Eastern Michigan University
DigitalCommons@EMU

Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations

Master's Theses, and Doctoral Dissertations, and Graduate Capstone Projects

8-7-2013

Systems of accountability for abusive men in a domestic violence context: The nature of abuse, limited effectiveness and intervention strategy improvement

Carla Cezario

Follow this and additional works at: http://commons.emich.edu/theses

Part of the Sociology Commons

Recommended Citation

Systems of Accountability for Abusive Men in a Domestic Violence Context:

The Nature of Abuse, Limited Effectiveness and Intervention Strategy Improvement

A Literature Review and Discussion

By

Carla Cezario

Thesis

Submitted to the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology

Eastern Michigan University

in Partial Fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

Criminology and Criminal Justice

Thesis Committee:

Marilyn Corsianos, Ph.D, Chair

Solange Simoes, Ph.D.

August 7, 2013

Ypsilanti, Michigan

Acknowledgements

Words cannot describe my appreciation for family, friends, and professors who all dedicated their time and effort to provide feedback, support, and love to me for this dissertation. Especially, I want to thank my parents who have always believed in me and provided me with all the love, patience, and support that I needed to pursue my dream of obtaining a Master's degree in Criminal Justice in the United States. I would also like to give a special thank you to my professors who, during this program, offered me their knowledge, skills, and expertise. I would like to extend a special debt of gratitude to my thesis advisor, professor, and chair member, Dr. Marilyn Corsianos, for her enthusiasm, ideas, words of encouragement, and passionate involvement regarding women's rights. She not only motivated me to complete this thesis, but also offered many wonderful discussions on feminism, gender discrimination, and domestic violence. I would like to thank all those involved, especially, those women who are contributing to finding ways to recreate a better world removed and safe from inequalities and discriminations.

Thank you, Goddess!

Abstract

The domestic violence movement had extraordinary success in enlightening society on the scope, predominance, and consequences of battering, but more limited ability in successfully intervening and preventing the abuse of women by their intimate male partners. Taking this perspective, the present study offers four main goals: 1) describe the theories of domestic violence causation and the evolution of the current strategies for intervening with abusive men and why men are abusive; 2) evaluate current domestic violence interventions to understand the rationale has produce the development of these strategies; 3) Describe and critically analyze the limitations of current domestic violence intervention strategies for abusive men; and 4) Present solutions to improve the system. A literature review focusing on the nature of abusive behavior, the effectiveness of current strategies and suggestions on how to develop new intervention strategies to reduce male abusive behavior against their female partners are presented.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction and Background

Introduction

Despite three decades of activism, domestic violence continues to be one of the major challenges facing the criminal justice system in the United States. Usually defined as a pattern of abusive and coercive behaviors committed toward an intimate partner, domestic violence can include physical abuse or the threat of physical abuse, psychological abuse, emotional abuse, sexual abuse, social isolation, and economic control (Dobash & Dobash, 2000).

Even though there ongoing debate regarding the similarity of perpetration rates for men and women (Kimmel, 2002), it is recognized that women are overwhelmingly the victims of the domestic abusive pattern and suffer more severe physical consequences as a result (Buzawa & Buzawa, 2003). Estimates suggest that between 2 and 4 million women are physically assaulted each year by an intimate male partner (Bancroft, 2002), and according to the latest statistics from the U.S. Department of Justice, 700,000 reported incidents were reported in 2004, an estimated victimization rate for women of 3.6 incidents per 1000 women and 0.9 per 1000 men in 2005 (BJS, 2006). Intimate partner violence accounts for over 500,000 injuries per year (Rennison, 2000). A recent Center for Disease and Prevention study (2003) estimated that the annual health care costs associated with intimate partner violence exceed to $5.8 billion.

Undoubtedly, over the last 30 years, the domestic violence movement has had significant success enlightening the public on the scope, predominance, and consequences of battering, while it has been somewhat less successful in intervening with abusers and preventing them from re-assaulting their intimate partners (Stover, 2005).

Even though the increased response from the criminal justice system has led to the legal handling of a large number of offenders, as well as the creation of intervention programs for

abusive men, the effectiveness of these strategies remains questionable (Feder & Wilson, 2005; Haaken &Yraqui, 2003). Researchers have been inconsistent in finding that behavioral change positively relates to intervention from the criminal justice system and batterer intervention programs, and there is also only minimal evidence to suggest that women who seek police protection are less likely to be abused in the future (Stover, 2005) or that men who are arrested and mandated to attend batterer intervention programs are less likely to be abusive after their release or upon completion of the programs (Feder & Wilson, 2005). While there is an impressive group of support services, crisis lines, shelters, and legal advocacy measures available for victims of domestic violence, prevention and successful interruption of male abusive behavior is essential to solve the problem of domestic violence.

The most common approaches for treating abusive men have been batterer intervention programs (BIPs; Mederos, 1999) and the use of group treatment modalities because the group treatment context has been proposed since theoretically the best context for male re-socialization, and groups is also considered to be the most cost-effective (Gondolf, 2002). Thus, during the last two decades, researchers have focused on learning the effectiveness of BIPs and treatment groups in reducing intimate partner violence. Surprisingly, however, there has still been little research directed at understanding why domestic violence intervention strategies with the perpetrators are only minimally effective.

Most studies have focused specifically on the degree to which and for whom individual aspects of domestic violence intervention, such as arrest, prosecution, and intervention educational programs for abusive men are successful, but they have not clarified why intervention strategies are not more effective than they are. Most of these studies focus on describing the

intervention characteristics at the individual level, such as program attrition and abuse recidivism (Gondolf, 2002), instead of identifying the possible systemic limitations of these programs. Focusing attention on a literature review will help us to learn why current domestic violence intervention approaches are not more successful in reducing the abuse of intimate partners and identify new areas of research development for future policy improvements.

Using this perspective, I embraced a literature review and discussion with four main goals. First, the review seeks to delineate the theories of domestic violence causation and then describe the evolution of the current strategies undertaken for intervening with abusive men. Understanding the theories of why men are abusive to their intimate partners is useful to evaluate current domestic violence intervention and better understand the explanations for men's violence that have given rise to the development of the specific intervention strategies. In addition, the paper describes and critically analyzes the limitations of current domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men. Last, the study describes and discusses possible solutions to implement to improve the current intervention strategies with abusive men.

Also, the study will be limited to males who assault their female partners. Although there is no "perpetrator profile" or demographic or other characteristics, certain features are often associated with an abuser. An abuser in this study is described as being of any race, educational level, cultural background, socio-economic level, occupational group, and religious group and from any geographic region.

The Nature of Abusive Behavior and the Evolution of Current Strategies

The intention of this chapter is to present general background information about what theories or concepts have been advanced, critiqued, and legitimatized to explain men's violence

toward women and what intervention practices have been adopted by the criminal justice system and its advocates.

The first subsections organize the theorized antecedents of men's violence towards women (Wallpe, 2010; Harway & O'Neil, 1999) in terms of levels of analysis. Usually identified levels of analysis include the individual level, the group or social level, and the societal or institutional level (Wallpe, 2012; Rappaport, 1977). The second part of this chapter provides a literature review of the main contributions of feminist criminologists for understanding the details of labeling theory, social control theory, differential theory, and differential association. These theories can enlighten and lead to a better understanding of why a disproportionate number of victims of domestic violence are women and what can be changed to guide the intervention programs to help both victims and perpetrators and thus move beyond the "one model fits all" approach.

The Individual Level

The physiological and biological theories of male aggression include the role of genetics, hormones, and brain dysfunction (Simpson, 2005). Some biologists have suggested that the Y chromosome holds in it a tendency toward aggression as evidenced by the fact that statistically males are more aggressive than females (Gail, 2007). Others have suggested that is not the genes but rather the testosterone hormone that explain men's preference toward violence. However, there is no evidence from biological studies that the testosterone level causes increased aggression. It has also been suggested that the supposed relationship between testosterone and aggression may not be direct and may instead be more closely related to other chemicals in the body that are adjusted by the testosterone level.

One of the most likely candidates is serotonin. Serotonin is a neurotransmitter in the brain that has been repeatedly linked to aggression and impulsivity. High testosterone levels are often correlated with low levels of serotonin, which have in turn been strongly linked to aggression (Bernhardt, 1997). Still other researchers argue that frontal lobe dysfunction may be responsible for much of men's abuse of women (Raine, 1993). The fronto-temporal limbic area appears to regulate violence and aggressive behavior, and a history of head injury has been seen to lead a man to abuse his intimate partners (Raine, 1993).

Mental illness or psychopathology has frequently been considered to be a contributing factor or even the cause of men's violence against women (Eigenberg, 2001). A psychopathology explanation suggests that individuals who are aggressive toward women have some sort of personality disorder or mental illness that might get in the way of normal self-consciousness about using violence (Jasinski, 2000). Recent studies have indicated that disorders and antisocial behavior do include acts of aggression and violence toward women. Donald Dutton (1999) has been working with abusive men for over 25 years and believes that most domestic violence is committed by men who suffer from a borderline personality disorder that is also associated with antisocial personality disorder and specifically brought on by a combination of three childhood sources: shame, insecurity, and direct personal experience of abuse in the home. One estimate suggests that approximately 25% of men arrested for domestic violence demonstrate symptoms of antisocial personality disorder (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). These personality disorders are correlated with little experience of empathy in responding themselves, a restrained ability to empathize with their victims or experience remorse for their actions, and a tendency to abuse drugs and alcohol (Eigenberg, 2001).

