination of domestic violence, therefore, Broward County is committed in its approach to promote a coordinated community response that is grounded in the principles of zero tolerance.

1. Domestic violence offenders are a separate category of violent offenders requiring a specialized approach. Where batterers are guilty of other offenses, their domestic violence must be addressed separately;
2. The primary goal is cessation of abuse;
3. Abuse can never be condoned under any circumstances;
4. Batterers are responsible for their violent and abusive behavior;

5. Batterers must be held accountable for their abusive behavior; the community must provide consequences for engaging in violent behavior such as being arrested, convicted and punished for a criminal act. The community must make batterers aware of the full emotional, social and economic costs of their behavior;
6. The batterer's use of violence is a learned behavior and is therefore, changeable;
7. Programs shall not focus on saving relationships, but on ending violence;
8. The safety and rights of victims/survivors must be the highest priority;
9. It is recognized that the batterer may have unique service needs; therefore, the individual differences and rights of the batterer shall be respected;
10. Service providers shall not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, ancestry, age, physical or mental disabilities, sexual orientation, or economic circumstances; and
11. Staff composition of organizations should strive to reflect the cultural diversity of the community they serve.

Purpose of the batterers' intervention program

The purposes of the program are to:

- a) hold batterers accountable, challenge their beliefs, and teach new skills that will facilitate changes in their behavior;
- b) provide a role model while educating the batterer about alternative behaviors;
- c) collect data to assist with evaluations of program effectiveness, efficiency and satisfaction;
- d) collect data regarding demographics, profile characteristics and rates of recidivism;
- e) disallow collusion and victim blaming by batterers and others;
- f) challenge myths about domestic violence and promote "zero tolerance" of violent behavior;
- g) coordinate services including referrals to other agencies for needed services;
- h) heighten public awareness by making information available to the community; and
- i) report compliance and non-compliance to the courts or other referral sources

The purposes for the curriculum for intervention programs are to:

- a) provide a model for intervention which identifies and remediates tactics of power and control;
- b) promote consistency of services;
- c) challenge beliefs of batterers so that they can see that they are accountable for their behavior and can change that behavior, especially when given appropriate alternatives; and
- d) provide a model of violence-free behavior among family or household members to the program, its facilitators, and the community.

Intervention Programs and the Criminal Justice System

Each treatment program shall have an understanding of the laws regarding domestic violence and the operation of the criminal justice system. Batterers' intervention programs are responsible to the justice system. The following represent the minimum knowledge that any provider must have:

1. Familiarity with the state laws which regulate police response to domestic violence calls;
2. Familiarity with relief available to victims of domestic violence (Florida Statutes, Chapter 960, The Florida Crimes Compensation Act); and
3. Knowledge of local law enforcement, prosecution, and court policies regarding court cases.

Programs providing mandated intervention shall establish a method of information exchange with the justice system. Intervention programs should undertake the following activities in pursuit of information exchange:

1. Obtain pertinent court orders (including copies of protection orders, bail conditions, and probation or parole conditions) and intervention records whenever possible;
2. Obtain copies of assessments conducted by The Department of Probation as well as pertinent police reports;
3. Report any serious and/or repeated violations of protection orders, bail conditions and probation/parole conditions to the appropriate court officer or judge;
4. Report violations of any provision of a court order mandating batterer intervention to the appropriate court officer, judge, or prosecuting agency;
5. Document further incidents of violence, including dates, brief descriptions, and outcomes;
6. Submit periodic participant evaluations to the court or any designated agency- reports include attendance, participation, progress, and recommendations for further intervention;

7. Provide information regarding termination and fee collection to the court and/or designated agencies;
8. Inform law enforcement personnel and any appropriate court officer, as well as warn any battered partner, of the risk of violent conduct posed by the program participant that may result in serious bodily injury or death to the battered partner or any other foreseeable person;
9. Provide training and technical assistance to the justice system about domestic violence, its perpetrators, and appropriate intervention strategies to eliminate violence against women and children.

Intervention Services and Domestic Violence Programs

Intervention programs shall seek to establish cooperative, accountable relationships with domestic violence programs and the Broward Domestic Violence Council which shall include:

1. Collaborative work to assure that battered partners are provided outreach, advocacy, safety planning, and other assistance while men who batter are participating in intervention services;
2. Development and dissemination of information packets for battered women about batterer intervention services and the entitlement of battered women to specific information about the program, including program philosophy and curriculum content, confidentiality of communications of battered women, limitations on confidentiality for men who batter, purpose and scope of routine partner contacts, mechanisms by which partners are advised of any risk posed by intervention participants, and supportive services offered by the batterers' intervention program to partners of participants;
3. Establishment of referral mechanisms between the domestic violence and the batterers' intervention program;
4. Agreement as to non-competitive fundraising with local battered women services;
5. Consultation on and potential collaboration in advertising and public information campaigns relating to batterer intervention services;
6. Collaboration for training of professionals in the community (i.e., justice system, medical, schools, mental health, religious, drug and alcohol treatment, child protective services professionals) about domestic violence, the laws regarding domestic violence, services for victims and perpetrators, safety strategies for battered women and children and accountability of men who batter;
7. Collaborative negotiation of any written or informal agreements with the justice system, particularly the courts, related to batterer intervention services;

8. Cooperative creation of any research agenda on domestic violence and batterers' intervention programs and collaborative production and dissemination of findings thereon;
9. Collaboration on issues of public policy related to safety for battered women and children and intervention with men who batter.¹

Intervention Programs and Battered Partners

Each treatment program shall establish procedures for safeguarding battered women. Batterers' intervention programs will be monitored to ensure that the goals of increasing victim safety, eliminating violence in intimate relationships (previous or current) and stopping other forms of abusive behavior are the focus of the program.

As safety for victims of domestic violence and their children is primary to all aspects of batterers' programming, providers shall develop procedures which:

- a) adequately assess the safety of the victim and her children;
- b) provide regular contact with the victim to verify the victim's safety;
- c) ensure that the victim is offered referrals or assistance and inform the victim of the batterer's status in the group;
- d) ensure that records of victim contact are kept separate and secure from batterer files;
- e) demonstrate cooperation and communication with area domestic violence center(s) so as to stay advised on common issues;
- f) follow and comply with procedures for reporting non-compliance to the referral source;
- g) hold batterers accountable to the fullest extent possible to victims and the community for their use of violence by paying costs associated with attending the intervention program;
- h) have a staff who is knowledgeable of the laws and the legal system as they pertain to domestic violence crimes including, but not limited to, criminal and civil remedies for victims and local law enforcement, prosecution, and local court personnel, domestic violence rules and policies and education of justice system personnel;
- i) demonstrate cooperation with other victim service agencies that work with victims of domestic violence; and
- j) offer to assist local domestic violence centers in the training and education of justice system personnel.

¹ Adopted in large part from the *Batterer's Treatment Program Guidelines*, developed by the Los Angeles County Domestic Violence Council, June, 1988

Each treatment program shall attempt to contact victims of batterers. The purposes of the contact are to determine if she is safe, to get her assessment of the batterer's past and present abusive behavior and, if she desires, to link her to victim services and open, ongoing communication. Safety issues should be explored on a regular basis throughout the course of treatment, as well as options available to the partner, such as orders for protection, and referral to domestic violence centers for shelter and legal advocacy. Batterers shall be held accountable to their victims and society at large. The programs shall educate and teach new skills to batterers and document participation. At a minimum, procedures for safeguarding battered women shall include²:

1. Working collaboratively with domestic violence programs to assure that battered partners are provided advocacy, safety planning, and other assistance while men who batter are participating in intervention services;
2. Informing battered partners of their right to be free of violence and to access legal protections;
3. Giving informed referrals to partners to domestic violence programs, victim-witness assistance and legal services;
4. Advising battered women of the status of the batterer in relation to intervention services, including application, rejection, or acceptance, attendance, and administrative or contractual discharge;
5. Assessing the lethality of all participants at intake and periodically throughout intervention;
6. Warning battered partners and appropriate law enforcement agencies of potential violence by the participant;
7. Taking appropriate action to protect partners and minor children from dangers posed by program participants (including, but not limited to, seeking involuntary mental health commitment of the batterer and finding emergency safe housing for the endangered partner);
8. Avoiding even the appearance of complicity with the batterer in all work undertaken by the organization; and
9. Focusing primary attention on the safety of battered partners in all contacts made with them and all communications made on their behalf.

Guidelines for contacting the victim:

1. To the degree possible, providers should ensure that victim contacts will be conducted by individuals of the same gender as the victim to foster an uninhibited flow of information.

² Adopted in large part from the *Batterers' Treatment Guidelines*, developed by the Los Angeles County Domestic Violence Council, June, 1988

2. Contact shall be made with all partners within four working days of the batterer's enrollment, initially to conduct the lethality assessment. Providers shall make at least three documented attempts by telephone. If telephone contact is unsuccessful, the provider shall use first class mail to send a letter, retaining a copy for the victim file. The letter shall express concern for the victim and the children and will provide general information about the batterers' intervention program, the local domestic violence center, and other related advocacy services. If the letter is returned unopened, the letter and envelope shall be retained in the file;
3. When making telephone contact, providers shall identify themselves and ask if this is a good time to talk. If it is not, ask for a convenient time to call back and the best number to use. Always remember that victim participation is completely voluntary. If the victim refuses, it should be recorded on the victim contact form and maintained in the victim's file;
4. When speaking with the victim, advise her that the call is out of concern for the victim and the children's safety. Acknowledge that you know about the violence and control in the relationship. Inform the victim that the perpetrator is aware that you are making this contact and that any information shared will not be disclosed to the perpetrator. Give the victim the name and phone number of the nearest domestic violence center. Validate the perception that the victim is not responsible for the partner's violence and control. If the victim agrees to participate, a lethality assessment shall be completed to the extent the victim is willing or has time to share information. Completed forms shall be maintained in the victim file;
5. Follow-up contacts may be made monthly but shall occur no less than four (4) working days after the twelfth week and the twenty second week of attendance in the batterers' intervention program. The Victim Follow-Up Form shall be used to document the contact and shall be maintained in the victim file;
6. The provider shall notify the partner by telephone within four (4) working days after the batterer is involuntarily terminated from the program. All attempts at victim notification will be documented in this file. If after three attempts contact is not made, a letter of notification shall be sent via first class and a copy retained in the victim file. If returned unopened, both the letter and envelope will be kept in the victim file;
7. The provider must immediately report any threat of violence from a batterer to a prior victim or potential victim. If unable to reach the partner, the provider must immediately contact local law enforcement. These action(s) must be documented in both the batterer's file and the victim file.
8. All contact with the victim shall be kept strictly confidential and will not be disclosed to any third party without specific written authorization from the victim or upon order of the court. Signed authorization will be maintained in the victim contact file.

The victim has the right to refuse to participate and may ask that the treatment program make no further contact. The response may be due to severed ties with the victim's abuser and the desire to move on from the incident, or it may be because of fear of retribution. Whatever the reason, it is the victim's choice whether or not to participate.

STAFF SELECTION AND TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

Staff shall be competent in general interpersonal skills required to relate to battering clients, general knowledge of human behavior and specific knowledge about domestic violence, and they shall have attitudes and behavior consistent with these guidelines.

The program shall provide orientation for all new employees to acquaint them with the program's philosophy, organization, treatment program, policies, procedures, and goals.

Treatment programs shall employ staff who are reflective of ethnic and linguistic minorities within the community served. Programs shall be linguistically accessible and culturally appropriate to communities of color in the geographic areas served.

Moral Character

1. Facilitators must be violence-free in their own lives. In addition, no program shall hire an individual who has been a perpetrator of violence unless the program director is satisfied that the potential staff member has successfully completed a certified batterers' intervention program;
2. Staff employed by the batterers' intervention program must not use alcohol or drugs to an extent or in a manner that is determined to impair the individual's ability to function in a responsible, professional manner;
3. No person acting as a batterers' intervention program executive director (president or sole proprietor), program director, assessor, facilitator, supervisor, trainee, or person functioning in a clerical position having access to batterer or victim records, may be under any form of community supervision, administrative or otherwise, by any law enforcement agency or county, state, or federal authority. This includes, but is not limited to, any form of misdemeanor or felony probation, community control, pre-trial diversion, post-release supervision (prison releases), or parole;
4. No person acting as a batterer intervention program executive director (president or sole proprietor), program director, assessor, facilitator, supervisor, or trainee, may have been convicted, pled nolo contendere or had adjudication withheld for any crime of violence within the last two years or have been under any form of community supervision, including but not limited to the above mentioned supervision types. For purposes of this application, a crime of violence is defined as assault, aggravated assault, battery, aggravated battery, sexual assault, sexual battery, stalking, aggravated stalking, or any criminal offense resulting in physical injury or death; and

5. No person acting as a batterer intervention program executive director (president or sole proprietor), program director, assessor, facilitator, supervisor, or trainee, may be the subject of an injunction for protection or any other judicial restraint for any violent act as defined above within the last two years.

All arrests for any criminal charge within the last two years must be reported on the application for certification.

Confidentiality

1. Treatment programs shall develop policies and procedures concerning the confidentiality that will be afforded to program participants in other aspects both within and outside the program, for example, use of audio or video taping of group sessions, contracts with the television or print media and community education activities;
2. Batterers' intervention programs shall develop policies and procedures regarding the provision of testimony in administrative and judicial proceedings, addressing matters such as the scope of participation of batterers' intervention program staff in such proceedings and the parameters of confidentiality in cases involving batterers mandated by the court. The policy should specify that the court is entitled to information about application, enrollment, attendance, potential violence or threats of violence, lethality assessment, dismissal and justification of same, and completion of court mandate;
3. Treatment programs shall not persuade nor coerce victims to waive confidentiality and shall inform victims of the limits to confidentiality. Victims who wish to give information to the batterers' intervention program must be informed of the limitations and usefulness of doing so and encouraged to seek further assistance from victim advocates.

Prerequisite Credentials for Assessors and Facilitators

Education

Assessment of the perpetrator and facilitators of groups may only be conducted by a person certified under these standards and who is also:

- a) licensed under Chapter 490 or 491, Florida Statutes;
- b) license eligible under Chapters 490 or 491, Florida Statutes (so long as that person is working under the supervision of a Chapter 490 or 491 licensee);
- c) a Master's level professional trained in the areas of counseling, social work, psychology, or marriage and family therapy; or
- d) a psychiatrist licensed under Chapter 458, Florida Statutes.

Additional Credentials for Facilitators

For all facilitators, the program applicant must show that the following work experience requirements are met, in addition to the above educational requirements. Each facilitator must have:

- a) 78 hours of direct face-to-face contact facilitating or co-facilitating batterer's groups using the power and control model. These requirements must be completed in not less than six months; and
- b) 40 hours of victim-centered training which can include providing advocacy to battered women and their children, conducting women's and children's groups, attending victim panels or presentations at which victims discuss their victimization and any other program or training where victim issues are taught.

Training

Both the assessor and facilitator applicant must have a minimum of 27 hours of training as described below:

- a) Completion of 19 hours of training as follows:
 - i) the dynamics of domestic violence within the context of power and control; **(3 hours)**
 - ii) the effects of domestic violence on victims and their children and the critical nature of victim contacts and safety planning; **(2 hours)**
 - iii) that understanding that domestic violence is deeply rooted in historical attitudes toward women and is intergenerational; **(3 hours)**
 - iv) lethality assessment for risks of suicide, homicide, further domestic violence or other violent aggressive behaviors, and access to or use of weapons; **(2.5 hours)**
 - v) information on state and federal laws pertaining to domestic violence, including the policies affecting treatment of court-ordered program participants, child abuse, divorce, and custody matters; **(1.5 hours)**
 - vi) the role of the facilitator within the group and within the context of a coordinated community response to domestic violence; **(2.5 hours)**
 - vii) teaching non-controlling alternatives to violent and controlling behaviors; **(3 hours)**
 - viii) understanding and preventing collusion **(1.5 hours)**
- b) Eight (8) hours of substance abuse training specific to domestic violence and
- c) Four (4) hours of riding along with local law enforcement or

Four (4) hours of court attendance during domestic violence cases; or a combination of both.

Facilitator Trainees

If an apprenticeship or "trainee" period is necessary to fulfill any of the prerequisite credentials for the facilitator's requirement, a trainee must work under the direction of a trained facilitator using the power and control model and a supervisor at a batterers' intervention program and under the direction of or in conjunction with a certified domestic violence center. Experience and required face to face contact as described above may be voluntary or part of a university internship program, paid or unpaid, but must be documented by the program executive director.

Continuing Education for Assessors and Facilitators

- a) Twelve hours of total education or experience annually in any of the following areas as they pertain to batterers' intervention are required:
 - i) domestic violence and substance abuse
 - ii) domestic violence and the law
 - iii) completion of power and control model training
 - iv) other issues which pertain to domestic violence such as, mediation, arrest procedures and its affect on children

or

- b) Eight hours of education as described above and four hours of documented supplemental experience in the area of family violence such as:
 - i) court attendance during domestic violence hearings or trials
 - ii) riding along with local police
 - iii) work with a state-certified domestic violence center
 - iv) evaluation and intervention with families where domestic violence is present

The program director is responsible for ensuring the appropriateness of the education and experience used to meet this requirement.

Principal Duties of Assessors

For each referral for assessment, the assessor shall:

- a) agree to schedule the assessment within 10 calendar days from the batterer's initial contact;
- b) complete a psychosocial assessment using an assessment instrument requiring a minimum of one hour to complete;
- c) submit assessment and any additional information to the treating clinician within five calendar days of assessment;

- d) provide for release of information concerning the psychosocial assessment to the program, appropriate probation department, The Division of Human Services (for monitoring purposes) or other criminal justice agency;
- e) collect and receive fees from each batterer for his psychosocial assessment based on the recommended range of \$6.00-\$60.00 and the ability to pay;
- f) maintain accurate records of the batterer's attendance at and cooperation with the psychosocial assessment; and
- g) refer to the referring bid, within five calendar days, those who are screened out of group in accordance with the rejection criteria described previously.

Principal Duties of Facilitators

The principal duties of program facilitators are to:

- a) facilitate or co-facilitate weekly intervention groups utilizing the established curriculum and techniques;
- b) model appropriate boundary setting, confrontation, refraining, paraphrasing, reflection, and clarification;
- c) identify and eliminate collusion or complicity and intragroup conflicts for individual and group growth;
- d) communicate non-hostility, respect, and unconditional acceptance of ethnocultural and lifestyle differences;
- e) teach and model problem-solving skills and non-violent behavior options;
- f) recognize and process denial and minimization and other defense mechanisms;
- g) establish rapport and understanding in a non-judgmental and objective manner so as to build trust, reduce resistance, and elicit the necessary feedback to gauge understanding of intervention information imparted;
- h) appropriately confront acts of domestic violence and other counterproductive behavior(s);
- i) elicit self-disclosure to enhance participant's self-exploration; and
- j) maintain case notes regarding participation, cooperation and other pertinent information.

Prerequisite Credentials for Supervisors

- a) For all supervisors, the program applicant must show that the following educational/work experience requirements are met:
 - i) a master's degree plus one year of equivalent experience involving direct contact work with victims and/or batterers; and
 - ii) 78 hours of direct face-to-face contact facilitating or co-facilitating batterers' groups using the power and control model. These requirements must be completed in not less than six months; and

- iii) 40 hours of victim-centered training which can include providing advocacy to battered women and their children, conducting women's and children's groups, attending victim panels or presentations at which victims discuss their victimization and any other program or training where victim issues are taught.
- b) Applicants for supervisor positions are further required to have three or more years of domestic violence experience, which may include the following areas:
 - i) domestic violence training;
 - ii) teaching domestic violence in high school or post secondary settings;
 - iii) domestic violence program development, implementation, monitoring, or evaluation;
 - iv) documented research conducted in the field of domestic violence; and
 - v) authorship of publications in the field of domestic violence.

Applicants for supervisory certification may provide supervision as a supervisor trainee under the supervision of or on a contract basis with a person who is licensed under Chapters 490 or 491, Florida Statutes.

Records of Personnel and Contract Workers

The provider's personnel records must contain the following information regarding each staff member and all contract workers:

- a) name, address, home phone number, social security number, date of birth, and a recent clear photograph or a copy of a Florida driver's license;
- b) name, contact information of closest relative and emergency contact;
- c) training goals for trainees clearly stated and acknowledged by the staff (contract worker);
- d) proof of a local criminal background check;
- e) a criminal background check to include FCIC and fingerprint card;
- f) verification of an injunction registry background check;
- g) a signed job description;
- h) a signed privacy act statement (acknowledging confidentiality of information received);
- i) a signed copy of the program's philosophy and mission statement;
- j) completed resume and/or application for employment;
- k) official transcript or certified documentation of level of required education, training, and experience;

- l) written verification of previous employment and previous experience;
- m) a signed drug-free workplace policy;
- n) a signed sexual harassment policy; and
- o) a signed violence-free lifestyle statement.

PROGRAM GOALS

The overall goal of the education and treatment program shall be the cessation of coercive, dominating, and violent behavior, and the safety of the victim and the children, if any. Specifically, the program shall be designed to achieve the following goals:

1. To assist the batterer to understand that his acts of violence, abuse and use of power and privilege are a means of controlling the victim's actions, thoughts, and feelings;
2. To encourage the batterer to acknowledge his abuse and to recognize his use of abusive behavior as a choice and accept responsibility for its impact on his partner and others;
3. To increase the batterer's willingness to change his actions, for example, by examining the negative effects of his behavior on his relationship, his partner, his children, his friends, and himself;
4. To expand the batterer's understanding of the causes of his violence and abuse by examining the cultural, social, and personal factors that influence his choice to be violent and abusive;
5. To teach the batterer practical skills for noncontrolling and nonviolent ways of relating to women; and
6. To encourage the batterer to become accountable to those he has hurt through his use of violence, to take whatever actions are necessary to comply with the safety needs of his partner and to make restitution for the effects of the abuse.

Program Structure

Groups shall be used as the primary means of intervention for the following reasons:

1. Confrontation of the batterer's abuse by other individuals in the group challenges pro-violence norms that often exist among men in other settings;
2. Groups provide greater opportunity for confrontation than individual settings and more effectively decrease the batterer's isolation and dependence on his partner; and
3. Groups are more cost-effective.

The provider agrees to establish a program structure that utilizes the following parameters:

1. Composition of the groups shall be restricted to perpetrators of domestic abuse who are of the same gender and sexual orientation;
2. Facilitators shall speak the same language as that of the perpetrators;
3. Where specialized groups are indicated (i.e., women's groups, gay/lesbian, Spanish speaking, Creole speaking, juvenile offender, etc.), the provider shall either indicate their ability and capacity to conduct such specialized groups, or establish referral procedures to other organizations that may provide such services;
4. Groups shall be open (accepting new members on an ongoing basis);
5. A perpetrator shall attend a program of no fewer than 26 weeks (including intake, orientation, and 24 groups), each group session of which shall be no less than 90 minutes in length;
6. While groups shall be the primary format of intervention, programs should develop individualized plans to meet the needs of the participants. These plans may include individual sessions and adjunctive interventions as necessary;
7. The maximum group size shall be 15 participants;
8. Male-female co-facilitation teams are preferred, as the presence of a female co-leader diminishes the possibility of collusive male bonding in the groups, and for the purpose of modeling healthy egalitarian relationships; and
9. Excused absences may be accepted and will be reviewed on a case by case basis by the appropriate program authority.

Program Model

Program topics must closely follow a model that depicts an overall system of physical and sexual abuse where the batterer uses methods and tactics of power and control over a victim. Those tactics are as follows:

- using intimidation;
- using emotional abuse;
- using isolation;
- minimizing, denying, and blaming;
- using children;
- using economic abuse; and
- using coercion and threats.

A minimum of two to three sessions (for a total of 24 weeks) must be devoted to each specific tactic of power and control.

Intake/Assessment Procedures

Purpose: A psychosocial assessment is an inherent component of all batterers' intervention. It is performed in order to identify persons who would benefit from concurrent mental health or substance abuse treatment programs; to screen out those persons from the batterers' intervention program who have substance abuse problems or other impairments which make them unable to participate in the group intervention even with concurrent or preliminary treatment of those problems; to screen out those persons from the batterers' intervention programs who may be dangerous or have severe mental illness and would not benefit from the program; and to elicit information that the batterers' intervention program may use during the psychoeducational process.

General Considerations: An intake shall be performed by the provider indicated by the judge on the court order. A copy of the intake must be maintained in all batterer files. A contract must be signed by the batterer and must be in the batterer's file. Programs shall develop criteria for service and an intake form by which batterers are screened and assessed for eligibility. The decision to invite partners to participate in the assessment process should always be based on her willingness to do so, taking into account that participation may encourage unrealistic hopes for positive outcome. In addition, it is always essential to consider the risk to her safety. Finally, all attempts should be made to gather preliminary information prior to the evaluation to determine the perpetrator's suitability for the program (i.e., police reports, probationary assessment, court order, etc.)

