Portland State University

PDXScholar

1-1-2010

Engaging a Systems Approach to Evaluate Domestic Violence Intervention with Abusive Men: Reassessing the Role of Community

Courtenay Silvergleid Wallpe
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Engaging a Systems Approach to Evaluate

Domestic Violence Intervention with Abusive Men:

Reassessing the Role of Community

by

Courtenay Silvergleid Wallpe

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Systems Science: Psychology

Dissertation Committee:
Eric Mankowski, Chair
Jan Haaken
George Lendaris
Kris Henning
Annette Jolin

Portland State University
©2010

ABSTRACT

The domestic violence movement has had remarkable success illuminating the

scope, prevalence and consequences of battering, but has been more limited in its ability

to successfully intervene and prevent abuse of women by their intimate male partners.

Surprisingly, there has been little research directed at understanding why intervention

strategies with perpetrators are only minimally effective. Studies have focused on

assessing the degree to which and for whom individual components such as arrest,

prosecution and psycho-educational programs for abusive men are successful, but few

explorations have attempted to describe limitations and challenges to the domestic

violence intervention **system as a whole**.

Employing a systems approach, a process-oriented evaluation of the domestic

violence intervention system in Portland, Oregon was conducted. Ten focus groups were

facilitated with key stakeholders in the coordinated community response. Participants

included police and probation officers, victim advocates, victim/survivors, batterer

intervention program providers, and batterer intervention program participants. The

focus group discussions were analyzed using constructivist grounded theory and

emergent themes were identified. Based on stakeholder testimony, it appears as though

seven interacting features may limit the effectiveness of domestic violence intervention

strategies with abusive men: 1) attempting to simultaneously punish and rehabilitate

perpetrators, 2) dominance of a "one size fits all" approach, 3) insufficient accountability

within the system 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 and other findings are discussed in light of their capacity to illuminate fundamental tensions associated with relying so heavily on the criminal justice system to intervene in domestic violence (e.g., the contradictions that surface when attempting to protect and empower victims, the difficulty of balancing consistency with an individually tailored response when sanctioning perpetrators). Despite these and other challenges, complete dismissal of the criminal justice system's role in holding abusive men accountable seems unwise. Instead, it will be important for movement activists, practitioners, and researchers to critically reflect upon its limitations and work to redress and refine its use, while simultaneously developing new strategies that engage a wider range of community resources.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this endeavor to my magnificent family.

You are the passion of my heart and the wings of my soul.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

be eternally grateful to my parents for nurturing my passion for social justice and my quest for knowledge. I particularly want to recognize my mother's ongoing gift of unconditional love and support, a gift which creates essential space so that I can laugh at myself. Finally, I want to honor and acknowledge my amazing husband Bryan, along with our two beautiful boys Zachary and Zander, who graciously and lovingly sacrificed so much in order for me achieve this dream.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

Chapter One: Overview

Despite three decades of political activism, domestic violence continues at epidemic levels within the United States. Commonly defined as a pattern of abusive and coercive behaviors perpetrated on 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, 1998; Pence & Paymar, 1993). Although there is some debate regarding the equivalence of perpetration rates between men and women (Archer, 2000; Dutton & Nicholls, 2005; Fiebert, 1997; Kimmel, 2002; Saunders, 2002), it is generally acknowledged that women are overwhelmingly the victims of this abusive pattern and suffer more severe physical consequences (Archer, 2000; Buzawa & Buzawa, 2003; Dobash, Dobash, Cavanagh, & Lewis, 1999; Saunders, 2002). Estimates suggest that between 2 and 4 million women are physically assaulted by an intimate male partner each year (Bancroft, 2002; Collins, Schoen, Joseph, Duchon, Simantov, & Yellowitz, 1999) and according to the American Psychological Association (1996), one in three women will be assaulted by a male partner at some point during her lifetime. The physical, psychological, and financial cost to these women, their children and our society as a whole is staggering (Bancroft, 2002; Healey, Smith & O'Sullivan, 1998).

Women who are abused by an intimate partner are at an increased risk for death (Eisenstadt & Bancroft, 1999; Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2001), physical injuries (Rand & Strom, 1997), post-traumatic stress disorder (Astin, Ogland-Hand, Coleman, & Foy, 1995; Dutton, 1992), somatic disorders, depression, suicide attempts (Campbell,

Kub, Belknap, & Templin, 1997; Moscicki, 1989; Walker, 1991), substance abuse

(Stewart & Israeli, 2002), work-related absences, job loss (Center for Disease Control,

2003), and homelessness (Bufkin & Bray, 1998). Children exposed to domestic violence

are at risk for physical injuries (McKay, 1994, Straus, Gelles & Smith, 1990), behavioral

and developmental problems (Fantuzzo & Mohr, 1999), substance abuse, suicide, and are

more likely to either be victimized or perpetrate abuse in the future (Dutton, 1999;

Dutton, 2000; Healey et al., 1998, Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986, Whitfield, Anda, Dube &

Felitti, 2003). While the impact on extended family members, community members and

society as a whole is difficult to quantify, a recent Center for Disease Control and

Prevention study (2003) estimated that the annual health care costs associated with

intimate partner violence exceed 5.8 billion dollars.

　　　In the last 30 years, the domestic violence movement has had remarkable success

illuminating the scope, prevalence and consequences of battering (Carlson & Worden,

2005; Klein, Campbell, Soler & Ghez, 1997), but has been somewhat less successful

intervening with perpetrators and preventing them from re-assaulting their intimate

partners (Stover, 2005). While there is certainly an enhanced criminal justice system

response, as well as a proliferation of intervention programs for abusive men (Gondolf,

2002), the effectiveness of these strategies remains questionable (Babcock, Green &

Robie, 2004; Babcock & Steiner, 1999; Feder & Wilson, 2005; Haaken &Yragui, 2003;

Healey et al., 1998). There is only minimal evidence to suggest that women who seek

police protection are less likely to be abused in the future (Gross, Cramer, Forte, Gordon,

Kunkel, & Moriarty, 2000; Maxwell, Garner, & Fagan, 2001) or that men who are

arrested and mandated to attend batterer intervention programs are less likely to be

abusive upon completion (Dunford, 2000; Feder & Dugan 2002; Feder & Wilson, 2005;

Harrell, 1991). Though an impressive array of support services, such as emergency

shelters, crisis lines, and legal advocacy now exist for victims of domestic violence

(Farmer & Tiefenthaler, 2003; Gordon, 1988; Haaken, 2010; Jolin, 2008; Pleck, 1987),

successful interruption and prevention of men's abusive behavior is essential if the

problem of domestic violence is to be successfully addressed.

       Surprisingly, there has been little research directed at understanding why

domestic violence intervention strategies with perpetrators are only minimally effective.

Studies have focused on assessing the degree to which and for whom individual aspects

of domestic violence intervention such as arrest, prosecution and psycho-educational

programs for abusive men are successful, but do not illuminate why, on the whole,

intervention strategies are not more effective. The vast majority of evaluations report

high levels of post intervention violence (Dobash & Dobash, 1997), but with little

analysis, explanation, or discussion of what factors contribute to this failure. The studies

that do expressly target failure focus narrowly on describing characteristics at the

individual level that are associated with program attrition and abuse recidivism (Daly,

Power & Gondolf, 2001; Gerlock, 2001; Gondolf, 1997; Hamberger & Hastings, 1990;

Jones & Gondolf, 2001; Taft, Murphy, Elliott & Keaser, 2001), rather than on identifying

potential systemic limitations. Focusing attention explicitly on why current domestic

violence intervention approaches are not more successful in reducing intimate partner

violence could prove quite illuminating, and is likely to reveal candidates for practice and policy improvements.

In this context, I embarked on an exploratory study with three overarching goals: 1) describe and critically analyze limitations of current domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men, 2) identify and describe additional opportunities for engaging community resources in domestic violence intervention with abusive men and, 3) create opportunities for key stakeholders within the domestic violence intervention system to dialogue about its limitations, thus facilitating possibilities for action and change. I provide an overview of my project in the remainder of this chapter.

Chapter Two comprises a three-part literature review. I begin by outlining theories of domestic violence causation, then briefly describe the evolution of current strategies for intervening with abusive men, and conclude with a discussion of evaluation literature on domestic violence intervention. Commencing with a review of theories or conceptualizations of why men are abusive to their intimate partners is useful for two reasons. In order to meaningfully evaluate current domestic violence intervention strategies, it may be helpful to understand the explanations of men's violence that have given rise to the development of these strategies.