Researchers have also demonstrated a link between substance abuse and domestic violence over the years, with some studies indicating that rates of alcohol abuse among men who batter approach 70% (Johnson, 2006). Murphy (1998) reported that marital violence was four to six times more prevalent and substantially more frequent for alcoholics and their wives than for a nonalcoholic comparison sample. In one large multi-site study that involved 840 men entering batterer intervention programs, 50% were diagnosed with either alcohol or drug abuse problems (Gondolf, 2002). Those who believe that substance abuse plays a contributing role in domestic violence suggest drugs and alcohol impact men's inclination to abuse because both reduce men's tolerance for negative emotions such as frustration, pain, and disappointment, thus making it more likely that they will overreact and lash out at the source of their discomfort (Murphy, 1998). Others suggest that substance abuse reduces men's inhibitions such that even if they normally are not violent in their intimate relationships, they become unresponsive to these inhibitions in their altered states (Gondolf, 2002).

Some psychologists have suggested that men are violent because they lack the necessary skills to avoid violence (Bancroft, 2002). Especially they lack the skills to manage their feelings of anger, or they lack critical communication skills and are therefore unable to secure attention for their needs in non-abusive ways. While girls are encouraged to express both emotively and verbally a wide range of feeling, boys are traditionally discouraged from expressing any feelings at all in other ways than anger (Bancroft, 2002).

Critiques of the Individual Level Explanation

Arguing from a rigorously statistical perspective, movement activists have challenged that not all men are abusers, not all men who have brain disturbances and head injuries become abusers, and not all abusers have brain or head injuries (Rosenbaum, 1994). Similarly, not all men

who abuse substances or suffer from mental illness commit domestic violence, and not all perpetrators of domestic violence abuse substances or suffer from psychopathology. In other words, activists argue that while many abusers may indeed have head injuries, abuse substances, and/or experienced mental illness, these are likely not the main causes of their abusive behavior.

Activists have expressed similar concerns for the cognitive emotional skill deficit explanation for men's violence toward women. It has been argued that men who batter women often do not simultaneously batter their co-workers, friends, and other family members. In other words, if abusers are basically men who lack the skills necessary to avoid violence, it would be expected that abusers of intimate partners would physically strike out every time they became angry or had difficulty getting their needs met (Bancroft, 2002). There are a lot of men who are raised to not express feelings other than anger, but they do not all batter their partners.

From an intervention level, victim advocates have been worried that adoption of these individual level explanations for men's violence toward women would suggest mental health intervention instead of criminal justice intervention (Walppe, 2010; Dutton & Nicholls, 2005). The principal concern of advocates was that if perpetrators of domestic violence are treated as men with illnesses, they would receive counseling or training and our sympathies as they struggle to heal and educate themselves. Consequently, not only would society be discounting the crime of domestic violence and depriving women of their right to safety in their homes, but these victims would be more inclined to remain with their abusers, supporting them through their therapy and re-education (Gondolf, 2002).

Group or Social Level of Abusive Behavior

Family system psychologists suggest there is a pattern of couple interaction that creates and maintains battering (Walppe, 2010; Cook & Frantz-Cook, 1984). They argue it is difficult to

understand behavior when you isolate it from the environment. In other words, to understand batterer behavior, it is important to examine and analyze its immediate context. The assumption within this paradigm is that in a violent relationship both partners play a role in escalating and reinforcing the violence (Walppe, 2010; Flynn, 1990). They take into consideration that women's socialization attempts to meet their partners' emotional needs has them experience difficulty in setting and maintaining boundaries, and that incapability contributes to the cycle of abuse. Non-violent couples are theorized as being distinct from violent couples not because of differences in the men's behavior but because of the way these couples interact (Walppe, 2010; Jacobson, & Gottman, 1994).

The social learning theory suggests that as human beings we learn how to behave by observing and then modeling others (Bandura, 1973). To explain men's violence toward women, this theory suggests that boys learn to abuse women by watching their fathers abuse their mothers. These men learn that violence and abuse are acceptable and an efficient means to get to what they want from the women in their lives. In a recent childhood experience study of 8,629 participants that explored the impact of childhood experiences of abuse and trauma on future perpetration and victimization of interpersonal violence, Whitfield (2003) found that witnessing domestic violence as child doubled the odds of violence behavior in the adult relationship. The implications of social learning theory are even more important for explaining men's violence. Some argue that in addition to witnessing their father's control and abuse of their mothers, their own sexual and physical abuse in childhood can lead to aggressiveness and violence in adulthood. When children experience violence in the home and their needs and feelings are not recognized or responded to correctly, they may have little experience of empathic responses themselves or any opportunity to learn to identify and experience the more affective signals and states of others (Eigenberg, 2001).

In other words, by imitating the behavior of their abusers, these children may lack empathy and become insensitive adults who are indeed capable of dehumanizing others whom they perceive as vulnerable, most of the time these individuals are women.

Dhawan (1996) indicated that many men who experienced abuse during childhood developed the characteristics for perpetrating behaviors similar to their own victimization experiences. Dhawan's ideas were endorsed by a study by Johnson (2006) which indicated the several characteristics associated with violence and an unpleasant family environment, as described through different forms of abuse and neglect, was one of the more important factors. Families that were abusive or neglectful often lacked nurturance and guidance, which often resulted in problems of social functioning, such as mistrust, hostility, and insecure attachments.

These in turn, could lead to social rejection, loneliness, negative peer associations, and delinquent behavior. His study also suggested that hostile home environments, such as those that include family violence and/or child sexual abuse, placed males at greater risk for developing patterns of coercion and/or force when interacting with others.

Also, the social learning theory argues that boys frequently are subjected to and are influenced by seeing other men abuse and dominate women, either in their extended family or with friends. Not only are boys often subjected to destructive modeling as they mature, but based on the principles of social learning theory, men continue to be influenced by their social network, peers, family members, and public figures throughout adulthood (Wallpe, 2010).

Critics of the Group or Social Level

Activists in the domestic violence movement were alarmed by both the theoretical and intervention implications of family systems and the social learning explanations of men's violence toward women. Responsibility for the abuse from a family system perspective was thus shared

with the victims, which was not what advocates were looking for after years of victim blaming. However, in the case of the social learning theory, the responsibility for men's abusive behavior was transmitted to the fathers and other role models. In other words, batterers were victims of their dysfunctional relationship with their partners or their problematic childhood environment. The intervention implications of both of these theoretical explanations of men's violence toward women were problematic. Family system solutions often involved marital or couple counseling, considered by many advocates to be extremely dangerous because it placed battered women in an impossible situation. While a battered woman was expected to be open about her feelings and report her husband's violence, doing that placed her in critical danger of continued and even more violence (Adams, 1988). At the same level, the social learning theory intervention challenged victim advocates on how they could direct effective intervention if the source of the problem was outside the abuser. Shifting responsibility or blame modeling to childhood experiences appeared to leave little space for holding individual men accountable for their adult choice to abuse.

Societal and Institutional Levels

During the 17th century, the common law asserted that a husband had the right to physically discipline a misbehaving wife, provided the stick was no bigger than his thumb. The Puritans in colonial Massachusetts theorized the problem of domestic violence to be one of "sinful" men who were not properly protecting the sanctity and peace of the home. Later during the early 19th century, antebellum feminists combined with restraint reformers to suggest that the evils of alcohol caused husbands to beat their wives. It was not until the 19th century, with the manifestation of first-wave feminism, that women commenced under difficulty to establish their legal rights (James & Wilson, 2007). The amazing changes for women that then occurred over the next seven generations of family life in religion, in government, in employment, and in education,

did not happen spontaneously. Women made these changes happen themselves and very intentionally. However, it was only when the second wave of feminists in the late 1970's turned their attention to the dilemma of the battered woman that an explanation for men's violence clearly implicated the institutionalized oppression of women and was publicly discussed. Grassroots efforts to address the violence against women were credited with bringing greater attention to the need for addressing those who perpetrated violence, particularly those men who abused their female partners, and holding them accountable for their behavior (Smith, 1998). Fresh from their other successes, radical feminists saw the tragedy and injustice of the battered wife as an opportunity to highlight the brutal consequences of patriarchy overall (Haaken, 2010). The patriarchal culture depended on a relationship of dominance of men over women, politically, socially and interpersonally (Haaken, 2010). Therefore, feminist activists suggested that men acted violently toward women as a way to reestablish the power and control promised them as heads of a patriarchal society. As a result, domestic violence came to be understood as a pattern of controlling behavior executed with the purpose of establishing and maintaining an imbalance of power between male perpetrators and their female victims (Adams, 1988). Men who were raised in patriarchal cultures developed attitudes and values consistent with patriarchy and thus with battering (Bancroft, 2002). A central explanation of this "patriarchy as cause" theory suggested that men were abusive to women because they could be. Control and domination of women was considered acceptable in a patriarchal society, and subsequently, men experienced fewer negative consequences for their abuse of women and would have little motivation to treat women any differently (Bancroft, 2002).