Enrollment/Intake

1. Each treatment program agrees to establish written policies and procedures regarding intake and assessment;
2. These policies and procedures shall include, but not be limited to, the following information:
 - a) admission criteria
 - b) length of time between receipt of referral and intake appointment;
 - c) accepted length of time between intake and orientation;
 - d) procedure for no-call, no-show and process for informing appropriate individuals;
 - e) process for completing the assessment, including the individual(s) responsible for assessment and their credentials;
 - f) referral procedures for persons eliminated from program participation during the screening process;

- ii) The form for conducting an intake assessment shall include, but not be limited to, the following information:
- a) referral source
 - b) nature and details of precipitating event
 - c) name and address of the perpetrator
 - d) social security number
 - e) medical insurance
 - f) employer and employment history
 - g) educational history
 - h) partner and/or victim's name
 - i) relationship to victim
 - j) living arrangement
 - k) marital status
 - l) previous criminal history/activity
 - m) proximity of victim and offender
 - n) obsession over victim
 - o) history of violence and other abusive behaviors, including those both within and outside the intimate relationship. Special attention should be paid to possible incidents of child abuse or neglect by the batterer.
 - p) frequency/cycle of violence
 - q) violence in previous relationships
 - r) violence used in the individual's family of origin
 - s) attitudes toward violence
 - t) homicide risk (refer to section on lethality assessment)
 - u) suicide risk, including ideations, threats, or attempts
 - v) life stresses and/or potential triggers
 - w) accessibility to weapons (see section on lethality assessment)
 - x) substance abuse assessment, including:
 - (1) involvement of alcohol/drugs at time of incident
 - (2) current and past use
 - (3) current and past treatment

- (4) age first used
- (5) substances used
- y) mental health assessment, including;
 - (1) psychiatric hospitalizations
 - (2) psychotropic medications
 - (3) current and past treatment
 - (4) age of onset
 - (5) diagnosis

Fee Assessment/Procedures

Purpose: Payment for one's own participation in a batterers' intervention program is one of many indicators of responsibility and shall be incorporated into the program. All batterers shall be charged for participation in the batterers' intervention program. The batterers' intervention program shall establish a fee scale to contribute to the cost of the program. Fees shall be based on a sliding scale or an alternative system that would accommodate the inability to pay.

General Considerations: Fee for service shall be assessed by the batterers' intervention program and paid by the batterer. Exceptions for those persons who are indigent will be made as programs must accept indigent participants as explained below. Exceptions may also be made for government supported programs. Programs must be financially structured to allow for the delivery of a quality program.

1. Each provider agrees to establish a fee scale to cover the cost of the program. Fees shall be based on either a sliding fee scale or an alternative system that would accommodate inability to pay, enabling batterers to afford services. It is recommended that the programs assess weekly fees ranging between \$5.00 and \$50.00, based on the program's determination of ability to pay;
2. Fees shall be set following an income evaluation using, at a minimum, the participant's most recent federal income tax form, or if not available, other relevant income records or information which may be useful for an accurate determination of standard of living, income, and ability to pay;
3. Participants in the batterers' intervention program shall be required to pay their fees either weekly or in advance, however, exceptions may be made at the discretion of the program director;
4. Fees for the assessment are to be paid at the time of the assessment;
5. Providers shall not compete with domestic violence centers for funding. Both are necessary to address the problems of domestic violence and they must exist in cooperation, not in competition, with each other; and
6. Service providers shall not refuse to accept individuals with an inability to pay;

Substance Abuse Assessment

If the initial intake evaluation indicates drug and/or alcohol abuse, this should be addressed either prior to, or in conjunction with, the batterer's programming. Referrals to other agencies or to services within the organization for specialized services should be initiated in those circumstances. Violence cannot be successfully addressed without treating the substance abuse problem. However, treatment for substance abuse shall not be substituted for a batterers' intervention program.

1. Each treatment program agrees to establish policies and procedures regarding substance abuse assessment, referral, and treatment;
2. These policies and procedures shall include, but not be limited to, the following information:
 - a) assessment tools and procedures for completion
 - b) substance abuse services provided by the treatment program
 - c) limitations of services provided
 - d) policies regarding urinalysis (frequency, payment, procedure)
 - e) process for referral to outside providers of service
 - f) procedure for follow-up with outside agencies
 - g) process for informing judicial system and Department of Probation regarding substance use and treatment

Mental Health Assessment

If the mental health assessment conducted during intake and evaluation indicates that the perpetrator suffers from a serious and persistent mental illness that would prevent them from participating fully in the batterers' intervention program, the treatment program is responsible for making an appropriate referral to an organization that has expertise in addressing their symptoms. If a program believes they can successfully treat that individual in a group modality, policies and procedures must be in place for that situation.

1. Each treatment program agrees to develop policies and procedures relating to the mental health issues of individuals referred to their program;
2. These procedures shall include, but not be limited to, the following information:
 - a) procedures for conducting mental status exams;
 - b) policies regarding admission criteria, and ineligibility for participation;
 - c) process for informing judicial system and Department of Probation of appropriateness of referral;

- d) process for referring individuals with special mental health needs to specialized programs;
- e) policies for admission into batterers' intervention program with concurrent mental health treatment; and
- f) procedures for follow-up with outside agencies

Concurrent or Subsequent Treatment and Follow-Up Services

As stated above, concurrent or subsequent treatment for mental health or substance abuse problems may take place during the psychoeducational program. Extended services can occur only after the minimum requirements of the batterers' intervention program have been met. If agreed to by the partner, the batterer may engage in couples, marriage, or family therapy after completion of the batterers' intervention program.

Lethality Assessment

All providers will conduct a lethality assessment to identify potential chronic batterers. This assessment is conducted in an effort to increase victim safety and to potentially reveal individuals who are most likely to continue attacking their intimate partners. The past is an excellent predictor of the future. If the male has a long history of violence, the probability that it will continue is very high. The longer the history, the greater is the probability of its continuance. The greater number of psychological and behavioral commonalties that he possesses, the greater his potential for continued violence or homicide. The possession of weapons and the abuse of alcohol or drugs are two major predictors. The victim has the right to refuse to participate and may ask that the provider make no further contact.

1. Each treatment provider agrees to establish procedures for meeting with the batterer's partner within four days of enrollment in the group;
2. These policies and procedures should include, but not be limited to, the following information:
 - i) contacting the victim;
 - ii) maintenance of confidentiality;
 - iii) assessment tool;
 - iv) completion of assessment;
 - v) maintenance of information

ORIENTATION

The batterers' intervention program shall conduct a group orientation. The minimum time for the group orientation is 90 minute session (excluding breaks). An outline of the orientation and a statement acknowledging attendance must be in each batterer's file. Orientation should include, but is not limited to, the following:

- a) the definition of domestic violence;
- b) domestic violence statistics;
- c) an introduction of the power and control wheel;
- d) an introduction of the equality wheel;
- e) an overview of rules and regulations;
- f) the completion of a safety plan;
- g) an overview of the effects of domestic violence on children; and
- h) an outline of program content showing the dynamics of power and control, the effects of abuse on the victim, children and others, gender roles, socialization, and the nature of the violence.

PROGRAM ATTENDANCE POLICY

- a) The batterer must attend the 24 week sessions that comprise the batterers' intervention program. However, the batterer cannot begin the program until intake assessment and orientation are completed;
- b) Three successive unexcused absences may result in termination from the program and such a termination shall be within the discretion of the provider. A total of four or more unexcused absences during the 24 week intervention program shall result in an automatic termination from the program. The provider must immediately report any termination to the court or other referral source, if applicable;
- c) Notice of this policy must be signed by the batterer and maintained in their file;
- d) Batterers must complete the program with which they originally enrolled unless approval to change programs is obtained from the court (if applicable) and the program director;
- e) Excused absences may be accepted and will be reviewed on a case by case basis by the appropriate program authority.

PROGRAM CONTRACTS

Treatment programs shall establish a written agreement that clearly delineates the obligations of the batterer to the program and consequences for noncompliance with the agreement. The program shall also establish a written agreement that clearly delineates the obligations of the program to the batterer. The program shall review the contract with the participant and furnish a copy to the batterer. Consequences shall be commensurate with the violation; partners, the court and/or probation shall be advised of the breach of contract.

The contents of the contract shall include, but not be limited to, the following information:

- a) attendance policy of intake, orientation, and 24 weeks of group sessions;

- b) batterer attendance at group sessions free of alcohol, drugs, and violence;
- c) suspension and termination criteria;
- d) program rules and regulations;
- e) agreement to participate in evaluations regarding history of abuse;
- f) commitment from the batterer to participate in the program and to be violence-free;
- g) disclosure of information statement informing the batterer of the right of the program staff to advise appropriate individual(s) including the victim, courts, or probation or other referral source of the following:
 - i) threat to conduct bodily harm to the victim or to any other person or to commit suicide;
 - ii) any belief that child abuse or neglect is present or has occurred, which also will be reported pursuant to section 415.504, Florida Statutes.
- h) language that informs the batterer of the program's continuing responsibility to take safety initiatives by notifying any person at risk, including but not limited to, the victim, any children, significant others, victim's advocates or the police, of any concerns they have about the participant's potential for violence and lethality;
- i) a list of provider expectations such as participation and homework and that the batterer will be held accountable for abusive and violent behavior;
- j) responsibility of safety planning for batterers, including awareness of abusive/violent behavior and patterns, violence avoidance techniques, controlling behavior logs, and non-violence maintenance;
- k) specific release of information for collateral treatment (i.e., substance abuse, mental health)
- l) payment of fees; and
- m) waiver which specifies that information may be revealed to the probation department and the court, and that the appropriate criminal justice agency must be apprised of a mandated batterer's failure to participate, further acts of violence, or dismissal

The provider may contract with the batterer for video/audio recordings of group sessions for the purposes of internal instruction, education, research, or program monitoring. However, agreement to such a contract provision is not mandatory for the batterer.

PROGRAM CONTENT

Each treatment program shall include a written educational curriculum based on interpersonal and resocialization techniques. At a minimum, the curriculum of the educational component shall include the following:

1. the nature and effects of domestic violence on children, families and the community, including the definition of domestic violence, domestic violence laws and consequences and the identification of abusive, controlling, and violent behaviors;
2. assisting the batterer in taking responsibility for violent and abusive behavior, including the identification, confrontation and change of abusive and controlling behaviors toward victims, including partners and children. All forms of physical abuse and intimidation shall be identified and challenged. Specific attention to emotional, mental, sexual, and economic abuse shall also be included;
3. erasing myths and beliefs about domestic violence, including myths about provocation and the work that is necessary to bring about changes in the attitudes and beliefs that promote family violence;
4. teaching about the cycle of violence;
5. teaching self-awareness components, including the identification of arousal cues and patterns of verbal and behavioral abusiveness by helping batterers to learn to identify behavior, emotional, and physical cues which signal escalating anger and the need for using a time-out;
6. improving the batterer's ability to identify and articulate feelings;
7. identifying profiles of batterers;
8. improving listening and communication skills and listening with empathy;
9. developing the skills necessary for the maintenance of non-abusive behavior which includes learning non-violent conflict resolution, assertive, non-aggressive communication, and achieving and maintaining positive, healthy, nurturing, nonabusive partnerships and parenting;
10. identifying and discussing the effects of violence and abuse on victims, including children who witness such abuse, as well as on self and others. The short and long-term effects of violence on spouses and children shall be enumerated. Clients shall be expected to take responsibility for creating these consequences and the negative effects their abuse has caused; the exercises shall build empathy and take the perspective of the victim;
11. improving problem solving and decision making skills;
12. improving negotiation and nonviolent conflict resolution skills;
13. teaching personal change strategies and systematic methods for restructuring self-defeating thought patterns;

14. encouraging the development, improvement, and use of support systems;
15. teaching stress management techniques, including relaxation for arousal control;
16. challenging stereotypical gender role expectations, including issues of sexism, attitudes supporting male superiority to women and male privilege, as well as a belief in male entitlement to control women;
17. improving self-esteem;
18. exploring the socio-cultural basis for domestic violence;
19. identifying the effects of distorted thinking on emotions and behavior;
20. male power and control issues, including the comparison of self-control versus power and dominance
21. learning about the relationship of alcohol and drug use/abuse with domestic violence;
22. developing plans to take personal responsibility to eliminate violent, abusive behaviors, prevent relapse, and develop self-advocacy skills;
23. exploring the role of ethnicity and culture in domestic violence; and
24. encouraging clients to do volunteer work for social change, allowing the batterer to give something of themselves back to the community and to contribute to changing the climate that condones violence against women; developing a reliable method to monitor such activities.

Guidelines for Appropriate Intervention

This model is "psychoeducational." It addresses abuse in both a personal and social context through gender-based expectations, beliefs, and attitudes. This model acknowledges that violence is a learned behavior, and therefore, can be unlearned. Participation in the program is mandatory for the perpetrator and shall not extend beyond the perpetrator's term of probation.

Getting in touch with one's feelings and emotions or alternatives to violence, as well as ventilation techniques are considered to be appropriate approaches. It is recognized that a limited number of perpetrators may not be able to sustain the confrontational nature of a group setting (i.e., individuals with serious and persistent mental illness), therefore, individual counseling may be indicated for this population. This counseling shall focus on the violence and other abuse perpetrated by the offender.

Inappropriate Intervention Approaches

Theories or methods which in any way bring the victim into the circle of responsibility for the batterer's behavior or diminish the batterer's responsibility for the violence are inappropriate. While the following methods may, from time to time, be incorporated into a treatment model that focuses on power and control in

relationships, they are considered to be inadequate and inappropriate if they stand alone as the focus of treatment.

1. Any intervention approach that blames or intimidates the victim or places the victim in any danger is not allowed. There is no behavior on the part of the victim which causes or excuses abuse. Batterers bear sole responsibility for their actions;
2. Any approach that coerces, mandates, or otherwise requires victim participation is inappropriate. Couples, marriage, or family therapy is prohibited during the psychoeducational intervention phase. Such methods may be used as an adjunct to treatment only after the cessation of violence and coercion, the victim is not fearful of the perpetrator and is making decisions independent of the abuser, and the victim is in agreement;
3. Psychodynamic interventions which center causality of the violence to past experiences and unconscious motivations are not allowed;
4. Communication enhancement or anger management which lay primary causality on anger are prohibited;
5. Systems theory approaches which treat the violence as a mutually circular process, blaming the victim as well as the perpetrator, are inappropriate;
6. Addiction counseling models which identify the violence as an addiction and the victim and children as enabling or codependent in the violent drama are not allowed;
7. Any approach that encourages gradual containment and de-escalation of violence is prohibited;
8. Theories or techniques which identify poor impulse control as the primary cause of the violence are inappropriate;
9. Methods which identify psychopathology on the part of either party as a primary cause of the violence are not allowed; and
10. Teaching fair fighting techniques is prohibited.

DISCHARGE

Batterers' intervention programs shall develop a written policy regarding successful and unsuccessful termination. The program shall establish written criteria for satisfactory completion of the batterers' intervention program. In addition, programs shall develop a written policy outlining the circumstances under which a batterer may be terminated before completing the program. The program shall utilize the Discharge Summary to be forwarded to the court upon discharge; policies and procedures shall be developed by the program for the completion of the Discharge Summary. Under no circumstance does completion of the program guarantee further non-violence.

There are three categories of discharge:

- a) **Completion:** The batterer has been in compliance with the rules and regulations, attended scheduled appointments, participated at an acceptable level, completed homework and other assignments and paid required fees.
 - i) The program shall notify the referring court of the perpetrator's attendance and history of abuse while in the program once all criteria have been met.
 - ii) The victim shall be notified of completion by the perpetrator unless the victim requests to not be informed. The notification shall indicate only that the perpetrator has complied with contractual and court requirements. The program shall advise the victim that successful completion of batterer's treatment does not guarantee that the perpetrator will not return to violence.
- b) **Rejection:** The program can reject the batterer for services due to:
 - i) extensive psychiatric history including an active mental health history;
 - ii) chronic substance abuse or chemical dependency that first requires completion of a residential treatment program; and
 - iii) an inability to function in a group due to limited mental ability.

If the batterer is rejected, the program must:

- iv) document the reason for rejection;
 - v) make specific recommendations to the court or referral source;
 - vi) inform the victim of the rejection; and
 - vii) place a copy of the documentation in the batterer's file.
- c) **Termination:** The provider can terminate the batterer from the program for:
 - i) recurrence of violence and/or arrest;
 - ii) failure to abide by the rules and regulations of the program, including absences and other matters as set forth in these standards;
 - iii) failure to participate and attend sessions; and
 - iv) attending group under the influence of alcohol and drugs.

If a batterer is terminated from the program, the provider must:

- i) document clearly and specifically the reasons for termination without jeopardizing the safety of the victim;
- ii) make specific recommendations, including alternatives such as weekend incarceration, community service hours, probation violation, and return to the program;

- iii) inform the victim of the termination within three days; and
- iv) inform the referral source of the termination within three days.

FOLLOW-UP

Follow-up is essential in the evaluation of the effectiveness of batterers' intervention programs, therefore, each treatment program agrees to develop policies and procedures that relate to the aftercare services provided for victims and perpetrators. Follow-up may include contacting victims and perpetrators by telephone or mail to determine continued acts of violence, being notified by The Department of Probation regarding incidences of reoffense, or the conduct of an aftercare group for graduates.

DOCUMENTATION

All treatment providers shall maintain records on both participants and victims. Victim records shall be filed separately, so as to maintain confidentiality standards. Staff will be trained in the proper methods of documentation as part of their orientation to the program. Perpetrators' records shall include, but not be limited to, the following information:

- a) face sheet, including demographic and other client information
- b) contracts of agreement
- c) assessment information
- d) fee assessment, including documentation of financial status and sliding fee scale
- e) referrals made to other treatment agencies
- f) release(s) of information
- g) consent for treatment
- h) rules and regulations of program
- i) philosophy, mission statement and goals of treatment program
- j) confidentiality statement
- k) progress notes
- l) progress reports
- m) discharge summary

Victims' records shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- a) lethality assessment
- b) victim contact forms

DATA COLLECTION

All providers shall have a system for collection of data, including, but not limited to, information regarding demographics, profile characteristics, and completion rates.

Purpose: To ensure the consistency between organizations providing services to batterers. To collect statistical data that will assist in the future planning of programs. To identify the numbers of individuals being served to plan for future growth of programs. To provide the Human Services Department, Health Care Management Division and the Judiciary with information needed to determine the type of participant best served by the program. To identify any trends in referral and intake.

General Considerations: All individuals who are court-mandated for treatment will be evaluated by the referral organization. Information regarding these individuals will be collected in a systematic, compatible manner across organizations to provide for consistency and congruency in methodology. Guidelines regarding the security of information on program participants have been discussed previously.

- a) Each treatment provider shall establish a system for collecting statistical data and for reviewing this data. A database shall be maintained to develop a record of workload. The following information must be collected by each program:
 - i) Number of referrals received
 - ii) Referral source
 - iii) Number of scheduled appointments
 - iv) Number of intakes
 - v) Number of, and reasons for, refusals by program
 - vi) Number of no-call/no-shows for intake
 - vii) Reasons for no-show based on follow-up
 - viii) Basic demographic information, including
 - a) race
 - b) ethnicity
 - c) gender
 - d) primary language
 - e) age
 - f) religion
 - g) marital status
 - h) zip code

- i) highest level of educational attainment
- j) vocation
- k) disabilities
- ix) Involvement of substance/alcohol use at time of offense
- x) History of substance/alcohol use/abuse
- xi) History of psychiatric problems
- xii) History of abuse experienced as a child
- xiii) Criminal history
- xiv) Referrals made by program type (mental health, substance abuse, etc.)
- xv) Number of offense (first time, second, etc.)
- xvi) Charge type
- xvii) Offense description
- xviii) Date intake conducted
- xix) Program start date
- xx) Program completion date
- xxi) Termination from program
- xxii) Reason for termination
- xxiii) Amount charged for fees
- xxiv) Amount of fees collected
- b) Aggregate data will be compiled and analyzed by the Program Evaluator.
- c) Areas of concern and improvement needs will be identified and presented to the providers and judiciary in a providers' meeting.
- d) A strategic plan of corrective action will be developed by the providers, with input from the Program Evaluator and Judiciary.

PROGRAM MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Monitoring is a process by which batterers' intervention programs are designed, evaluated, and structured. Evaluation is both structural and substantive, and includes the review of organizations to ensure that services provided are effective and efficient, and that there is satisfaction with such services by clients as well as community stakeholders. The monitoring and evaluation component is an effort that actively seeks continuous improvement and enhancement in the provision of intervention and treatment services to perpetrators of domestic violence. It is designed to provide a means of identifying accountable service outcomes for individuals served by these programs. It seeks to ensure that the effectiveness and efficiency of services can be defined, pursued, achieved, and

maintained. Inherent in this concept is the creation of formal mechanisms for identifying criterion for success, as well as methodologies to collect, analyze, and report information related to outcomes.

The Monitoring and Evaluation program will provide oversight and appraisal of organizations who are currently approved to provide batterers' intervention services, as well as those agencies who seek to become approved providers. Program monitoring and evaluation will be conducted by the Broward County Department of Human Services, Health Care Management Division. The evaluation will be conducted by a Program Evaluator as previously identified. The Division must determine that providers are complying with required policies, such as partner contact, duty to warn, progress, and termination plans for group participants, are not providing inappropriate intervention services such as marriage and family counseling as determined by these standards, and that they are following any applicable rules and regulations. Site visits shall be conducted to ensure providers are in compliance with basic standards relative to group content, philosophy, and approach that must be adhered to ensure accountability of the batterer, safety of the victims, and overall provider compliance. During site visits, documents and forms will be examined to determine provider compliance with the requirements. During the evaluation, the following areas will be addressed:

- assessment of batterer
- timeliness of assessment
- signed agreements, including release of information, sliding fee scale, contract for services
- progress with treatment
- termination summaries and documentation related to completion or non-completion of treatment
- referral tracking and follow-up
- victim contact and follow-up
- qualifications and skills assessment of personnel
- observation and evaluation of the group process
- policy and procedure manual review

In addition, this program will include a review of the following:

- integration with community agencies, local task forces, and the criminal justice system
- analysis of program efficiency based on access to services (i.e., geographic locations, languages spoken, special needs populations, hours/days of service, crisis intervention)
- demographic data and profiles of individuals who receive services
- program completion and compliance
- measurement of program participation at various stages of treatment
- unit cost analysis
- rates of recidivism and reoffense
- comorbidity of substance/alcohol abuse

- involvement of substance abuse at the time of offense
- longitudinal follow-up with victims and perpetrator

Monitoring and evaluation will be conducted by the Program Evaluator on a continuous basis, with formal reviews conducted semi-annually. Providers shall participate in monthly meetings with the program evaluator, discussing issues that are pertinent to the improvement and enhancement of the program. Each treatment program will be furnished with a copy of the program monitoring instrument and group observation guide to ensure a complete understanding of the monitoring process. Reports will be made to The Division as well as to the judiciary and plans for corrective action will be developed and implemented to address areas of concern. As research on perpetrators and batterers' intervention programs progresses, philosophical and programmatic changes may be necessary.

CERTIFICATION PROCEDURES AND MINIMUM STANDARDS
FOR
ASSESSORS AND BATTERERS' INTERVENTION PROGRAMS

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
OFFICE OF CERTIFICATION AND MONITORING

MAY 1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction/Background	1
II. Definitions	3
III. Declaration of Purpose	5
Purposes of Batterers' Intervention Programs	5
Purposes of Assessment	6
IV. Application and Certification Requirements	7
Application and Certification Process	7
Requirements and Timelines	7
Decertification	9
Batterers' Intervention Programs	10
Application Prerequisites	10
Application Attachments	12
Records of Personnel and Contract Workers	13
Credentials for Batterers' Intervention Program Personnel	13
Prerequisite Credentials for Facilitators	13
Facilitator Trainees	14
Knowledge and Skills of Facilitators	14
Continuing Education	15
Principle Duties of Facilitators	16
Prerequisite Credentials for Supervisors	16
Reciprocity	18
The Assessment Process-Conditions for Certification	18
Prerequisite Credentials for Assessors	18
Training	18
Continuing Education	19
Principle Duties of Assessors	20

Moral Character	20
Conflicts of Interest	21
Referral System	22
V. Declaration of Policy.....	23
Policy Goals	23
Participant Fees	24
Program Specifics	26
Groups	26
Enrollment/Intake	26
Orientation.....	27
Program Attendance Policy	28
Discharge.....	28
Concurrent or Subsequent Treatment and Follow-up Services	29
Victim Contact and Related Services.....	29
VI. Program Content.....	32
Model.....	32
Content	32
Guidelines for Appropriate Intervention Approaches	33
Inappropriate Intervention Approaches	33
Substance Abuse and Mental Health	34
VII. Program Monitoring and Evaluation.....	35

I INTRODUCTION

The Florida Department of Corrections, Office of Certification and Monitoring, is responsible for certifying and monitoring assessors and batterer intervention programs. Program approval will include the department's analysis of each assessor's and program's ability to meet the minimum standards before they are able to receive referrals from the court as a certified provider or referrals as a certified assessor.