Community psychologists have a long history of trying to understand social problems and the solutions for impacting those problems. One of the most persuasive explanations they have advanced for intervention failure is entitled the ecological fallacy (Watzlawick, Weakland, & Fisch 1974). The ecology fallacy is the erroneous assumption that a problem conceived on one level of analysis can be effectively

understood or impacted by an intervention that targets a different level of analysis. In other words, the ecological fallacy suggests that for maximum effectiveness, the levels of analysis between our problem definitions and our solutions should align. For example, if the problem of incomplete homework assignments is attributed to the low value that children's parents assign to the completion of school work at home (social/familial level explanation of the problem), an effective intervention would target parental attitudes and values regarding homework (social/familial level intervention) rather than focusing solely on the children (individual level intervention). Subsequently, it may be helpful to consider the dominant level of analysis in the theories regarding the problem of domestic violence (e.g., what causes men's violence towards women) and assess their alignment with corresponding intervention strategies.

Anthropologists, evolutionists, socio-biologists, psychologists, political scientists, and sociologists (Harway & O'Neil, 1999) have each advanced theories of what causes men's violence against women. These theories have attributed responsibility or blame to a wide range of individual, social and societal factors including biology, physiology, mental illness, social learning, poverty and patriarchy (Harway & O'Neil, 1999). Over the years, mainstream activists within the domestic violence movement have critiqued, and subsequently marginalized, most explanations for men's violence against women, concerned that they either re-victimize and endanger women or minimize men's responsibility for their abusive choices (Schechter, 1982).

For example, in the late 1970's and early 1980's, anti- violence activists expressed concern regarding explanations for men's violence that relied on mental

illness, drug and alcohol abuse, or childhood trauma, because it was feared that they

diverted attention away from a socio-political analysis of men's violence towards women.

"Activists and family sociologists took on the psychopathological model of wife abuse,

challenging the notion that battering was an individual rather than social problem" (Yllo,

1988, p. 39). Similarly, family systems theories were denounced, as they were

interpreted to hold victims partially accountable and responsible for their own abuse and

suggested the use of couples counseling, an intervention strategy believed to directly

endanger battered women (Gondolf, 1993; Yllo & Bograd, 1988).

Feminist domestic violence activists theorized that male domination and control

of women, a key feature of patriarchy, was the most valid explanation for men's violence

against women (Bograd, 1988; Dobash & Dobash, 1992; Pence & Paymar, 1993).

Attributing responsibility to mental illness, drug or alcohol abuse, and or dysfunctional

relationships shifted attention away from a societal level explanation, and was perceived

to give men excuses for their violence. Feminist activists preferred to endorse an

explanation of violence that targeted the institutionalized power differential between men

and women and which held men responsible for their choice to exhibit abusive behavior

(Dobash & Dobash, 1992; Haaken, 2010; Pence & Paymar, 1993).

Despite the fact that there is growing interest among academics and practitioners

to develop integrated theories that advance multi-determined explanations for domestic

violence, few such theories exist and none have widely influenced the development of

interventions (Harway & O'Neil, 1999; Rigazio-DiGilio & Lanza, 1999). It may be

worth exploring the impact this theoretical restriction has on the efficacy of current

domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men.

Current domestic violence intervention is not a singular enterprise, but rather a

collection of strategies. This collection is known in most areas of the United States as the

Coordinated Community Response (CCR) to domestic violence and is modeled on an

approach developed in Duluth, Minnesota (Pence & Paymar, 1993). The Duluth model

contends that domestic violence intervention will be most successful when the

independent efforts to protect victims of abuse and confront perpetrators of abuse are

coordinated. "A coordinated community response involves police, prosecutors, probation

officers, battered women's advocates, counselors and judges in developing and

implementing polices and procedures that improve interagency coordination and lead to

more uniform response to domestic violence cases" (Shepard, 1999, p. 2).

Although perhaps not originally intended as such, the coordinated community

response to perpetrators of domestic violence is primarily a coordination of facets of the

criminal justice system. In striving to hold individual men accountable for abusing their

female partners, and simultaneously pointing a finger of blame towards patriarchal

institutions for sanctioning men's violence towards women, mainstream activists within

the domestic violence movement chose the criminal justice system as an "ally" in

domestic violence intervention (Pence, 1999). By identifying, and targeting for change,

the police and courts as locations where victims of domestic violence were also victims

of patriarchal indifference, activists accomplished two goals. First, abusive men began to

be held accountable for their actions; they began to be arrested, jailed, placed on

probation and sent to educational intervention programs. Second, by lobbying the criminal justice system to make substantial practice changes on behalf of abused women, activists were able to make a dent, albeit an arguably small one, in the patriarchal stronghold.

Unfortunately, there is little evidence to suggest that this criminal justice response (e.g., arresting, jailing and or mandating men to education programs) sufficiently reduces the propensity of perpetrators to abuse their partners (Fagan, 1996; Feder & Dugan, 2002; Healey et al., 1998). Most studies report unsettlingly high rates of recidivism (20-60%) following arrest (Babcock & Steiner, 1999; Schmidt & Sherman, 1996), prosecution (Murphy, Musser & Maton, 1998), and batterer intervention program completion (Feder & Wilson, 2005; Gondolf, 2002; Saunders, 1996). "Research has not clearly shown that the enhanced and innovative efforts made by the criminal justice systems adequately address … domestic violence" (Buzawa & Buzawa, 2003, p 1).

Additionally, primary reliance on a criminal justice response to domestic violence has been identified as problematic (Collins, 2000; Grauwiler & Mills, 2004; Guzik, 2009; Mankowski, Haaken & Silvergleid, 2002; Mederos, 1999; 1993; Messerschmidt, Mills, 2003; Ms. Foundation for Women, 2003; Pence, 1999; Ptacek, 2010; Ritchie, 2000; van Wormer, 2009). Many of the new policies, such as mandatory arrest and no-drop prosecution, have been critiqued as disempowering for victims and disproportionately applied based on race and socio-economic status (Guzik, 2009; Ptacek, 2010; Ritchie, 2000). The impact of criminal justice involvement differs depending on the race, socio-economic status and cultural background of both victims and perpetrators (Mederos,

1999). Mederos (1999) contends that women of color are less likely than white women to consider the police as allies and men of color are less likely to respond positively in batterer intervention programs, which traditionally ignore the impact of racial and class oppression (Gondolf & Williams, 2001). Furthermore, concerns have been raised about the efficacy of creating lasting attitudinal and behavioral changes in perpetrators through the use of coercion and punishment (Dutton & Corvo, 2006; Guzik, 2009; Lehmann & Sinmons, 2009).

In striving to understand why domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men are only minimally effective, it may be worth considering limitations associated with the heavy reliance on a criminal justice response to domestic violence. Additionally, it may be worth considering whether the criminal justice "community" being coordinated in the CCR is a sufficient use of the community in the effort to stop domestic violence, or whether informal social support networks (Budde & Schene, 2004), neighborhoods, community groups, faith based organizations, educational settings, and cultural groups might also be helpful (INCITE! 2003; Smith, 2009.

Chapter Two concludes with a brief discussion of the state of evaluation literature on domestic violence intervention. Most evaluation studies conducted to date have focused solely on documenting outcomes (Gondolf, 1997; Gondolf, 2002). These evaluations have not only failed to demonstrate satisfactory efficacy of domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men (Dunford, 2000; Feder & Dugan, 2002; Ford & Regoli, 1993), but more importantly, have provided little guidance for policy makers wishing to improve current intervention approaches. This lack of guidance is partially

due to the shortage of process-oriented evaluations, evaluations that focus primarily on understanding *how* a program or intervention works or fails to work (Patton, 1990), and partially due to the fact that only a handful of evaluations to date have attempted to evaluate domestic violence intervention holistically, recognizing the entire intervention system, as opposed to isolating the success or failure of individual components or pieces (Gondolf, 2002).

Researchers have recently responded to these gaps. A handful of studies focusing on processes of change in batterer intervention (Pandya & Gingerich, 2002; Scott & Wolfe, 2000; Silvergleid & Mankowski, 2006) and on the combined impact of different elements of the coordinated community response have been published (Klevens, Baker, Shelley, and Ingram, 2008; Murphy et al., 1998; Orchowsky, 1999). Unfortunately, an organized attempt to explicate what is not working on a systemic level has not been made. "System-wide evaluations are necessary to understand the impact of different components of a coordinated community response, and the effectiveness of the overall response" (Shepard, 1999; p. 5). In order to garner this type of information, it may be necessary to adopt a methodological approach that is specifically designed to study processes within complex systems.