An analysis of the problem of men's violence toward women on this societal level offered the potential for exciting intervention opportunities. By implicating patriarchal systems in men's

violence against women and structuring the issue as a violations of women's civil rights (Haaken, 2010), feminists activists were able to balance significant changes in childcare, education, financial equity, legislation, and political power with the issues of violence against women by men. Implicating the nature of men's social, financial, and political power over women in terms of women's victimization at the hands of men provided a perfect opportunity for achieving greater and more unilateral gender equality. While there were certainly advantages in focusing the responsibilities for men's violence toward their partners exclusively on the men themselves, this explanation unfortunately captured only part of a much more complex story.

The characteristics of societal level and gender role socialization did not explain why most men do not abuse, why some women abuse men, or why abuse also occurs in gay and lesbian relationships where both people have experienced similar gender role socialization. Individual and social level forces, such as mental illness, drugs and alcohol, and childhood abuse thus had to be considered to explain any man's decision to "choose" violence toward their partner (Kimmel, 2000). However, it is not surprising that the dominant script for why men abuse their intimate partners has rigidified over time into a singular and more limited explanation that essentially claims that men are violent because they choose to exercise their patriarchal rights and their privileges in a patriarchal society (Haaken, 2010). Still, to understand how exactly patriarchy causes men to choose violence toward their partners, one need to look at how patriarchal values are transmitted. It does seem plausible that individual men's willingness to use the power promised to them under the power of a patriarchy could be linked to mental illness, education, income, experience of oppression, childhood experience, environment, etc. Acknowledging that individual level (such as mental illness and substance abuse), the group or social level (such as family dynamics, modeling, peer groups, work environments, community groups) and also the

societal level forces (such as racism, class, and gender bias) can work together to translate patriarchal values, beliefs, and privileges. This view indeed suggests there is a need to re-create patriarchy as a cause theory and embrace the ways in which patriarchy impacts men at all these multiple levels of analysis (Wallpe, 2010).

However, in terms of an intervention strategy for abusive men, it is just too difficult to design and manage effective interventions based on multiple levels of analysis of the cause. In other words, if a primarily societal level explanation of men's violence has indeed emerged as the dominant theory of men's violence, it may be important to ascertain whether the dominant intervention strategies can successfully target positive societal level changes.

Contributions of Feminist Criminologists

Here it is important to call attention to the contributions of feminists criminologists in the study of domestic violence. How do feminist perspectives on labeling theory, social control theory, differential opportunity and differential association provide helpful insight on why a disproportionate number of victims of domestic violence in opposite sex relationships are women and how these theories offer helpful frameworks to guide intervention programs to help both victims and perpetrators move beyond the "one model fits all" approach. Understanding these theories can lead us to evaluate current domestic violence interventions precisely, analyze the limitations of these interventions, and consequently develop suggestions on how to improve interventions strategies to reduce men's abuse against their partners.

Feminist criminologists have argued that the control of intimate violence depends on a fundamental restructuring of gender relations and the greater empowerment of women. Gender is a complex social, historical, and cultural entity that is related to, but not simply derived from biological sex differences. Gender orders both social life and social institutions in fundamental

ways. Gender and their relationships and definition are the basis for the constructs of masculinity and femininity, organized so that male power gives men dominion over women. The views of men that also rationalize the subordinate position of women are embedded in multiple systems of knowledge and in the processes that produce them (Humphries, 2009). Feminists view domestic violence as a form of political, social, economic, sexual and the physical oppression of women individually and as a group. They see domestic violence as a means for men to gain power and then control, dominate, devalue and unempower women. Our culture encourages, supports, condones, entitles, and expects men to dominate and take control over women.

Feminist theory has provided the basis and justification for the existence of domestic violence throughout history. This theory suggests that intimate partner violence grows out of inequality within the marriage (and other intimate relationships modeled on marriage) and thus reinforces male power and female subordination within the home. In other words, violence against women of any kind is part of the goal of male control. Although there is no one feminist approach to intimate partner violence, most feminists look to power imbalances that exist in patriarchal societies and recognize that societal structural factors prevent equal participation of women in the full social, economic, and political system. Imbalances at the societal level are then naturally reproduced within the family where men exercise power and control over women, one form of which is violence (McCue, 2008).

Supporters of the feminist theory believe that domestic violence is a systemic issue. Change would require a restructuring of the family unit and its associated gender roles. Establishing greater gender equality would empower and enhance each family member, allowing honest communication and strengthening the family unit. In other words, as long as women are

not equal to men in all ways, domestic violence will continue to be a problem in the home and in society.

Obviously, it seems that changing the restructure of the family and its gender roles would have a major impact on the way men and women are socialized and socialize. However, how can that evolution be achieved? Is it achievable? Would one model fit everyone? Does every couple suffer and struggle with the same problems or different ones?

Certainly the personal experiences of those living with abusive men does indicate that patterns of abuse vary with the relationship, the economic status of the couple and race, criminal history, the community where the abuser and the victims live, and other factors. To understand some of these problems, this literature review of the feminist perspectives on labeling theory, social control theory, differential opportunity and differential association theory are helpful. Hopefully, these theories can provide us helpful structures to guide intervention programs in a direction that will help both victims and perpetrators.

The Labeling Theory

It can be said that everyone at some point in life experiences some form of label. This label may appear in the form of identifying one's race, color, gender, country of origin, speech, association with particular groups, or even be just a simple action which an individual may not normally undertake, such as being labeled rude for not holding the door open. The process of labeling creates categorization. Labeling theory is associated with how the self-identity and behavior of certain groups of individuals is influenced or even created' (Kirby, 2000). These particular groups can then be categorized by other individuals in their society as a result of not conforming to the specific rules and regulations set out by the state. The theory originates from both sociological and criminological perspectives and mainly focuses on the linguistic and visual

tendencies for the majority of these negatively labeled minorities or categories. These individuals may be seen as deviating from the accepted and presumed norms and values of society and thus be associated with and become a self-fulfilling prophecy or stereotyping (Kirby, 2000). For a domestic violence scenario, labeling theory proposes that when individuals experience arrest for committing partner abuse, they become labeled as criminals by themselves and the society.

The criminal label then increases the likelihood of subsequent similar abusive/criminal behavior. If labeling increases future criminal acts, then those arrested by domestic violence then become more likely to commit later abuse. Still, Sherman (1992) found that arrest did deter suspects that were employed, possibly because an arrest became more serious for those with more still to lose. For the unemployed, arrest had the opposite effect as rightly predicted by the labeling theory. Unemployed men who had been arrested were more likely to commit a subsequent assault than were those who had been separated or counseled. Applying the labeling theory, we can imply that an arrest would not deter all men from committing domestic violence; however, it would deter the majority of employed man while also increasing future criminal acts for those who have less to lose. Therefore; victims of domestic violence would generally be in more at risk if their partner were arrested.

Also, from the victim's point of view, many researchers found that patriarchy contributes to wife abuse and that patriarchy is increased due to the current economic and social system. Our social system has defined and labeled the husband as the dominant, strong, authoritarian, aggressive, and rational provider for the family, while the wife is traditionally labeled a dependent, passive, submissive, soft, and at times, even hysterical and given roles that fit that description. Our society has flourished under this model by dividing the labor force in half, encouraging women to remain at home and care for their husbands and children, while having

husbands leave the home to provide living for the family (McCue, 2008). As the dominant class,

men as a class exercise power over women. Men also have access to material and symbolic

resources, while women are devaluated as secondary and inferior and prevented strong economic

access. The feminist theory states that early socialization historically labeled girls to become

submissive victims while boys were defined as strong and controlling and thus potential

perpetrators of violence. In preschools, one can observe this strong gender role identification

when children play house. Usually the mother is serving the father coffee while he makes

demands of both the wife and the child before going off to work. This early process sets the stage

for the dominant male figure to have power over the passive female figure. Men develop

unrealistic expectations and perceptions of their dominance through the teaching of family

structure early on, and therefore, the batterer accepts the right to be violent within the purity of his

home. It is expected and thus condoned, even accepted in some instances.

The Social Control Theory

Social control theory was developed by Richard J. Gelles (1983) using the basic

proposition of an exchange theory of aggression. The social control model of family violence

suggests that wife abuse is governed by the principle of cost and reward. Drawing from the

exchange theory, Gelles (1983) noted that violence and abuse are used when the rewards are

higher than the costs. The cultural approval of violence as both expressive and instrumental

behavior raises the potential rewards for violence. Following the concept of labeling theory,

sociologist Kirk Williams (1992) tested some of the propositions of social control theory of

intimate violence in two national surveys on family violence. These findings indicated that men

who believed themselves to be more isolated from the police (greater privacy/ lower likelihood of

formal social control) and who were also more powerful in their relationship with their partner (great inequality), and who approved of men hitting their partners (lower perceived cost of violence) were less likely to perceived arrest as being costly for them. Men who perceived the cost of arrest as low compare to the rewards they gained from control and feelings of superiority were more likely to assault their partners. For example, men abused their partners because the cost of their behavior was seen as not outweighing the reward. Rewards for male abusive behavior include getting what they wanted, avoiding what they didn't want, feeling stronger or better about themselves or as more of a winner than someone else. With such rewards driving abusers to abuse, their victims' pain, or any requests for change from his partner, the criminal justice system or programs of rehabilitation did not stand a chance of making any difference. Abusive men received many personal and psychological rewards for their behavior, and there was also high cost, in their minds at least, for giving up abusive behavior, even if that meant getting arrested. Abusive men needed extremely good reasons to even consider changing their behavior and it was of course difficult for their victims to provide those reasons as they were the chosen victims. The only hope a victim has of forcing the abuse to stop, is to remove them from the abuser. Loss of love, companionship, money, their children, comfort and reputation may provide enough of a cost to make the abusive person consider changing his behavior. It is more likely, however, that leaving abusive men will not cause them to genuinely change, but instead cause them to raise the stakes. Many abusers just find a new victim because that is a lot easier for them to do than changing their behavior or in some cases they will stalk their one until takes her back. Abusers may say they will change; they may even go for counseling or make tiny changes enough to convince their victim to come back, but the changes won't last. As soon as they have

done or said whatever is necessary to get their victims to return they will carry on behaving just as abusively.

