

Project Information

Review Title	Assessing Domestic Violence Intervention Programs in the United States: Identifying Strengths, Weaknesses, and a Path Towards Restorative Justice
Project Lead	Deborah M. Weissman, JD
Team Members	Deborah M. Weissman, JD Kathryn E. Moracco, PhD, MPH Erika M. Redding, MSPH Alexis Pendergraft Alexandra Riginos
Date	April 12, 2021
Institution(s)	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, School of Law University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Gillings School of Global Public Health

Background

Domestic Violence Intervention Programs (DVIPs) were established during the 1970s and expanded rapidly during subsequent decades.¹ As the response to domestic violence (DV) increasingly resorted to criminal justice interventions, at least forty-eight states and the federal government enacted statutes authorizing DVIPs as sentencing options for abusers.² Judges in civil cases were also statutorily authorized to order abusers to attend a treatment program as part the provisions of a civil domestic violence protection order (DVPO).² The majority of state statutes mandate standards and guidelines for DVIPs and designate agencies, most of which are state DV agencies embedded within the criminal justice system, to approve and monitor these programs.^{2,3}

Most DVIPs rely on two similar models (Emerge and Duluth);⁴⁻⁶ these models serve as the prototype for state programs, including North Carolina's DVIPs. Recent studies have revealed the ineffectiveness of DVIPs and the failure of current program models to improve outcomes related to DV.⁷ Furthermore, anecdotal national and local data about DVIPs collected since March 2020, when the COVID-19 pandemic required changes to program service delivery, indicate that a shift in program strategies to include crisis management services, such as guidance on economic issues and mental and physical health well-being check-ins, appears to have had a beneficial impact; including improved attendance and group participation. These findings suggest the need for a new approach to interventions that address DV perpetration to include attention to a broader range of structural issues that often underlie perpetrator behavior.

Objective

The goal of this project is to consider strategies to realign DVIPs to better fulfil their mission to hold accountable program participants who have harmed their intimate partners, provide justice and restore wholeness to those who have been harmed, and to do so within a social justice framework with an emphasis on restorative justice (RJ) praxis.^{8,9} There are three principles of RJ-related goals regarding DV



that will be the focus of our inquiry: 1) centering responses on the agency and safety of the harmed person(s); 2) engaging the person(s) causing harm to acknowledge the harm that they have caused and to include a network of invested community members through participatory processes of accountability; and 3) endeavoring to respect the diversity of cultural values and the impact of systemic oppression on interpersonal violence. A related principle that is often included derives from transformative justice praxis and includes efforts to gain community support to address conditions that create violence, disavow carceral, punitive approaches to transgressive behavior. Programs incorporating RJ practices prioritize ending violence, promoting safety and empowerment, and changing social norms.¹⁰ Our review of the literature will focus on program efficacy and the extent to which DVIPs utilize social justice frameworks, such as RJ, to inform the development and implementation of curriculum and other program components.

Search Strategy

Databases

Below is a list of academic databases that our research team will search:

- PubMed
- EBSCO-Academic Search Premier
- EBSCO- Women’s Studies International
- EBSCO- PsycInfo
- EBSCO- Social Work Abstracts
- JSTOR
- ProQuest-Sociological Abstracts
- ProQuest-PAIS Index
- ProQuest-Political Science Database
- ProQuest-GenderWatch
- ProQuest- Social Services Abstracts
- ProQuest-Criminal Justice Database
- Social Science Research Network
- Hein Online
- WestLaw
- Lexis

Hand Searching

Hand searching will include, but is not limited to, the following web-based resources, developed by DV and social justice advocacy organizations:

- Futures Without Violence (<https://www.futureswithoutviolence.org/>)
- National Resource Center on Domestic Violence (<https://www.nrcdv.org/>)
- Men Stopping violence (<https://www.menstoppingviolence.org/>)
- A Call to Men (<https://www.acalltomen.org/>)
- Stop Violence Against Women- Batterer’s Intervention Programs (https://www.stopvaw.org/batterers_intervention_programs)
- Violence Against Women—Gender Based Violence Resource Library (<https://vawnet.org/>)
- Batterer’s Women’s Justice Project—Current Research on Batterer Intervention Programs and Implications for Policy (<https://www.bwjp.org/resource-center/resource->