In Chapter Three, I describe the benefits of engaging a systems approach to evaluate domestic violence intervention with abusive men, asserting that a systems approach is particularly appropriate for assessing domestic violence intervention holistically. A systems approach recognizes and accommodates the impact of the relevant environment, allowing integrity of the whole system to be maintained, as well as

attending to processes, particularly nonlinear processes, among system components (Lendaris, 1986). Ultimately, a systems approach provides a unique lens or framework through which to view the problem and shifts the way we study it. Instead of asking an outcome-focused, one-dimensional question, "do isolated components of domestic violence intervention work?", a systems approach inspires a more process-oriented, multi-level query such as "what theoretical restrictions and intervention decisions do key stakeholders believe interact to limit the effectiveness of domestic violence intervention with abusive men?" Shifting our question in this fashion enables us to explore new and potentially valuable information.

I conclude Chapter Three with a review of the dissertation goals and discuss how these goals, and subsequently this project, reflect my commitment to community based action research (Hills & Mullett, 2000; Kaufman et al., 2006; Kelly, Mock, & Tandon, 2001). They emerged directly from conversations and deliberations I held with key stakeholders in the domestic violence field over a period of several years and are orientated towards problem identification as a pathway for initiating change within the system of study. As Fine & Vanderslice (1999) clearly state, "applied social psychological research is designed to not only explain, but also to provide social change" (p. 199).

In Chapter Four, I describe the methodological details of my study, outlining my intention to achieve the project goals by addressing five interrelated research questions: 1) What do key stakeholders within Portland's Coordinated Community Response (CCR) identify as current domestic violence intervention with abusive men? 2) What do key

stakeholders within Portland's CCR believe limits the effectiveness of domestic violence intervention with abusive men? 3) How do key Portland CCR stakeholders make sense of any discrepancies between theorized antecedents for men's domestic violence and the current intervention strategies? 4) How do key Portland CCR stakeholders make sense of any discrepancies between the Duluth model of coordinated community response and current intervention strategies for domestically abusive men? 5) What do key Portland CCR stakeholders believe the role of community should be in domestic violence intervention with abusive men?

In order to gather data and respond to these questions, a series of focus groups with police and probation officers, victim advocates, victim/survivors, batterer intervention program providers, and batterer intervention program participants was conducted. The focus group discussions were analyzed using an iterative, constructivist-grounded theory approach and emergent themes organized into a coherent analytic framework (Charmaz, 1995).

In Chapter Five, detailed findings from my exploration are reviewed. Drawing on stakeholder quotes to support generalizations and summary statements, I walk the reader through each major research question. I present what police and probation officers, victim advocates, victims/survivors, batterer intervention providers and perpetrators identified as the current response efforts to abusive men, followed by their detailed critiques of existing strategies, and their suggestions for how to better engage the community in domestic violence intervention.

At the conclusion of Chapter Five, I synthesize the vast quantity of material that I collected by applying a systems lens to the question, "what features or components interact to limit the success of intervention strategies with abusive men". Assessed from this perspective, seven subunits emerged: 1) attempting to simultaneously punish and rehabilitate perpetrators, 2) dominance of a "one size fits all" approach, 3) insufficient accountability within the system 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.

In the final chapter, I discuss the ways in which these seven themes or subunits operate together to manifest the attribute "limited effectiveness" of dominant domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men. More specifically, I note how these seven themes illuminate fundamental tensions that coincide with heavily reliance on the criminal justice system to intervene in men's intimate violence. I then review limitations of the project design and suggest implications for theory, practice and research.

Engaging a systems approach shaped the way I defined the problem and guided my methodology to a unique end. By not constricting the theories about what causes men's abuse, the best methods for how to intervene, or the subunits available to study, I was able to gather and integrate multiple perspectives on the numerous processes impacting the success of domestic violence intervention with abusive men as a whole. The net result of this theoretical and empirical expansion is a set of recommendations that bridge and join multiple exciting new trends in the field including the use of strengths-

based batterer intervention treatment, restorative justice, intimate abuse circles, and community-based prevention models.

While heavy reliance on the criminal justice system is clearly somewhat problematic for stakeholders, a complete dismissal of its role in protecting victims and holding abusive men accountable is also risky. Instead, movement activists, practitioners and researchers must continue to reflect critically on its limitations and work to redress and refine its use, while simultaneously developing new strategies that better meet the needs and goals of the stakeholders involved. Given the complexity of domestic violence dynamics and the diversity of victims and perpetrators, a single solution for how best to intervene in men's violence is neither realistic nor desirable. Rather, we must strive to draw on the diverse strengths and collective wisdom within our communities to advance responses that avoid the ecological fallacy and address antecedents of domestic violence at the individual, social, organizational, and institutional levels of analysis.

Chapter Two: Mapping the Terrain of Domestic Violence Intervention:

A Review of Conceptualization, Intervention and Evaluation

The purpose of this chapter is to provide the reader with general background information about domestic violence intervention; specifically, what theories or conceptualizations have been advanced, critiqued, and endorsed to explain men's violence towards women, what intervention practices have been adopted, and how researchers have evaluated these practices. One of the greatest challenges in presenting this information is that these three areas are not distinct. In fact, the relationship between domestic violence theory, practice and evaluation is quite transactional (Altman & Rogoff, 1987). Theories about what causes men's violence against women have been used to justify the endorsement of some intervention approaches over others, just as perceptions about safe versus unsafe intervention practices have been used to legitimize the validity of some theories over others (Adams, 1988; Dutton & Nicholls, 2005; Yllo, 1988). Not surprisingly, researchers conducting evaluations of domestic violence interventions have been influenced by dominant conceptualizations of domestic violence and the practices available to study (Gordon, 1988). It is for the sake of organization, as opposed to accuracy, that I review these areas sequentially. My intent is not to provide an in-depth review of all the existing theories, intervention strategies, and evaluation findings, but to provide the reader with a sense of the range of theories that have been postulated, an understanding of the dominant strategies for intervention, and an awareness of the pattern of research that has been conducted as context for a meaningful assessment.

Theorizing Men's Violence against Women

In order to understand and critique current domestic violence intervention approaches, it is helpful to be aware of the theories explaining men's violence against women that have guided interventionists' efforts (Corvo & Johnson, 2003). I have chosen to organize, as have others (Gelles & Straus, 1979; Harway & O'Neil, 1999), the theorized antecedents of men's violence towards women in terms of their level of analysis. By level of analysis, I mean the primary domain of responsibility identified by the theory. Commonly identified domains include the individual level, the group or social level, and the societal or institutional level (Rappaport, 1977). I begin by describing some of the individual level theories that have been advanced to explain men's violence towards women, followed by a brief description of some of the concerns that victim advocates in the domestic violence movement have expressed regarding these theories. After following a similar pattern for social level theories, I describe the societal level explanation for men's violence that has been widely endorsed within the field. I then discuss how this societal level theory has been oversimplified and rigidified over time, casting much aside. I conclude by describing a multi-level conceptualization of men's violence against women, one that embraces and integrates individual, social and societal level explanations. It is worth noting that many of the theories explaining men's violence against women, as well as their critiques, have targeted only one level of analysis. Exploring a multi-level critique and analysis of the problem of men's violence towards women creates opportunities, particularly with respect to understanding the limited effectiveness of current intervention approaches.

Individual level conceptualizations of men's violence

   Physiological or biological causes of male aggression. Physiological and

biological theories of male aggression include the role of genetics, hormones, and brain

dysfunction (Green, 1999; Janssen, Nicholls, Stefanakis, Spidel, & Simpson, 2005).

Some biologists have suggested that the Y chromosome carries with it a propensity

towards aggression as evidenced by the fact that in general, human males are more

aggressive than females (Green, 1999). Others have suggested that it is not the genes, but

the differential excretion of particular, sex-linked (e.g., testosterone) hormones that

explain men's predilection to violence (Tedeschi & Felson, 1994). "The best conclusion

seems to be that endocrinological factors are related to aggressive and violent behavior,

such as battery, perhaps by indirectly potentiating impulsive acts or by their role in

adaptation to the demands of a stressful environment" (Green, 1999, p. 55). Still others

contend that frontal lobe dysfunction, particularly damage to the fronto-temporal-limbic

area that appears to regulate violent and aggressive behavior, may be responsible for

much of men's abuse of women (Raine, 1993). Rosenbaum, Hoge, Adelman, Warnken,

Fletcher & Kane (1994) compared the history of head injuries in 130 men, 53 of whom

were abusive to their intimate partners. Medical evaluations revealed that 53% of the

maritally abusive men had experienced a significant head injury, and in 93% of the cases,

these head injuries occurred prior to the first incidence of aggression. "Logistic

regression, which statistically controlled for the contribution of potential demographic

confounders (ethnicity, age, education, and occupational status), indicated that a history

of significant head injury increased the chances of marital aggression almost sixfold"

(Rosenbaum et al., 1994, p. 1191).