Courts regularly send offenders to be treated as a condition for reducing their sentences. Yet, most of these programs are short (between 6 to 32 weeks) and involve group therapy, which is useless with abusers who are also narcissists or psychopaths. Rather than cure the person, these workshops seek to "educate" and "reform" the offender, often by introducing him to the victim's point of view. This point of view is supposed to teach the offender empathy and clear the habitual batterer of the remains of patriarchal prejudice and control. Abusers are encouraged to examine gender roles in modern society and, by direct implication, ask themselves if battering one's spouse is proof of their virility.

Also, offenders are taught to identify the hidden and real causes of their anger and then learn techniques to control that anger. Even though a few batterers can be rehabilitated by this strategy of intervention, batters are not a homogeneous group. Sending all abusers to the same type of treatment is guaranteed to produce recidivism. Further, judges not qualified to decide whether a specific abuser requires treatment or even can benefit from it. The variety of abusers is so great that it is safe to say that, although they share the same misbehavior patterns, no two abusers are alike. Therefore, the "one model fits all approach" that the criminal justice system currently uses will fail from the social control theory perspective.

Differential Association Theory

Differential Association Theory states that learning the definitions favorable to crime in a manner that supersedes definitions favorable to non-criminal activity increases the likeliness of engaging in criminal activity. As defined by Sutherland (1974) "a person's associations are determined in a general context of social organization", referring to the fact that direct association

with people of a lower social class, being members of a naturally disorganized subculture and residing in an area favorable to criminal behavior, are more likely to lead to the commission of a crime. This explanation can be rephrased to say that people of a lower social class who lack the resources and connections to achieve the "good life" via either criminal or non-criminal methods will default to delinquent activities. This default social effect is aggravated by observational learning of definitions that favorable to criminal activity in situations that tend to validate the acceptability of such activity. While the point is very arguable, one should out point out that those individuals from a higher social class will have a more legitimate means of attaining the good life at hand and will probably live in a socially organized area, and also will be most likely be exposed to a far greater number of definitions and opportunities favorable to non-criminal activity. They will have much more to lose when committing any criminal activity. This perception will ultimately result in fewer violent and malicious crimes which, in lower class communities, often result from an angry reaction to a social structure that prohibits their attainment of the "American Dream" (Crutchfield 2005).

In general, however, we find that crime exists within all classes in society and that the basis upon which the Differential Association Theory rests becomes ambiguous if we expand our definition to mean "all crime" due to the large number of factors that can result in different definitions of criminal activity. That is, the correlation between low-class people and crime becomes weaker when we expand our definition of crime with self-reported data, but becomes stronger if we narrow that definition to the crime of partner violence (Crutchfield 2005).

Differential Opportunity Theory

When Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin (1960) introduced their theory of differential opportunity, they indicated their work was influenced by two schools of thought: Durkheim's and Merton's concepts of anomie, which focuses on the pressures associated with deviance, and Edwin H. Sutherland's differential association theory which believes that a person's associations are determined in a general context of social organization. Cloward and Ohlin (1960) maintained that sociological and psychological factors can limit a person's access to both illegitimate and legitimate roles, but that these factors are not recognized by other approaches to crime. For example, the anomie approach views individuals from the perspective of the legitimate opportunity structure, which means that, the focus is on differential access to *legitimate* means of achieving goals, but the approach assumes that either illegitimate route to success are freely available to all or that there is few implications regarding that availability. Consequently, anomie theory recognizes that not all persons have equal ways to become a doctor. However, the theory does not recognize that many persons do not have easy access to unapproved means of achieving the success they desire, such as cheating, stealing, and so on. In contrast, Sutherland's differential association theory recognizes the differential access to *illegitimate* opportunities but does not recognize the same differential access to legitimate opportunities. Cloward and Ohlin's (1960) theory of differential opportunity structures ties the theories of anomie and differential association together and considers the individual in terms of both the legitimate and the illegitimate systems.

Differential opportunity theory includes three types of subcultures: Criminal, conflict, and retreatist. *Criminal subcultures* exist primarily in lower-class neighborhoods where successful criminals are more available and willing to assist young people in committing crimes.

Conventional role models are less available as well. The *conflict subculture* features violence as a positive way of gaining status. Social controls are weak, and the area is populated with failures from both the conventional and the criminal groups. Instability creates disorganization in areas, and people turn to violence as a result of a lack of an organized way to address their frustrations. There is common reliance on this theory to explain why women are victims of violence in these social groups.

Those who fail in the conflict and criminal subcultures tend to resort to the *retreatist subculture*, which is characterized by drug use. Differential opportunity theory adopted the extensive early research and used it to provide a basis for numerous programs intended to prevent domestic violence. Differential opportunity theory is fixed in the Chicago School of Ecology, and because of that connection, some have relegated it to historical status. Cullen (2004) suggests that the theory be reexamined for its potential contributions to the analysis of crime causation.

One of the problems with the differential opportunity theory is its lack of precise, measurable definitions of the relevant concepts. Cloward and Ohlin (1960) do not specify the degree of organization required for a gang to fall within their theoretical framework. The empirical validity of their theory has also been questioned. Despite these criticisms, however, the theory identifies an important element found in the development of domestic violence, namely, the difference in the deviant's perceptions of the availability of illegitimate compared with legitimate opportunities and also the belief in the greater chance of achieving success through illegitimate means. If a person does not have access to legitimate means, they would not necessarily have access to illegitimate means; they would need specific personal characteristics

and contacts to gain that access to illegitimate means. The researchers theorized that   this characteristics could explain partners' violence in lower classes because if a person is not able to achieve status through monetary gain, he will look to fighting as a way of gaining respect, status and masculinity by abusing a partner.

Strategies for Intervention

As the number of women accessing victim advocacy services grew in the 1970's, the attention increased toward what should be done with the perpetrators of abuse (Dobash & Dobasch, 2000). Victim advocates reasoned that it was not a completely effective strategy to just help women escape their abusers, because often these women returned to their abusers after brief relief in a shelter (Adams, 1982). Also, those few abusive men whose partner managed to leave permanently would often just move on to victimize new different woman (Bancroft, 2002). Recognizing that victims' advocates did not have either the desire or expertise to work with these men, the assistance of male counselors was demanded. The initial treatment goal was to help men recognize responsibility for their abuse, raise awareness of the socialized ideas about sex roles, and become more aware of their personal emotional needs and dependency on women (Adams, 1982). The creation of programs now commonly referred to as battered intervention programs, was in many ways the direct result of advocates' efforts to engage the criminal justice system as an ally to protect battered women (Mederos, 1999). The purpose of the program became to hold men responsible for their abusive behavior toward their partners with the goal of stopping male abusive attitudes and moving men toward equality in their intimate relationships (Mederos, 1999).

By the early 1980's, advocates' efforts to secure greater responsiveness from law enforcement began to meet with some success. States began to expand police powers in domestic violence cases, allowing officers to make arrests for misdemeanor domestic assault without a

warrant and without having witnessed the assault as long as there was probable cause that an assault had actually taken place (Renzetti & Bergen, 2005). Probable cause was established by the presence of witnesses, visible injuries, or property damage that indicated a crime had been committed (Renzetti & Bergen, 2005).

The most influential experiment demonstrating the substantial deterrent effect of arrest on subsequent domestic violence cases was conducted in 1981 in the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment. This experiment demonstrated an even greater willingness and urgency to criminalize domestic violence (Miller, 2004). The result was the adoption of mandatory arrest laws by most states (Miller, 2004). Mandatory arrest laws require police officers to make an arrest, as opposed to just mediation or separation, if there is evidence to support an arrest. The intent of mandatory arrest was to treat domestic violence as a crime. The advantages of mandatory arrests were several. The police were more likely to initiate prosecution if they could make an arrest at the time they responded to the domestic violence call. By targeting the criminal justice system as a site for change in how abuse was handled, advocates were attempting to correct historically unjust disparities in the treatment of battered women. This type of institutional level reform also aligned with their societal level conceptualization of patriarchy as the cause of men's violence against women. However, happy with the changes and efforts of the criminal justice system to make perpetrators accountable for their actions, the main question now became what to do with the perpetrators. The courts were ill equipped to manage the influx of men arrested as a result of the new laws for criminalization of domestic violence, and judges were uncertain about sending first- time offenders to prison (Miller, 2004). Even though batterer intervention programs were very new and untested as an effective "treatment" for abusive men, they seemed a reasonable compromise to either the dismissal of all charges or prison time

(Gondolf, 2002). Judges thus began mandating attendance at intervention programs as a condition of probation following arrest and conviction or in some cases as a way to defer actual conviction. The most common approach developed for batterer intervention involved a gender-based cognitive behavior approach distinct from conventional individual psychotherapy (Gondolf, 2002). Most gender-bases group programs that were developed had a psycho-educational approach so as to focus on teaching behavior and attitude change, with many of the programs' having an underlying feminist orientation (Rosenbaum, 2001). Advocates of psycho-educational groups suggested that men will change when they are held accountable for and directly confronted with their patriarchal attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors (Pence & Paymar, 1993). The goal of this program was to educate men. The education was accomplished through presentations, role playing, and by challenging and confronting the men in the group, thus drawing attention to each instance when a man tried to escape responsibility to accountability for his behavior by either blaming his partner, his past traumas, or current problems.