The Florida Legislature has stated that the purpose of the certification of batterers' intervention programs is "to uniformly and systematically standardize programs to hold those who perpetrate acts of domestic violence responsible for those acts and to ensure safety for the victims of domestic violence."¹ The Department of Corrections' first set of standards, based upon the minimum certification standards developed by the Commission on Minimum Standards for Batterers' Intervention Programs, suggest a gender based classification regarding appropriateness for programs among batterers. These standards clearly and substantially relate to the important governmental purposes of protecting the public, standardizing programs, and monitoring programs for safety. Developing certification standards for male batterers' programs will set a uniform and systematic standard for the development of certification standards for programs designed to meet the needs of other types of perpetrators such as females and juveniles.

The Florida Department of Law Enforcement reports that approximately 75% of those who perpetrate domestic violence are male. For these standards to effectively meet the public safety needs of this state, the Department, based on the recommendations of the Commission and the statute, found it reasonable and necessary to focus its initial certification efforts on programs designed for male perpetrators of domestic violence. The Department and the Commission recognize that there are other areas, such as female perpetrators and juveniles who also require programming. It is anticipated that certification standards for those groups will also be developed.

Certification under these standards is permissive and not a mandatory requirement for batterers' intervention programs in Florida. Although Florida law expresses a preference towards certified programs, the current law gives a judge full discretion to send a perpetrator to any program that the judge determines to be best suited for that person, and so supports and allows other programs to operate.

¹ Fla. Stat. Ch 741.32(2) (1995)

BACKGROUND

In September 1993, Governor Lawton Chiles created Florida's first statewide domestic violence task force. The executive order creating that task force charged it with the responsibility of assessing and evaluating Florida's response to the epidemic of domestic violence. In its first report, issued January 1994, the task force recommended that there be created a Commission of Minimum Standards for Batterers' Treatment to propose criteria that would govern the various batterers programs operating around the state. The Legislature responded and created the Commission, which the Governor appointed in August 1994. The Commission began its work immediately and relied heavily on the work done in other parts of the country and that which had begun in Florida. Many of these jurisdictions had developed and implemented minimum standards for batterers' intervention programs.

The standards that were recommended by the Commission and adopted by the 1995 Florida Legislature are designed to give batterers who wish to stop their violence the opportunity to change. The successful implementation of these standards, contained in the PROPOSED MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR BATTERERS' TREATMENT PROGRAMS, published in December 1994, requires community coordination and can lead to violence-free family life in Florida as well as an interruption in the intergeneration perpetration of family violence that is spilling from our homes and into our schools and streets.

Florida Statutes 741.32 and 741.325(1995), established the Office for Certification and Monitoring of Batterers' Intervention Programs within the Department of Corrections and provided policy making authority to the department. In preparing for the commencement of the certification of programs and assessors due in July 1996, the Commission, in conjunction with the Department of Corrections, conducted numerous additional public hearings statewide and has clarified and modified several of the proposed standards.

II. DEFINITIONS

For the purpose of this application packet, the following are definitions of terms used throughout the application packet:

“Assessor” is a person licensed or license eligible under F.S. Chapters 490, 491 or 498 and who is certified to perform the uniform assessment for those perpetrators ordered by the court to a batterers’ intervention program.

“Batterer” refers to a person who commits an act of domestic violence.

“BIP” refers to the batterers’ intervention program.

“Certification Fee” means the fee charged for certification as a batterers intervention program or an assessor.

“Domestic violence” is defined in F.S. 741.28, (1995), as “any assault, aggravated assault, battery, sexual assault, sexual battery, stalking, aggravated stalking or any criminal offense resulting in physical injury or death of one family or household member by another who is or was residing in the same single dwelling unit.” For the purposes of these standards, the definition of domestic violence includes, but is not limited to: patterns of coercive behavior that are used by one family or household member to control another such as using physical violence, sexual violence, emotional and psychological violence, intimidation, verbal abuse, economic control, coercion and threats, male privilege, children and isolating and blaming the victim or minimizing the violence.

“Facilitator” means a batterers’ intervention group leader.

“Family or household member” is defined in section 741.28, Florida Statutes (1995) as “spouses, former spouses, persons related by blood or marriage, persons who are presently residing together as if a family or who have resided together in the past as if a family, and persons who have a child in common regardless of whether they have been married or have resided together at any time.” However, for the purposes of these standards, “family or household member” is restricted to spouse, ex-spouse, cohabitant, or former cohabitant who lived or live together as a couple.

“Monitor” the agent of the department trained and authorized to conduct monitoring of both the administrative and programmatic components of the batter intervention providers.

“Office of Certification and Monitoring” or **“Office”** is the office, within the Florida Department of Corrections Probation and Parole Program Office, that is responsible for the certification and monitoring of the Batterers’ Intervention Programs.

“Perpetrator” refers to a person who commits an act of domestic violence.

“Program” refers to a batterers’ intervention program (“BIP”).

“Provider” means an entity or individual who provides batterers’ intervention programs.

“Psycho-educational” means structured educational interventions with batterers.

“Supervisor” means one who meets all facilitator requirements and supervisor criteria established by these standards and provides oversight, guidance, and evaluation to a trainee.

“The Department” means the Florida Department of Corrections.

“Trainee” means an individual in the process of becoming certified as a facilitator as required by these standards.

“Victim” means the family or household member against whom the perpetrator committed, or is committing, domestic violence. “Victim”, “partner”, and “survivor” are used interchangeably. These terms reflect the perspective of battered persons and the attitudes of society, service providers and those who give support.

“Victim liaison” means a person who is on the program’s staff or who contracts with the program to contact the victim.

III. DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

The purpose of these standards is to establish minimum operating guidelines for those persons assessing the batterer and for batterers' intervention programs. Assessors will be monitored to ensure that they meet the minimum requirements for conducting assessments and programs will be monitored to ensure that the goals of increasing victim safety, eliminating violence in intimate relationships (previous or current) and stopping other forms of abusive behavior are the focus of the program. These standards will establish guidelines for batterers' intervention programs so that they can hold batterers accountable to their victims and society at large. The programs will educate and teach new skills to batterers and document participation.

A. Purposes of Batterer Intervention Programs

1. The purposes of the program are to:
 - a) hold batterers' accountable, challenge their beliefs, and teach new skills that will facilitate changes in their behavior;
 - b) provide a role model while educating the batterer about alternative behaviors;
 - c) collect data to assist with evaluations of program effectiveness and recidivism;
 - d) disallow collusion and victim blaming by batterers and others;
 - e) challenge myths about domestic violence and promote "zero tolerance" of violent behavior;
 - f) coordinate services including referrals to other agencies for needed services;
 - g) heighten public awareness by making information available to the community; and
 - h) report compliance and non-compliance to the courts or other referral sources.

2. The purposes of the curriculum for intervention programs are to:
 - a) provide a model for intervention which identifies and remediates tactics of power and control;
 - b) promote consistency of services statewide;
 - c) challenge beliefs of batterers so that they can see that they are accountable for their behavior and can change that behavior, especially when given appropriate alternatives; and
 - d) provide a model of violence-free behavior among family or household members to the program, its facilitators, and the community.

B. Purpose and Rationale of Assessment

1. A psychosocial assessment is an inherent component of all batterers' intervention. It is performed to:
 - a) identify persons who would benefit from concurrent mental health or substance abuse treatment programs;
 - b) screen out those persons from the batterers' intervention program who have substance abuse problems or other impairments which make them unable to participate in the group intervention even with concurrent or preliminary treatment of those problems;
 - c) screen out those persons from the batterers' intervention programs who may be dangerous or have severe mental illness and would not benefit from the program; and
 - d) elicit important information that the batterers' intervention program may use during the psycho-educational process including:
 - (1) most recent violent episode;
 - (2) violence in previous relationships;
 - (3) family of origin violence (observed or experienced); and
 - (4) assessment of lethality to include:
 - (a) homicide risk
 - (b) suicide risk
 - (c) frequency/cycle of violence
 - (d) history of violence
 - (e) substance use/abuse
 - (f) assaults on other family members, including children
 - (g) previous criminal history/activity
 - (h) violence outside the home
 - (i) proximity of victim and offender
 - (j) attitudes toward violence
 - (k) life stresses and/or potential triggers
 - (l) accessibility to weapons
 - (m) obsession over victim
 - (n) assessment of other forms of abusive behavior (emotional, sexual, financial etc.);
 - (o) substance abuse assessment; and a mental health assessment

The uniform assessment instrument, which is enclosed in the packet, must be completed and kept on file when performing an assessment in accordance with these standards. Assessors are encouraged to forward the report to the BIP in which the batterer has enrolled within two working days, but not later than five calendar days, of the assessment.

IV. APPLICATION AND CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

A. Application and Certification Process

The certification process has been separated into two categories: application for certification as an assessor and application for certification as a batterers' intervention program. A program may apply for both of these certifications as long as it meets the requirements for both categories.

This booklet contains all minimum standards and policy and procedure statements for certification as an assessor and/or batterer intervention program by the Florida Department of Corrections, Office of Certification and Monitoring. Copies of the monitoring instruments for assessors and batterer intervention programs are included in the application packet, along with copies of the uniform assessment form, uniform intake form and uniform victim contact forms. Forms may be computerized and program name and logo may be imprinted on these forms

The actual certification process for both assessors and batterer intervention programs is detailed below and is part of each application form.

B. Requirements and Timelines

1. A fee of \$300.00 will be assessed per applicant for BIP certification and \$100.00 per assessor. All branches or satellite offices of a BIP are covered by one fee as long as they are located within the same judicial circuit. Separate applications and full certification fees must be submitted for offices located in each additional judicial circuit.
2. Completed application(s) and certification fee(s) are to be returned to the following address, along with a cover letter identifying the category for which certification is being sought:

**Department Of Corrections
Office Of Certification And Monitoring
Probation an Parole Programs Office
2601 Blair Stone Rd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2500
Attention: Barbara Carter**

3. The Office of Certification and Monitoring will accept completed applications at any time and begin review of the applications on July 1, 1996. The Office of Certification and Monitoring will review the application within 90 days of receipt.
4. If the application meets certification criteria, the department will issue probationary certification to the applicant.

5. If the application does not meet certification requirements, the Office will respond in writing, within 90 days of receipt, to the applicant describing application deficiencies.
6. The applicant has 60 days from the date of notification of noncompliance to re-submit the application packet with the necessary changes to the Office of Certification and Monitoring. The Office must respond within 90 days from receipt of the corrected packet.
7. The Office will monitor the program (both administrative and group observation for batterers' intervention) for compliance within 180 days of the program receiving probationary certification.
8. Programs and/or assessors which meet the standards of the monitoring, will be granted certification.
9. Monitoring visits will be scheduled annually based on the date the assessor or program receives full certification, however, the Office of Certification and Monitoring has the option of visiting an assessor or BIP site without prior notification.
10. There are no provisions for requests by programs or assessors to delay or postpone monitoring.
11. If an assessor/program does not pass the monitoring process, they will receive in writing, by certified mail, a program compliance letter outlining the standards that are in non-compliance and the time frames allowed to bring the program into compliance.
12. If at any time information is received by the Office of Certification and Monitoring that a program or assessor is not meeting certification standards, the Office of Certification and Monitoring may utilize the Office of the Inspector General for the Florida Department of Corrections to complete an immediate investigation based on the information and allegations.

C. Decertification

The following are the Terms and Conditions of both the assessor and batterers' intervention program application. The signature of the applicant on both or either of these applications accepts the terms and conditions of this program.

It is understood and agreed upon by the undersigned that (1) approval status granted as a result of this application is for the purpose set forth herein and in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations and policies of the Florida Department of Corrections, Office of Certification and Monitoring; (2) I have read the Certification Procedures and Minimum Standards for Assessors and Batterers' Intervention Programs in its entirety and I agree to adhere to all program standards, policies and procedures contained within that apply to my certification as an assessor/program (3) I understand that my program/assessment files will be monitored based on the monitoring instruments contained in the certification packet (4) I understand that any failure to correct deficiencies after proper notification by the Office of Certification and Monitoring may result in decertification (5) any proposed changes in the certification process as approved, will be submitted in writing by the office of certification and monitoring, Florida Department of Corrections and, upon notification to the assessor/program, shall be deemed incorporated into and become part of this approval; (6) this approval is subject to annual renewal.

Any misstatement or misrepresentation in the application process may be cause for denial or revocation of assessor or program certification.

If the assessor/program's non-compliance with the minimum standards is to such an extent that it has a detrimental impact on the participants and/or public safety, the program/assessor will be decertified. The assessor/program will receive a complete report by certified mail stating reasons for decertification.

The assessor/program may re-apply for certification no less than 180 days from the date of decertification. The program/assessor has the right to a Department of Administration hearing, s. 120.57, F.S., to reinstate state certification if such are decertified.

Batterers' Intervention Programs-Conditions Of Certification

1. Application Prerequisites

An entity or individual who wishes to apply to become a certified batterers' intervention provider must complete the application. By signing and submitting the application, the chief executive officer agrees to adhere to all standards, policies and procedures outlined in these minimum standards, to include but are not limited to the following:

- a) ensure that qualified facilitators are on staff (or are subcontracted) to facilitate groups;
- b) provide trained supervisor(s) to monitor compliance of the facilitators' use of minimum standards;
- c) ensure that facilitators and supervisors receive the ongoing minimum training as required by law;
- d) notify the Office of Certification and Monitoring in writing, of any changes in program staff, to include program directors, supervisors, facilitators and trainees, and forward copies of their credentials within 15 days of hire.
- e) maintain individual records on each batterer to include attendance, payment of required fees both to the program and to the Department of Corrections. Providers must notify the victim and the referral source of any violations including failure to enroll;
- f) maintain and hold confidential records of victim contacts unless the victim waives confidentiality in writing,
- g) routinely refer victim to support groups of the local domestic violence center or similarly qualified provider but not coerce victims into treatment or imply that they should seek help;
- h) be willing to participate in quarterly meetings with area-wide domestic violence coalitions, other intervention programs, and representatives of the local referral sources;
- i) provide for weekly intake and weekly orientation as required in the standards;
- j) obtain contracts for participation from each batterer containing, at a minimum, information required as in the standards;
- k) collect fees weekly based on the suggested range of \$5.00-\$50.00 per class; accept indigent cases and include them in groups with those who can pay;
- l) agree not to do couples, marriage, or family counseling with the batterer until he has completed the program, and then only if the victim agrees;
- m) agree to cooperate with other service providers who may be providing concurrent treatment in substance abuse and mental health;
- n) agree to have a drug-free workplace policy, signed by all program personnel and contained in each personnel file;

- o) agree to accept a batterer, if court-ordered and previously enrolled in another program, into the program only if approval has been granted by the court;
- p) if previously notified of the referral, agree to notify the referral source within five (5) working days of the failure of the batterer to comply with the court's order or a substantive term of the provider's contract. (Voluntary referrals are exempt);
- q) agree that intervention must be intensive and long term, while also being humane, affordable, and reflective of the diversity of each community;
- r) agree to have a program policy and procedure manual incorporating all elements and criteria of the statewide minimum standards within 90 days of probationary certification and available routine scheduled monitoring; and
- s) agree to send quarterly reports to the Florida Department of Corrections, Office of Certification and Monitoring on a quarterly basis. (see page 36 of Certification Procedures and Minimum Standards).

2. Application Attachments

The initial application for program certification also must include:

- a) a cover letter requesting certification as a batterers' intervention program, along with a check for \$300.00, made payable to the Florida Department of Corrections.
- b) a brief narrative demonstrating an understanding of the state established minimum standards and how the program will implement these standards;
- c) a prior year's financial audit performed by a certified public accountant, if the provider has been in operation for one year. (If the provider has not been in operation for one year prior to the application, an audited statement of financial viability shall be required);
- d) proof of general liability insurance and fire insurance ;
- e) a statement signed by the executive director, president, or sole proprietor, ensuring accessibility to persons with disabilities in accordance with Public Law 101-36, Americans With Disabilities Act, USC s. 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (29 USC 704, the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 (42 USC 4151-4157, as amended.) Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards 795, 29 June, 1987;
- f) a signed Public Entity Crimes statement in accordance with s. 287.133(3)(a), Florida Statutes (1994);
- g) a statement that the applicant is an Equal Opportunity Employer (EOE) and that it has a hiring policy that supports employment of persons who represent the demographic diversity of the local area.;
- h) a sexual harassment policy;
- i) a code of ethical conduct for staff that actively promotes work on staff's own issues of power and control and prohibits: use of violence; use of illegal drugs, use of alcohol prior to or during working hours, conflicts of interest and sexual conduct with program participants;
- j) an emergency plan for facilitators (i.e. disruptive or dangerous participants);
- k) a duty to warn policy;
- l) job descriptions for specific program staff;
- m) copies of all degrees, certified transcripts, certificates, and/or documentation of required education, training, and experience for each program staff member as outlined in the standards; and
- n) a complete resume and/or employment application for all program staff.

3. Records of Personnel and Contract Workers

The provider's personnel records must contain the following information regarding each staff member and all contract workers:

- a) name, address, home phone number, social security number, date of birth; and a recent clear photograph or a photocopy of a Florida driver's license;
- b) name, contact information of closest relative and emergency contact;
- c) training goals for trainees clearly stated and acknowledged by the staff (contract owner);
- d) proof of a local criminal background check;
- e) a criminal background check to include FCIC and fingerprint card;
- f) verification of an injunction registry background check;
- g) a signed job description;
- h) a signed privacy act statement (acknowledging confidentiality of information received);
- i) a signed copy of the program's philosophy and mission statement;
- j) completed resume and /or application for employment;
- k) official transcript or certified documentation of level of required education, training, and experience;
- l) written verification of previous employment and previous experience;
- m) a signed drug-free work-place policy;
- n) a signed sexual harassment policy; and
- o) a signed violence-free lifestyle statement.

D. Credentials for Batterers' Intervention Program Personnel

1. Prerequisite Credentials for Facilitators

- a) For all facilitators, the program applicant must show that the following educational/work experience requirements are met. Each facilitator must have:
 - (1) A bachelor's degree and;
 - (2) 78 hours of direct face-to-face contact facilitating or co-facilitating batterers' groups using the power and control model. These requirements must be completed in not less than six months; and
 - (3) 40 hours of victim-centered training which can include providing advocacy to battered women and their children, conducting women's and children's groups, attending victim panels or presentations at which victims discuss their victimization and any other program or training where victim issues are taught.

or, in lieu of a bachelor's degree,

- (1) Two years of equivalent experience involving direct contact work with victims and batterers and;
- (2) 78 hours of direct face-to-face contact facilitating or co-facilitating batterers' groups using the power and control model. These requirements must be completed in not less than six months; and
- (3) 40 hours of victim-centered training which can include providing advocacy to battered women and their children, conducting women's and children's groups, attending victim panels or presentations at which victims discuss their victimization and any other program or training where victim issues are taught.

2. Facilitator Trainees

If an apprenticeship or "trainee" period is necessary to fulfill any of the pre-requisite credentials for facilitators requirement, a trainee must work under the direction of a trained facilitator using the power and control model and a supervisor at a batterers' intervention program and under the direction of or in conjunction with a certified domestic violence center. Experience and required face to face contact as described above may be voluntary or part of a university internship program, paid or unpaid, but must be documented by the program executive director.

3. Knowledge and Skills of Facilitators

The facilitator applicant must have a minimum of 27 hours of a state-approved course(s) on batterers' intervention as described below:

- a) Completion of a 19 contact hour state approved course or courses on batterers' intervention so long as the following is included:
 - (1) the dynamics of domestic violence within the context of power and control; **(3 Hours)**
 - (2) the effects of domestic violence on victims and their children and the critical nature of victim contacts and safety planning; **(2 Hours)**
 - (3) the understanding that domestic violence is deeply rooted in historical attitudes toward women and is intergenerational; **(3 Hours)**

- (4) lethality assessment for risks if homicide, suicide, further domestic violence, or other violent aggressive behaviors, and access to or use of weapons; **(2.5 Hours)**
 - (5) information on state and federal laws pertaining to domestic violence, including the policies affecting treatment of court-ordered program participants, child abuse, divorce and custody matters; **(1.5 Hours)**
 - (6) the role of the facilitator within the group and within the context of a coordinated community response to domestic violence; **(2.5 Hours)**
 - (7) teaching non-controlling alternatives to violent and controlling behaviors; **(3 Hours)** and
 - (8) understanding and preventing collusion. **(1.5 Hours)**
- b) Four hours of substance abuse training specific to domestic violence and
 - c) Four hours of riding along with local law enforcement ; or
Four hours of court attendance during domestic violence cases; or
a combination of both.

4. Continuing Education For Facilitators

- a) Twelve hours of total education or experience annually in any of the following areas as they pertain to batterers' intervention are required:
 - (1) domestic violence and substance abuse
 - (2) domestic violence and the law
 - (3) completion of a power and control model training
 - (4) other issues which pertain to domestic violence such as, mediation, arrest procedures and its affect on children

or
- b) Eight hours of education as described above and four hours of documented supplemental experience in the area of family violence such as:
 - (1) court attendance during domestic violence hearings or trials
 - (2) riding along with local police
 - (3) work with a state-certified domestic violence center
 - (4) evaluation and intervention with families where domestic violence is present

The program director is responsible for ensuring the appropriateness of the education and experience used to meet this requirement.

5. Principal Duties of Facilitators

- a) The principal duties of program facilitators are to:
- (1) facilitate or co-facilitate weekly intervention groups utilizing the established curriculum and techniques;
 - (2) model appropriate boundary setting, confrontation, refraining, paraphrasing, reflection, and clarification;
 - (3) identify and eliminate collusion or complicity and intragroup conflicts for individual and group growth;
 - (4) communicate non-hostility, respect, unconditional acceptance of ethnocultural and lifestyle differences;
 - (5) teach and model problem-solving skills and non-violent behavior options;
 - (6) recognize and process denial and minimization and other defense mechanisms;
 - (7) establish rapport and understanding in a non-judgmental and objective manner so as to build trust, reduce resistance, and elicit the necessary feedback to gauge understanding of intervention information imparted;
 - (8) appropriately confront acts of domestic violence and other counterproductive behavior(s);
 - (9) elicit self-disclosure to enhance participant's self-exploration; and
 - (10) maintain case notes regarding participation, cooperation and other pertinent information.

6. Prerequisite Credentials for Supervisors

- a) For all supervisors, the program applicant must show that the following educational/work experience requirements are met:
- (1) a master's degree plus one year of equivalent experience involving direct contact work with victims and/or batterers; and
 - (2) 78 hours of direct face-to-face contact facilitating or co-facilitating batterers' groups using the power and control model. These requirements must be completed in not less than six months; and
 - (3) 40 hours of victim-centered training which can include providing advocacy to battered women and their children, conducting women's and children's groups, attending victim panels or presentations at which victims discuss their victimization and any other program or training where victim issues are taught.

or, in lieu of a master's degree,

- (1) a bachelor's degree plus two years of equivalent experience involving direct contact work with victims and batterers; and
- (2) 78 hours of direct face-to-face contact facilitating or co-facilitating batterers' groups using the power and control model. These requirements must be completed in not less than six months; and
- (3) 40 hours of victim-centered training which can include providing advocacy to battered women and their children, conducting women's and children's groups, attending victim panels or presentations at which victims discuss their victimization and any other program or training where victim issues are taught.

or, in lieu of a master's or bachelor's degree,

- (1) Three years of equivalent experience involving direct contact work with victims and batterers and;
- (2) 78 hours of direct face-to-face contact facilitating or co-facilitating batterers' groups using the power and control model. These requirements must be completed in not less than six months; and
- (3) 40 hours of victim-centered training which can include providing advocacy to battered women and their children, conducting women's and children's groups, attending victim panels or presentations at which victims discuss their victimization and any other program or training where victim issues are taught.

b) Applicants for supervisor positions are further required to have three or more years of domestic violence experience, which may include the following areas:

- (1) domestic violence training;
- (2) teaching domestic violence in high school or post secondary settings;
- (3) domestic violence program development, implementation, monitoring, or evaluation;
- (4) documented research conducted in the field of domestic violence; and
- (5) authorship of publications in the field of domestic violence.

Applicants for supervisory certification may provide supervision as a supervisor trainee under the supervision of or on a contract basis with a person who is licensed under Chapter 490 or 491, Florida Statutes.

7. Reciprocity

Florida will grant reciprocity to applicants from states with equivalent or more rigorous certification requirements upon submission of appropriate proof of certification standards and applicant certification. Each application requesting reciprocity will be reviewed on a case by case basis.

E. The Assessment Process-Conditions For Certification

1. Prerequisite Credentials for Assessors

The assessment may only be performed by a person certified under these standards and who also is:

- a) licensed under Chapters 490 or 491, Florida Statutes
- b) license eligible under Chapters 490 or 491, Florida Statutes (so long as that person is working under the supervision of a Chapter 490 or 491 licensee) or
- c) a psychiatrist licensed under Chapter 458, Florida Statutes..