[results/current_research_on_batterer_intervention_programs_and_implications_for_policy.html](#))

- Stone, Erin. 2019. *Can Domestic Abusers be Cured?* Mother Jones. <https://www.motherjones.com/crime-justice/2019/05/batterer-intervention-programs-domestic-violence-treatment/>
- Critical Resistance—Resources for Addressing Harm, Accountability and Healing (<http://criticalresistance.org/resources/addressing-harm-accountability-and-healing/>)

Experts or Stakeholders

N/A

Reference Searches

In addition to searching bibliographic databases, our team will conduct forward and backwards reference searches for all final articles included in the study (e.g. articles deemed eligible after title, abstract, and full text reviews).

To conduct the backwards review, we will conduct a title review for all referenced articles; to conduct our forward review we will conduct a title review for all articles that cite our selected studies. For all articles deemed relevant after this initial forwards and backwards title review, we will conduct subsequent abstract, and full text reviews to determine final eligibility.

Hand searching will be conducted for all web-based resources.

Eligibility Criteria

PPICO	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Program	Literature included in this review should be pertaining to Domestic Violence Intervention Programs (DVIPs); these programs are sometimes referred to as Batter Intervention Programs (BIPs) and Abuser Treatment Programs. These programs can be either court-mandated or self-referred	Literature regarding DVIP/BIPs conducted before 2000 should be excluded from this research. Additionally, we will exclude programs that are court mandated but do not focus on DV (ex: anger management programs, couples counseling, etc.)
Participant Population	Participant population should include individuals who are over the age of 18; there is no exclusion criteria regarding participant gender identity, sexual orientation, or other demographic factors.	Programs that engage with participants under the age of 18 should be excluded from this research.



Intervention	Literature describing DVIPs should pertain to programs designed to prevent repeated/additional Domestic Violence (DV) perpetration (secondary prevention).	Exclude description of intervention programs that are not DVIPs or that do not focus on the secondary prevention of DV perpetration.
Comparison	N/A	
Outcomes	In terms of participant outcomes, we are particularly interested in determinations regarding program effectiveness and understanding how effectiveness is defined across various DVIP programs.	There are no specific exclusion criteria regarding program outcomes.

Data Extraction

Erika Redding (ER) and Alexis Pendergraft (AP) will conduct the initial database search and deduplication process. ER and AP will also conduct the subsequent title review. After the title review phase, ER, AP, Kathryn Moracco (KM) and Deborah Weissman (DW) will conduct the abstract, and full article review phases.

Alexandra Riginos (AR) will conduct a hand search of the grey literature.

We intend to collect data from the following categories: Author(s), Year of Publication, Country of Origin, Aims/Purpose, Intervention Type, Duration of Intervention, Restorative Justice Practices, Transformative Justice Practices, Social Justice Practices, Economic Inequality, Participant Demographics, Racism, Case management, Program Partner/Alliances, Participant Outcomes, Key Findings, Study Design, Journal Volume, Journal Name, Citation Page, Pin Cite Page, Pin Citation, publication category (i.e. peer reviewed, grey, etc.), website address.

Study Quality Assessment

N/A

Data Synthesis

For each included study we will abstract information pertaining to the data collection categories listed above. Ultimately, we will summarize existing DVIPs’ incorporation of social justice practices, which include restorative justice principles, into DVIP intervention programs.



We are also interested in considering how current DVIPs provide opportunities to incorporate social justice practices in future DVIP curricula as well as the future inclusion of community stakeholders that have thus far not been included as partners and allies with DVIPs.

Project Tools

Software programs used for this project will include: EndNote, Covidence, Microsoft Excel, ATLAS.ti

Project Timetable

	Month	Month	Month	Month	Month	Month
Preparation	January 2021	February 2021	March 2021			
Conduct searches			April 2021			
Pilot test eligibility criteria			April 2021			
Ti/Ab + Full Text Selection			May 2021			
Pilot test data collection			May 2021			
Data collection			May 2021	June 2021		
Conduct assessments					June 2021	
Conduct synthesis & interpret results					June 2021	
Draft methods section of manuscript					June 2021	
Write manuscript						July 2021

Research Team Member Roles

Task	Description	Team Member Responsible
------	-------------	-------------------------