The most widely accepted batterer education/intervention program curriculum was the Duluth model, a feminist theory paradigm that is based on the premise that violence is used by men in order to control women's behavior and reinforce male dominance (Van Wormer, 2009). However, advocates for the Duluth model argued that men would only be held truly accountable for their actions when law enforcement, victim advocates, the courts, and batterer intervention providers coordinated their efforts and services. Common elements of a coordinated community response would include victim advocates, legislative reforms, law enforcement, district attorneys, judges, batterer intervention providers, and child protective services (Ptacek, 2010). In many communities, the principal mode for establishing this requisite collaboration involved setting up domestic violence coordinating councils. These councils were made up of representatives from

the various agencies privileged by the VAWA act: Law enforcement, probation, the courts, and victims' advocates. Even though coordinating councils did vary from community to community, most traditionally focused on improving police responsiveness to distress calls, enhancing prosecutorial efforts, encouraging judicial use of harsh and immediate sanctions for perpetrators, and ensuring that batterer intervention programs' receiving court referrals held to an appropriate model of intervention (Allen, 2006).

In the last 15 years, researchers have recognized and begun to focus on understanding how abusive men change during batterer intervention programs as well as attending more precisely to the impact of the coordinated community response as an intervention system (Murphy, 1998). Several studies have revealed the importance of overcoming denial and engaging new ways of thinking (Wallpe, 2010; Scott & Wolfe, 2000), the impact of recognizing and taking responsibility for past abusive behavior, developing empathy for others, and reducing dependency, including the goal of accepting full responsibility for changing abusive behavior and improving communication skills (Wallpe, 2010; Scott & Wolfe, 2000).

Unfortunately, these studies have focused exclusively on but one component of domestic violence intervention with abusive men instead of looking at intervention strategies as a whole. Given the prevalence of the coordinated community response, it makes little sense to evaluate any of the components of domestic violence intervention in isolation. These components operate as part of a collective, and until we understand how that collective is working as a whole, we will not truly understand very much about the impact of these strategies. Gondolf (2002) notes that the cultural climate (actions, values, and procedures of police officers, probation officers, district attorneys, and judges) in which a program operates greatly impacts its effectiveness.

Subsequently, it is no longer sufficient to evaluate batterer intervention programs in isolation; instead that they must be understood as only one piece of a broader intervention system.

Chapter Two: Systems of Accountability

The previous chapter offered a literature review of the dominant theories and intervention strategies for domestic violence with abusive men. It was suggested that to achieve the best intervention effectiveness we should align the levels of analysis between the problem definition and our solutions, a process enhanced by the availability of theories and interventions. Currently , there is a movement toward supporting a single-level theory to explain men's violence, one that defines the problem primarily at the societal level (patriarchy), as well as a push towards a single-level criminal justice- based intervention, which manifests mainly at the individual level (arrest, conviction, and sentencing individual men to treatment). Consequently, not only has the field been reduced to one level of analysis in terms of theory and practice, but the sub-levels are incompatible. It is an ironic paradox that despite the broad acceptance of the societal and feminist explanations for domestic violence, most interventions with abusive men are individualized (Laing, 2002).

Unfortunately this evaluation methodology offers few suggestions for how to improve the success of strategic interventions with batterer men. Most of the studies have utilized individual outcome measures of recidivism to determine efficacy and have intently focused on one component of domestic violence intervention at a time instead of challenging that point of view and working to represent, understand and evaluate domestic violence as a whole system.

It has been suggested that undertaking such an ecological analysis to understand the causes of men's abuse against women and thus review the limitations of current intervention strategies would better acknowledge the multi-leveled complexity of domestic violence as an issue (Tolman, 2001).

Ecological theory recognizes that social phenomena do not exist in isolation, but rather are inextricably surrounded by their environment. Tolman (2001) suggests that an ecological analysis can help evaluators explain the failings of the coordinated community response to domestic violence. He states that any coordinated community response requires several mesosystems (law enforcement, probation, the courts, and program staff) to interact regularly in order to hold individual men appropriately accountable. The success of intervention is compromised if these systems fail to collaborate; for example, if program staff neglects to notify probation officers of participant absence or probation officers fail to follow up when they receive paperwork that suggests that one of their charges is not attending the court-mandated program. In other words, Tolman (2001) suggests that failure often is not the responsibility of on individual component system but rather due to a lack of connection between all the components in that system.

As stated in the introduction, there are three goals for this study: 1) Describe the theories of domestic violence causation and then briefly describe the evolution of current strategies used for intervening with abusive men; 2) provide a literature review on the studies that focused on the limitations of current domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men; 3) provide suggestions for improvement in intervention action and changes to produce the best effective strategy for successful domestic violence intervention.

This section specifically provide this literature review and analyzes the research that addresses the challenges for members of the coordinated community and its response and identify the limitations of current domestic violence intervention strategies. In selecting these studies, I the criteria became extremely important so as to gather information and feedback from sources close

enough to the phenomenon of interest to gain meaningful insight. From this perceptive, this literature review accesses those sources that possibly hold valuable detailed information regarding domestic violence intervention strategies to use with abusive men.

Two groups of the coordinated community response met these conditions: (1) Law enforcement that arrest abusive men and are a fundamental part of the process of intervention with victims and abusers and (2) batterer intervention programs facilitators who interact with abusive men.

Law Enforcement

Police officers are often the first members of the coordinated community response to interact with abusive men. Their response to domestic violence calls has several facets of response, including reporting domestic violence and making a decision to arrest. They respond to the 911 calls, most often initiated by victims, and actually implement many of the laws, including mandatory arrest. They are also the first system members to witness its failings when they are called out to make arrests after perpetrators recidivate.

Batterer Intervention Providers

Many of the men arrested for domestic violence are frequently mandated to attend a batterer intervention program. These programs are provided as weekly groups set up and monitored by trained facilitators. These facilitators are in the unique position to witness change or failure when it occurs. They are not only interacting with the abusive men personally, but also frequently interact with other members of the coordinated community response team.

Unfortunately, just a few researchers have centered their interest on utilizing groups in the

coordinated community response to understand the limitations of intervention strategies. For the purpose of this study, the literature review utilizes coordinated community response participants to understand why domestic violence intervention with abusive men is not more effective. Wallpe (2010) in her dissertation, *Domestic Violence Intervention With Abusive Men: Reassign the Role of Community* a addressed the problem of current domestic violence intervention strategies by engaging a system approach to study the existing limitations of those programs. She contacted six key stakeholders from the population in Portland Tri-County in Oregon and asked a series of questions designed to elicit their feedback regarding what was limiting the success of domestic violence intervention. Police and probation officers, victim advocates, victims/survivors, batterer intervention providers, and perpetrators met in a homogeneous group, made of between 4 and 12 members for an average of 77 minutes to discuss their perceptions of what constituted current domestic violence intervention with abusive men, what is limiting its success, and how else they would like to see their community engaged.

Major Findings

Wallpe (2010) found seven emergent themes that operate together to manifest the attribute of "limited effectiveness". 1) Attempts to simultaneously punish and rehabilitate perpetrators of domestic violence; 2) dominance of a "one size fits all" approach; 3) insufficient accountability within the system set up for abusive men; 4) rampant victim blaming; 5) barriers to effective collaboration; 6) confusion created by complex domestic violence dynamics; and 7) reactivity instead of activism and prevention.

These seven emergent themes stated by Walppe (2010) work together to manifest the limited effectiveness of the intervention system and point to four fundamental challenges allied with utilizing the criminal justice system as the principal means to use to hold perpetrators

accountable for their abuse: 1) Mixing the goals of punishment and rehabilitation; 2) balancing consistency with an individually tailored response; 3) effectively protecting and empowering victims; and 4) moving beyond reactivity towards prevention (Walppe, 2010).

Mixing the Goals of Punishment and Rehabilitation

On mixing the goals of punishment and rehabilitation, the participants were concerned about the effectiveness of current domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men. They suggested that punishment does not connect to rehabilitation, and   criminal justice sanctions often produce great dislike and resistance in the perpetrators who get worse in the abuse of the victim and interfere with treatment success. They also find it challenging to achieve both functions simultaneously. Even more disturbing than the fact that punishment does not seem to rehabilitate perpetrators is the fact that, according with participants in the Wallpe (2010) study, criminal justice system involvement might actually make perpetrators more abusive. Participants related that abusers' overnight holds place their victims in an enormously terrifying position. These findings are consistent with other literature suggesting that police intervention can sometimes exacerbate the violence instead of stopping it (Eighnberg, 2001). However, it is important also to understand that the participants in the Wallpe (2010) study did not appear to be promoting a reduction in criminal justice sanctions when they talked about the dangers of arrest. In others, they suggested that punitive consequences needed to be greater to provide appropriate levels of punishment for abusers and clear protection for victims. Along the same trend of thinking, participants also believed that mandated batterer intervention treatment can sometimes increase the abuse toward the victim. They also stated that batterer intervention can produce feelings of resentment and resistance, which can then translate into anger and abuse, directed at their victims, and also interfere with the men's ability to engage in treatment. It was further

suggested that the punishment position embraced by most batterer intervention programs actually

can complicate the change process, particularly the initial decision to change (Wallpe, 2010; Day,

Chung & O'Leary, 2009). Finally, the participants discussed the challenges they personally face

when trying to achieve the goals of punishment and rehabilitation and thus fulfill their

responsibilities to achieving the coordinated community response. Batterer's intervention

facilitators related how it can be very difficult to be effective as therapists while operating within

the dominant punishment orientation of the coordinated community response. The focus on

punishment promotes the notion that perpetrators are bad men in need of sanctions, as opposed to

madmen in need of treatment (Wallpe, 2010; Mankowski, 2002). Participants also showed a

concern about the criminal justice system merely labeling men as hopeless and bad, which likely

interfered with treatment effectiveness.