Mental illness. Mental illness or psychopathology has frequently been advanced

as a contributing factor or cause of men's violence against women (Ehrensaft, Moffitt &

Caspi, 2004). "A psychopathological explanation suggests that individuals who are

violent towards women have some sort of personality disorder or mental illness that

might get in the way of otherwise normal inhibitions about using violence" (Jasinski,

2000, p. 8). Donald Dutton (1995) who has been working with abusive men for over 25

years believes that most domestic violence is perpetrated by men who suffer from a

borderline personality disorder, specifically brought on by the combination of three

childhood sources: shame, insecure attachment to one's mother, and direct experience of

abusiveness in the home. "I posit that a triad of childhood events found retrospectively in

populations of batterers constitutes a powerful trauma source and that many aspects of

the personality structure and function of intimately abusive men are best understood from

a trauma response framework" (Dutton, 1999, p. 431).

Extreme personality "disorders" or psychopathology, such as narcissistic and anti-

social personality disorders, have also been credited with at least a portion of men's

violence against women (Dutton & Starzomski, 1994; Hamberger & Hastings, 1990;

Saunders, 1992). Narcissism is defined as "a pattern of traits and behaviors which signify

infatuation and obsession with one's self to the exclusion of all others and the egotistic

and ruthless pursuit of one's gratification, dominance and ambition." (American

Psychiatric Association, 2000, p. 715). Anti-social personality disorder is defined as a

"pervasive pattern of disregard for and violation of the rights of others occurring since age 15 years" (American Psychiatric Association, 2000, p. 706). Current estimates suggest that approximately 25% of men arrested for domestic violence exhibit symptoms of narcisstic or antisocial personality disorders (Gondolf, 1999; Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). These personality disorders are credited with inhibiting men's ability to empathize with their victims or experience remorse over their actions, fostering rigidity in thinking, and creating a propensity to abuse drugs and alcohol.

Substance abuse. Research has repeatedly demonstrated a link between substance use and domestic violence (Johnson, 2000; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2005; Quigley & Leonard, 2000; Schafer, Caetano & Cunradi, 2004; Stuart, Moore, Kahler & Ramsey, 2003; Tolman, & Bennett, 1990), with some studies indicating that rates of alcohol abuse among men who batter approach 70% (Brookoff, O'Brien, Cook, Thompson, & Williams, 1997; Easton & Sinha, 2002; Davidovich, 1990; Roberts, 1988). O'Farrell and Murphy (1995) reported that martial violence was "four to six times more prevalent and substantially more frequent for alcoholics and their wives than it was in the nonalcoholic comparison sample" (p. 259). In one large multi-site study involving 840 men who were entering batterer intervention programs, 50% were diagnosed with either an alcohol or drug abuse problem (Gondolf, 2002).

Those who contend that substance abuse plays a role in domestic violence suggest drugs and alcohol impact men's abuse in a variety of ways. Some claim that substance use reduces men's tolerance for negative emotions such as frustration, pain, and disappointment making it more likely that they will "overreact" and lash out at the source

of their discomfort (Murphy & O'Farrell, 1996). Others suggest that substance abuse

reduces men's inhibitions such that even if they normally do not utilize violence in their

intimate relationships, they are unresponsive to these inhibitions in their altered state

(Collins, 1982). Finally, there are some who suggest that a combination of alcohol related

changes are responsible for the association with battering.

> The role of physiological and cognitive changes brought on by alcohol, the
>
> interaction of alcohol and frustration in producing aggression, and needs for
>
> personal power in men who drink and then aggress all appear to be promising
>
> explanations for the alcohol-battering link. We can assume that none of these
>
> theories alone is adequate to account for alcohol related battering. (Conner &
>
> Ackerley, 1994, p. 147)

Cognitive-emotional skill deficits. Some psychologists have suggested men are

violent because they lack the necessary skills to avoid violence (Sonkin & Durphy,

1997). Specifically, 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. Abusive men are "less assertive in expressing their wants and

needs in a socially appropriate and growth oriented manner" (Maiuro, Cahn & Vitalian,

1986, p. 285). Proponents of this explanation for men's violence, point to the differential

socialization practices for boys and girls. While girls are encouraged to express both

emotively and verbally a wide range of feelings, boys are traditionally discouraged from

expressing any feelings other than anger (Kivel, 1992). The cultural ideal for manhood

(Brannon, 1985) involves a stoic, non-communicator who does not need to express his

emotions because he basically does not "need" anything from anyone and therefore does

not have any reason to learn to verbally communicate his needs or desires.

Critiques of individual level explanations of men's violence Mainstream anti-violence

advocates have historically downplayed the legitimacy of theories linking domestic

violence with individual level explanations (Schechter, 1982; Straus, 1974). Arguing

from a strictly statistical perspective, activists have contended that not all men are

abusers, not all men with brain disturbances and head injuries are abusers and not all

abusers have brain or head injuries (Rosenbaum et. al, 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 have contended that while many batterers may have head injuries,

abuse substances and experience mental illness, these are likely not the primary causes of

their abuse. Articulating the tenor of this argument, Michelle Bograd (1988) concludes

that, "the search for psychological causal factors or distinct personality configurations

associated with wife abuse has not proven very useful. Not all abusive men evidence

psychopathology and those who do reveal no consistent psychological patterns" (p. 16).

Anti-violence activists have expressed similar concern with the cognitive-

emotional skill deficit explanation for men's violence towards women. They have argued

that men who batter women often do not simultaneously batter their co-workers, friends

and other family members. In other words, if batterers are simply men who lack the

skills necessary to avoid violence, one might expect that perpetrators of domestic abuse

would physically strike out every time they became angry or had difficulty getting their

needs met (Schechter, 1982). "Approaches that point to external stress or poor coping skills cannot explain why women are often the sole targets of men's abuse. Nor can they adequately account for the evidence that many men who lack basic interpersonal and stress-coping skills do not beat their wives" (Adams, 1988, p. 190). There are lots of men who are raised to not express feelings other than anger and they do not all batter their partners. If an absence of skills could explain domestic violence then why aren't more men abusing their wives and girlfriends?

On an intervention level, victim advocates were alarmed that adoption of these individual level explanations for men's violence would suggest mental health intervention as opposed to a criminal justice intervention (Dutton & Nicholls, 2005; Yllo, 1988). The two-fold concern for advocates was that if perpetrators of domestic violence are treated as men with illnesses or skill deficits instead of men who have committed a crime, victims of domestic violence would not be appropriately recognized as citizens of the state entitled to the same protections as other victims of violence and they might actually be in greater danger. Criminals are arrested and often sent to prison as a means of punishing and containing them for their illegal actions. People with mental illness or skill deficits receive counseling or training and are often subject to our sympathies as they struggle to heal and educate themselves. Subsequently, not only would society be discounting the crime of domestic violence and depriving women of their right to safety in their homes, but victims might be more inclined to remain with their abusers, supporting them through their therapy and re-education (Gondolf, 1988).

Didactic or group level conceptualizations of men's violence

     Family systems. Family systems psychologists were at the forefront of theorists

suggesting that there is a pattern of couple interaction that creates and maintains battering

(Cook & Frantz-Cook, 1984; Neidig, Freidman, and Collins, 1985). A foundational

principle of system science is that it is difficult to understand behavior when you isolate it

from its environment. In other words, it is important to examine and analyze the

immediate context in order to explain behavior. Applying this principle to domestic

violence suggests a shift in focus from men's violence against women in isolation to how

violence or conflict is managed within the relationship (Anderson & Scholossberg, 1999).

The assumption within this paradigm is that in violent relationships both partners play a

role in escalating and reinforcing the violence (Flynn, 1990; Straus & Gelles, 1990).

Adams (1988) nicely describes this perspective, writing that for interactionists, "battering

is not characterized as one partner attempting to control or dominate the other but by the

couples' combined communication deficits and the attempts of both partners to coerce

and otherwise incite the other" (p. 185). Theorists drawing on the couple's interactions to

explain men's violence have highlighted ways that women's gender role socialization to

be dependent, submissive, nurturing and overly focused on relationships (Nutt, 1999)

impacts their actions in intimate relationship with men. For example, they take into

consideration that women's socialization to meet their partners' emotional needs

predisposes them to have difficulty setting and maintaining boundaries (Nutt, 1999;

Pittman, 1985) and that this inability contributes to the cycle of abuse. Non-violent

couples are theorized to be distinct from violent couples not because of differences in

men's behavior and predispositions, but because of differences in the way the couple

interacts (Jacobson, Gottman, Waltz, Rushe, Babcock, & Holtzworth-Munroe, 1994).