2. Training

The assessor applicant must have a minimum of 27 hours of training as described below:

- a) Completion of 19 hours of training as follows:
 - (1) the dynamics of domestic violence within the context of power and control; **(3 Hours)**
 - (2) the effects of domestic violence on victims and their children and the critical nature of victim contacts and safety planning; **(2 Hours)**
 - (3) that understanding that domestic violence is deeply rooted in historical attitudes toward women and is intergenerational; **(3 Hours)**
 - (4) lethality assessment for risks if homicide, suicide, further domestic violence or other violent aggressive behaviors, and access to or use of weapons; **(2.5 Hours)**

- (5) information on state and federal laws pertaining to domestic violence, including the policies affecting treatment of court-ordered program participants, child abuse, divorce and custody matters; **(1.5 Hours)**
 - (6) the role of the facilitator within the group and within the context of a coordinated community response to domestic violence; **(2.5 Hours)**
 - (7) teaching non-controlling alternatives to violent and controlling behaviors; **(3 Hours)**
 - (8) understanding and preventing collusion; **(1.5 Hours)**
- b) Eight (8) hours of substance abuse training specific to domestic violence.

3. Continuing Education

Continuing education requirements for assessors will be the same as those for facilitators of batterer intervention groups except for those training components directly related to the facilitation of batterer intervention groups. Facilitator training is optional and should be attended in addition to the above required domestic violence training for assessors.

Assessors are required to have twelve hours of total education or experience annually in any of the following areas:

- a) domestic violence and substance abuse
- b) domestic violence and the law
- c) completion of a power and control model training
- d) other issues which pertain to domestic violence such as, mediation, arrest procedures and its affect on children

or

Eight hours of education as described above and four hours of documented supplemental experience in the area of family violence such as:

- a) court attendance during domestic violence hearings or trials
- b) riding along with local police
- c) work with a state-certified domestic violence center
- d) evaluation and intervention with families where domestic violence is present

4. Duties of Assessors:

For each referral for assessment, the assessor shall:

- a) agree to schedule the assessment within 10 calendar days from the batterer's initial contact;
- b) complete a psychosocial assessment using the uniform assessment instrument requiring a minimum of one hour to complete;
- c) submit assessment and any additional information to the batterer intervention provider within five calendar days of the assessment;
- d) provide for release of information concerning the psychosocial assessment to the program, appropriate probation department, the Department (for monitoring purposes) or other criminal justice agency;
- e) collect and receipt fees from each batterer for his psychosocial assessment based on the recommended range of \$5.00-\$50.00 and the ability to pay;
- f) maintain accurate records of the batterers attendance at and cooperation with the psychosocial assessment;
- g) refer to the referring bid, within five calendar days, those who are screened out of group in accordance with the rejection criteria described at section VI. C. 6

F. Moral Character (for Batterer Intervention Program Personnel and Assessors)

1. No person acting as an assessor, batterer intervention program executive director (president or sole proprietor), program director, facilitator, supervisor, trainee, or person functioning in a clerical position having access to batterer or victim records, may be under any form of community supervision, administrative or otherwise, by any law enforcement agency or county, state, or federal authority. This includes, but is not limited to, any form of misdemeanor or felony probation, community control, pre-trial diversion, post-release supervision (prison releases), or parole.
2. No person acting as an assessor, batterer intervention program executive director, (president or sole proprietor) program director, facilitator, supervisor, or trainee, may have been convicted, pled nolo contendere or had adjudication withheld for any crime of violence within the last two years or have been under any form of community supervision, including but not limited to the above mentioned supervision types. For purposes of this application, a crime of violence is defined as assault, aggravated assault, battery, aggravated battery, sexual assault, sexual battery, stalking, aggravated stalking or any criminal offense resulting in physical injury or death.

3. No person acting as an assessor, batterer intervention program executive director, (president or sole proprietor), program director, facilitator, supervisor, or trainee, may be the subject of an injunction for protection or any other judicial restraint for any violent act as defined above within the last two years.

All arrests for any criminal charge within the last two years must be reported on the application for certification. Any subsequent arrests must be reported to the below office within ten days of the occurrence and will be reviewed on a case by case basis.

**Department of Corrections, Probation and Parole Programs Office
Office of Certification and Monitoring
2601 Blair Stone Rd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2500
Attention: Barbara Carter (904) 487-2165**

G. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

1. Actual and apparent conflicts of interest among assessment providers, batterers' intervention providers and concurrent treatment providers shall be avoided. Therefore, the following safeguards are suggested as a way to avoid such conflicts:
 - a) The court may provide the batterer with a listing of area certified batterers' intervention programs. The batterer then makes a selection of which program to attend from that listing.
 - b) The batterers' intervention program, chosen by the batterer, provides a listing of area assessment providers to the batterer. At that time, the batterer makes contact and schedules an assessment choosing from that assessment provider listing. This listing may include the same batterer intervention program already chosen by the batterer so long as that program is qualified under these standards to do the assessment.
2. The completed assessment may include a recommendation that the batterer undergo substance abuse or mental health treatment in addition to, the batterers' intervention program. The provider shall give a list of those who can perform the treatment to the batterer and may include itself on that list if it is so qualified.

H. Referrals

The policies outlined in this document are applicable to individuals referred to or enrolled in a certified intervention program and are designed primarily to address violence perpetrated by males against females in previous or current intimate relationships. In accordance with the Commission on Minimum Standards for Batterers' Treatment recommendations, female batterers, juvenile offenders, and offenders under the age of 18 who have been tried as adults should not be referred to or enroll in intervention groups for adult male batterers. These groups may be provided individual or group services separate from adult male services. Gay male perpetrators may enroll in programs for heterosexual perpetrators, if the court and the provider determines such group interventions to be appropriate.

Batterers' intervention is appropriate when the court (or other referral source, if applicable) determines that a person has committed or is likely to commit an act of domestic violence against his partner or if that person is a respondent to a permanent injunction for protection against domestic or repeat violence.

An individual may self refer to a Batterers' Intervention Program. An individual who self refers is required to meet the same attendance and participation requirements as individuals referred to the program from an outside source.

Also, an individual may be referred to a Batterers' Intervention Program by an employer, an Employee Assistance Program or similar referral source.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

A. Policy Goals

These guidelines are designed to meet the needs of victims and batterers, and in so doing, the whole community. Programs should be developed where there are domestic violence centers and where economic, medical, psychological, and other support services are available to domestic violence victims.

Safety for victims of domestic violence and their children is primary to all aspects of batterers' programming therefore providers shall develop procedures which:

1. adequately assess the safety of the victim;
2. provide regular contact with the victim to verify the victim's safety;
3. ensure that the victim is offered referrals or assistance and inform the victim of the batterers' status in the group;
4. ensure that records of victim contact are kept separate and secure from batterer files;
5. demonstrate cooperation and communication with area domestic violence center(s) so as to stay advised on common issues;
6. follow and comply with procedures for reporting non-compliance to the referral source;
7. hold batterers accountable to the fullest extent possible to victims and the community for their use of violence by paying costs associated with attending the intervention program either directly or through community service;
8. have a staff who is knowledgeable of the laws and the legal system as they pertain to domestic violence crimes including, but not limited to, criminal and civil remedies for victims and local law enforcement, prosecution and local court personnel, domestic violence rules and policies and education of justice system personnel;
9. demonstrate cooperation with other victim service agencies that work with victims of domestic violence; and
10. offer to assist local domestic violence centers in the training and education of justice system personnel.

B. Participant Fees

While there are many people who are close to indigence, a fee for services, no matter how minimal, will be assessed and paid by the batterer. Exceptions for those persons who are indigent will be made as programs must accept indigent participants as explained below. Exceptions may also be made for government supported programs. Taking responsibility for the payment for services is an important part of the participant's taking responsibility for violent behavior. Programs must be financially structured to allow for delivery of a quality program. To the extent allowed by law, community service should be ordered by the court if a participant cannot pay for services.

1. Participant fees shall be based on a sliding scale. It is suggested that the programs assess weekly fees ranging between \$5.00 and \$50.00, based on the program's determination of the participant's ability to pay. Programs shall be required to accept indigent participants. Fees are to be set after the program conducts an income evaluation using, at a minimum, the participant's most recent federal income tax form, or if not available, other relevant income records or information which may be useful for an accurate determination of standard of living, income and ability to pay.
2. Participants in the batterers' intervention program will be required to pay their fees either weekly or in advance, however exceptions may be made at the discretion of the program director.
3. Fees for the assessment are to be paid at the time of the assessment.
4. Participants shall not be allowed to participate in programs, or be formally assessed, until they pay the appropriate fees in accordance with the established policy.
5. Providers should not compete for funds with domestic violence centers. Both are necessary to address the problems of domestic violence and they must exist in cooperation, not competition, with each other.

6. Florida Statute 945.76, (1996), certification and monitoring of batterers' intervention programs; fees, mandates a one time fee of \$30.00 to be assessed on each court-ordered program participant. The funds are to be collected by the program during the first week of class, receipted, and deposited. The BIP should then forward one check, made payable to the Department of Corrections, on or before the tenth day of the following month. Attached to the payment shall be a list that includes the names of the program participants whose funds are enclosed, along with the date of their acceptance into the program.

Exemptions to the \$30.00 participant's fee will be made for indigent program participants as follows:

- a) Any program participant responsible for the care and custody of children under the age of eighteen (18) who receives AFDC or its equivalent.
- b) Any program participant who receives Supplemental Security Income (SSI)

C. Program Specifics

1. Groups

- a) The length of the intervention is 24 group sessions which shall be completed within at least 32 weeks.
- b) Each group session will be 1 hour and 30 minutes (excluding breaks) for a total of 36 hours over the 24 sessions.
- c) The maximum group size will be 15 members for one facilitator with no more than 24 group members per two facilitators.
- d) Group interventions may be co-facilitated by one male and one female for the purpose of modeling healthy egalitarian relationships and to monitor the group process; however, this is not mandatory.
- e) Excused absences may be accepted and will be reviewed on a case by case basis by the appropriate program authority.

2. Enrollment/Intake (one hour minimum)

- a) An intake shall be performed by the batterers' intervention program chosen by the batterer from the list of providers given to the batterer by the referral source. A copy of the intake must be maintained in all batterer files.
- b) A contract must be signed by the batterer and must be in the batterers' file. This contract must include:
 - (1) attendance policy of 24 weeks, including batterer attendance at group sessions free of drugs, alcohol, and violence;
 - (2) suspension and termination criteria;
 - (3) program rules and regulations;
 - (4) disclosure of information statement that says the following will be reported to the appropriate person(s) including the victim, courts or probation or other referral source:
 - (a) bodily harm to the victim or to any other person or to commit suicide; or
 - (b) any belief that child abuse or neglect is present or has occurred, which also will be reported pursuant to section 415.504, Florida Statutes.
 - (5) the following language:

"Please be advised that this program is under a continuing obligation to disclose any conduct you willfully chose to engage in which poses a threat to the victim, his or her property, or to third persons related to the parties."
(for example: Continuing Duty to Disclose Information. Fla.R.Cr.P. 3.220(j));

- (6) a list of provider expectations such as participation and homework and that the batterer will be held accountable for abusive and violent behavior;
 - (7) responsibility or safety planning for batterers which means awareness of abusive/violent behavior and patters (e.g., the power and control wheel), violence avoidance techniques (e.g., time out procedures that inform the victim/partner appropriately and are not used to control her), controlling behavior logs, and non-violence maintenance (e.g., "buddy" phone calls, additional support groups, relaxation, and exercise); and
 - (8) specific release of information for collateral treatment, (i.e., substance abuse, mental health treatment).
- c) The provider may contract with the batterer for video/audio recordings of group sessions for the purposes of internal instruction, education, research or program monitoring. However, agreement to such a contract provision is not mandatory for the batterer.
 - d) The provider may gather information for an abuse history and shall attempt to gain a commitment from the batterer to participate in the program and be violence-free.

3. Orientation

The batterers' intervention program shall conduct a group orientation. The minimum time for the group orientation is a one hour and thirty minute session (excluding breaks). An outline of the orientation and a statement acknowledging attendance must be in each batterers' file. Orientation should include:

- a) the definition of domestic violence;
- b) domestic violence statistics;
- c) an introduction of the power and control wheel;
- d) an introduction of the equality wheel;
- e) an overview of rules and regulations;
- f) the completion of a safety plan;
- g) an overview of effects of domestic violence on children; and
- h) an outline of program content showing the dynamics of power and control, the effects of abuse on the victim, children and others, gender roles, socialization, and the nature of the violence.

4. Program Attendance Policy

- a) The batterer must attend the 24 week sessions that comprise the batterers' intervention program. However, the batterer cannot begin that program until intake assessment and orientation are completed.
- b) Three successive unexcused absences may result in termination from the program and such a termination shall be within the discretion of the provider. A total of four or more unexcused absences during the 24 week intervention program shall result in an automatic termination from the program. The provider immediately must report any termination to the court or, other referral source if applicable;
- c) Notice of this policy must be signed by the batterer and in his file.
- d) Batterers must complete the program with which he originally enrolled unless approval to change programs is obtained from the court (if applicable) and the program director.
- e) Excused absences may be accepted and will be reviewed on a case by case basis by the appropriate program authority.

5. Discharge

There are three categories of discharge:

- a) Completion - The batterer has been in compliance with the rules and regulations, attended scheduled appointments, participated at an acceptable level, completed homework and other assignments and pay required fees both to the program and the Department of Corrections.
- b) Rejection - The program can reject the batterer for services due to:
 - (1) extensive psychiatric history including an active mental health history;
 - (2) extensive criminal record of violent crimes;
 - (3) chronic substance abuse or chemical dependency that first requires completion of a residential treatment program; and
 - (4) an inability to function in a group due to limited mental ability.

If the batterer is rejected, the program must:

- (1) document the reason for rejection,
- (2) make specific recommendations to the court or referral source
- (3) inform the victim of the rejection , and
- (4) place a copy of the documentation in the batterer's file.

- c) **Termination** - The provider can terminate the batterer from the program for:
- (1) recurrence of violence and/or arrest;
 - (2) failure to abide by the rules and regulations of the program including absences and other matters as set forth in these standards;
 - (3) failure to participate and attend sessions; and
 - (4) attending group under the influence of alcohol or drugs.

If a batterer is terminated from the program, the provider must:

- (1) document clearly and specifically the reasons for termination without jeopardizing the safety of the victim;
- (2) make specific recommendations, including alternatives such as weekend incarceration, community service hours, probation violation, and return to the program;
- (3) inform the victim of the termination within three days; and
- (4) inform the referral source of the termination within three days

6. Concurrent or Subsequent Treatment And Follow-Up Services (Optional)

- a) Concurrent or subsequent treatment for mental health or substance abuse problems may take place during the psycho-educational program.
- b) Extended services can occur only after the minimum requirements of batterer intervention program have been met.
- c) If agreed to by the partner, the batterer may engage in couples, marriage, or family therapy after completion of the batterers' intervention program.

7. Victim Contact and Related Services

One of the goals of intervention programs is to increase victim safety. It is for that reason that victim or partner contacts are an integral component and are a requirement for all providers. This contact is intended to make a statement to the victim that someone has concern for the victim and any affected children and does not blame the victim for the violence. The victim has the right to refuse to participate and may ask that you make no further contact. The response may be due to severed ties with the victim's abuser and the desire to move on from the incident, or it may be because of fear of retribution. Whatever the reason, it is the victim's choice whether or not to participate.

- a) Providers should ensure that victim contacts will be conducted by victim liaisons of the same gender as the victim to foster an uninhibited flow of information. Partner contact services may be sub-contracted for a fee to a local domestic violence center or other advocacy programs in the community.
- b) Providers shall routinely contact all partners with four working days of the batterer's enrollment. The provider or (or sub-contractee) shall make at least three documented attempts by telephone. If telephone contact is unsuccessful, the provider shall use first class mail to send a letter, retaining a copy for the victim file. The letter shall express concern for the victim and the children and will provide general information about the batterer's intervention program, the local domestic violence center, and other related advocacy services. If the letter is returned unopened, the letter and envelope shall be retained in the file.
- c) When making telephone contact partner liaisons will identify themselves and ask if this is a good time to talk. If it is not, ask for a convenient time to call back and the best number to use. **Always remember that victim participation is completely voluntary.** If the victim refuses, it should be recorded on the victim contact form and maintained in the victim's file.
- d) When speaking with the victim advise her that the call is out of concern for the victim and children's safety. Acknowledge that you know about the violence and control in the relationship. **Inform the victim that the perpetrator is aware that you are making this contact and that any information shared will not be disclosed to the perpetrator.** Give the victim the name and phone number of the nearest domestic violence center. Validate the perception that the victim is not responsible for the perpetrator's violence and control. If the victim agrees to participate, a victim contact form shall be completed to the extent the victim is willing or has time to share (reference attachment). Completion of the Victim Abuse Inventory (reference attachment) is optional. Completed forms shall be maintained in the partner file.
- e) Follow-up contacts may be made monthly but shall occur no less than four (4) working days after the twelfth week and the twenty second week of attendance in the batterers' intervention program. The Victim Follow-up Form (reference attachment) shall be used to document the contact and will be maintained in the partner file.
- f) The provider shall notify the partner by telephone within four working days after the batterer is involuntarily terminated from the program. All attempts at victim notification will be documented in the file. If after three attempts, contact is not made a letter of notification may be sent via first class and a copy retained in the file. If returned unopened, both the letter and envelope will be kept in the file.

- g) The provider must immediately report any threat of violence from a batterer to a prior victim or potential victim. If unable to reach the partner, the provider must immediately contact local law enforcement. These action(s) must be documented in both the batterer's file and the partner's file.
- h) **All information obtained from the victim shall be deemed confidential and will not be disclosed to any third party without specific written authorization from the victim or upon order of the court. Signed authorization will be maintained in the victim contact file.**

VI. Program Content

A. Model

Program topics must closely follow a model that depicts an overall system of physical and sexual abuse where the batterer uses methods and tactics of power and control over a victim.

1. Those tactics are:
 - a) using intimidation;
 - b) using emotional abuse;
 - c) using isolation;
 - d) minimizing, denying, and blaming;
 - e) using children;
 - f) using male privilege;
 - g) using economic abuse; and
 - h) using coercion and threats.
2. A minimum of two to three sessions (for a total of 24 weeks) must be devoted to each specific tactic of power and control.

B. Content

Batterer providers must also address each of the following content areas in the intervention sessions:

1. assisting the batterer in taking responsibility for violent and abusive behavior;
2. defining domestic violence;
3. erasing myths and beliefs about domestic violence, including myths about provocation;
4. teaching about the cycle of violence;
5. helping batterers to learn to identify behavior, emotional, and physical cues which signal escalating anger and the need for using a time-out;
6. improving the batterers' ability to identify and articulate feelings;
7. identifying profiles of batterers;
8. improving listening and communication skills and listening with empathy;
9. improving problem solving skills;
10. improving negotiation and conflict resolution skills;
11. teaching stress management techniques;
12. challenging stereotypical gender role expectations;
13. improving self-esteem;
14. developing and improving support systems;
15. exploring the socio-cultural basis for domestic violence;
16. identifying the effects of distorted thinking on emotions and behavior;
17. comparing self-control versus power and dominance;

18. identifying the effects of domestic violence on partner, children, self, and others;
19. learning about the relationship of alcohol and drug use/abuse with domestic violence; and
20. exploring the role of ethnicity and culture in domestic violence.

C. Guidelines for Appropriate Intervention

1. This model is "psycho-educational." It addresses abuse in both a personal and social context through gender-based expectations, beliefs, and attitudes. This model acknowledges that violence is a learned behavior and can be unlearned.
2. Group intervention for batterers is mandatory under these standards.
3. Groups shall be open (accepting new members on an ongoing basis).
4. Groups must be same gender.
5. For cases where there is a language barrier, separate groups should be created, based on the needs of the local population. If necessary, the court should make accommodations in cases where there is a language barrier.
6. Getting in touch with emotions or alternatives to violence; and ventilation techniques may be appropriate intervention approaches.

D. Inappropriate Intervention Approaches

1. Any intervention approach that blames or intimidates the victim or places the victim in any danger is not allowed. There is no behavior on the part of the victim which causes or excuses abuse. Batterers bear sole responsibility for their actions.
2. Any approach that coerces, mandates, or otherwise requires victim participation is inappropriate. Couples, marriage, or family therapy is prohibited during the psycho-educational intervention phase. Such therapy may be used only when the batterer has completed the intervention program, violence has ceased, the victim is making decisions independent from the abuser, and the victim is in agreement.
3. Psychodynamic interventions which link causes of the violence to past experiences and unconscious motivations are not allowed.
4. Communication enhancement or anger management techniques which lay primary causality on anger are prohibited.
5. Systems theory approaches which treat the violence as a mutually circular process, blaming the victim are inappropriate.
6. Addiction counseling models which identify the violence as an addiction and the victim and children as enabling or codependent in the violence are not allowed.
7. Any approach that encourages gradual containment and de-escalation of violence is prohibited.
8. Theories or techniques which identify poor impulse control as the primary cause of the violence are inappropriate.

9. Methods which identify psychopathology on the part of either party as a primary cause of violence are not allowed.
10. Teaching fair fighting techniques is prohibited.

E. Substance Abuse and Mental Health

1. Individual concurrent counseling is allowable under special circumstances such as a diagnosed psychiatric disorder.
2. Substance abuse, mental health, and mental capacity are to be evaluated during the intake and assessment phase and should be well-documented in the batterer's file.
3. Substance abuse or mental health treatment should not be ordered or provided in lieu of domestic violence interventions. Such treatment may be concurrent if conducted on an outpatient basis

VII. PROGRAM MONITORING AND EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

Program monitoring and evaluation shall be conducted by the Office of Certification and Monitoring, which is housed within the Probation and Parole Programs Office, Florida Department of Corrections. The Department must determine that providers are complying with required policies, such as partner contact, duty to warn, progress, and termination plans for group participants, and are not providing inappropriate services such as marriage and family counseling as determined by these standards, and are following any applicable rules and regulations. Site visits shall be conducted to ensure providers are in compliance with basic standards relative to group content, philosophy, and approach that must be adhered to ensure accountability of the batterer, safety of the victims, and overall provider compliance. During site visits, documents and forms will be examined to determine provider compliance with the requirements.

Each BIP applicant will be furnished with a copy of the program monitoring instrument and group observation guide to ensure a complete understanding of what will be reviewed during the monitoring process and group observation.

Each assessor applicant will be furnished with a copy of the assessor monitoring instrument to ensure a complete understanding of what will be reviewed during the monitoring process.

Providers must agree to provide for data collection to conduct research and evaluate the effectiveness of batterers' intervention programs. The provider shall send copies of the initial program enrollment form for each program participant that has been discharged from the program within the last quarter. The bottom of the enrollment form has space for program discharge information. Each program will provide the completed enrollment form to the Office of Certification and Monitoring within 20 days of the end of each quarter (June 30, September 30, December 31 and March 31). As research on perpetrators and batterers' intervention programs progresses, philosophical and programmatic changes may be appropriate.

Defendant's Second Interview

Florida Atlantic University is continuing the study for the Department of Justice on how Broward County handles family disputes. As before, your answers will be completely private and confidential. In order to make sure that no one will know your answers, please do NOT put your name or any identifying information on this questionnaire. In all of the questions below, when we refer to the "incident" we are speaking about the event which led to the court appearance resulting in your conviction for domestic violence.

Unless otherwise told, please fill in the box next to the best answer or fill in the blank.

1. In the 6 months since you were in court and sentenced, have you moved from your house or apartment?
 (4) 1. No 2. Yes
2. In the months since you were in court and sentenced, how many of the past 6 months were you doing each of the following. Write in the number of months (from 0 to 6) for each:

- (5) Unemployed – not looking for work _____ months
- (6) Unemployed – looking for work _____ months
- (7) Unemployed – full time homemaker _____ months
- (8) Unemployed - on disability or retired _____ months

- (9) Working - part time _____ months
- (10) Working – full time _____ months

**If you are or have been working in the last 6 months, answer the next question.
 Otherwise, skip to Question 4**

3. What is your usual WEEKLY take home pay?

(11) \$ _____ per week

4. In the months since you were in court and sentenced, , how many of the past 6 months were you doing each of the following. Write in the number of months (from 0 to 6) for each:

(12) Not seeing or living with any woman romantically _____ months

(13) Not living with any woman romantically but seeing someone other than the woman involved in the domestic dispute _____ months

(14) Not living with any woman romantically but seeing the woman involved in the domestic dispute _____ months

(15) Living with a different woman than the one involved in the dispute _____ months

(16) Living with the woman involved in the dispute leading to the court appearance _____ months

If you are or have been seeing a woman romantically in the last 6 months, answer the questions in the shaded box. Otherwise, skip to Question 7

5. Is this contact (check one reply only):

(17) 1. Daily 2. Weekly
 3. Monthly 4. Occasionally

6. If you are or have been seeing a woman romantically, have there been any domestic disputes since you were in court and sentenced approximately 6 months ago?