Balancing Reliability with Individually Personalized Response

There have been many studies on the fact that current domestic violence intervention

strategies are dominated by the "one size fits all" approach. This singularity has been strongly

criticized particularly by batterer intervention facilitators. Participants in the Wallpe (2010) study

questioned the benefits of a "one size fits all" approach to treatment, given the diverse needs of

the individual perpetrators. They also showed a further concern by observing that minority men

are treated unfavorably by the criminal justice system. They stated that minorities are more likely

to be arrested, prosecuted, and incarcerated for domestic violence than white or wealthy men. As

such, law enforcement officers suggested that these minorities are more likely to have a different

response to the threat of the criminal justice system sanction than the less targeted population.

Police officers related that utilization of the criminal justice system in and of itself reinforced the

primacy of a "one size fits all" approach through the adoption of mandatory arrest and

prosecution policies coupled with that system's gender-blind decontextualized view of crime. Mandatory arrest laws were originally designed to protect victims from police officers who would frequently minimize the violence, side with the perpetrator, or attempt mediation (Buzawa & Buzawa, 2003). However, police officers have shown some concern about the fact that victims' acting in self-defense are more and more frequently being arrested as the primary aggressor or in conjunction with the primary aggressor in the case of a dual arrest (Miller, 2001). They further related that not only are victims who are arrested as a consequence of mandatory arrest laws subjected to the humiliation of criminal justice sanctions, but the consequences can be disturbing in terms of decreased future employment and housing opportunities. Also and more importantly, police officer pointed out that knowing that abuse victims might also be arrested can discourage victims from seeking police protection.

The criminal justice system "one size fits all" approach to domestic violence wrongly assumes that domestic violence is a singular occurrence and that it manifests in a similar pattern for all perpetrators and victims. It is reasonable to conclude instead that mandatory arrest laws and the decontextualization of individual cases have led to arrests of both women and men engaging in common couple violence under the application of laws that were originally intended to protect women from male patriarchal violence (Guzik, 2009).

Evidently, the criminal justice system as a "one size fits all" approach to domestic violence struggles to meet the diverse needs of both the perpetrators and the victims. Police officers, in particular, observed that the reasons why any particular man is abusive will differ and disregarding this diversity seems imprudent.

Unfortunately, as a result of the wide-spread adoption of state standards, batterer intervention programs may not be well enough prepared to deal with and respond to the diverse

needs of different perpetrators. While many theories have been advanced to explain men's violence toward women, the theories that observe the impact of physiological and biological forces, mental illness and psychopathology, substance abuse, skill deficits, destructive relationship patterns, culture, race and class, are most of the time applied substantially in batterer intervention programs.

Gelles (2001) argues that while a socio-political analysis of domestic violence may be appropriate, it has limited therapeutic value. Participants in the Wallpe (2010) study suggested that trying to match individual perpetrators' profiles with specific treatment strategies would enhance overall effectiveness. However, while most expressed reservations about the primacy of the "one size fits all" approach, they were not uniformly in favor of less consistency in its application, particularly if the resulting inconsistency was likened to or resulted in less accountability for abuse perpetrators.

Effectively Protecting and Empowering Victims

The participants in Wallpe (2010) study expressed skepticism when talking about the ability of the criminal justice system to protect and empower the victims of domestic violence. They described how victims are often pushed into a relationship with the criminal justice system and how if deprived of the authority to make decisions about their lives they are forced to submit to the criminal justice system rules. Also, while many argue that the rights of battered women as a whole are served by advancing zero tolerance policies, such as mandatory arrest and no-drop prosecution, the actual authority and power of women are regularly compromised by these policies.

Stark (1996) makes the case that mandatory arrest policies do "work" because they demonstrate to society that battering is wrong and punishable. Whether or not the policies work to

reduce recidivism in specific batterers, these policies do serve to openly withdraw any consent of the criminal justice system to wife abuse. However, Miller (2001) found that women did not use their sense of personal power (derived from an independent income) to end domestic violence. Rather, she found, that victims' perception of legal power (derived from their satisfaction with the police action taken) could be used to make them feel safer and control their interactions with violent partners in the future. She concluded that "the most reasonable criminal justice and social service responses to domestic violence are those that consider the victim's needs by taking into account her subjective experiences, her cultural and social resources, and her personal and legal resources" (p.121).

Ironically, mandatory arrest and no-drop prosecution policies may actually serve to increase the rates of domestic violence when victims avoid contacting the criminal justice system out of fear that they will no longer be in control of their lives and might be arrested as well.

The most common manifestation of victim disempowerment reported by the participants in The Wallpe (2010) study was the extensive production of victim blaming. According to participants, victims were blamed for choosing abusive partners, for staying in the relationship, for not calling the police, for calling the police too often, for not pressing charges, for not participating in prosecution, for allowing abusers to violate "no contact" orders and for going back to their abusers. Police officers, acknowledging that regardless of their training and experience and despite that fact that most of them are well aware of the fact that contextual factors, such as lack of sufficient housing, childcare, and employment, often force women to choose to stay in an abusive relationship, these officers are often guilty of blaming the victim for her situation, especially if there are children involved.

Feminists have argued that the control of intimate violence depends on the fundamental restructuring of gender relations and the further empowerment of women. Gender is a complex social, historical, and cultural entity that is related to, but not simply derived from, biological sex differences. Gender orders social life and social institutions in fundamental ways. Gender and relationship definitions are the basis for the social constructs of masculinity and femininity, which are organized in such a way that male power gives men dominion over women. The views of men that rationalize the subordinate position of women are deeply embedded in systems of knowledge and in the processes that produce them (Humphries, 2009). Therefore, as a major part of a patriarchal society where more than 70% of police officers are men, gender is frequently ignored in criminal justice practice. This truth led us to think that more training and further efforts to increase the number of women in policing that responds to domestic violence calls would be an adequate way to provide greater victim empowerment.

Walppe (2010) concludes that police officers may be attributing blame to victims pursuant to their own feeling of impotence with respect to successfully being able to intervene in domestic violence. Participants reported feeling helpless to protect women and frustrated when women did not appear to help themselves, as well as a sense of hopelessness about the potential rehabilitation of the abuse perpetrators.

Moving Beyond Reactivity toward Prevention

Participants in the Walppe (2010) study suggested there existed a tension between reacting to an individual man's violence against an individual woman and developing strategies to prevent men's violence against women in general terms. Participants were concerned by the fact that current efforts almost exclusively target individuals who have been abusive instead of focusing more effort on the social-political analysis of the root causes of domestic violence overall.

Current strategies implemented for intervening with men's violence rarely focus on the societal levels of change, usually attributed to a shortage of resources and a choice for accepted prioritization within the field. Participants acknowledge that if they were more focused on prevention, they would be able to engage in better prevention efforts, particularly in training on medical and religious and prevention education in the schools.

The most enthusiastically missed prevention discussed by participants involved providing basic needs, such as housing, childcare, and employment, for both the perpetrators and the victims. They were quite clear that until these basic needs are fulfilled, domestic violence will continue to plague their communities. Police officers pointed out that focusing on improving criminal justice sanctions without attending to these vital human rights is sadly shortsighted. Victims will not choose to engage in criminal justice sanctions if the end result means they cannot feed their children or house their children and themselves. The practice of increasing law enforcement response and aggressive prosecution policies often fails to take into account the daily needs of women who are battered, which can include long -term housing, economic support, and/or childcare (Erwin, 2006). Further, perpetrators will not be able to respect and abide by any sanctions if they do not have critical resources themselves, such as housing and employment. A number of limitations that affect the effectiveness of domestic violence intervention with abusive men have been described in this chapter and several of the limitations from solely on criminal justice system to intervene in domestic violence have been indicated. However, despite the limitations associated with the criminal justice system, I strongly defend the idea that the domestic violence movement should not turn its back on the response of the criminal justice system or the multiple gains that can derive from the criminalization of domestic violence. However, it is vital that the domestic violence movement as well as stakeholders it the system

respond to the critics and the issues that have been identified for a more effective domestic

violence phenomenon. As the final goal of this study, the next chapter discusses and suggests

opportunities for the most and effective improvement in domestic violence intervention.

Chapter 3: Improving the Domestic Violence Intervention System

Applying the previous literature review on the limitations of strategies for intervention in domestic violence cases, this chapter suggests three primary opportunities for solid/positive intervention enhancement: 1) Improve the criminal justice system police response to domestic violence cases; 2) Improve the efficacy of batterer intervention programs; and 3) Focus on a prevention approach instead of the reactive approach proposed by the current intervention strategies.