Social learning theory. Social learning theory suggests that as human beings we

learn how to behave by observing and then modeling others (Bandura, 1973). One of the

central uses of social learning theory to explain men's violence is suggesting that boys

learn to abuse women by watching their fathers abuse their mothers. Often referred to as

the intergenerational transmission of violence (Alexander, Moore, & Alexander, 1991;

Mihalic & Elliott, 1997; Jasinski, 2000; Whitfield et al., 2003), the supposition is that

boys learn that violence and abuse are an acceptable and efficient means to get what they

want from the women in their lives. Empirical evidence suggests a relationship does

exist between watching abuse in the home as a child and adult perpetration of abuse

(DeMaris & Jackson, 1987; Kalmuss, 1984; Straus & Gelles, 1990), with 10-80% of

batterers typically reporting having witnessed their fathers beat their mothers (Hotaling &

Sugarman, 1986; Tolman & Bennett, 1990; Waldo, 1987). In a recent Adverse

Childhood Experiences study with 8, 629 participants that explored the impact of

childhood experiences of abuse and trauma on future perpetration and victimization of

interpersonal violence, Whitfield et al, (2003) reported that witnessing domestic violence

as a child doubled the odds of violence perpetration in adult relationships.

The implications of social learning theory are far-reaching when it comes to

explaining men's violence towards women. Some argue that in addition to witnessing

their fathers control and abuse their mothers, boys frequently are subject to and are

influenced by seeing other men abuse and dominate women, either in their extended

family or with friends (Bowker, 1983; Katz, 2006; Smith, 1991). Not only are boys often subject to destructive modeling as they mature, but under the principles of social learning theory men can continue to be influenced by their social networks, peers (Bowker, 1983), family members, and public figures, throughout adulthood.

Critiques of didactic or group level explanations of men's violence

Activists in the domestic violence movement were alarmed by both the theoretical and intervention implications of family systems and social learning explanations of men's violence towards women (Adams, 1988, Bogard, 1984, Edelson, 1985, Schechter, 1982). On a theoretical level, both explanations appeared to divert responsibility for the perpetration of abuse from the male abuser. Responsibility from a family systems perspective was co-joint or shared with the victim of the abuse (Anderson & Schlossberg, 1999; Bogard, 1984, 1988; Brygger & Edleson, 1987) and in the case of social learning, the responsibility for men's abusive behavior was transmitted to fathers and other role models. In other words, batterers were victims of either their dysfunctional marriages or their problematic developmental environments. After decades of victim blaming in mainstream discourse explaining family violence, activists were understandably uneasy about explanations that placed any amount of responsibility for abuse on the shoulders of victims. They were equally uncomfortable painting perpetrators of violence against women as puppets of their upbringing especially given that many men who experience this particular childhood trauma do not go on to abuse their partners (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Schechter, 1982).

The intervention implications of family systems and social learning theories were similarly problematic. Family systems solutions often involved marital or couples counseling which was considered by many advocates to be extremely dangerous (Mederos, 1999).

> Besides clouding the issue of who is responsible for the violence, couples counseling places the battered women in an impossible bind. Though she is expected to be open about her feelings, air her grievances, and report her husband's violence, to do any of these things places her in grave danger of continued violence. (Adams, 1988, p. 187)

It was undesirable for most in the domestic violence movement to advance a theory, and subsequently an intervention, that in any way appeared to implicate women in their own victimization. Activists were working too diligently to re-educate the public about women's role in the cycle of violence to endorse an approach where the implication is that women are partially responsible for the violence they experience. The question of laying blame or responsibility was similarly challenging when interventions based on social learning theories were proposed. A question for victim advocates was how to direct effective intervention if the source of the problem was outside of the perpetrator. Shifting responsibility or blame to misogynistic modeling in childhood appeared to leave little room for holding individual men accountable for their choice to abuse.

A societal and institutional level conceptualization of men's violence

In their historical accounts of the movement to end family violence, Linda Gordon (1998) and Elizabeth Pleck (1987) identify three distinct periods in American

history characterized by efforts to protect women from their abusive husbands. During

the 17th century, the Puritans of 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

aligned with temperance reformers to suggest that the evils of alcohol caused husbands to

beat their wives (Gordon, 1988; Pleck, 1987). It was only when second wave feminists in

the late 1970's turned their attention to the plight of the battered woman that an

explanation for men's violence explicitly implicating the institutionalized oppression of

women was advanced (Dobash & Dobash, 1979). Fresh from their successes and

frustrations during the civil rights, antiwar, and anti-rape movements, radical feminists

saw the tragedy and injustice of the battered wife as an opportunity to highlight the brutal

consequences of patriarchy (Gordon, 1988, Haaken, 2010; Pleck, 1987). "The bruises

and broken bones of beaten wives viscerally displayed what second-wave feminists

advanced in pamphlets and at rallies: the home is a dangerous place for women"

(Haaken, 2010, p. 8).

In developing a satisfactory theory or explanation of men's violence against

women, feminist activists sought to avoid the dangers they perceived in theories

previously advanced. In particular, they wanted to steer clear of theories focused on

explaining why an individual man might hit an individual woman and instead desired to

design "a theory of why men as a group direct their violence at women" (Schechter,

1982, p. 214). "The priority is to understand why abuse is directed at women, not why

each individual man abuses" (Schechter, 1982, p. 216). Dobash & Dobash (1979) were

among the first to articulate an explanation of wife abuse that implicated male-dominated social structures as well as dichotomized socialization into rigid gender roles in the perpetration of domestic violence. There are many variants of, what I will refer to as, the "patriarchy as cause" explanation for male violence against women, however most tend to point to the institutionalized power imbalance between men and women as a training ground and justification for men to abuse and control the women with whom they are intimately involved (Dobash & Dobash, 1979, Pence & Paymar, 1993; Schechter, 1982).

Patriarchal culture depends on relationships of dominance between men and women, politically, socially and interpersonally (Pence & Paymar, 1993). Therefore, feminist activists suggested that men are violent towards women as a way of maintaining the power and control promised to them as members of a patriarchal society. As such, domestic violence is 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 raised in patriarchal cultures develop attitudes and values consistent with patriarchy and with battering (Bancroft, 2002). These "misogynistic attitudes function as disinhibitors, legitimizing women as a target for violent behavior and paving the way for the transmission of arousal, anger and aggression directed toward women" (Marin & Russo, 1999, p. 32). A central tenant of the "patriarchy as cause" theory is that men are abusive to women because they can be. Control and domination of women is condoned in patriarchal society, subsequently men experience few negative consequences (Carden, 1994) for their abuse of women and have very little motivation to treat women differently (Kivel, 1992).

A societal level analysis of the problem of men's violence towards women offered the potential for exciting intervention opportunities. By implicating patriarchal systems in men's violence against women, and framing the issues as a violations of women's civil rights (Haaken, 2010), feminist activists were poised to lobby for significant changes in childcare, education, financial equity, legislation, and political power. If public outcry over the plight of victims of domestic violence could be mobilized, feminist activists hoped that substantial gains in the women's liberation movement might be possible. Implicating men's social, financial, and political power over women in women's victimization at the hands of men provided a perfect opportunity to lobby for greater and more unilateral gender equality.

Oversimplifying the "patriarchy as cause" explanation of men's violence

Unfortunately, over the years the "patriarchy as cause" explanation for men's violence has been oversimplified and constricted within mainstream domestic violence discourse. While original theorists (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Schechter, 1982) created space in their analysis for the inclusion of individual, social and societal level forces impacting men's violence, the translation or dominant script about why men abuse their intimate partners has rigidified over time into a singular and consequently more limited explanation that essentially claims that men are violent because they <u>choose</u> to exercise their patriarchal rights and privileges (Haaken, 2010). While there are certainly advantages to focusing responsibility for men's abuse of their intimate partners exclusively on men themselves, this explanation captures only part of a much more complex story. It disregards the impact that individual and social level forces (such as

mental illness, drugs and alcohol, or childhood abuse) have on any given man's decision to "choose" violence and it marginalizes feminist analyses of men's violence that incorporate the ways that societal level forces such as race and class oppression interact with patriarchy to influence the actions of individual men (Collins, 2000; Crenshaw, 1994; Haaken, 2010; Ritchie, 2000).

It is not particularly surprising that constriction towards a singular or narrow explanation of men's violence has occurred within the mainstream domestic violence movement; this often happens within social movements as they turn to sound bites or slogans in order to galvanize and unify activists. In her recently published book entitled, *Hard Knocks: Domestic violence and the psychology of storytelling,* Jan Haaken (2010) notes that important strength was derived from creating a unifying statement or story to explain men's violence; however she cautions that this unification was achieved at the cost of other important stories. "Although mobilizing around a unifying story of woman battering was an advance, the search for a single voice in resisting male violence in the household also meant that some voices were inevitably shouted down" (p. 8).