(18) 1. None at all
 2. One or more but it has not come to the police or probation's attention
 3. One or more and on at least one occasion the police or probation have been involved

7. Has any of the following events happened to you since you were in court and sentenced 6 months ago?

- | | | | |
|------|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| (19) | •You received a traffic violation | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. No | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes |
| (20) | •Someone obtained a restraining on you | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. No | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes |
| (21) | •Probation spoke with you about another domestic incident involving this or another woman | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. No | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes |
| (22) | •The police spoke with you about another domestic incident | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. No | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes |
| (23) | •The police arrested you for another domestic incident | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. No | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes |
| (24) | •The police contacted you regarding a property offense in which you were a suspect | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. No | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes |
| (25) | •The police arrested you for a property offense | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. No | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes |
| (26) | •The police contacted you for an alcohol or drug offense | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. No | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes |
| (27) | •The police arrested you for an alcohol or drug offense | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. No | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes |
| (28) | •The police contacted you for a non-domestic assault offense | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. No | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes |
| (29) | •The police arrested you for a non-domestic assault offense | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. No | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes |
| (30) | •The police contacted you for a violent offense other than an assault | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. No | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes |
| (31) | •The police arrested you for a violent offense other than an assault | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. No | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes |
| (32) | •Probation began violation of probation (VOP) procedures against you | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. No | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes |
| (33) | •Your probation was revoked | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. No | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes |
| (34) | •You were sent to jail for violation of probation or on a new charge | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. No | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes |

8. In the 6 months since you were in court and sentenced, have you received any counseling or treatment for dealing with domestic violence disputes?

1. No – I have not received any domestic violence counseling

- (35) 2. Yes – I was court ordered into domestic violence counseling and have been attending as instructed
 3. Yes – I have gone for domestic violence counseling on my own

If you have gone for domestic violence counseling or treatment since being sentenced, answer the questions in the shaded box. Otherwise skip to Question 14

9. If you have gone for domestic violence counseling or treatment, approximately how many sessions have you attended to date?

(36) _____ sessions

10. If you have gone for domestic violence counseling or treatment, have you found it helpful in teaching you how to avoid being violent in the future?

- (37) 1. No 2. Yes

11. If you have gone for domestic violence counseling or treatment, have you found it has improved your relationship with the woman you are romantically involved with presently?

- (38) 1. No 2. Yes 3. Don't know – have not been involved with anyone

12. If you have gone for domestic violence counseling or treatment, where have you gone?

- (39) 1. To a minister or some other religious leader
 2. To a private therapist or psychologist
 3. To a treatment program other than one ordered by the judge
 4. To one of the treatment programs ordered by the judge at sentencing

If you have gone to a treatment program, answer the question below.
Otherwise skip to Question 14

13. Please specify the program which you attended.

- (40) 1. Family Service Agency
 2. 5th Street Counseling
 3. Glass House
 4. Lifeline of Miami
 5. Other (specify)

14. No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, want different things from each other, or just have spats or fights because they are in a bad mood, are tired, or for some other reason. Couples also have many different ways of trying to settle their differences. This is a list of things that might happen when you have differences. Please place a check (✓) in the box indicating how many times you did each of these things in the 6 months since you were in court and sentenced. If you did not do one of these things in the past six months, but it happened before, check the box saying, "Not in the past 6 months but it did happen".

	In the past 6 months:				Not in past 6 months but it has happened before
	Never	1 Time	2 - 5 Times	6 or More Times	
(41) I showed my partner I cared even though we disagreed					
(42) I explained my side of a disagreement to my partner					
(43) I insulted or swore at my partner					
(44) I threw something at my partner that could hurt					
(45) I twisted my partner's arm or hair					
(46) My partner had a sprain, bruise or small cut due to a fight we had					
(47) I showed respect for my partner's feelings about an issue					
(48) I made my partner have sex without a condom					
(49) I pushed or shoved my partner					
(50) I used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make my partner have oral or anal sex					
(51) I used a knife or gun on my partner					
(52) My partner passed out from being hit on the head in a fight with me					
(53) I called my partner fat, ugly or some other insult					
(54) I punched or hit my partner with something that could hurt					
(55) I destroyed something belonging to my partner					
(56) My partner went to the doctor because of a fight with me					
(57) I choked my partner					
(58) I shouted or yelled at my partner					
(59) I slammed my partner against the wall					
(60) I said I was sure we could work out a problem					
(61) My partner needed to see a doctor because of a fight with me but didn't					
(62) I beat up my partner					
(63) I grabbed my partner					
(64) I used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make my partner have sex					
(65) I stomped out of the room or house or yard during a disagreement					
(66) I insisted on sex when my partner did not want to (but did not use physical force)					
(67) I slapped my partner					
(68) My partner had a broken bone from a fight with me					
(69) I used threats to make my partner have oral or anal sex					
(70) I suggested a compromise to a disagreement					
(71) I burned or scalded my partner on purpose					
(72) I insisted my partner have oral or anal sex (but did not use physical force)					
(73) I accused my partner of being a lousy lover					
(74) I did something to spite my partner					
(75) I threatened to hit or throw something at my partner					
(76) My partner still felt physical pain the next day because of a fight we had					
(77) I kicked my partner					
(78) I used threats to make my partner have sex					
(79) I agreed to try a solution to a disagreement my partner suggested					

15. What do you think the chances are that you would hit your partner in the next year? Please rate the chances on a scale of 0 (not a chance) to 100% (it will definitely happen). Circle the answer which best describes the likelihood of this event.

	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
(80)	No					50/50					Sure to
	Chance					Chance					Happen

16. Please read the following questions and answer each truthfully. Check the "No" box if that best answers question. Otherwise, check the "Yes" box.

- (81) •Do you think that you are a normal drinker? (By normal we mean that you drink less than or as much as most other people.) 1. No 2. Yes
- (82) •Does your wife or girlfriend ever worry or complain about your drinking? 1. No 2. Yes
- (83) •Do you ever feel guilty about your drinking? 1. No 2. Yes
- (84) •Do friends or relatives think you are a normal drinker? 1. No 2. Yes
- (85) •Are you able to stop drinking when you want to? 1. No 2. Yes
- (86) •Have you ever attended a meeting of Alcoholics Anonymous? 1. No 2. Yes
- (87) •Has drinking ever created problems between you and your wife or girlfriend? 1. No 2. Yes
- (88) •Have you ever gotten into trouble at work because of drinking? 1. No 2. Yes
- (89) •Have you ever neglected your obligations, your family, or your work for two or more days in a row because you were drinking? 1. No 2. Yes
- (90) •Have you ever gone to anyone for help about your drinking? 1. No 2. Yes
- (91) •Have you ever been in a hospital because of drinking? 1. No 2. Yes
- (92) •Have you ever been arrested for drunken driving, driving while intoxicated, or driving under the influence of alcoholic beverages? 1. No 2. Yes
- (93) •Have you ever been arrested, even for a few hours, because of other drunken behavior? 1. No 2. Ye

17. Please place a check (✓) in the boxes below that best reflect the way you think about things. There are no right or wrong answers. Check only one response for each statement.

	Agree	Disagree
(94) Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce		
(95) A woman getting drunk is worse than a man getting drunk		
(96) Men should share in household tasks (such as washing the dishes and laundry) if women work outside the home		
(97) Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mother		
(98) A woman should not expect to have quite the same freedom of action as a man		
(99) Women should be given equal opportunity with men for all jobs		
(100) Our government should do more to help battered women		
(101) Wives try to get beaten by their husbands in order to get sympathy from others		
(102) A woman who constantly refuses to have sex with her husband is asking to be beaten		
(103) Wives could avoid being beaten by their husbands if they knew when to stop talking		
(104) Even when women lie to their husbands they do not deserve to get a beating		
(105) Women should be protected by law if their husbands beat them		
(106) Sometimes it is OK for a man to beat his wife		
(107) A sexually unfaithful wife deserves to be beaten		
(108) Battered wives try to get their partners to beat them as a way to get attention from them		
(109) The best way to deal with wife-beating is to arrest the husband		
(110) Even when a wife's behavior challenges her husband's manhood, he is not justified in beating her		

18. Do you think the incident that brought you to court 6 months ago should be considered a crime?

- (111) 1. No 2. Yes

19. Do you think that the woman involved was responsible for this incident?

- (112) 1. Not at all responsible 2. Somewhat responsible
 3. Equally responsible 4. Completely responsible

20. Do you think the sentence you received for this incident was fair?

- (113) 1. Very unfair 2. Unfair
 3. Fair 4. Very fair

BROWARD COUNTY HUMAN SERVICES DEPT.
HEALTH CARE MANAGEMENT DIVISION
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SECTION
BATTERERS' INTERVENTION MONITORING
PROGRAM

ISSUES REGARDING CERTIFICATION OF BIP PROGRAMS

Background: Since the inception of the Domestic Violence Court in Broward County in 1994, programs that have been providing batterers' intervention services have been reviewed and monitored by a variety of sources. In 1997, the responsibility for this oversight was given to the Human Services Department, Health Care Management Division, who in turn contracted with Henderson Mental Health Center, Inc. to provide such services. Broward County funds this program in the amount of \$35,000 annually. It employs one Program Evaluator who monitors the four existing County certified providers.

In 1996, the Department of Corrections promulgated standards for batterers' intervention programs in the State of Florida. Broward County established standards that incorporate and exceed these standards.

State law mandates that referrals be to programs certified by the Department of Corrections only when said referral is incidental to the issuance of an injunction against domestic or repeat violence. Referrals to county certified batterer intervention programs may be made in dissolution of marriage actions, paternity cases, post-judgment matters, or any other civil or criminal litigation. *Unless the referral is incidental to the issuance of an injunction against domestic or repeat violence, it is not mandatory that the programs individuals are referred to be certified by the Department of Corrections.*

Funding for the Department of Corrections monitoring program comes directly from client fees. Although the Department does not expect a program to pay for any offender who does not pay the fee or who drops out of the program, the provider is expected to make a "good faith effort" in collecting the fee. If the program cannot collect the fee after using their best efforts, the program must be able to provide documentation in the offender's file supporting their efforts. The collection of fees is part of the monitoring procedure and is considered in granting permanent certification to providers.

Currently, there is no legislation requiring the judiciary to refer domestic violence cases that are criminal in nature to programs that are certified by the Department of Corrections.

COMPARISON OF D.O.C. AND BROWARD COUNTY STANDARDS

	<u>Broward County</u>	<u>State of Florida Department of Corrections</u>
Requirements for facilitators	Master's Degree, as well as licensed or license eligible	Minimum of two years experience working with batterers plus 78 hours of facilitation and 40 hours of training
Monitoring	Occurs twice per year, in addition to ongoing meetings with providers	Once per year
Program Evaluation	Contains extensive information relative to program evaluation, including a plan that measures the effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction with batterers' intervention services	Contains a brief paragraph referencing research and evaluation of the effectiveness of batterers' intervention programs.
Data Collection	Information is collected on a monthly basis by the Program Evaluator, compiled and analyzed and distributed to interested parties, including the Judiciary, Probation Department, and County. Data is used not only for informational purposes, but also for identification of areas for focus and improvement.	Information is collected on a quarterly basis. It is unclear as to what is done with the information collected.
Assessment of Need for Providers	Standards provide for an assessment of the need for numbers of providers, based on several variables, including geographical location, numbers of individuals seen, waiting list information, and time between intake and enrollment.	There is no current assessment of need for the number of providers in any given geographical location. Not placing a limit on the number of providers has the potential for a variety of negative implications, which are described below.
Exclusivity of Assessor/Treatment Provider	Standards do not allow for the separation of assessor and treatment provider. Separating the assessor from the treatment provider is not good clinical practice. In addition, the treatment provider would conduct their own assessment regardless; conducting two assessments is not only redundant, they may be in conflict based on information received.	Standards allow for the separation of assessor from treatment provider. In addition to providing a redundant service, there is the potential for conflicts of interest as assessors may refer individuals for treatment at providers who they find favorable.

Financial Hardship

Broward County provides funding for monitoring and certification. Programs do not receive funding for batterers' intervention services.

The Department of Corrections requires an annual \$300 certification for providers and a \$100 fee for assessors. In addition, clients are required to pay a one-time \$30 fee for monitoring and evaluation. These fees present a financial hardship not only on the client, but potentially to the organization as well. This will be described in more detail below.

Implications for unlimited numbers of providers in a given geographical location:

Allowing an unlimited number of organizations or individuals to become certified in a given geographical location provides the potential for a variety of negative implications. Not only does it make tracking of clients a difficult, if not impossible task, it also makes the creation of consistent policies and procedures and the monitoring of such, an arduous process. In addition, by creating an unlimited list of providers, the referral base is spread out among numerous organizations and individuals. This has the potential of diluting the numbers of referrals organizations receive, and therefore may force quality organizations to close groups or programs altogether for both financial and clinical reasons.

In an effort to maintain high-quality, cost-effective services for batterers' intervention programs, the Health Care Division reserves the right to limit the number of certified providers. This number is based on a needs assessment that evaluates numbers of referrals and the length of time between referral and intake into programs. In addition, certified providers must meet the needs of the County in terms of geographical access, language and ethnicity, and the needs of special populations (i.e., substance abusers, individuals with psychiatric disabilities, sexual orientation, etc.).

The State of Florida Department of Corrections does not allow for the limiting of numbers of certified providers in a given geographical location.

Financial Hardship and Impact

County certified batterers' intervention programs in Broward County treat approximately 2,000 individuals annually. None of the programs that provide such treatment receive funding for these services; they are all self-sufficient and financially viable, relying on client fees for operation. The Department of Corrections standards require that a \$30.00 fee be assessed to each court-ordered program participant for the purpose of certification and monitoring. The organization is then responsible for forwarding one check, monthly, to the Department of Corrections for the number of individuals enrolled that month times the \$30.00 fee. No other state in the country, nor other specialized service (i.e., mental health, substance abuse, DUI) requires the client to pay for the monitoring and evaluation of the programs they attend. In addition, each organization is required to pay an annual fee of \$300.00 for certification and \$100.00 for each assessor.

The current average rate for group sessions for Broward County certified providers (as of January 1, 1999) is \$16.17, which is based on a sliding fee scale. This figure represents approximately 50% of the required \$30.00 fee. In addition, the current rate of collection by the agencies providing service (again, as of January 1, 1999) is 91%, indicating a shortfall of 9%. The following provides a visual representation of the potential shortfall to Broward County organizations for D.O.C. certification.

<p style="text-align: center;"> $2000 \text{ clients served} \times \\$30 \text{ fee} = \\$60,000$ $\text{Average group rate: } \\$16.17 \times 2,000 = \\$32,340$ $\text{Average collection rate: } 91\% \times \\$32,340 = \\$29,429$ Potential difference to be made up by agency: \$30,571 <i>This figure does not include the \$300 certification fee or \$100 assessor application fee</i> </p>
--

This process also provides the potential for organizations who pay their required fees in a timely manner to be favored by the monitoring agency, regardless of the quality of services provided.

In addition, the cost-effectiveness of County vs. State monitoring and certification deserves attention. Using a "best practices" model, the standards developed by Broward County incorporate and exceed those promulgated by the State Department of Corrections, in addition to those of other counties and states across the country. The Program Evaluator for Broward County has extensive experience in the area of monitoring and certification and meets at least monthly with the certified providers. In addition, the providers and Program Evaluator are in continuous contact with the Judiciary, as well as the Department of Probation and Family Court. These relationships promote collaboration and communication, an area that is not addressed in the Department of Corrections standards.

A comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan has been developed in Broward County which identifies specific performance and outcome measures that must be met and/or exceeded by providers. The Department of Corrections standards do not address outcome measures in a specific, detailed format. The cost for local monitoring vs. State monitoring is presented visually below:

<p style="text-align: center;"> $\text{Broward County monitoring program: } \\$35,000 / 2000 \text{ clients} = \text{unit cost of } \\17.50 $\text{Department of Corrections monitoring program: } \\$30 \times 2000 \text{ clients} = \\$60,000 = \text{unit cost of } \\30.00 </p>

SUMMARY

The differences between Broward County's and the Department of Correction's approach to monitoring and evaluation of batterers' intervention services have been described in detail above. Domestic violence, and the treatment and solution should be coordinated and monitored at the local level. Combating domestic violence in the community requires a coordinated, integrated response from all stakeholders. The evaluation of such programs on a community level will ensure the ongoing, detailed process that is necessary to assess the effectiveness of the system. Programs that provide mental health, substance abuse, and foster care services are monitored on a local level, with information provided to the state; this process is judicious and reasonable and should be applied to domestic violence as well.

APPENDIX TWO
SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

Coding Probation Folder 1

Code # _____

Def's Home Address:	_____
Def's Phone #:	_____ (Home) _____ (Work)

Victim's Name:	_____ (Last Name)	_____ (First Name)
Victim's Address:	_____	
Victim's Phone #:	_____ (Home)	_____ (Work)

Def's DOB: _____

Race: 1. Black 2. White 3. Hispanic 4. Other _____

Birthplace: _____ (City) _____ (State) _____ (Country)

US Citizen? 1. No 2. Yes 9. Missing

Marital Status: 1. Married 2. Separated/Divorced 3. Widowed
 4. Single 9. Missing

Residence: 1. Own 2. Rent 9. Missing

Resides With: 1. Wife 2. Girlfriend 3. Parents 4. Other Relatives
 5. Friends 6. Self 7. Other _____ 9. Missing

Broward Resident: _____ Months [Note code in months and code 9999 if missing]

Florida Resident: _____ Months [Note code in months and code 9999 if missing]

Drivers License #: _____ [Note code -- if missing and 0 if none]

Employment Status:	<input type="checkbox"/> 1. No	<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> 9. Missing
If yes, complete next four questions. Otherwise skip.			
Type of work:	_____ [Note code 99 if missing]		
#of Hrs Wkly:	_____ hours/week	[Note code 999 if missing]	
Length of Employ:	_____ Months	[Note code in months and code 9999 if missing]	
Mthly Income:	\$ _____ . 00	[Note code 9999 if missing]	

Current Student: 1. No 2. Yes 9. Missing

Educational Level: _____ [Note code 1-16+ or 99 if missing]

Note for arrest history, if the Intake Sheet is completed but this left blank, assume this indicates none (00). Otherwise, code 99			
Number of Prior Adult Arrests:	_____ Felony	_____ Misdemeanor	_____ Traffic
Number of Prior Convictions:	_____ Felony	_____ Misdemeanor	
Number of Juvenile Arrests:	_____ Felony	_____ Misdemeanor	
Number of Prior Prison:	_____	Number of Prior Jail:	_____

Firs. Arrest for DOV? 1. No 2. Yes 9. Missing

Currently on State Probation? 1. No 2. Yes 9. Missing

Health Status: 1. Good 2. Fair 3. Poor 9. Missing

Previous Psychiatric Care: 1. No 2. Yes 9. Missing

Military Service: 1. No 2. Yes 9. Missing

Arrest Information

Blood Alcohol Level: _____ % [Note code 99 if missing]

Offenses Charged [Note code -- if missing]:

For next four questions, only code missing if no police narrative. Otherwise assume it is NO

Alcohol Influence? 1. No 2. Yes 9. Missing

Drug Influence? 1. No 2. Yes 9. Missing

Problems noted? 1. No 2. Yes (Specify) _____ 9. Missing

Visible Injuries? 1. No 2. Yes 9. Missing

If yes, what injuries noted? (Fill in ALL the boxes next to ALL the injuries sustained)

1. Black and blue marks 2. Cuts and bruises - not requiring stitches

3. Cuts and bruises - requiring stitches 4. Burns

5. Broken bones 6. Gun shot wounds

7. Other - specify _____

If yes, did the injuries require hospitalization?

1. None required 2. Trip to hospital recommended but victim refused

3. Hospital emergency room only 4. Hospital overnight stay for one or more nights

Relationship to victim:

1. Ex-girlfriend 2. Ex-wife 3. Girlfriend, not living together

4. Girlfriend, living together 5. Wife 6. Other - specify _____

9. Missing

If wife or girlfriend, how long living together? _____ Months

[Note code in months and code 9999 if missing]

Assailant taken into custody? 1. No 2. Yes 9. Missing

If yes, bond amount? \$ _____ .00

[Note code 99999 if taken into custody and missing otherwise leave blank]

Conviction Offense [Note code -- if missing]:

Adjud: 1. Trial 2. Jury 3. Court 4. Pled Gity 5. Pled Nolo 9. Missing

Programs Ordered for Convicted Defendant (Note check all that apply):

01. No harmful contact with victim 02. No contact with victim

03. Domestic Violence treatment program 04. Community Service _____ hours

05. Alcohol/Drug Evaluation 06. Random Alcohol/Drug Testing

07. Alcohol/Drug Treatment Program 08. Restitution _____ .00 amount

09. Jail time _____ days [Note code 8888 for reserved restit 9999 for missg]

10. Other specify _____ 99. Missing

Defendant's First Interview

Your name was selected from Broward County official records of people who have been in contact with the courts about family disputes. We are interviewing 600 families to better understand why these problems arise so that the needs of families like yours can be better served. We do not work for the courts or probation but instead are researchers from Florida Atlantic University. Your answers will be completely private and confidential. In order to make sure that no one will know your answers, please do NOT put your name or any identifying information on this questionnaire.

In all of the questions below, when we refer to the "incident" we are speaking about the event which led to your recent court appearance.

Unless otherwise told, please fill in the box next to the best answer or fill in the blank.

1. What was your highest grade completed in school? (Please circle the best answer)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17+
Grade School High School College Grad
2. Do you own your own home?
 1. No 2. Yes
3. At the time of the incident, how many years had you lived at that address? (If less than one year, please write in "0" and answer the next question. If more than one year, skip to Question 5)
_____ years
4. If you lived at that address for less than one year, how many months had you lived at that address?
_____ months
5. Fill in the box next to the response which best represents your current employment status.
 1. Not employed - looking for work 2. Not employed - on disability or retired
 3. Not employed - seasonal worker 4. Not employed - not looking for work
 5. Not employed - full or part-time student 6. Not employed - fulltime homemaker
 7. Employed - part time 8. Employed - full time

If you are employed full or part-time, please answer the questions in the shaded box. If you are not employed, skip to Question 14

6. What kind of work do you do? Briefly describe below:

7. How many hours a week do you typically work?
_____ hours per week
8. How many years have you been working for your current employer? (If less than one year write "0")
_____ years
If you answered "0" to Question 8, please answer the questions in the darker shaded box. Otherwise skip to Question 12
9. If you have been at your current job for less than one year, how many months have you worked there?
_____ months
10. If you have been at your current job for less than one year, were you without a job anytime within the last 12 months?
 1. No 2. Yes
11. If yes, for how many months within the last 12 were you without a job?
_____ months

12. Do you usually get paid:

<input type="checkbox"/> 1. Daily	<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Weekly
<input type="checkbox"/> 3. Every two weeks	<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Monthly
<input type="checkbox"/> 5. Other - specify _____	

13. What is your usual WEEKLY take home pay?

\$ _____ per week

14. At the time of the incident, was anyone else who lived with you working and contributing money to the household expenses?

1. No

2. Yes

If someone else was living with you and contributing money to household expenses, please answer the questions in the shaded box. Otherwise, skip to Question 18

15. Fill in the box next to ALL the other people living with you who were contributing. You can fill in more than one box if more than one person contributed to household expenses.

<input type="checkbox"/> 1. Parents
<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Brothers/Sisters
<input type="checkbox"/> 3. Children
<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Wife/Girlfriend

If your wife or girlfriend was contributing to household expenses, answer the questions in the darker shaded box. Otherwise, skip to Question 18

16. If your wife or girlfriend was employed full or part time, did she usually get paid:

<input type="checkbox"/> 1. Daily	<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Weekly
<input type="checkbox"/> 3. Every two weeks	<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Monthly
<input type="checkbox"/> 5. Other - specify _____	

17. If your wife or girlfriend was working, what was her WEEKLY take home pay?

\$ _____ per week

18. At the time of the incident, did your household regularly receive any money other than from work?

1. No

2. Yes

If your household received money from other sources, fill in the next question. Otherwise, skip to Question 20

19. If yes, where did this money come from? (Fill in the boxes for EVERY other source of income you regularly received money from. Fill in more than one box if you had more than one source of income)

<input type="checkbox"/> 1. Welfare (AFDC/WAGES)	<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Disability
<input type="checkbox"/> 3. Social Security/other retirement income	<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Income from savings account, bonds, etc
<input type="checkbox"/> 5. Money from friends and relatives	<input type="checkbox"/> 6. Another job
<input type="checkbox"/> 7. Hustling or taking odd jobs	<input type="checkbox"/> 8. Other - specify _____

20. During the past year, has your income decreased, increased or stayed about the same?

<input type="checkbox"/> 1. Decreased	<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Increased
<input type="checkbox"/> 3. Stayed about the same	<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Don't know

21. Over the next few years, do you expect your income to decrease, increase or stay about the same?

<input type="checkbox"/> 1. Decrease	<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Increase
<input type="checkbox"/> 3. Stay about the same	<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Don't know

22. No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, want different things from each other, or just have spats or fights because they are in a bad mood, are tired, or for some other reason. Couples also have many different ways of trying to settle their differences. This is a list of things that might happen when you have differences. Please place a check (✓) in the box indicating how many times you did each of these things in the past six months. If you did not do one of these things in the past six months, but it happened before, check the box saying, "Not in the past 6 months but it did happen".