Improving the Criminal Justice System

While there were many requests from the participants in the Wallpe (2010) study for greater accountability for perpetrators of domestic violence in the form of sanctions, such as arrests, prosecutions, and incarcerations, these participants also expressed their concerns about the dangers of and the lack of rehabilitative potential of these sanctions. Consequently, one aspect seems very clear about the changes that need to happen to improve the criminal justice system and make it more effective in this area of concern.

The criminal justice system must do a better job of listening to, empowering, and protecting current victims. These women must be better supported and their voices solicited and incorporated into any responses. The behavior of police officers mirrors the values of the larger social culture, which historically has failed to view violence against women as a serious social problem. Most police officers believe that battered women choose to remain in abusive situations and that they could leave these violent situations if they only wanted to leave. Furthermore, domestic violence calls have been generally classified as social work and despite the fact that the

majority of a police officer's time is spend in service work, officers and their occupational culture highlight crime fighting, the law enforcement nature of their work and also their general response to domestic violence. Thus, they become frustrated when they receive a call from a domestic violence victim, and then, after arriving at the scene, the victim denies the abuse because of "fear". Some victims do not appear in court, and most of them go back to living with their abuser. However, the police officers work to ensure protection and safety for the victim when it is needed and not deny help because they think or are told the victim will not respond to their expectations. Another issue surrounding the police work in domestic violence cases is that police officers seem to dislike these calls. Some officers have disregard for domestic violence calls because there is no formal incentive that rewards their performance in this area. Training academies do not focus on domestic violence for as long as they should and rarely is a separate interviewing course offered during recruit training to help officers communicate with domestic abuse victims on the scene (Moriarty, 2002).

Education in domestic violence should be required for all judges, prosecutors, police, parole boards, and correctional personnel. According to Bloom (2003), traditional correctional policies are currently usually male-based with no due consideration of the gender differences that shape individual behavior. Therefore, the correctional systems have been left to deal with the behavior and characteristics of these male offenders.

These details show that when the police response to domestic violence fails, all of society and the local community loses, as well as the women, the abuser, the criminal justice system and often the children who now have no father and no mother and probably will be sent to a shelter or foster care. The image of the police is one of delivering social damage as an inefficient

organization that instead should be promoting safety and protection. The gender issue will likely remain in our society, as most of the cases tend to blame the victims (women).

Aware of all these failures in the criminal justice system, certain activists continue to invest their energies in making the legal system more responsive to victims and transforming the sense of discrimination that is felt and related to gender, race, sexual orientation, and class. A coordinated community response model was created by the domestic abuse intervention project (DAIP) and emphasized that the community, not the victims, is responsible for addressing violence.

Feminists approach domestic violence as another form of the political, social, economic, sexual, and physical oppression of women individually and as a group. They see domestic violence as a way for men to gain power, control, dominate, devalue and disempower women. Our culture encourages, supports, condones, allows, and expects men to dominate and take control over women; therefore, the problem of domestic violence should be addressed by the community as a community issue, not just a legal issue. Key elements of this community response include police, the courts, and advocates for abused women, as well as those social service agencies that work with victims and offenders. The goal of a coordinated community response is to modify, coordinate, and monitor the response of multiple community agencies (Ptacek, 2010). The principle behind a coordinated community response is that the State is responsible for domestic violence through policies and practices it endorses that fail to protect women and fail to hold abusers accountable. Even when changes have focused more on increased efficiency, arrests and convictions have not provided true safety, autonomy and integrity for battered women. Neither have rehabilitation and/or attempts at education of the abusers.

A successful community response to domestic violence needs to establish the means to evaluate state and community interventions from the standpoint of women who are seeking protection and abusers seeking successful intervention to prevent further abuse . This standpoint must also be contrasted with the standpoint of effective case management or a "law-and-order" perspective that measures its success in terms of arrests, conviction rates and incarceration (Pence 1995 as cited in Ptacek 2010, p 47). In other words, in order for the criminal justice system to change its view of a police officer as a crime fighter and adopt the idea of police work being more focused on community relations, changes will be necessary in the way biases shape the responses of the criminal justice system. These biases are based on gender, race, ethnicity, age, immigration status, class, language, and sexual orientation. Furthermore, community policing should emphasize crime control and order maintenance, crime prevention, proactive policing, community problem-solving, and improvement of police community relations by reducing the current social distance between the police and the public (Corsianos, 2009) and breaking the bias view so prevalent in some segments of the community as of "us vs. them."

Mills (1998) proposes a "survivor center model" in order to shift from the currently abusive relationship that many victims have with the State toward a relationship that promotes acceptance, respect, reassurance, re-socialization, empowerment and liberation. She suggests that officers of the state should view every interaction they have with a victim as an opportunity to model for and reinforce healthy patterns of relating. This modeling could mean that police officers spend more time at the scene defining the history and context of any particular assault and the complications or implications of their enforcement actions. Current members of the coordinated community response must manage together to determine how best to engage and

empower victims. It is very possible that abusers will be held more accountable if victims are heard and respected fully, along with the sanctions that are then enforced.

Also, if the criminal justice system is going to play a key role in the interruption of domestic violence, then that system will have to challenge the unique dynamics clearly inherent in interpersonal violence. Victims of patriarchal violence are not served well when the absence of physical abuse translates into a refusal of the system to intervene on their behalf. Indeed, the victims of common couple violence may not be best served when arrest, probation, no contact orders and treatment strain the family's ability to survive financially. Understanding the different tactics that batterers use to keep their victims victimized is an important step to take to have the most efficient police response to the victim. Domestic violence is a pattern of coercive behavior used by men to control their intimate partners. It always involves a physical assault or a threat of physical assault. A physical assault is almost always accompanied by one or more abusive tactics earlier, later or in conjunction with the physical assault. For instance, coercion and threats, economic abuse, male privilege, children as a threat to get full custody, emotional abuse, isolation of the victim from friends and family, minimizing and denying the abuse and blaming the victim for their acts, and finally intimidating the victim by treating her badly or even killing her and the children if she leaves are common tactics (Eigenberg, 2001).

Also, as long as the criminal justice system insists on viewing those who are involved in domestic violence as either perpetrator or victims, much will be lost. Victims will lose the chance to fight back or defend themselves for fear of getting arrested themselves, and perpetrators will lose the opportunity to be seen as whole human being struggling with their own personal experience of victimization, well worthy of compassion and capable of changing (Wallpe, 2010).

Heightening the Efficacy of Batterer Intervention Programs

Strong arguments of having a generalized "patriarchy as cause" as an explanation for men's behavior combined with criminal justice system sanctions are the best way to interrupt men's violence toward women, but these have led to some confusion for the facilitators of batterer intervention programs. Lehmann & Simmons (2009) in their book, *Strength-based Batterer Intervention* suggest that to have a process of change, a paradigm shift has to occur, one that recognizes the individuality of abusers instead of just the manual implementation of BIP programs, which wrongly assumes a "one fit all " abuse population.

Given the high rates of recidivism following participation in batterer intervention programs, it seems premature and thus inappropriate to advance only one program model over others for batterer intervention. Batterer intervention facilitators should be encouraged to develop and advocate for different models based on the theories, practice and experience, and evaluation.

Batterer intervention programs need to become more specifically personalized to the needs of the individual offenders who attend domestic violence groups. New treatment models will need to be developed r to competently address the wide array of diverse level issues presented by abusers in domestic violence. In order to develop future strategies for interventions more information is needed about individual domestic violence offender experiences instead of use the one- model- fits all approach in batterer intervention programs.

Focusing on Batterer Prevention

Finally, the domestic violence movement must renew its focus on prevention and activism rather than on rehabilitation. Placing full confidence in the criminal justice has diminished the passion and capacity for social activism among abuse advocates (Allen, 2009) Attention must be refocused on the societal environment and positive social movements to end domestic violence.

Feminist advocates and others within the movement must continue to provide prevention education that addresses and changes gender roles, masculinity/femininity issues, conflict resolution, equity and the coercive uses of power. Prevention education should not be limited to school age children, but delivered to all the community and elements of society. Our society is surrounded by many messages all the time. The media, music, videos, movies, computer games, magazines, websites, pornographic videos, etc, are all forms of communication that occurs between people and society. Communication is an important factor in the development of our values, beliefs and behaviors. Children and teens have as their idols men who songs that show abuse explicitly which helps make   males aggressive and feel in control and keep the values of females restricted to their sexual allure only. Media, pornography and many popular songs are teaching society that women are unworthy of respect and valuable only as sex objects. Violence against women in the media thus reinforces violent behavior among men, children and teenagers toward women.

According to Humphries (2009) the cultural characteristics of his gender role are sufficient to prepare a boy to become an abusive man. Domestic violence is a complex phenomenon, and the media often portray cases where victims are deeply in love with their perpetrators, and the perpetrators are often extremely conflicted about their violence. Advocates must continue to illuminate these complexities to the public as well as the problematic portrayals of romantic love that encompass conventional culture.

A major media campaign is an interesting possibility to help prevent abusive behaviors because of its focus on population behavior. It has been shown that individuals are more likely to get involved in violence prevention if they have been given specific skills that relate to handling particular situations (Wallpe, 2010; Banyard, Plante, & Maynihan, 2004). It is reasonable to

expect that friends and neighbors may be more likely to intervene in domestically abusive situations if they are educated in the ways that interpersonal violence manifests and how the society and the criminal justice system has accepted the behavior as wrong behavior.