The stories most ardently silenced were those that involved men's experiences of victimization, whether that victimization occurred at the hand of individual level factors such as mental illness or social level factors such as witnessing marital abuse as a child, or institutionalized factors such as race or class oppression. Haaken (2010) speculates that mainstream feminist activists have been operating as though theorizing men's violence were a zero sum game where acknowledgement of any suffering or hardship experienced by abusive men takes something away from abused women. "One of the real

difficulties in feminist theorizing concerning abusive men is that any concession of the

suffering and humanity of violent men seems to lead to lost ground for women" (p. 168).

While this approach is understandable given centuries of theorizing about men's violence

that displaced responsibility onto the devil, stress, poverty, and women (Gordon, 1988;

Pleck, 1987), ignoring the sources and impact of men's victimization has severely limited

the usefulness of the "patriarchy as cause" theory for explaining why they perpetrate.

Feminists of color like Kimberele Crenshaw (1994), Beth Richie (2000), and

Angela Davis (1990) have been insisting for decades that while patriarchy may be

responsible for men's violence against women, it is not solely responsible. Instead,

patriarchy operates in conjunction with race and class oppression to impact men's use of

violence towards their intimate partners. "The systematic oppression of women in our

society cannot be accurately evaluated except as it is connect to racism and class

exploitation" (Davis, 1990, p. 50). In other words, while feminists of color may concur

that men's violence towards women is influenced by patriarchy, their conceptualizations

include an analysis and recognition that men of color and men in poverty suffer from

oppressions that interact and limit the power and control that they experience under

patriarchy. "Each individual derives varying amounts of penalty and privilege from the

multiple systems of oppression which frame everyone's lives" (Collins, 2000, p. 287).

For men who have been subjected to racial and economic oppression, the dominant and

narrow version of the "patriarchy as cause" explanation for their violence is likely to be

incongruent with their own personal histories and realities (Kaufman, 1994). The notion

that their abuse stems from the power and control society imparts to them through

patriarchy is consistent with some aspects of their relationship to women, but not others. Certainly a poor, undocumented, migrant farm worker from Mexico may have difficulty connecting to the theory that he batters because he holds the belief that it is acceptable to dominate all women. He may feel domination over his wife, but he likely does not feel the same sense of power when confronted with affluent White women.

In his book entitled, *Masculinities and Crime: Critique and Reconceptualization of Theory*, James Messerschmidt (1993) suggests that while under patriarchy, crime (and violence) may be used to accomplish masculinity, each man's construction of masculinity is also significantly impacted by their socio-economic status and race.

> Men are positioned differently throughout society and, therefore, share with other men the construction of masculinities peculiar to their position in society. A sociology of masculinity must acknowledge that socially organized power relations among and between men are historically constructed on the basis of class, race, and sexual orientation. In other words, while there is a complex interlocking of masculinities, these masculinities are quite clearly unequal (p. 81).

An interpretation of "patriarchy as cause" that suggests men are abusive because they choose to express their socially endorsed power and control may be less helpful for describing poor men or men of color if it doesn't account for and incorporate the influence of race or class oppression.

Ironically, it appears as though the "patriarchy as cause" explanation has been distilled within mainstream discourse in such a way as to contradict its origins as a societal/institutional level explanation. By focusing so narrowly on individual men's

choice and ignoring the multi-faceted ways that patriarchy exerts influence, one is left to wonder, how exactly does patriarchy cause men to choose domestic violence? In other words, how does patriarchy at the societal level translate into individual men's choice to use violence towards their intimate partners? To respond to this question, additional sources of influence might need to be considered. In other words, one might need to look at how patriarchal values get transmitted. Is it through the schools, media, workplace and governmental practices, community groups and organizations, peer groups, or extended family? Additionally, it seems plausible that individual men's willingness to grab the power promised to them under patriarchy may be linked to their mental health, education, income, or experiences of oppression due to race and ethnicity? Acknowledging the individual level forces (such as mental illness and substance abuse), the group level forces (such as family dynamics, modeling, peer groups, work environments, community groups) as well as the societal level forces (such as racism and classism) that work together in order to translate patriarchal values, beliefs, and privilege, suggests the need to re-broaden the "patriarchy as cause" conceptualization in order to embrace the ways in which patriarchy impacts men at multiple levels of analysis.

A multi-level conceptualization of men's violence against women

There is a burgeoning trend towards the development of multi-faceted explanations of men's violence, ones that incorporate knowledge from various disciplines, rather than privileging one at the expense of the others (Brooks & Silverstein, 1995; Harway & O'Neil, 1999). This trend, however, is still marginalized and there are only a handful of theories that attempt "a more complete theoretical framework [that]

would complement macro-level explanations with individual-level explanations"

(Magdol, Moffitt, Caspi & Silva, 1998, p. 375). It is more common for theorists to

acknowledge that domestic violence is multi-faceted, but still focus primarily on their

specific discipline's level of analysis when identifying antecedents. Rigazio-DiGilio &

Lanza (1999) have articulated what a growing number in the field believe: "it is our

contention that the field would benefit from ecological frameworks that advance the

integration of factors, such as biology, interpersonal communication and power

discrepancies, gender socialization, socio-cultural factors and historical determinants

because these are [all] understood to contribute to relational violence" (p. 153).

Michele Harway and James O'Neil (1999) offer precisely this type of framework

with their multivariate model explaining men's risk factors for violence against women.

In *What Causes Men's Violence Against Women,* they extensively review the range of

theories that have been advanced to explain men's violence against women and propose a

multivariate model that strives to acknowledge the role of all previously summarized

influences on men's violence, suggesting that for each particular man the constellation of

influences interact in idiosyncratic ways (see Figure 1). Their model recognizes the

influences of societal violence and cultural oppression, sociocultural factors such as race,

class, age, men and women's gender role socialization, couples' interactional patterns,

men's conscious and unconscious psychological processes, as well as biological,

hormonal and evolutionary factors. Specifically, they suggest that there are multiple risk

factors that interact to create an individual's propensity for violence towards women.

These risk factors fall into seven categories: biological, psychological, relational,

socialization, macrosocietal, and psychosocial and interacting risks.   The biological risk factors include physiologic predispositions to violence, including genetics, hormones, and neuroanatomy. The psychological risk factors include a man's mental and emotional processes that support attitudes, values and behaviors that lead to violence against women. Relational risk factors include the dynamic patterns of interaction within the couple that lend themselves to violence. Socialization risk factors include narrowly defined masculine gender role and their corresponding values, attitudes, and behaviors, and macrosocietal risks include institutional structures and forms of oppression such as racism and classism. The psychosocial and interacting risk factors take into consideration the transactional relationship that exists between the psychological, socialization and macrosocietal risk factors.

Figure 1

Multivariate model explaining men's risk factors for violence against women adapted from O'Neil & Harway (1999).

Macrosocietal
Factors

Relational
Factors

Biological Factors

Interaction of
the Multiple
Risk Factors of
Violent Men

Psychological
Factors

Sociological
Factors

Psychosocial Factors

Men's Violence Against Women

Harway and O'Neil offer the following advice in concluding their book:

> Future study on the risk factors of men's violence against women needs to be
> multidisciplinary and collegial… Given the complexity of men's risk for
> violence, multiple theories are needed. This implies that sociological,
> psychological, biological, evolutionary and family systems and relational theories
> need to be integrated...We indicated that the previous theories on the causes of
> violence against women sometimes appeared fragmented, rigidly bound by
> discipline or political agendas and developed in reaction to the predominant
> paradigm of each decade… We think it is time for theoreticians, researchers and
> practitioners to move on with more collaborative, constructive, and
> interdisciplinary dialogues about the causes of men's violence. (O'Neil &
> Harway, 1999, p. 213)

Advancing a multi-level conceptualization of men's violence against women does not
diminish the importance and influence of patriarchy; rather it seeks to understand its
influence in concert with forces or factors at the individual, social and societal level.
Unfortunately, as described earlier, conceptualizations like O'Neil and Harway's (1999)
are not widely endorsed or discussed within the field, an absence that likely impacts the
range of intervention strategies available, as well as their efficacy.