	In the past 6 months:				Not in past 6 months but it has happened before
	Never	1 Time	2 - 5 Times	6 or More Times	
I showed my partner I cared even though we disagreed					
I explained my side of a disagreement to my partner					
I insulted or swore at my partner					
I threw something at my partner that could hurt					
I twisted my partner's arm or hair					
My partner had a sprain, bruise or small cut because of a fight with me					
I showed respect for my partner's feelings about an issue					
I made my partner have sex without a condom					
I pushed or shoved my partner					
I used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make my partner have oral or anal sex					
I used a knife or gun on my partner					
My partner passed out from being hit on the head in a fight with me					
I called my partner fat, ugly or some other insult					
I punched or hit my partner with something that could hurt					
I destroyed something belonging to my partner					
My partner went to the doctor because of a fight with me					
I choked my partner					
I shouted or yelled at my partner					
I slammed my partner against the wall					
I said I was sure we could work out a problem					
My partner needed to see a doctor because of a fight with me but didn't					
I beat up my partner					
I grabbed my partner					
I used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make my partner have sex					
I stomped out of the room or house or yard during a disagreement					
I insisted on sex when my partner did not want to (but did not use physical force)					
I slapped my partner					
My partner had a broken bone from a fight with me					
I used threats to make my partner have oral or anal sex					
I suggested a compromise to a disagreement					
I burned or scalded my partner on purpose					
I insisted my partner have oral or anal sex (but did not use physical force)					
I accused my partner of being a lousy lover					
I did something to spite my partner					
I threatened to hit or throw something at my partner					
My partner still felt physical pain the next day because of a fight we had					
I kicked my partner					
I used threats to make my partner have sex					
I agreed to try a solution to a disagreement my partner suggested					

We are going to ask some questions about your feelings about the incident, court process, and whether you think domestic violence counseling would be helpful for families that end up in court.

23. Do you think the incident that brought you to court should be considered a crime?
 1. No 2. Yes
24. Do you think that your wife/girlfriend was responsible for this incident?
 1. Not at all responsible 2. Somewhat responsible
 3. Equally responsible 4. Completely responsible

25. Do you think the sentence you received for this incident was fair?
 1. Very unfair 2. Unfair
 3. Fair 4. Very fair
26. Have you ever been involved in a violent romantic relationship in the past?
 1. No 2. Yes
27. Do you think counseling offered through the courts could help you avoid violent disputes with your partner in the future?
 1. No 2. Maybe 3. Yes
28. Do you think that you could quit being violent to your partner without counseling?
 1. No 2. Maybe 3. Yes
29. What do you think the chances are that you would hit your partner in the next year? Please rate the chances on a scale of 0 (not a chance) to 100% (it will definitely happen). Circle the answer which best describes the likelihood of this event.
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------|
| 0% | 10% | 20% | 30% | 40% | 50% | 60% | 70% | 80% | 90% | 100% |
| No | | | | | 50/50 | | | | | Sure to |
| Chance | | | | | Chance | | | | | Happen |

30. Which of the following best describes your relationship with the person involved in the dispute at the time the incident occurred. Was she then your:
 1. Ex-girlfriend 2. Ex-wife
 3. Girlfriend, not living together 4. Girlfriend, living together
 5. Wife 6. Other - specify _____

If this was your wife or girlfriend, answer the questions in the shaded box. Otherwise, skip to Question 35.

31. How many years had you been together before this incident? (If less than one year, write in "0" and answer the next question. Otherwise skip to Question 33)
 _____ years

32. If you had been together for less than one year, how many months were you together at the time of the incident?
 _____ months

33. How many children do you have together?
 _____ children

34. How many children does your wife/girlfriend have from previous relationships who are presently living with you?
 _____ children

35. Since the incident, has your relationship with this woman changed because of this dispute?
 1. No 2. Don't Know
 3. Yes
- If yes, please answer the next question. Otherwise, skip to Question 37**
36. If your relationship has changed, what is your relationship now? Is this woman now your:
 1. Ex-girlfriend 2. Ex-wife
 3. Girlfriend, not living together 4. Girlfriend, living together
 5. Wife 6. Other - specify _____

37. Are you currently seeing anyone else?
 1. No 2. Yes

38. When you are not working, how do you spend your time? (Fill in the boxes next to ALL the things that you do regularly. This means that you can fill in more than one box if you do more than one activity.)
- 1. Take classes
 - 2. Attend religious activities
 - 3. Work on hobbies
 - 4. Go to the gym
 - 5. Hang out with friends
 - 6. Other - specify _____

39. In order to understand how you spend your time, please place a check (✓) in the box marked "Yes" next to all the people listed below who you regularly spend time with in the course of a month. If you do not see them regularly in the course of a month, place a check in the "No" box.

	Regularly Spend Time	
	No	Yes
Your extended family (mother, father, sisters, brothers)		
Your wife/girlfriend's extended family (her mother, father, sisters, brothers)		
Your friends		
Your neighbors		
Your co-workers (outside of the work setting)		

40. In the past six months, have you spoken with any of your relatives (e.g., mother, father, sisters, brothers, etc) about your disputes with your wife/girlfriend?
- 1. No
 - 2. Yes

If you have spoken with your relatives about this problem, answer the questions in the shaded box. Otherwise, skip to Question 43.

41. Were they critical of your violence?
- 1. Never
 - 2. Sometimes
 - 3. Usually
42. Were they critical of your wife/girlfriend's actions?
- 1. Never
 - 2. Sometimes
 - 3. Usually

43. In the past six months, have you spoken with any of your friends, neighbors or co-workers about your disputes with your wife/girlfriend?
- 1. No
 - 2. Yes

If you have spoken with your friends, neighbors or co-workers about this problem, answer the questions in the shaded box. Otherwise, skip to Question 46.

44. Were they critical of your violence?
- 1. Never
 - 2. Sometimes
 - 3. Usually
45. Were they critical of your wife/girlfriend's actions?
- 1. Never
 - 2. Sometimes
 - 3. Usually

46. When you were growing up, how often did you see your parents physically fight?
- 1. Never
 - 2. Rarely
 - 3. Sometimes
 - 4. Frequently

If your parents ever physically fought, complete the questions in the shaded box. Otherwise, skip to Question 49.

47. Who usually was the first person to become violent?
- 1. Father
 - 2. Mother
 - 3. Sometimes father and sometimes mother
48. Who usually ended up worse off for it?
- 1. Father
 - 2. Mother
 - 3. Sometimes father and sometimes mother

49. When you were growing up, how often did your parents hit or beat you?

- 1. Never
- 2. Rarely
- 3. Sometimes
- 4. Frequently

If you were ever hit or beat by your parents, answer the questions in the shaded box.
Otherwise, skip to Question 53

50. Who typically hit or beat you?

- 1. Father
- 2. Mother
- 3. Sometimes father and sometimes mother

51. Did injuries ever result from a parental hitting or beating?

- 1. No
- 2. Yes

52. What injuries did you suffer? (Fill in ALL the boxes for ALL the injuries sustained)

- 1. No injuries ever resulted
- 2. Black and blue marks
- 3. Cuts and bruises - not requiring stitches
- 4. Cuts and bruises - requiring stitches
- 5. Burns
- 6. Broken bones

53. Imagine for a moment that you are with your partner and have another physical dispute. Below is a list of things which might happen as a result. First, tell me how likely you think each thing is to happen. Then tell me how bad each thing would be for you if it did happen - even if you think it is not likely to happen.

Likelihood 1 to 10	Rate the chances of each thing happening on a scale of 1 to 10. "1" indicates that there is little or no chance of this happening. "5" indicates a 50/50 chance and "10" indicates it is sure to happen. Use any number between 1 and 10.	Severity 1 to 10
	Your partner would lose respect for you	
	Your partner would leave you	
	You would not be able to see your children	
	Your relatives would disapprove	
	Your friends would disapprove	
	Your co-workers would disapprove	
	You would lose your job	
	You would lose your self-respect	
	The police would be called	
	The police would arrest you	
	You would spend the night in jail	
	You would be convicted	
	You would have to pay a fine	
	You would be sentenced to spend time in jail	

54. When the judge placed you on probation, did he tell you that you had to attend a batterer's counseling program?

- 1. No
- 2. Yes

If the judge told you to attend a batterer's treatment program, please answer the next two questions.
Otherwise, skip to Question 57.

55. Do you feel forced into this counseling program?

- 1. Not at all forced into the program
- 2. Somewhat forced into the program
- 3. Very forced into the program

56. Have you attended your first batterer's counseling session?

- 1. No
- 2. Yes

57. Please place a check (✓) in the boxes below that best reflect the way you think about things. There are no right or wrong answers. Check only one response for each statement. If you Strongly Disagree with the statement, check the SD box. If you Disagree, check the D box. If you Agree, check the A box and if you Strongly Agree check the SA box.

	SD	D	A	SA
Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce				
A woman getting drunk is worse than a man getting drunk				
Men should share in household tasks (such as washing the dishes and laundry) if women work outside the home				
Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers				
A woman should not expect to have quite the same freedom of action as a man				
Women should be given equal opportunity with men for all jobs				
Our government should do more to help battered women				
Wives try to get beaten by their husbands in order to get sympathy from others				
A woman who constantly refuses to have sex with her husband is asking to be beaten				
Wives could avoid being beaten by their husbands if they knew when to stop talking				
Even when women lie to their husbands they do not deserve to get a beating				
Women should be protected by law if their husbands beat them				
Sometimes it is OK for a man to beat his wife				
A sexually unfaithful wife deserves to be beaten				
Battered wives try to get their partners to beat them as a way to get attention from them				
The best way to deal with wife-beating is to arrest the husband				
Even when a wife's behavior challenges her husband's manhood, he is not justified in beating her				
No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener				
I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable				
I am quick to admit making a mistake				
I would let someone else be punished for my wrongdoing				
I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget				
I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my own way				
There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone				
I often act on the spur of the moment without stopping to think				
I devote a lot of thought and effort to preparing for the future				
I often do whatever brings me pleasure here and now, even at the cost of some distant goal				
I'm more concerned with what happens to me in the long run than in the short run				
I much prefer doing things that pay off right away rather than in the future				
I frequently try to avoid projects that I know will be difficult				
When things get complicated, I tend to quit or withdraw.				
The things in life that are the most difficult to do bring me the most pleasure				
I like really hard tasks that stretch my abilities to the limit				
I like to test myself every now and then by doing something a little risky				
Sometimes I will take a risk just for the fun of it				
I find it exciting to do things which may get me in trouble				
Security is more important to me than excitement and adventure				
If I had a choice, I would almost always rather do something mental than something physical				
I almost always feel better when I am on the move than when I am sitting and thinking				
I like to read or contemplate ideas more than I like to get out and do things				
I seem to have more energy and a greater need for activity than most other people my age				
I try to look out for myself first, even if it means making things difficult for other people				
I'm very sympathetic to other people when they are having problems				
If things I do upset people, it's their problem not mine				
I try to get the things I want even when I know it's causing problems for other people				
I lose my temper pretty easily				
Often, when I'm angry at people I feel more like hurting them than talking to them about why I am angry				
When I'm really angry, other people better stay away from me				
When I have a serious disagreement with someone, I can usually talk calmly about it without getting upset				

58. How many alcoholic drinks do you usually consume in a typical drinking episode? (By "drink" we mean a drink with a shot of 1.5 ounces or hard liquor, 12 ounces of beer, or 5 ounces of wine.)

of hard liquor drinks _____ # of beers _____ # of glasses of wine _____

59. How many days a week do you usually drink?

of days per week _____

60. Were either or both of you drinking right before the incident which ended up in court?

- 1. Neither my partner nor I were drinking at that time
- 2. I was the only one drinking at that time
- 3. My partner was the only one drinking at that time
- 4. Both my partner and I were drinking at that time

61. Were either or both of you using illegal drugs right before the incident which ended up in court?

- 1. Neither my partner nor I were using drugs at that time
- 2. I was the only one using drugs at the time
- 3. My partner was the only one using drugs at the time
- 4. Both my partner and I were using drugs at the time

Thank you very much for helping us with this study. Please feel free in the lines below, to tell us what you think of the way in which your case was handled.

Victim's First Interview

Your name was selected from Broward County official records of people who have been in contact with the courts about family disputes. We are interviewing 600 families to better understand why these problems arise so that the needs of families like yours can be better served. We do not work for the courts or probation but instead are researchers from Florida Atlantic University. Your answers will be completely private and confidential. In order to make sure that no one will know your answers, please do NOT put your name or any identifying information on this questionnaire.

In all of the questions below, when we refer to the "incident" we are speaking about the event which led to your recent court appearance.

Unless otherwise told, please fill in the box next to the best answer or fill in the blank.

1. What was the highest grade completed in school? (Please circle the best answer)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17+
Grade School								High School				College			Grad	

2. What is your date of birth? (Fill in the month, day and year)

____ - ____ - ____
 month day year

3. At the time of the incident, how many years had you lived at that address? (If less than one year, please write in "0" and answer the next question. If one year or more, skip to Question 5).

_____ years

4. If you lived at that address for less than one year, how many months had you lived at that address?

_____ months

5. Fill in the box next to the response which best represents your current employment status:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Not employed - looking for work | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Not employed - on disability or retired |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Not employed - seasonal worker | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Not employed - not looking for work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Not employed - full or part-time student | <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Not employed - fulltime homemaker |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Employed - part-time | <input type="checkbox"/> 8. Employed - full-time |

If you are employed full or part-time, please answer all the questions in the shaded box. If you are not employed, skip to Question 10

6. What kind of work do you do? Briefly describe below:

7. How many hours a week do you typically work?

_____ hours per week

8. How do you usually get paid?

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Daily | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Weekly |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Every two weeks | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Monthly |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Other - specify _____ | |

9. What is your usual WEEKLY take home pay?

\$ _____ per week

10. At the time of the incident, was anyone else who lived with you working and contributing money to the household expenses?

1. No
 2. Yes

If someone else was living with you and contributing money to household expenses, please answer the questions in the shaded box. Otherwise, skip to Question 14

11. Fill in the box next to all the other people living with you who were contributing. You can fill in more than one box if more than one person contributed to household expenses.

- 1. Parents
- 2. Brothers/Sisters
- 3. Children
- 4. Husband/Boyfriend

If your husband or boyfriend was contributing to household expenses, answer the questions in the darker shaded box. Otherwise, skip to Question 14

12. If your husband or boyfriend was employed full or part time, did he usually get paid:

- 1. Daily
- 2. Weekly
- 3. Every two weeks
- 4. Monthly
- 5. Other - specify _____

13. If your husband or boyfriend was working, what was his WEEKLY take home pay?

\$ _____ per week

14. At the time of the incident, did your household regularly receive any money other than from work?

- 1. No
- 2. Yes

If your household received money from other sources, fill in the next question. Otherwise, skip to Question 16

15. If yes, where did this money come from? (Fill in the boxes for EVERY other source of income you or your husband or boyfriend regularly received money from. Fill in more than one box if you had more than one source of income)

- 1. Welfare (AFDC/WAGES)
- 2. Disability
- 3. Social Security/other retirement income
- 4. Income from savings account, bonds, etc
- 5. Money from friends and relatives
- 6. Another job
- 7. Hustling or taking odd jobs
- 8. Other - specify _____

16. Which of the following best describes your relationship with the person involved in the dispute at the time the incident occurred. Was he then your:

- 1. Ex-boyfriend
- 2. Ex-husband
- 3. Boyfriend, not living together
- 4. Boyfriend living together
- 5. Husband
- 6. Other - specify _____

If this was your husband or boyfriend, please answer the questions in the shaded box. Otherwise, skip to Question 21

17. How many years had you been together before this incident? (If less than one year, write in "0" and answer the next question. Otherwise skip to Question 19)

_____ years

18. If you had been together for less than one year, how many months had you been together at the time of the incident?

_____ months

19. How many children do you have together?

_____ children

How many children do you have from previous relationships that are presently living with you?

_____ children

21. Since the incident, has your relationship with this man changed because of this dispute?
- 1. No
 - 2. Don't Know
 - 3. Yes

If your relationship has changed, please answer the next question. Otherwise, skip to Question 23

22. What is your relationship now with this man?
- 1. Ex-boyfriend
 - 2. Ex-husband
 - 3. Boyfriend, not living together
 - 4. Boyfriend, living together
 - 5. Husband
 - 6. Other - specify _____

23. Please place a check (✓) in the boxes below that best reflect the way you think about things. There are no right or wrong answers. Check only one response for each statement. If you Strongly Disagree with the statement, check the SD box. If you Disagree, check the D box. If you Agree, check the A box and if you Strongly Agree check the SA box.

	SD	D	A	SA
Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce				
A woman getting drunk is worse than a man getting drunk				
Men should share in household tasks (such as washing the dishes and laundry) if women work outside the home				
Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers				
A woman should not expect to have quite the same freedom of action as a man				
Women should be given equal opportunity with men for all jobs				
Our government should do more to help battered women				
Wives try to get beaten by their husbands in order to get sympathy from others				
A woman who constantly refuses to have sex with her husband is asking to be beaten				
Wives could avoid being beaten by their husbands if they knew when to stop talking				
Even when women lie to their husbands they do not deserve to get a beating				
Women should be protected by law if their husbands beat them				
Sometimes it is OK for a man to beat his wife				
A sexually unfaithful wife deserves to be beaten				
Battered wives try to get their partners to beat them as a way to get attention from them				
The best way to deal with wife-beating is to arrest the husband				
Even when a wife's behavior challenges her husband's manhood, he is not justified in beating her				
No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener				
I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable				
I am quick to admit making a mistake				
I would let someone else be punished for my wrongdoing				
I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget				
I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my own way				
There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone				

24. When you are not working, how do you spend your time? (Fill in the boxes next to ALL the things that you do regularly. This means that you can fill in more than one box if you do more than one activity.)
- 1. Take classes
 - 2. Attend religious activities
 - 3. Work on hobbies
 - 4. Go to the gym
 - 5. Hang out with friends
 - 6. Other - specify _____

25. In order to understand how you spend your time, please place a check (✓) in the box marked "Yes" next to all the people listed below who you regularly spend time with in the course of a month. If you do not see them regularly in the course of a month, place a check in the "No" box.

	Regularly Spend Time	
	No	Yes
Your extended family (mother, father, sisters, brothers)		
Your husband/boyfriend's extended family (his mother, father, sisters, brothers)		
Your friends		
Your neighbors		
Your co-workers (outside of the work setting)		

26. In the past six months, have you spoken with any of your relatives (e.g., mother, father, sisters, brothers, etc) about your disputes with your husband/boyfriend?

1. No

2. Yes

If you have spoken with your relatives about this problem, answer the questions in the shaded box
Otherwise, skip to Question 29

27. Were they critical of your husband/boyfriend's violence?

1. Never

2. Sometimes

3. Usually

28. Were they critical of your actions?

1. Never

2. Sometimes

3. Usually

29. In the past six months, have you spoken with any of your friends, neighbors or co-workers about your disputes with your husband/boyfriend?

1. No

2. Yes

If you have spoken with your friends, neighbors or co-workers about this problem, answer the questions in the shaded box. Otherwise, skip to Question 32

30. Were they critical of your husband/boyfriend's violence?

1. Never

2. Sometimes

3. Usually

31. Were they critical of your actions?

1. Never

2. Sometimes

3. Usually

We are going to ask some questions about your feelings about the incident, court process, and whether you think domestic violence counseling would be helpful for families that end up in court.

32. Were there any injuries you sustained as a result of the incident which brought your husband/boyfriend to court?

1. No

2. Yes

If you yes, answer the questions in the shaded box. Otherwise, go to Question 35

33. What injuries did you suffer from this incident? (Fill in ALL the boxes next to ALL the injuries sustained):

1. Black and blue marks

2. Cuts and bruises - not requiring stitches

3. Cuts and bruises - requiring stitches

4. Burns

5. Broken bones

6. Gun shot wounds

34. Did the injuries from this incident require that you be hospitalized?

1. No

2. Hospital emergency room only

3. Hospital overnight stay for one or more nights

35. Do you think the incident that brought your husband/boyfriend to court should be considered a crime?

1. No

2. Yes

36. Do you think that you were responsible for this incident?

1. Not at all responsible

2. Somewhat responsible

3. Equally responsible

4. Completely responsible

37. Do you think the sentence he received for this incident was fair?

1. Very unfair

2. Unfair

3. Fair

4. Very fair

38. Have you ever been in a violent romantic relationship in the past?
 1. No 2. Yes
39. Do you think counseling offered through the courts could help your husband/boyfriend avoid violent disputes in the future?
 1. No 2. Maybe 3. Yes
40. Do you think that your husband/boyfriend could quit being violent to you without counseling?
 1. No 2. Maybe 3. Yes
41. What do you think the chances are that your husband/boyfriend would hit you in the next year? Please rate the chances on a scale of 0 (not a chance) to 100% (it will definitely happen). Circle the answer which best describes the likelihood of this event.

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%
 No 50/50 Sure to
 Chance Chance Happen

42. How safe do you feel with your husband/boyfriend?
 1. Very unsafe 2. Somewhat unsafe
 3. Safe 4. Very safe
43. Please look at the list of actions which one might take when their partner is violent. If you have previously taken that action in response to your husband/boyfriend's violence, either in response to this most recent incident or sometime before that, check (✓) the "Yes" box. If you have not used a particular action in response to his violence, check "No".

Actions Taken In Response to Partner's Past Violence:	No	Yes
Told him not to do that again		
Was angry with him for a period of time		
Did not speak with him for a period of time		
Threatened to tell family, friends, neighbors or co-workers about his violence		
Threatened to leave the relationship		
Threatened to call the police or have him arrested		
Found out about services available for battered women		
Told family, friends, neighbors or co-workers about his violence		
Called (or had someone call) the police		
Left the relationship temporarily and stayed with family or friends		
Left the relationship and went to a woman's shelter		
Left the relationship permanently and/or began divorce proceedings		

44. When you were growing up, how often did you see your parents physically fight?
 1. Never

2. Rarely
 3. Sometimes
 4. Frequently

**If your parents ever physically fought, complete the questions in the shaded box.
 Otherwise, skip to Question 47**

45. Who usually was the first person to become violent?
 1. Father 2. Mother 3. Sometimes father and sometimes mother

46. Who usually ended up worse off for it?
 1. Father 2. Mother 3. Sometimes father and sometimes mother

47. When you were growing up, were you ever sexually abused?

1. No
 2. Yes

If you were sexually abused, answer the next question. Otherwise, skip to Question 49

48. Who sexually abused you?

1. Father 2. Step-father
 3. Mother's boyfriend 4. Grandfather
 5. Brother, uncle, or other relative 6. Close family friend
 7. Stranger 8. Other - specify _____

49. When you were growing up, how often did your parents hit or beat you?

1. Never
 2. Rarely
 3. Sometimes
 4. Frequently

If you were ever hit or beat by your parents, answer the questions in the shaded box.
Otherwise, skip to Question 53

50. Who typically hit or beat you?

1. Father 2. Mother 3. Sometimes father and sometimes mother

51. Did injuries ever result from a parental hitting or beating?

1. No 2. Yes

52. What injuries did you suffer? (Fill in ALL the boxes for ALL the injuries sustained)

1. No injuries ever resulted 2. Black and blue marks
 3. Cuts and bruises - not requiring stitches 4. Cuts and bruises - requiring stitches
 5. Burns 6. Broken bones

53. How many alcoholic drinks does your husband/boyfriend usually consume in a typical drinking episode?
(By "drink" we mean a drink with a shot of 1.5 ounces or hard liquor, 12 ounces of beer, or 5 ounces of wine.)

of hard liquor drinks _____ # of beers _____ # of glasses of wine _____

54. How many days a week does he usually drink?

of days per week _____

55. Were either or both of you drinking right before the incident which ended up in court?

1. Neither my partner nor I were drinking at that time
 2. I was the only one drinking at that time
 3. My partner was the only one drinking at that time
 4. Both my partner and I were drinking at that time

56. Were either or both of you using illegal drugs right before the incident which ended up in court?

1. Neither my partner nor I were using drugs at that time
 2. I was the only one using drugs at the time
 3. My partner was the only one using drugs at the time
 4. Both my partner and I were using drugs at the time

PLEASE CONTINUE ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

57. No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, want different things from each other, or just have spats or fights because they are in a bad mood, tired, or for some other reason. Couples also have many different ways of trying to settle their differences. This is a list of things that might happen when you have differences. Place a check(✓) in the box indicating how many times the man you were involved with at the time of the incident did them in the past six months. If he did not do one of these things in the past six months, but it happened before, check the box saying, "Not in the past 6 months but it did happen".