Chapter Four: Conclusion, Limitations of the Study, and,

Recommendations for Further Research

Considering the many significant actions by the feminist antiviolence movement over the last 35 years, the domestic violence movement has taken many extremely impressive steps toward reducing the incidence of domestic violence. Historically, the family was viewed as a private entity within the context of the privileges imposed by a patriarchal society. Domestic violence was considered a private matter, not one for intervention by the state. Once, considered normal and acceptable behavior, men's abuse of their intimate partners is no longer morally or legally allowed in the United States.

It was a historic occasion indeed when the first laws criminalizing domestic violence were passed informing society that the privacy granted to the family by the State did not include acceptance of men who beat their wives. In the same way, when police officers refused to enforce the new laws, mandatory arrest and legal action was taken through class action law suits (Wallpe, 2010; Jolin, 2008) and an impressive victory against institutionalized gender oppression was thus achieved. It could easily be argued that the success of the domestic violence movement to this point in time can be attributed to activist enthusiasm to modify existing practices and policies in response to the full realization and recognition of women's rights in society.

I embraced this study with the hope that by turning a critical and evaluative literature review toward the nature of abusive behavior, the effectiveness of current strategies, and possible improvements in the domestic violence scenarios and places of conflict would emerge. Consequently, positive suggestions and future research and development would take place on how to improve the current intervention strategies. The goal was always to reduce men's abuse

against their partners through appropriate change and education.

What is clear to me after this study is that the particular current level of the theories, despite their benefits, are fundamentally inadequate to address the complex nature and manifestation of domestic violence today. As an alternative, multi-level models for understanding domestic violence are necessary if we are to avoid continuing some of the limitations of strategies interventions identified in this study. When choosing to acknowledge the background of men's violence against women on multiple levels of analysis, we open ourselves to the possibility of responding more effectively. The criminal justice system's "one size fits all" approach to domestic violence wrongly assumes that domestic violence is a singular occurrence and that it manifests in a similar pattern for all perpetrators and victims. It is reasonable to conclude that mandatory arrest laws and the decontextualization of individual cases to one size fits all have led to arrests of women and men engaging in common couple violence under the application of laws that were originally intended to protect women from male patriarchal violence (Guzik, 2009).

Evidently, the criminal justice system's a "one size fits all" approach to domestic violence has only struggled further to meet the diverse needs of perpetrators and victims. It is safe to conclude after this dissertation that the reason why any particular man is abusive can differ in many aspects and disregarding this diversity in motivation seems to be both imprudent and ineffective and even discriminatory.

Unfortunately, as a result of the widespread adoption of State standards, batterer intervention programs are not well prepared to deal with and respond to the diverse needs of abuse perpetrators. While many theories have been advanced to explain men's violence toward women, those theories that observe the impact of physiological and biological forces, mental

illness and psychopathology, substance abuse, skill deficits, destructive relationship patterns, culture, race and class, are most often insignificant in the batterer intervention programs.

Gelles (2001) argues that while a socio-political analysis of domestic violence may be appropriate, it has limited therapeutic value. Indeed, trying to match a perpetrator's profile with specific treatment strategies would enhance treatment effectiveness. Also, by acknowledging social influences, such as gender roles; relational influences, such as interaction patterns within couples; and individual influences, such as biology and psychology, we can develop our intervention efforts and better meet the specific and collective needs of both victims and perpetrators. Victim advocates can better understand the history of activism that guided and shaped the domestic violence movement and directly target those experiences at the social level of analysis in addition to helping individual women. Batterer intervention providers will be inspired from the knowledge and successes of mental health professionals to develop programs that better engage perpetrators and also participate in more community/media outreaches targeted at challenging overly strict gender roles, notions of masculinity and femininity, and acceptable relationship behaviors.

Additionally, by embracing multi-level theories and police responses, it is possible to improve the Criminal Justice System response by better engaging victims, improving the efficacy of batterer intervention by experimenting with alternative approaches, and moving away from a "one size fits all" model .The focus will finally be on prevention as a way to improve the effectiveness of current strategies of intervention in combating domestic violence by either preventing it or applying the better intervention strategies to hold down the rates of recidivism.

References

Adams, D. (1982). Men unlearning violence: A group approach based on the collective model. In M. Roy (Ed.), *The Abusive Partner.* New York, NY: Nostrand.

Allen, N.E. (2006). An examination of the effectiveness of domestic violence coordinating councils. *Violence Against Women, 12 (1),* 46-67.

American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders DSM-IV-TR Fourth Edition*. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing.

Bancroft, L. (2002). *Why does he do that? Inside the minds of angry and controlling men*. New York: Penguin Putnam, Inc.

Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A social learning analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Buzawa, E.S., & Buzawa, C.G. (2003).*Domestic violence: The criminal justice response.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Center for Disease Control (2003).*Costs of intimate partner violence against women in the United States.* Atlanta, GA: Author.

Cloward, R., & Ohlin, L. (1960).*Delinquency and opportunity: A theory of delinquent gangs*. Indiana University: Free Press.

Corsianos, M. (2009). *Policing and gendered justice: Examining the possibilities.* Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto.

Cullen, F. T. (2004). *Criminal circumstance: A dynamic multicontextual criminal opportunity theory* (book). *Contemporary Sociology*, 33(3), 359, 361.

Dhawan, S. (1996). Sexual abuse histories of sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatmen*t, Vol. 8.

Dobash, R.E., & Dobash, R.P. (1998).*Rethinking violence against women.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Dutton, D. G. (1999).Traumatic origins of intimate rage. *Aggression & Violent Behavior, 4(4),* 431-447.

Eigenberg, H. (2001). *Woman battering in the United States: Till death do us part*. Long Grove, Illinois: Waveland Press. Inc.

49

Erwin, P. E. (2006). Exporting U.S. domestic violence reforms: An analysis of human rights frameworks and U.S. "best practices". *Feminist Criminology, 1(3)*, 188-206.

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

Gelles, R. (2001). Standards for programs for men who batter? Not yet. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 5,* 11-20.

Gondolf, E.W. (2002). *Batterer intervention systems: Issues, outcomes, and recommendations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Guzik, K. (2009). *Arresting abuse: Mandatory legal interventions, power, and intimate abusers.* DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press.

Haaken, J. (2010). *Hard Knocks: Domestic violence and the psychology of storytelling.* London: Routhledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Humphries, D. (2009). *Women, violence, and the media.* Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Jasinski, J. L. (2000). Theoretical explanations for violence against women. In C.M. Renzetti, J.L. Edleson, & R. K. Bergen (Eds.), *Sourcebook on violence against women* (pp. 5-21). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Johnson, A. S. (2006). *Physical abusers and sexual offenders: Forensic and clinical strategies.* Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press.

Kimmel, M.. (2000). *The gendered society reader.* New York, New York: Oxford University Press.

Laing, L. (2002). Responding to men who perpetrate domestic violence: Controversies, Interventions, and challenges. *Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse, 7.*

Mederos, F. (1999). Batterer intervention programs: The past and future prospects. In M. Shepard, & E. Pence (Eds.), *Coordinating community responses to domestic violence: Lessons from Duluth and beyond* (pp. 127-150). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Miller, N. (2004). *Domestic violence: A review of state legislation defining police and prosecution duties and powers* [Online]. Retrieved December 11, 2006, from www.ilj.org/publications/DV_Legislation-3.pdf.

Miller, S. L. (2001). The paradox of women arrested for domestic violence: Criminal justice professionals and service providers respond. *Violence Against Women, 7(12),* 1339-1376.

50

Mills, L. G. (1998). Mandatory arrest and prosecution policies for domestic violence: A critical literature review and the case for more research to test victim empowerment approaches. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 25,* 306-318

Moriarty, L. (2002). *Policing and victims.* Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Murphy, C. M., Musser, P.H., & Maton, K.I. (1998). Coordinated community intervention for domestic abusers: Intervention system involvement and criminal recidivism. *Journal of Family Violence, 13*, 263-284

Pence, E., & Paymar, M. (1993).*Education groups for men who batter: The Duluth Model*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.

Ptacek, J. (2010). *Restorative justice and violence against women.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Raine, A. (1993). *The psychopathology of crime: Criminal behavior as a clinical disorder.* San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Renzetti, C., & Bergen, R.(2005). *Violence against women.* Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Rosenbaum, A., Hoge, S. K., Adelman, S.A., Warnken, W. J., Fletcher, K.E., & Kane, R. L. (1994). Head injury in partner-abusive men. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62,* 1187-1193.

Stover, C.M. (2005). Domestic violence research: What have we learned and where do we go from here? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20(4),* 448-454.

Tolman, R.M. (2001). An ecological analysis of batterer intervention program standards. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 5 (2)*, 221-233.

Van Wormer, K. (2009). Restorative justice as social justice for victims of gendered violence: A standpoint feminist perspective. *Social Work, 54(2).*107-116

Wallpe, C. (2010). *Engaging a system approach to evaluate domestic violence intervention with abusive men: reassessing the role of community*.(Doctoral dissertation, Portland State University).

Whitfield, C.L. (2003). Violent childhood experiences and the risk of intimate partner violence in adults: Assessment in a large health maintenance organization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18(2)*, 166-185.