Preparation	Preparation includes the development of project protocol and preliminary organization for conducting the scoping review	ER, AP
Conduct Searches	Searches will be conducted using the aforementioned data bases, journals, and websites; the following search terms will be used to conduct searches: ((Abuser OR Batterer) AND (Treatment OR Intervention OR Program)) OR (“Domestic Violence Intervention Program” OR DVIP) OR ((Fatherhood OR “Strong Fathers”) AND Program) This task will also include a deduplication process conducted in EndNote	ER, AP
Pilot test eligibility Criteria	The pilot test will include 4 databases	ER, AP
Ti/abstract+full text selection	This task will include a review of all included articles using COVIDENCE software. ER and AP will conduct initial title reviews; DW and KM will participate in the abstract and full text selection phases	ER, AP, KM, DW
Pilot test data collection	ER will develop the data collection tool in Microsoft Excel. ER, AP, and AR will pilot test the data collection from 10 included articles	ER, AP, AR
Data Collection	Data collection will be conducting using the data collection tool developed by ER.	ER, AP, AR
Conduct Assessments	Conducting assessments will consist of a review of all collected data.	ER, AP, KM, DW
Conduct synthesis & Interpret Results	Synthesis and results interpretation will consist of an analysis of all collected data.	ER, AP, KM, DW
Write manuscript	Manuscript development and preparation will be conducted by ER, AP, KM, and DW	ER, AP, KM, DW



References

Articles cited in protocol:

1. Dekki A. Punishment or Rehabilitation-The Case for State-Mandated Guidelines for Batterer Intervention Programs in Domestic Violence Cases. *John's J Legal Comment*. 2003;18.
2. Pepin D, Hoss A, Penn MS. Menu of State batterer intervention program laws. 2015.
3. Weissman DM. In Pursuit of Economic Justice: The Political Economy of Domestic Violence Laws and Policies. 2020;2020:1.
4. Emerge . <https://www.emergedv.com/>. Accessed September 29, 2020.
5. Rosenbaum A, Leisring PA. Group intervention programs for batterers. *J Aggress Maltreat Trauma*. 2001;5(2):57-71. doi:10.1300/J146v05n02_05
6. Domestic Abuse Intervention Programs. <https://www.theduluthmodel.org/>. Accessed September 29, 2020.
7. Gondolf EW. *Gender-Based Perspectives on Batterer Programs: Program Leaders on History, Approach, Research, and Development*. Lexington Books; 2015.
8. Kim ME. From carceral feminism to transformative justice: Women-of-color feminism and alternatives to incarceration. *J Ethn Cult Divers Soc Work*. 2018;27(3):219-233. doi:10.1080/15313204.2018.1474827
9. Mills LG, Barocas B, Butters RP, Ariel B. A randomized controlled trial of restorative justice-informed treatment for domestic violence crimes. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2019;3(12):1284-1294. doi:10.1038/s41562-019-0724-1

This Review Protocol was originally created by Sarah Visintini, Maritime SPOR SUPPORT Unit and adapted from the following resources:

Cochrane Public Health Group. (2011) Guide for developing a Cochrane protocol. Retrieved from:

[http://ph.cochrane.org/sites/ph.cochrane.org/files/uploads/Guide%20for%20PH%20protocol Nov%202011 final%20for%20website.pdf](http://ph.cochrane.org/sites/ph.cochrane.org/files/uploads/Guide%20for%20PH%20protocol%20Nov%202011%20final%20for%20website.pdf).

Dartmouth Biomedical Libraries. (2012). Systematic Review Steps. Retrieved from

<http://www.dartmouth.edu/~library/biomed/services/lgr/docs/SR-Steps-Roles-revised.docx>

Durham University Community. (2009). Template for a Systematic Literature Review Protocol.

Retrieved from <https://community.dur.ac.uk/ebse/resources/templates/SLRTemplate.pdf>.

Warwick Medical School. (n.d.) Protocol Template: Systematic Review. Retrieved from

http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/med/staff/bridle/sr/protocol_template.doc.

World Health Organization. (2011). Review Protocol Template. Retrieved from

http://www.who.int/hrh/education/Rec1_CPDforfacultyteachingstaff.pdf.