	In the past 6 months:				Not in past 6 months but it has happened before
	Never	1 Time	2-3 Times	6 or More Times	
My partner showed care for me even though we disagreed					
My partner explained his side of a disagreement to me					
My partner insulted or swore at me					
My partner threw something at me that could hurt					
My partner twisted my arm or hair					
I had a sprain, bruise or small cut because of a fight with my partner					
My partner showed respect for my feelings about an issue					
My partner made me have sex without a condom					
My partner pushed or shoved me					
My partner used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make me have oral or anal sex					
My partner used a knife or gun on me					
I passed out from being hit on the head by my partner in a fight					
My partner called me fat, ugly or some other insult					
My partner punched or hit me with something that could hurt					
My partner destroyed something belonging to me					
I went to a doctor because of a fight with my partner					
My partner choked me					
My partner shouted or yelled at me					
My partner slammed me against the wall					
My partner said he was sure we could work out a problem					
I needed to see a doctor because of a fight with my partner but I didn't					
My partner beat me up					
My partner grabbed me					
My partner used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make me have sex					
My partner stomped out of the room or house or yard during a disagreement					
My partner insisted on sex when I did not want to (but did not use physical force)					
My partner slapped me					
I had a broken bone from a fight with my partner					
My partner used threats to make me have oral or anal sex					
My partner suggested a compromise to a disagreement					
My partner burned or scalded me on purpose					
My partner insisted I have oral or anal sex (but did not use physical force).					
My partner accused me of being a lousy lover					
My partner did something to spite me					
My partner threatened to hit or throw something at me					
I felt physical pain that still hurt the next day because of a fight we had					
My partner kicked me					
My partner used threats to make me have sex					
My partner agreed to try a solution to a disagreement I suggested					

Victim's Second Interview

Florida Atlantic University is continuing the study for the Department of Justice on how Broward County handles family disputes. As before, your answers will be completely private and confidential. In order to make sure that no one will know your answers, please do NOT put your name or any identifying information on this questionnaire. In all of the questions below, when we refer to the "incident" we are speaking about the event which led to your boyfriend/husband's court appearance resulting his conviction for domestic violence approximately 6 months ago.

Unless otherwise told, please fill in the box next to the best answer or fill in the blank.

1. In the months since this man was sentenced, how many of the past 6 months were you doing each of the following. Write in the number of months (from 0 to 6) for each:

- (4) Unemployed - looking for work _____ months
- (5) Unemployed - not looking for work _____ months
- (6) Unemployed - full time homemaker _____ months
- (7) Unemployed - on disability or retired _____ months
- (8) Working - part time _____ months
- (9) Working - full time _____ months

2. Referring to the man involved in the domestic violence incident leading to the court appearance, what has been your relationship with him since he was sentenced in court 6 months ago? Have you:

Check the ONE response which best characterizes your relationship

- (10) •Not had any contact with him since he was sentenced 1. No 2. Yes
- (11) •Had contact with him after he was sentenced but are not seeing him now 1. No 2. Yes
- (12) •Occasionally have had contact with him though not romantically involved 1. No 2. Yes
- (13) •Seeing him now though not living with them 1. No 2. Yes
- (14) •Living with him now 1. No 2. Yes

If you are or were having any contact with this man in the last 6 months, answer the questions in the shaded box. Otherwise, skip to Question 10

3. How frequent is (or was) your contact with him?

- (15) 1. Daily 2. Weekly
- 3. Monthly 4. Occasionally

4. Has he been involved in any domestic disputes with you since he was sentenced 6 months ago?

Note - Check ALL that apply

- (16) 1. None at all
- (17) 2. You obtained a restraining order against him
- (18) 3. One or more but it has not come to the police or probation's attention
- (19) 4. One or more and on at least one occasion the police or probation have been involved
- (20) 5. One or more which has resulted in probation beginning violation procedures against him
- (21) 6. One or more which has resulted in his probation being revoked
- (22) 7. One or more which has resulted in his arrest
- (23) 8. One or more which has resulted in new charges against him
- (24) 9. One or more which has resulted in his being sent to jail

5. Were there any injuries sustained as a result of any of these incidents?

- (25) 1. No
- 2. Yes

If yes, answer the questions in the darkest shaded box. Otherwise, go to Question 8

6. What injuries did you suffer from these incidents? **Note: Check ALL that apply.**
- (26) 1. No physical injuries resulted 2. Black and blue marks
 3. Cuts and bruises - not requiring stitches 4. Cuts and bruises - requiring stitches
 5. Burns 6. Broken bones
 7. Gun shot or knife wounds 8. Other - specify _____

7. Did the injuries from any of these incidents require that you be hospitalized?
- (27) 1. No
 2. Hospital emergency room only
 3. Hospital overnight stay for one or more nights

If there has been additional domestic disputes since this man was sentenced, answer Questions 8 & 9 below. Otherwise, skip to Question 10

8. Did you notify any of the following agencies about these incidents and, if you did, were they helpful?

	Had No Contact	If contacted, did you find them:		
		Very Helpful	Helpful	Not At All Helpful
(28) Police				
(29) State Attorney's Victim Advocates				
(30) Probation				
(31) Women in Distress				

If you have been in contact with the above agencies since this man was sentenced, answer Question 9. Otherwise, skip to Question 10

9. If you were in contact with any of the above agencies since he was sentenced, what information did they provide to you? (Check ALL that apply)
- (32) 1. They did not provide me with any information
(33) 2. They provided me with my rights as a victim
(34) 3. Information on how to document new incidences of violence
(35) 4. Information on how to get a restraining order
(36) 5. Information on how to develop a safety plan
(37) 6. Information on the potential dangerousness of battering mates
(38) 7. Information on how to make and follow-up on police reports
(39) 8. Information on how to pursue charges with the State Attorney's Office
(40) 9. Availability of counseling or support groups for victims of domestic violence
(41) 10. Other - Specify _____

10. Was the man involved in the incident ordered by the judge into domestic violence counseling?
- (42) 1. No 2. Don't know
 3. Yes

11. If he was ordered by the judge into domestic violence counseling, did he go?
- (43) 1. Don't know
 2. No - he was not ordered to go
 3. No - he was ordered but did not go
 4. Yes - he was ordered into counseling but does not regularly attend
 5. Yes - he was ordered into counseling and regularly attends

If he was ordered and/or has gone for domestic violence counseling since being sentenced, answer Question 12. Otherwise, skip to Question 18

12. What is the name of the domestic violence counseling program which he attends?
- (44) 1. Don't know - don't see him anymore 2. See him but don't know the name of the program
 3. Family Service Agency 4. 5th Street Counseling
 5. Glass House 6. Lifeline of Miami
 7. Other - Specify _____

13. Has this domestic violence counseling program contacted you since this man began treatment?
- 1. Never contacted
 - 2. Contacted once
 - (45) 3. Contacted twice
 - 4. Contacted three or more times

If this counseling program has contacted you, answer Question 14. Otherwise, skip to Question 15

14. What information did they provide to you? (Check ALL that apply)

- (46) 1. They did not provide me with any information
- (47) 2. They provided me with my rights as a victim
- (48) 3. Information on how to document new incidences of violence
- (49) 4. Information on how to get a restraining order
- (50) 5. Information on how to develop a safety plan
- (51) 6. Information on the potential dangerousness of battering mates
- (52) 7. Information on how to make and follow-up on police reports
- (53) 8. Information on how to pursue charges with the State Attorney's Office
- (54) 9. Availability of counseling or support groups for victims of domestic violence
- (55) 10. Other - Specify _____

15. Do you think the court ordered domestic violence counseling helped this man avoid being physically violent these past 6 months?

- (56) 1. Don't know - don't see him anymore
- 2. Counseling did not help
- 3. Unsure if counseling helped
- 4. Counseling definitely helped

16. Do you think that the court ordered domestic violence counseling helped this man avoid being abusive in non-physical ways these past 6 months?

- (57) 1. Don't know - don't see him anymore
- 2. Counseling did not help
- 3. Unsure if counseling helped
- 4. Counseling definitely helped

17. Do you think that the court ordered domestic violence counseling improved your relationship with this man these past 6 months?

- (58) 1. Don't know - don't see him anymore
- 2. Counseling did not help
- 3. Unsure if counseling helped
- 4. Counseling definitely helped

18. What do you think the chances are that the man involved in this dispute would hit you in the next year? Please rate the chances on a scale of 0% (Not A Chance) to 100% (It Will Definitely Happen). Circle the answer which best describes the likelihood of this event.

	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
(59)	No					50/50					Sure to
	Chance					Chance					Happen

19. How safe do you feel with this man?

- (60) 1. I don't see him anymore
- 2. Very unsafe
- 3. Somewhat unsafe
- 4. Safe
- 5. Very safe

20. Has this man had any contact with you since being sentenced in court?

1. No

(61) 2. Yes

If this man has had any contact with you since being sentenced, answer Question 20.
Otherwise, skip this question

21. No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, want different things from each other, or just have spats or fights because they are in a bad mood, tired, or for some other reason. Couples also have many different ways of trying to settle their differences. This is a list of things that might happen when you have differences. Please place a check (✓) in the box indicating how many times the man involved in this incident did each of these things in the 6 months since he was in court and sentenced. If he did not do one of these things in the past six months, but it happened before, check the box saying, "Not in the past 6 months but it did happen".

	In the past 6 months:				Not in past 6 Months but it has happened before
	Never	1 Time	2 - 5 Times	6 or More Times	
(62) My partner showed care for me even though we disagreed					
(63) My partner explained his side of a disagreement to me					
(64) My partner insulted or swore at me					
(65) My partner threw something at me that could hurt					
(66) My partner twisted my arm or hair					
(67) I had a sprain, bruise or small cut because of a fight with my partner					
(68) My partner showed respect for my feelings about an issue					
(69) My partner made me have sex without a condom					
(70) My partner pushed or shoved me					
(71) My partner used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make me have oral or anal sex					
(72) My partner used a knife or gun on me					
(73) I passed out from being hit on the head by my partner in a fight					
(74) My partner called me fat, ugly or some other insult					
(75) My partner punched or hit me with something that could hurt					
(76) My partner destroyed something belonging to me					
(77) I went to a doctor because of a fight with my partner					
(78) My partner choked me					
(79) My partner shouted or yelled at me					
(80) My partner slammed me against the wall					
(81) My partner said he was sure we could work out a problem					
(82) I needed to see a doctor because of a fight with my partner but I didn't					
(83) My partner beat me up					
(84) My partner grabbed me					
(85) My partner used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make me have sex					
(86) My partner stomped out of the room or house or yard during a disagreement					
(87) My partner insisted on sex when I did not want to (but did not use physical force)					
(88) My partner slapped me					
(89) I had a broken bone from a fight with my partner					
(90) My partner used threats to make me have oral or anal sex					
(91) My partner suggested a compromise to a disagreement					
(92) My partner burned or scalded me on purpose					
(93) My partner insisted I have oral or anal sex (but did not use physical force)					
(94) My partner accused me of being a lousy lover					
(95) My partner did something to spite me					
(96) My partner threatened to hit or throw something at me					
(97) I felt physical pain that still hurt the next day because of a fight we had					
(98) My partner kicked me					
(99) My partner used threats to make me have sex					
(100) My partner agreed to try a solution to a disagreement I suggested					

Victim's THIRD Interview

Florida Atlantic University is continuing the study for the Department of Justice on how Broward County handles family disputes. As before, your answers will be completely private and confidential. In all of the questions below, when we refer to the "incident" we are speaking about the event which led to your boyfriend/husband's court appearance resulting his conviction for domestic violence approximately 12 months ago. The period of time that all the questions refer to is 6 months to one year after this incident.

1. In this period of time, how many of the past 6 months were you doing each of the following. Write in the number of months (from 0 to 6) for each:

- (4) Unemployed - looking for work _____ months
- (5) Unemployed - not looking for work _____ months
- (6) Unemployed - full time homemaker _____ months
- (7) Unemployed - on disability or retired _____ months
- (8) Working - part time _____ months
- (9) Working - full time _____ months

2. Referring to the man involved in the domestic violence incident leading to the court appearance, what has been your relationship with him during this 6 month period? Have you:

Check the one response which best characterizes your relationship

- (10) •Not had any contact with him since he was sentenced 1. No 2. Yes
- (11) •Had contact with him after he was sentenced but are not seeing him now 1. No 2. Yes
- (12) •Occasionally have had contact with him though not romantically involved 1. No 2. Yes
- (13) •Seeing him now though not living with them 1. No 2. Yes
- (14) •Living with him now 1. No 2. Yes

If you are or were having any contact with this man in this 6 month period, answer the questions in the shaded box. Otherwise, skip to Question 8

3. How frequent during this 6 month period has your contact with him been?
- 1. Daily 2. Weekly
 - (15) 3. Monthly 4. Occasionally

4. Has he been involved in any domestic disputes with you in this 6 month time pd? Check all that apply

- (16) 1. None at all
- (17) 2. You obtained a restraining order against him
- (18) 3. One or more but it has not come to the police or probation's attention
- (19) 4. One or more and on at least one occasion the police or probation have been involved
- (20) 5. One or more which has resulted in probation beginning violation procedures against him
- (21) 6. One or more which has resulted in his probation being revoked
- (22) 7. One or more which has resulted in his arrest
- (23) 8. One or more which has resulted in new charges against him
- (24) 9. One or more which has resulted in his being sent to jail

5. Were there any injuries sustained as a result of any of these incidents?

- 1. No
- (25) 2. Yes

If yes, answer the questions in the darkest shaded box. Otherwise, go to Question 8

6. What injuries did you suffer from these incidents? Note - CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

- (27) 1. No physical injuries resulted 5. Black and blue marks (31)
- (28) 2. Cuts and bruises - not requiring stitches 6. Cuts and bruises - requiring stitches (32)
- (29) 3. Burns 7. Broken bones (33)
- (30) 4. Gun shot or knife wounds 8. Other - specify _____ (34)

Did the injuries from any of these incidents require that you be hospitalized?

- 1. No
- (35) 2. Hospital emergency room only
- 3. Hospital overnight stay for one or more nights

8. Have any of these agencies been in contact with you and were they helpful?

	Had No Contact	If contacted, did you find them :		
		Very Helpful	Helpful	Not At All Helpful
(36) Police				
(37) State Attorney's Victim Advocates				
(38) Probation				
(39) Women in Distress				

9. Was the man involved in the incident ordered by the judge into domestic violence counseling?

1. No 2. Don't know

(40) 3. Yes

10. If he was ordered by the judge into domestic violence counseling, did he go?

1. Don't know
 2. No - he was not ordered to go
 3. No - he was ordered but did not go
 4. Yes - he was ordered into counseling but does not regularly attend
 5. Yes - he was ordered into counseling and regularly attends

(41)

If he was ordered and/or has gone for domestic violence counseling since being sentenced, answer Questions 11-15. OTHERWISE, SKIP TO QUESTION 16

11. What is the name of the domestic violence counseling program which he attends?

1. Don't know - don't see him anymore 2. See him but don't know the name of the program
 3. Family Service Agency 4. 5th Street Counseling
 5. Glass House 6. Lifeline of Miami
 7. Other - Specify _____

(42)

12. Has this domestic violence counseling program contacted you since this man began treatment?

1. Never contacted me
 2. Contacted me once but I told them to not contact me again
 3. Contacted me once
 4. Contacted me twice
 5. Contacted me three or more times

(43)

13. Do you think the court ordered domestic violence counseling helped this man avoid being physically violent these past 6 months?

1. Don't know - don't see him anymore 2. Counseling did not help
 3. Unsure if counseling helped 4. Counseling definitely helped

(44)

14. Do you think that the court ordered domestic violence counseling helped this man avoid being abusive in non-physical ways these past 6 months?

1. Don't know - don't see him anymore 2. Counseling did not help
 3. Unsure if counseling helped 4. Counseling definitely helped

(45)

15. Do you think that the court ordered domestic violence counseling improved your relationship with this man these past 6 months?

1. Don't know - don't see him anymore 2. Counseling did not help
 3. Unsure if counseling helped 4. Counseling definitely helped

(46)

16. What do you think the chances are that the man involved in this dispute would hit you in the next year? Please rate the chances on a scale of 0 % (Not A Chance) to 100% (It Will Definitely Happen). Circle the answer which best describes the likelihood of this event.

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%
 No Chance 50/50 Chance Sure to Happen

(47)

17. How safe do you feel with this man?

1. I don't see him anymore 2. Very unsafe 3. Somewhat unsafe
 4. Safe 5. Very safe

(48)

18. Have you had *any* contact with this man in this 6 month period of time? Make sure to define & explore what you mean by contact when asking this question. (Contact includes any intentional or unintentional physical or *non*-physical interaction.)

- 19) 1. No
 2. Yes

If this man has had any contact with you since being sentenced, answer Question 19.
OTHERWISE, SKIP THIS QUESTION

19. No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, want different things from each other, or just have spats or fights because they are in a bad mood, tired, or for some other reason. Couples also have many different ways of trying to settle their differences. This is a list of things that might happen when you have differences. Please place a check (✓) in the box indicating how many times the man involved in this incident did each of these things in the 6 months since he was in court and sentenced. If he did not do one of these things in the past six months, but it happened before, check the box saying, "Not in this 6 month time period but it did happen"

	In this 6 month period:				Not in this 6 mth period but it's happened before
	Never	1 Time	2 - 5 Times	6 or More Times	
(50) My partner showed care for me even though we disagreed					
(51) My partner explained his side of a disagreement to me					
(52) My partner insulted or swore at me					
(53) My partner threw something at me that could hurt					
(54) My partner twisted my arm or hair					
(55) I had a sprain, bruise or small cut because of a fight with my partner					
(56) My partner showed respect for my feelings about an issue					
(57) My partner made me have sex without a condom					
(58) My partner pushed or shoved me					
(59) My partner used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make me have oral or anal sex					
(60) My partner used a knife or gun on me					
(61) I passed out from being hit on the head by my partner in a fight					
(62) My partner called me fat, ugly or some other insult					
(63) My partner punched or hit me with something that could hurt					
(64) My partner destroyed something belonging to me					
(65) I went to a doctor because of a fight with my partner					
(66) My partner choked me					
(67) My partner shouted or yelled at me					
(68) My partner slammed me against the wall					
(69) My partner said he was sure we could work out a problem					
(70) I needed to see a doctor because of a fight with my partner but I didn't					
(71) My partner beat me up					
(72) My partner grabbed me					
(73) My partner used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make me have sex					
(75) My partner stomped out of the room or house or yard during a disagreement					
(76) My partner insisted on sex when I did not want to (but did not use physical force)					
(77) My partner slapped me					
(78) I had a broken bone from a fight with my partner					
(79) My partner used threats to make me have oral or anal sex					
(80) My partner suggested a compromise to a disagreement					
(81) My partner burned or scalded me on purpose					
(82) My partner insisted I have oral or anal sex (but did not use physical force)					
(83) My partner accused me of being a lousy lover					
(84) My partner did something to spite me					
(85) My partner threatened to hit or throw something at me					
(86) I felt physical pain that still hurt the next day because of a fight we had					
(87) My partner kicked me					
(88) My partner used threats to make me have sex					
(89) My partner agreed to try a solution to a disagreement I suggested					

20. Referring to the incident that brought this man to court almost one year ago, did you wish to see him prosecuted?

(90) 1. No

2. Yes

21. If NO, provide the reasons that you were opposed to his being brought to court: Check ALL that apply

(91) 1. Fear he will retaliate/make things worse 6. Love him (96)

(92) 2. Financial considerations 7. Don't want him hurt (97)

(93) 3. Fear of family pressures 8. Don't want to loose him (98)

(94) 4. Worry about impact on children 9. He agreed to get help (99)

(95) 5. Lack faith in crim justice system 10. Other - specify (100)

22. If YES, provide the reasons that you supported his being brought to court: Check ALL that apply

(101) 1. Criminal justice officials encouraged prosecution

(102) 2. Family/friends encouraged prosecution

(103) 3. Severity of injuries demanded prosecution

(104) 4. Did not believe that he would change

(105) 5. Abuse was on-going over long period of time

(106) 6. Believed that prosecution would be the only way he'd get help

(107) 7. Fear that he would seriously hurt her next time

(108) 8. Fear that he would hurt the children next time

(109) 9. Relationship was over - wanted to be left alone

(110) 10. Wanted him to be punished

(111) 11. Other - specify

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE SURVEY

Coding Probation Folder II

Code Number: _____

Date Adjudicated: ____ - ____ - ____

PO Initials: _____

Coder Initials: _____

Term Date: ____ - ____ - ____

Programs Ordered by Court:

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> None | <input type="checkbox"/> No alcohol/drug use | <input type="checkbox"/> Alcohol/drug treatment (includes AA) | <input type="checkbox"/> Community service |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No harmful contact | <input type="checkbox"/> Alcohol/drug evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> Domestic violence counseling | <input type="checkbox"/> Jail time - ____ S/ ____ TS da |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No contact | <input type="checkbox"/> Random alcohol/drug testing | <input type="checkbox"/> Parenting classes | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Note if under another agency's custody: _____

Dates of Dual Custody (From When to When-Mth/Yr): ____ - ____ to ____ - ____

First Probation Appointment (as per prob appt form): ____ - ____ - ____

First Actual Apptmt: ____ - ____ - ____

TIMELINE:

May '97	June '97	July '97	Aug '97	Sept '97	Oct '97	Nov '97	Dec '97	Jan '98
Feb '98	March '98	April '98	May '98	June '98	July '98	Aug '98	Sept '98	Oct '98

MAKE SURE TO INDICATE ALL SIGNIFICANT OCCURRENCES AND ACCOUNT FOR ALL TIME ON TIMELINE ALONG WITH THEIR DATES

ADJD=adjudicated PROBMTG=prob meeting (indicate S/R/M) ARNST=arrest DV ARNST=domestic violence arrest VOP=violation of probation
 VOPHRING=violation of prob hearing REVKD=prob revoked RELSD=released ER=early release E OF T=end of term

Indicate time under probation supervision and free from problems in community in **PINK** (This includes successful mail-ins)
 Indicate time in community but not coming into probation though not VOP in **BLUE** (provide reason - not keeping appointments etc)
 Indicate time in community VOP in **YELLOW**
 Indicate time not in community in **GREEN** (provide reason - in jail, prison, hospital, treatment center etc)

WRITTEN MONTHLY REPORTS:

	Rept Mth	Residential Address	Phone Number	Employment History			Sub Use? Y N	Prgs Atnded DV DUI SA CS PET AM	Arrests Tickets or Citations (Date & Explain)
				Employer Type Wk	U F/T P/T S D	Mthly Earnings			
PI Form							X	XX	XXXXXX

ALCOHOL/DRUG TESTING:

- 0 No alcohol or drug testing done
 1 Alcohol or drug testing done on one or more occasions

Date	Amphetamines	Alcohol	THC (Marijuana)	Cocaine	Opiates	Barbituates	Benzodiapines	Creatinine
1								
2								
3								

■ Compliance with Program Rules:

- | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| Arrived on time for group session | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Non-compliant | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Compliant | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 Not Applicable | <input type="checkbox"/> 9 Missing |
| Participated in group discussions | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Non-compliant | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Compliant | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 Not Applicable | <input type="checkbox"/> 9 Missing |
| Completed homework assignments | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Non-compliant | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Compliant | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 Not Applicable | <input type="checkbox"/> 9 Missing |
| Complied with contract terms with provider | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Non-compliant | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Compliant | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 Not Applicable | <input type="checkbox"/> 9 Missing |

■ Progress:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Denied violence | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 Accepted responsibility |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Unknown because of silence | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 Developed insight into problem |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Placed blame on victim | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 Not applicable |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Accepted responsibility but sees as external problem | <input type="checkbox"/> 9 Missing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Accepted responsibility but minimized | |

● ■ Prognosis:

- | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Poor | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Guarded | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Good | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 Not Applicable | <input type="checkbox"/> 9 Missing |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|

VIOLATION OF PROBATION:

- 0 Never violated
1 Violated

VOP Date Affadavit	Reasons for VOP	Date Signd By Judge	Date Warnt Issued	Date VOP Hearing	R&S D	V&R	Outcome

P Pending/R&S Revoked and Sentences/V&R Violated and Reinstated/D Dismissed/(charges dismissed – not warrant)

Reasons for VOP:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1 Failed to rept/come to probation or mail in mthly | 7 Failed to complete court-ordered program other than DV or SA (eg, PET or CS) |
| 2 Failed to pay for cost of supervision (COS) | 8 Continuing to harass victim |
| 3 Used substances (includes testing positive) | 9 Additional domestic violence arrest |
| 4 Failed to enroll/attend SA program | 10 Additional non-domestic violence arrest |
| 5 Failed to enroll/attend/terminated DV program | 11 Additional convictions |
| 6 Violation of other minor conditions of probation (eg chging residence, employment, carrying weapon, not working) | 12 Other (specify): _____ |

If violation for ... or condition of probation, note:

If additional arrests, note:

INDIVIDUAL'S STATUS AT CLOSE OF PROBATION:

1 Probation revoked:

Date Revoked: ____ - ____ - ____

Sentence: ____ days ____ months ____ years

Present Whereabouts of Individual: _____ (Include phone)

2 Violation of probation or in process of being violated:

Date Prob VOP'd (as per Prob Affidavit): ____ - ____ - ____

Last Known Whereabouts of individual: _____ (Include phone)

3 Probation Completed:

Terminated: ____ - ____ - ____

Was it a (check one): 1 Successful Termination 2 Unsuccessful Termination

Provide Reason for Termination: _____

Regularly Completed: ____ - ____ - ____

MOST UPDATED INFORMATION ON VICTIM:

Name: _____

Address: _____

Home Ph: _____

Work Ph: _____

Coding Probation Folder - Final Numeric Coding

(p001) Code # _____ Probation Officer _____ (p002)

(p003) Date Adjudicated _____ - _____ - _____

(p004) End of Term _____ - _____ - _____

(p005) End of Prob Suprvsn _____ - _____ - _____ (code 88-88-88 if N/A)

(p006) First Probation Apptmt _____ - _____ - _____ First Actual Apptmt _____ - _____ - _____ (p007)

Programs Ordered by Court (0 = No 1 = Yes)

- | | | |
|--|---|-------------------|
| (p008) _____ None | _____ Alcohol/drug treatment | (p014) |
| (p009) _____ No harmful contact | _____ Domestic violence counseling | (p015) |
| (p010) _____ No contact | _____ Parenting classes | (p016) |
| (p011) _____ No alcohol/drug use | _____ Community service | (p017) |
| (p012) _____ Alcohol/drug evaluation | _____ Jail time (If No, Code = 888 below) | (p018) |
| (p013) _____ Random alcohol/drug testing | _____ Sentenced | _____ Time Served |
| | (p019) | (p020) |

Timeline Breakdown (Use .5 increments):

- (p021) _____ Number of months supervised via mail-in probation
- (p022) _____ Number of months in pink
- (p023) _____ Number of months in blue
- (p024) _____ Number of months in yellow
- (p025) _____ Number of months in green

(p026) _____	1. Jail/Prison	3. Hospital	5. Absconded
	2. Res Tx Ctr/Halfway House	4. Psychiatric Center	8. Not Applicable

(p027) _____	1. Jail/Prison	3. Hospital	5. Absconded
	2. Res Tx Ctr/Halfway House	4. Psychiatric Center	8. Not Applicable

(p029) _____	Number of months of overlapping custody supervision while in the community		
--------------	--	--	--

(p030) _____	1. State Probation	3. Other County Prob	8. Not Applicable
	2. Federal Probation	4. House Arrest	

(p031) _____	Color at close of probation supervision (E of T or ER):				
	1. Pink	2. Blue	3. Yellow	4. Green	5. No Color

(p032) _____	If No Color (#5), note reason				
	_____ # Mtgs Scheduled	_____ # Mtgs Showed	_____ # Mtgs Missd	_____ # Mtgs Mail In	
	(p033)	(p034)	(p035)	(p036)	

Probation Written Monthly Reports

(p037) _____ How many months out of twelve, not including PI Form, are there written monthly reports (Code 0 if never reported to Probation)?