In the next section, I provide a brief narrative on the evolution of current domestic
violence intervention strategies with abusive men. Given the suggestion that we
intervene most successfully when our interventions match our definition of a problem
(e.g., what causes men's violence against women) at the level of analysis (Watzlawick,

Weakland, & Fisch, 1974), it may be important to observe the intended and actual

targeted level of analysis in our dominant strategies. In other words, if a primarily

societal level explanation (e.g., "patriarchy as cause") has emerged as the dominant

conceptualization of men's violence, it may be important to ascertain whether dominant

strategies successfully target societal level changes. It may also be worth noticing

whether our interventions are inextricably limited by our theoretical boundaries and vice-

versa. If theoretically we are still in a nascent state with regard to multi-faceted

explanations of men's violence, it may be reasonable to suspect that our interventions

may be more uni- than multi-dimensional. Similarly, the scarcity of multi-level theories

explaining men's violence may partially be a result of the impracticality of implementing

more complex strategies. Perhaps it is just too difficult to design and manage

interventions based on multi-variate models such as O'Neil & Harway's (1999). What

would it look like to design interventions that respond to each individual man's risk

factors for recidivism at seven levels of analysis?

Intervening in Men's Violence Against Women

Current domestic violence intervention strategies for abusive men in the United

States are the result of a confluence of pressures, most of which are attributable to the

steady growth and influence of the domestic violence movement (Pence & Shepard,

1999). As the number of women accessing victim advocacy services grew in the 1970's,

awareness increased that something also needed to be done with the perpetrators of abuse

(Dobash, Dobash, Cavanagh, & Lewis, 2000; Pence & Shepard, 1999). Victim advocates

reasoned that it was not a wholly effective strategy to merely aid women in escaping their

battering partners, because quite often women would return to their abusers after a brief

hiatus in a shelter (Adams & McCormick, 1982; Geffner & Rosenbaum, 2001; Jennings,

1987; LaViolette, 2001). Additionally, shelter workers noticed that they often provided

assistance to multiple victims of the same abuser (Gondolf, 1987; LaViolette, 2001).

Those few abusive men whose partners somehow managed to leave them would often

just move on to victimize a different woman (Geffner & Rosenbaum, 2001).

Recognizing that they neither had the expertise, nor the desire to prioritize work

with these men, victim advocates enlisted the assistance of male counselors (Jennings,

1987). In the late 1970's, shelter workers in Boston encouraged a group of male

therapists to develop an intervention program for abusive men. The resulting Emerge

Collective became the first program in the United States for male batterers (Adams &

McCormick, 1982). The initial treatment goals were to help men recognize responsibility

for violent behavior, question their socialized ideas about sex roles, and become more

attuned to their emotional needs and dependency on women (Jennings, 1987).

The rapid proliferation of programs like Emerge (Adams & McCormick, 1982),

now commonly referred to as batterer intervention programs, was in many ways the

direct result of advocates' increased efforts to engage the criminal justice system as an

ally to protect battered women (Shepard & Pence, 1999). It was neither realistic nor

excusable that the only protection abused women could secure was in the form of

"underground", under-funded shelters. Subsequently, advocates began exerting intense

pressure on the criminal justice system, insisting that it recognize women's status as

equal citizens by prosecuting domestic violence like any other crime against the citizen

state (Miller, 2001).

> Activists in the U.S. battered women's movement [sic] argued successfully that
> the state has an obligation to intervene in personal relationships to protect women
> from their abusive partners, that it can and should remove violent husbands from
> their private homes to protect women in their private homes, that the police
> should arrest husbands for assault, and that the state should prosecute them.
> (Pence & Shepard, 1999, p. 5)

By the early 80's, advocates' lobbying efforts to secure greater responsiveness

from law enforcement began to meet with some success. States began to expand police

powers, 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 taken place (Brygger & Edleson, 1987). In 1984, The Minneapolis

Police Experiment (Sherman & Burk, 1984) demonstrated a substantial deterrent effect of

arrest on subsequent domestic violence, prompting even greater willingness and urgency

to criminalize domestic violence (Jolin, 2008). The result was the adoption of mandatory

arrest laws by most states (Miller, 2004). Mandatory arrest laws require police officers

called to the scene of a domestic violence dispute to make an arrest, as opposed to

mediation or separation, if there is evidence to support such an action.

> The advantages of warrantless arrests are several. It is easier to take a suspect
> into custody at the scene than to locate him after obtaining a warrant from the

court [and] police are more likely to initiate prosecution if they can arrest at the time they respond to the domestic violence call. (Hart, 1993, p. 22)

The procurement of the criminal justice system as an ally in the intervention of domestic violence has been protracted (Gordon, 1988; Pleck, 1987). An enforcer of patriarchal privilege for generations, genuine change within the system has been slow (Fusco, 1989). It took years of consistent pressure to get police to begin responding to calls for help by victims (Roy, 1977; Saunders & Size, 1980) and even more time and energy to get district attorneys to prosecute perpetrators in the absence of testimony from battered women (Hartman & Belknap, 2003). The struggle to convince judges to sentence perpetrators continues today (Buzawa & Buzawa, 2003; Hemmens, Strom, & Schlegel, 1998). However, in partnering with the criminal justice system, victim advocates successfully initiated a critical paradigm shift. Responsibility for ending domestic violence began to move from individual victims to the state (Brygger & Edleson, 1987), which grudgingly acknowledged that it should protect victims of domestic abuse and prosecute perpetrators as it would any other criminal. Mandatory arrest, probable cause arrest, no-drop, and pro-prosecution policies served to move the responsibility for action away from the victim to the legal system (Weisz, Tolman, & Bennet, 1998).

It is notable that in targeting the criminal justice system as a site for change (Pence, 1999), advocates were attempting to correct historically unjust disparities in the treatment of battered women (Fagan, 1996). This type of institutional level reform

aligned with their societal level conceptualization (e.g., patriarchy as cause) of men's

violence against women.

The law is on board. Now what do we do with the perpetrators?

According to Miller (2004), over 700 enactments (either amendments to old laws

or adoption of new laws) related to domestic violence were approved between 1997 and

2003. "Legislative attention to the problem of domestic violence led … to the enactment

of an avalanche of new laws in the 50 states" (Miller, 2004, p. 1). Unfortunately, the

courts were ill-equipped to manage the influx of men arrested as a result of this

"criminalization" (Fagan, 1996) of domestic violence. Judges were hesitant to send first

time offenders to prison, yet felt compelled to respond to victim advocates' insistence on

consequences (Holtzworth-Munroe, 2001). Though batterer intervention programs were

rather new and untested as an effective "treatment" for domestic violence, they seemed a

reasonable compromise to a dismissal of all charges or prison time (Gelles, 2001;

Gondolf, 2002). Judges began mandating attendance at intervention programs as a

condition of probation following arrest and conviction or in some cases as a way to defer

conviction (Ganley, 1987; Hamberger & Hastings, 1993; Harrell, 1991; Pence, 1999;

Soler, 1987).

A wide range of programs initially emerged under the rubric of batterer

intervention (Fagan, 1996; Gondolf, 2002; Healey et al., 1998). Although most programs

shared some common elements such as professionally led, single gendered groups of

mostly court-mandated men coming together once a week for several months, the

curriculum, structure, and practices for attempting to change participants varied (Babcock

et al., 2004; Mankowski, Wilson, Silvergleid, Chamberlain, Truesdell, & Huffine, 2002).

In other words, the theories about what causes men's violence towards women that the

interventionists relied upon to develop curriculum varied (Fagan, 1996). This variation

can be loosely summarized by three orientations: psycho-dynamic, anger

management/cognitive behavioral, and feminist psycho-educational (Gondolf, 2002;

Mankowski, Haaken, Silvergleid, 2002).

Groups oriented towards a psycho-dynamic or analytic approach developed in

response to individual level explanations of men's violence and target men's mental

distress or inner psychic turmoil as the root of their abusive behavior (Brown, Saunders

& Staecker, 1997). These programs are designed to provide a supportive environment

within which men can "heal" from their past or present emotional injuries, thereby

nullifying the source of their violent behavior. In these programs, insight and the client-

therapist or client-client relationship are seen as the primary processes responsible for

change or improvement. Group sessions are unstructured in that the facilitator guides the

discussions around certain themes, but only as they emerge naturally from the members

themselves (Jennings, 1987). This approach relies heavily on self-help principles of

reciprocity and self-disclosure, as well as mutual responsibility (Levine, 1988). Men

change because they are inspired through the support of the other men in the group to

change.

Anger management/cognitive behavioral interventions are also derived from

individual level theories; ones that suggest men are abusive to their partners because they

do not have appropriate skills and tools to manage their emotions, including anger

(Tolman & Edleson, 1989). Consequently, groups in this genre focus on providing

education and training regarding more appropriate methods (i.e., non violent) of dealing

with and communicating emotions and desires. These programs rely heavily on

structured skill building activities such as exercises in anger reduction (e.g., "time-outs"),

self-observation such as journaling, cognitive restructuring, relaxation training, and role

plays that illuminate acceptable responses to conflict (Tolman & Edleson, 1989).