(p038) _____ How many different moves were made while reporting to Probation? (Code 0 if man never moved and 88 if N/A since no WMRs available.)

(p039) _____ How many different places did they live in? (Else code 88)

How many months while reporting to Probation was the person:

(p040) _____	working part-time or full-time	_____ student/disabled	(p042)
(p041) _____	unemployed	_____ information missing	(p043)

(p044) _____ How many different places did the person work at while reporting to Probation?

(p045) _____ What was their AVERAGE monthly income while working reported to Probation (do not include while unemployed or monies from disability)?

How many months did the person attend (Code 88 if N/A since no WMRs):

- | | | | |
|--------------|--|--------------------------------------|--------|
| (p046) _____ | DV Counseling? | _____ Community Service? | (p049) |
| (p047) _____ | DUI Classes? | _____ Parent Effectiveness Training? | (p050) |
| (p048) _____ | Substance Abuse? | _____ Anger Management Classes? | (p051) |
| (p052) _____ | Date of last successful contact with probation (Code 8s if never reported to Prob) | | |

Alcohol/Drug Testing

(p053) ___ Alcohol/drug testing done (0 = No 1 = Yes)?

(p054) ___	Number of times testing done? (Code 88 if N/A)	
	Positive results ever found on (0 = No 1 = Yes 8 = N/A):	
(p055) ___	Amphetamines	Opiates (p059) ___
(p056) ___	Alcohol	Barbituates (p060) ___
(p057) ___	THC (Marijuana)	Benzodiazepines (p061) ___
(p058) ___	Cocaine	Creatinine (p062) ___

Domestic Violence Counseling

(p063) ___ Was he mandated into counseling (provide code 0 - 3)? If yes (code 2 or 3), provide following:

(p064) ___	Treatment Type (code 1 - 7 or 8 for N/A)
(p065) ___	Fee (Code 888 if N/A)
(p066) ___	Defendant attended tx (0 = Never Attended 1 = Attended 8 = N/A). If attended:
(p067) ___	Date Tx Began - - - - - Date Tx Ended (p068) ___
(p069) ___	Number of reports in probation folder. For each report note:
	Participation in Group (88 if Not Applicable):
(p070) ___	Initiates (number of attended sessions)
(p071) ___	Moderately Active (number of attended sessions)
(p072) ___	Tends When Addressed (number of attended sessions)
(p073) ___	Acceptable (number of attended sessions)
(p074) ___	Speaks Only When Addressed (1 % number of attended sessions)
	Attitude Towards Group (88 if Not Applicable):
(p075) ___	Always Positive (number of attended sessions)
(p076) ___	Usually Positive (number of attended sessions)
(p077) ___	Usually Negative (number of attended sessions)
(p078) ___	Always Negative (number of attended sessions)
	Progress (88 if Not Applicable):
(p079) ___	Rapid (number of attended sessions)
(p080) ___	Satisfactory (number of attended sessions)
(p081) ___	Slow (number of attended sessions)
(p082) ___	Little (number of attended sessions)
	Number of Group Sessions (Code 88 if N/A):
	(p083) Assigned (p084) Attended (p085) Documented (p086) Missed
(p087) ___	Is a Termination or Summary Report available (code below 0, 1 or 2)?
	0 No Discharge or Termination Summary (defendant never attended treatment)
	1 No Discharge or Termination Summary - information missing. If so:
(p088) ___	1 Defendant completed program
	2 Defendant did not complete program
	3 Cannot Know if defendant completed program
	2 Termination or Discharge Report Available.
	If Termination or Discharge Report available, answer the following questions:
	Termination Report:
(p089) ___	Attendance (8 if Not Applicable):
	4. Excellent 2. Acceptable
	3. Good 1. Needs Improvement

(p1090) **Participation in Group (8 if Not Applicable):**
 5. Initiates
 4. Moderately Active
 3. Tends When Addressed
 2. Acceptable
 1. Speaks Only When Addressed

(p1091) **Attitude Towards Group (8 if Not Applicable):**
 4. Always Positive
 3. Usually Positive
 2. Usually Negative
 1. Always Negative

(p1092) **Progress (8 if Not Applicable):**
 4. Rapid
 3. Satisfactory
 2. Slow
 1. Little

Discharge Summary:

(p1093) Reason for Discharge (code 1 through 8 with 88 for N/A)

(p1094) Arrived on time for group (code 0 through 9)

(p1095) Participated in group discussions (code 0 through 9)

(p1096) Completed homework assignments (code 0 through 9)

(p1097) Complied with contract terms with provider (code 0 through 9)

(p1098) Progress (code 1 through 9)

(p1099) Prognosis (code 1 through 9)

Violation of Probation

(p1100) Violation of Probation (0 = Never Violated 1 = Violated)

(p1101) Date of VOP Affidavit (Code 88-88-88 for N/A)

Reasons for VOP (for each listed reason, note 0 = No 1 = Yes 8 = N/A)

(p1102) Failed to rept/come to prob (p1107) Violation of other minor conditions of prob (p1107)

(p1103) Failed to pay COS (p1108) Failed to complete other ct-ordered program (p1108)

(p1104) Used substances (p1109) Continuing to harass victim (p1109)

(p1105) Failed to enroll/attend SA program (p1110) Additional domestic violence arrest (p1110)

(p1106) Failed to attend/terminated DV program (p1111) Addl non-domestic violence arrest (p1111)

Note additional arrests:
 (Code 88 for N/A) (p1112) (p1113) (p1114)

(p1115) Note outcome (Code 0= Pending 1 = Dismissed 2 = Violated and Reinstated 3= Revoked and Sentenced)

Status at Close of Probation

Answer "Yes" to only one of the three following statuses. All others must be coded "No" and then N/A (8s)

(p1116) Probation Revoked (code 0 = No 1 = Yes)

(p1117) Date revoked (code 88-88-88 NA)
 Sentence days months years (code 888 if N/A)
 (p1118) (p1119) (p1120)

(p1121) Date Incarcerated (p1121) (p1122) Date Released (Code 00-00-00 No Rls)

(p1123) Violation of Probation or in Process of Being Violated (code 0 = No 1 = Yes)

(p1124) Date prob VOP'd (code 88-88-88 NA)

(p1125) Probation Completed (code 0 = No 1 = Yes)

(p1126) Terminated (code 0 = No 1 = Yes 8 = NA)

(p1127) Termination type (code 0 = unsuccessful 1 = successful 8 = NA)

(p1128) Date terminated (code 88-88-88 NA)

(p1129) Provide termination reason

(p1130) Regularly completed (code 0 = No 1 = Yes 8 = NA)

(p1131) Date completed (code 88-88-88 NA)

(p132) _____ Total Number of Arrests (code 0 for none)

(p133) _____ Number of Arrests Not Leading to Violation of Probation

(p134) _____ - _____ - _____ Date of arrest(code 88-88-88 NA) _____ Type Arrest (p137)

(p135) _____ - _____ - _____ Date of arrest(code 88-88-88 NA) _____ Type Arrest (p138)

(p136) _____ - _____ - _____ Date of arrest(code 88-88-88 NA) _____ Type Arrest (p139)

(p140) _____ Number of Arrests Leading to Violation of Probation (Include those from last page)

(p141) _____ - _____ - _____ Date of arrest(code 88-88-88 NA) _____ Type Arrest (p144)

(p142) _____ - _____ - _____ Date of arrest(code 88-88-88 NA) _____ Type Arrest (p145)

(p143) _____ - _____ - _____ Date of arrest(code 88-88-88 NA) _____ Type Arrest (p146)

(p147) _____ Total Number of Violation of Probations (Include the VOP from last page/Code 0 for none)

(p148) _____ - _____ - _____ Date of Second VOP Affidavit (Code 88-88-88 for N/A)

Reasons for Second VOP (for each listed reason, note 0 = No 1 = Yes 8 = N/A)

(p149) _____ Failed to rept/come to prob _____ Violation of other minor conditions of prob (p154)

(p150) _____ Failed to pay COS _____ Failed to complete other ct-ordered program (p155)

(p151) _____ Used substances _____ Continuing to harass victim (p156)

(p152) _____ Failed to enroll/attend SA program _____ Additional domestic violence arrest (p157)

(p153) _____ Failed to attend/terminated DV program _____ Addl non-domestic violence arrest (p158)

Note additional arrests:
(Code 88 for N/A) _____ (p159) _____ (p160) _____ (p161) _____

(p162) _____ Note outcome (Code 0= Pending 1 = Dismissed 2 = Violated and Reinstated 3= Revoked and Sentenced)

(p163) _____ - _____ - _____ Date of Third VOP Affidavit (Code 88-88-88 for N/A)

Reasons for Third VOP (for each listed reason, note 0 = No 1 = Yes 8 = N/A)

(p164) _____ Failed to rept/come to prob _____ Violation of other minor conditions of prob (p169)

(p165) _____ Failed to pay COS _____ Failed to complete other ct-ordered program (p170)

(p166) _____ Used substances _____ Continuing to harass victim (p171)

(p167) _____ Failed to enroll/attend SA program _____ Additional domestic violence arrest (p172)

(p168) _____ Failed to attend/terminated DV program _____ Addl non-domestic violence arrest (p173)

Note additional arrests:
(Code 88 for N/A) _____ (p174) _____ (p175) _____ (p176) _____

(p177) _____ Note outcome (Code 0= Pending 1 = Dismissed 2 = Violated and Reinstated 3= Revoked and Sentenced)

Continued Timeline Breakdown Till E of T After Individual No Longer Under Prob Sup
Where individual's probation supervision originally ends at E of T, code ~~88~~ as "0" and code all of the remaining questions as "88" - Not Applicable

(p178) _____ Number of months until E of T (Use .5 increments)

(p179) _____ Total number of months in green (Use .5 increments)

(p180) _____	1. Jail/Prison	3. Hospital	5. Absconded
	2. Res Tx Ctr/Halfway House	4. Psychiatric Center	8. Not Applicable

(p181) _____ Number of months in pink (Use .5 increments)

(p182) _____ Number of months in blue (Use .5 increments)

(p183) _____ Number of months in yellow (Use .5 increments)

(p184) _____ Number of months no color - not under county probation (Use .5 increments)

(p185) _____ Total Number of Arrests After Prob Supervision Ended But Before E of T (code 0 for none)

(p186) _____ - _____ - _____ Date of arrest(code 88-88-88 NA) _____ Type Arrest (p191)

(p187) _____ - _____ - _____ Date of arrest(code 88-88-88 NA) _____ Type Arrest (p192)

(p188) _____ - _____ - _____ Date of arrest(code 88-88-88 NA) _____ Type Arrest (p193)

(p189) _____ - _____ - _____ Date of arrest(code 88-88-88 NA) _____ Type Arrest (p194)

(p190) _____ - _____ - _____ Date of arrest(code 88-88-88 NA) _____ Type Arrest (p195)

ADDITIONAL ARRESTS

(Case Number)

_____._____._____ TO _____._____._____
(Date of Adjudication Date of E of T (one year from date of adjudication))

_____._____._____
(ER or Revocation Date)

ARRESTS

Date of Arrest **Arrest Type (making sure to distinguish dom vs non-dom arrests)**

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Total # of all arrests

INCARCERATION

Incarc Date-Release Date **Incarc Institution** **For What (refer to arrests above w/ date)**

_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Reason for discrepancy b/w Prob folder & BSO

APPENDIX THREE
JUDGES' COURT ORDER
ORDERING RANDOM ASSIGNMENT

IN THE CIRCUIT/COUNTY COURT OF
THE 17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, IN
AND FOR BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

IN RE: THE EFFICACY OF COURT- :
MANDATED COUNSELING FOR
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE OFFENDERS :

ORDER

The undersigned judges are assigned to Broward's Domestic Violence Court.

Over the past decade many states have mandated the imposition of batterers' intervention counseling on persons found guilty of or placed on probation for crimes of domestic violence.

Florida has such a law. Florida law, however, allows the court the discretion not to order such counseling.¹

¹ Section 741.281, Florida Statutes (1996) provides in pertinent part:

"If a person is found guilty of, has had adjudication withheld on, or has pled nolo contendere to a crime of domestic violence, as defined in 741.28, that person shall be ordered by the court to a minimum term of 1 year's probation and the court shall order that the defendant attend a batterers' intervention program as a condition of probation.... The court must impose the condition of the batterers' intervention program for a defendant placed on probation or pretrial diversion under this section, but the court, in its discretion, may determine not to impose the condition if it states on the record why a batterers' intervention program might be inappropriate...."
Emphasis added.

Some might argue that this discretion can only be exercised on a defendant-specific basis. That is to say, the court can only lawfully choose not to order court-mandated counseling when the facts and circumstances of particular cases indicate that counseling is not necessary or is "inappropriate" in particular cases.

We disagree. We disagree because this is not what the statute provides. Section 741.281, Florida Statutes (1996) is clearly written and unambiguous. It provides no such limitation and none should be ascribed to the ordinary and common meaning of the rather uncomplicated language used.

The only limitation on the use of our discretion is that this discretion not be abused or used unwisely. We seek to demonstrate herein that this is not the case. In fact, we strive to show that our discretion is being utilized to accomplish the clear intent of Section 741.281, Florida Statutes (1996)... to assure greater victim safety.

What We Know Now

The first batterers' treatment programs began before there was any evidence that they were effective.²

² Andrew Klein, National Bulletin on Domestic Violence Prevention. Vol. 3, No. 3, 1 (March 10, 1997). "In 1984 the attorney general's Task Force on Family Violence wrote that 'the most successful treatment occurs when mandated by the criminal justice system' (p.49). At the time, no empirical research had documented the effectiveness of court-ordered treatment." Barry D. Rosenfeld, Court-Ordered Treatment of Spouse Abuse. Clinical Psychology Review, Vol. 12, 205 (1992).

In 1992, Barry Rosenfeld of the University of Virginia Department of Psychology found that little published research documented the effectiveness of court-ordered treatment.³ The studies he reviewed cast doubt on the assumption that mandatory psychotherapeutic treatments are effective in reducing future incidents of violence.

"For nearly two decades psychologists have argued for the psychotherapeutic treatment of spouse abusers... This has occurred despite the fact that nearly all empirical research has been published in the past 5 years, and much of this literature has been inconclusive. The 1984 attorney general's Task Force on Family Violence recommended court-ordered treatment programs as an adjunct to legal-system alternatives, yet 8 years later, evidence to support the effectiveness of this practice is minimal... Clinical recommendations, however, have often preempted conclusive empirical support... Writers have described considerable difficulties in stopping entrenched programs even when there is no empirical support of their effectiveness... It has been noted that political considerations often outweigh scientific considerations, such as treatment

³ Barry D. Rosenfeld, Court-Ordered Treatment of Spouse Abuse. Clinical Psychology Review, Vol. 12, 205-226 (1992).

effectiveness (Webster, 1986)." Rosenfeld

223.

Rosenfeld also found that differences in abuse recidivism between subjects court-ordered into treatment and subjects arrested and untreated have been small and that subjects who discontinue treatment prematurely remain violence - free almost as often as subjects who complete treatment programs. He found a great need for additional research to elucidate the precise benefits and appropriate focus of court-ordered counseling programs.

One year later, L. Kevin Hamberger and James E. Hastings in their work "Court-Mandated Treatment of Men Who Assault Their Partner"⁴ posed the question: "After reviewing much of the research literature, what do we 'know' about the short and long-term effects of treatment on wife assault? The answer unfortunately, is 'Not Much'."

"We cannot confidently say whether 'Treatment works'... Amid some moderately good studies, many have one or more significant methodological or conceptual flaws that render them at best unhelpful and at worst misleading... If we are to make progress in this area, studies must be conducted that are scientifically sound, and they must be conducted in a manner that makes it possible

⁴ In Z. Hilton (Ed.), Legal Responses to Wife Assault: Current Trends and Evaluation. Newbury Park, Ca: Sage Publications (1993).

to pool the results with those of other studies over time to allow solid generalizations to be made." Hamberger and Hastings, 220 (1992).

Hamberger and Hastings found important shortcomings to include:

1. small sample size;
2. nonrandom assignment to treatment;
3. no control groups;
4. attrition;
5. inadequate specification;
6. follow-up interval;
7. outcome measures;
8. statistics; and
9. anomalous findings.⁵

Social scientists have discussed the possibility that ineffective treatment may be more dangerous for the victim than no treatment at all. Recent research indicates that the most influential predictor of a woman's return to a spouse after a stay in a shelter is his participation in counseling.⁶ However, if treatment is essentially ineffective in decreasing recidivism than

⁵ Hamberger and Hastings 220-225 (1993).

⁶ Edward Gondolf, Evaluating Programs for Men Who Batter: Problems and Prospects. Journal of Family Violence, Vol. 2, No. 1, 95-108 (1987). Seeing Through Smoke and Mirrors: A Guide to Batterer Program Evaluations. Response, Vol. 10, No. 3, 16-19 (1987).

we are inadvertently providing these victims with a false sense of security which may lead to a higher likelihood of their being injured.⁷

One of the most rigorous and best designed of the studies found that contrary to expectations that treatment would reduce violence, a significantly smaller proportion of offenders in treatment abstained from physical aggression than those not ordered to treatment.⁸

"When measuring the effects of treatment on cessation of violence-defined as no violence across the study period-offenders not ordered to treatment were found to be as likely as treated offenders to abstain from severe violence or threats of violence. Between 80-85 percent of all offenders in the study abstained from severe violence during the treatment period, while just under half (47%) abstained from threats of violence. Contrary to expectations that treatment would reduce violence, a significantly smaller proportion of offenders in treatment abstained from physical aggression: the prevalence of cessation of physical aggression was 57

⁷ L. Kevin Hamberger and James Hastings, Court-Mandated Treatment of Men Who Assault Their Partner. In Z. Hilton (Ed.), Legal Responses to Wife Assault: Current Trends and Evaluation. Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage Publications (1993).

⁸ Adele Harrell, Evaluation of Court-Ordered Treatment for Domestic Violence Offenders. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute (1991).

percent for the treated offenders, compared to 88 percent of those not ordered to treatment... In addition, treated offenders were significantly more likely to face new domestic violence charges than offenders not ordered to treatment: 19 percent of the treated offenders had additional charges for domestic violence recorded in the court files, compared to 7 percent of those not ordered to treatment." Harrell 92 (1991).

Harrell postulated that an offender's receipt of counseling was associated with a victim's return to the offender. If that counseling is not effective, the victim's return increases the chances that the victim will be revictimized.

Because domestic violence entails violent, dangerous behavior the random assignment of subjects to different treatment conditions, or to a no-treatment control condition poses certain ethical issues.⁹ We fully appreciate that steps must be taken to insure the safety of abuse victims. Research has demonstrated, however, that about one third of all men identified as abusive or violent with their spouses alter their violent behavior for reasons other than successful psychotherapeutic intervention or legal-system deterrence¹⁰ and even without any intervention

⁹ In the complete absence of a control group, no-observed effects can be validly ascribed to counseling.

¹⁰ Rosenfeld 212 (1992).

whatsoever.¹¹ Rosenfeld has stated that with equal recidivism rates reported following legal intervention (arrest, prosecution, fines, incarceration) and court-ordered clinical interventions, the ethical considerations inherent in random assignment dissipate.¹²

Filling A Void - Scientifically Sound Research

Evaluating the effectiveness of psychotherapeutic treatment should be a necessary prerequisite to the use of court-ordered counseling.¹³

Lynette Feder, Ph.D., of Florida Atlantic University's College of Urban and Public Affairs has recently received a grant from the National Institute of Justice to study the efficacy of court-mandated counseling for domestic violence offenders in Broward County, Florida. A copy of her grant proposal is attached hereto as Exhibit 'A'. Her methodology is sound and rigorous. The study assures an appropriate sample size, random assignment to treatment and control groups, and provides personnel, plans and procedures to deal with attrition, specification, an appropriate follow-up interval, outcome measures, statistics, and anomalous

¹¹ Rosenfeld 214 (1992).

¹² Rosenfeld 222 (1992).

¹³ The undersigned can attest that among judges handling domestic violence cases exclusively or who have a high proportion of such cases, there are few greater concerns than the effectiveness of court-mandated counseling. This has been our experience both within the State of Florida and nationally.

findings.

We have decided to collaborate with her in this important research project because we believe the law permits it, victims' safety would be enhanced thereby, and because it would serve the interests of domestic violence victims in finding interventions which lower the likelihood of future violence.

It is clear that research to date provides no support for the argument that victims' safety is jeopardized by not ordering all or almost all probationers to counseling. This position is unsound at best and demagogic at worst.

Defendants in the no-counseling control group will be on probation monitored by Broward County's Domestic Violence Unit of County Probation. When appropriate, they will be ordered to attend and to successfully complete substance abuse counseling and will be closely monitored to assure that they do not consume alcohol or controlled substances. In short, they will receive exactly the same degree of supervision and access to programs (ie. substance abuse therapy) except court-mandated counseling intervention as the treatment group.

The study has certain limitations and restrictions which limit the danger to victims of domestic violence. They are:

1. The sample will be comprised of 600 men, one-half of whom shall be ordered to attend court-ordered counseling and one-half who will not;
2. Only misdemeanants placed on probation for battery shall be among the sample; and
3. The sample will exclude those defendants who are mentally impaired.

We believe that our participation in this scientifically sound research will benefit us locally as well as helping victims of domestic violence nationally. The study promises to provide important information to better understand the factors that facilitate change in men who batter.

We find it to be a proper exercise of our discretion to not order certain probationers to attend batterers' intervention programs to assure a proper sample size randomly assigned to counseling and control groups.


Accordingly, to assure the above we find it not appropriate that certain defendants be ordered to attend batterers' intervention counseling programs.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that commencing May 1, 1997, and concluding on or about July 31, 1997, every male defendant placed on probation for the offense of battery by the undersigned who has an odd case number shall be among the control group and will not be ordered to enroll in and complete batterer intervention counseling. Every above-said defendant assigned an even case number shall be among the treatment group and will be ordered to enroll in and complete a batterer intervention counseling program as a special condition of probation.


PROPERTY OF

National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)
Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20849-6000

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers at Fort Lauderdale, Broward
County, Florida, this 1st day of May, 1997.



ALFRED F. HOROWITZ
County Judge
201 Southeast 6th Street
Suite 6760
Fort Lauderdale, Fl 33301
(954) 831-7765



GEOFFREY D. COHEN
Circuit/Acting County Judge
201 Southeast 6th Street
Suite 5880
Fort Lauderdale, Fl 33301
(954) 831-7823

cc:

State Attorney
Public Defender