Feminist psycho-educational groups developed in response to the "patriarchy as

cause" analysis of men's violence suggesting that domestic violence is a conscious choice

by men to use power and control in abusive ways. Advocates of this analysis postulated

that what batterers need in an intervention program is education about how their violence

is an unacceptable choice and the alternatives at their disposal (Babcock et al., 2004).

This model of batterer intervention is more explicitly political and assumes that male

violence towards women is a symptom and mechanism of male dominance and control

over women, that is, of patriarchy (Dobash & Dobash, 1979). Physical violence is not

seen as a result of past or present trauma or skill deficits, but as a deliberate, intentional

choice to establish and or maintain authority and control over women. Advocates of

psycho-educational groups suggest 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 these programs is to educate men. This education is

accomplished through presentations, role play and by challenging and confronting the

men in the group, drawing attention to each instance when a man tries to escape

responsibility or accountability for his behavior by either blaming his partner, his past

traumas or current problems.

Coordinating a more effective response to domestic violence

Institutional change is difficult to accomplish and victim advocates became

increasingly frustrated by what appeared to be a lack of consistency and coordination

among the facets of the criminal justice system (Gamache & Asmus, 1999). Advocates

started to believe that battered women would not be safe until abusive men were

consistently confronted both by the criminal justice system through arrest, prosecution

and sentencing, and by batterer intervention programs regarding the inappropriateness

and unacceptability of abuse and violence towards their intimate partners (Gamache &

Asmus, 1999; Pence & Paymar, 1993; Stover, 2005). These views regarding what was

necessary in order to protect women from intimate partner violence were translated into a

model of intervention now commonly referred to as the Duluth Model (Pence & Paymar,

1993). The Duluth Model, developed by the Duluth Domestic Abuse Intervention Project

(DAIP) in Minnesota, calls for a coordinated community response to domestic violence.

A coordinated community response involves police, prosecutors, probation

officers, battered women's advocates, counselors and judges in developing and

implementing policies, and procedures that improve interagency coordination and

lead to more uniform response to domestic violence cases (Shepard, 1999).

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 the

coordinated community response include victim advocates, legislative reforms, law enforcement, district attorneys, judges, batterer intervention providers, and child protective services (see Figure 2).

This vision for how best to intervene in domestic violence received a critical endorsement upon the passage of the 1994 Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act, which provided crime prevention and response assistance to states and local communities (Ptacek, 2010). One section of this act specifically targeted violent crimes against women. Entitled the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), this congressional action set aside 1.3 billion dollars to prevent and respond to the domestic and sexual abuse of women (Orchowsky, 1999). One distribution requirement was that a portion of funds had to be utilized for enhancing collaboration and coordination among law enforcement, prosecution, victim services, and the courts (Buzawa & Buzawa, 2003).

It has been suggested that one of the reasons the Duluth Model of coordinated community response is so wide-spread today is the result of the federal funding that became available under the VAWA act (Grauwiler & Mills, 2004). Prior to VAWA, federal and state funding for domestic violence intervention was virtually nonexistent. VAWA provided desperately needed resources to develop and offer training to law enforcement, district attorneys and judges about domestic violence, enhance communication and accountability among the key players, and improve victim services. It is interesting to note that communities did not get rewarded (i.e., they did not receive funding) if their efforts at coordinating a response to domestic violence did not include collaboration with law enforcement and the courts. It other words, it was not considered

a coordinated community response if faith communities, mental health agencies and educators came together to address the problem of domestic violence. In essence, the VAWA act codified the central role of the criminal justice system in the intervention of domestic violence.

In many communities, the principle mode for establishing the 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, courts, and victim advocates. Although coordinating councils vary from community to community, most have traditionally focused on improving police responsiveness to distress calls, enhancing prosecutorial efforts, encouraging judicial use of strict and immediate sanctions for perpetrators and insuring that batterer intervention programs receiving court referrals adhere to an appropriate model of intervention (Allen, 2006).

Figure 2

Common elements in the coordinated community response to domestic violence.

What is "appropriate" batterer intervention?

The rapidly growing number of men arrested for domestic violence led to an explosion of batterer intervention programs with varying structure, curriculum and practices. This variation was troublesome to many involved in the coordinated community response (Geffner & Rosenbaum, 2001). "There was no central administrative agency that coordinated the programs, no standards for who could offer the programs, and no requirements regarding the qualifications of the clinicians who treated batterers. There was no oversight whatsoever for the treatment modalities and their effectiveness (or lack thereof)" (Gelles, 2001, p. 12). If batterer intervention programs were going to be mandated as a condition of probation following a domestic violence conviction it was not appropriate for men who committed similar crimes to receive vastly different legal consequences (i.e., intervention programs). Additionally, victim advocates maintained that domestic violence was a symptom of patriarchy, of men's domination over women, and that to say that it was about anger or about unresolved childhood trauma, or for that matter substance abuse or mental illness, was to essentially excuse men's choices (Corvo & Johnson, 2001).

In the mid-90's, states began to develop standards or guidelines regarding acceptable practices for batterer intervention programs (Holtzworth-Munroe, 2001). Topics traditionally addressed in these standards include degree of participation in a coordinated community response, length of program time, completion requirements, qualifications of facilitators, partner contact, and content to address during the program (Austin & Dankwort, 1999; Bennett & Piet, 1999). Standards also often dictate what is

not acceptable, often barring practices such as couples counseling, individual therapy, and anger management (Austin & Dankwort, 1999). In Oregon, the state standards suggest, among many other guidelines, that batterer intervention programs need to be part of the coordinated community response, promote recognition and accountability for patterns of controlling and abusive behavior, avoid suggesting, offering or recommending couples or family counseling, and avoid identifying anger, substance abuse, or mental health problems as the primary cause of battering (Oregon Department of Justice, 2005).

The movement to standardize batterer intervention programs might have been handicapped without buy-in from the criminal justice system. Certainly standards could be developed and adopted; however, most states lack the means through which to regulate compliance. Given that approximately 75% of clients in batterer intervention are mandated to attend programs by the courts (Gondolf, 2002), a highly effective method for regulation was for judges to sentence men to attend only those programs that meet statewide standards. Obviously, this became a powerful incentive for programs to adhere to guideline specifications.

The fact that victim advocates have been successful in shaping what constitutes acceptable domestic violence intervention with abusive men through the widespread adoption of the Duluth Model and statewide standardization of batterer intervention programs is encouraging in that it suggests a triumph in their efforts to engage patriarchal institutions on behalf of battered women. That the knowledge and wisdom of victim advocates is being honored, and by proxy the lived experiences of battered women, is certainly a reason to celebrate. After centuries of turning a blind eye and blaming women

who are victims of men's violence, it is commendable that the criminal justice system has

become a pillar of the domestic violence movement. Unfortunately, the success of the

victim advocacy community to engage the criminal justice system on behalf of battered

women has not been without problematic consequences (Grauwiler & Mills, 2004;

Guzik, 2009; Mankowski et al., 2002; Pence, 1999; Ptacek, 2010), consequences that

feminist activists have been among the first to acknowledge (Stark, 2005).

Too much of a good thing? Unintended consequences of the criminal justice response

A growing number of analysts in the domestic violence field have expressed

concerns regarding current intervention strategies, recognizing that "the criminal justice

system is no panacea for a problem as complex and persistent as domestic violence"

(DeLeon-Granados, Wells, & Binsbacher, 2006, p. 368). A report issued following a

round table sponsored by the Ms. Foundation for Women, entitled *Safety & Justice For*

All: Examining the Relationship Between the Women's Anti-Violence Movement and the

Criminal Legal System (2003) outlines concerns that many activists within the field

experience with regard to current dependence or perhaps "over-reliance" on the criminal

justice system. Issues raised include unintended negative consequences for victims when

the State enters their lives, the complexities that surface when we consider the interplay

of race and class in the appropriation of policies and services (Guzik, 2009; Haaken,

2010; Jolin, 2008; INCITE! 2003; Messerschmidt, 1993; Ritchie, 2000), and the lack of

alternative, innovative community-based solutions to domestic violence (Ptacek, 2010).

In light of these issues, one question that emerges is, "How can the anti-domestic

violence movement be reflective and self-critical about their analysis of battering and the

role of criminalization without demeaning or devaluating the integrity of activists' work

or their accomplishments over the last 30 years?" (McMahon & Pence, 2003, p. 61).

The problem with mandatory arrest and pro-prosecution policies. There has been

a surge of research and writing in the past 10 years regarding the problematic

consequences of mandatory arrest policies (Guzik, 2009; Smith, 2001). "Serious

unintended consequences can occur as a result of police interventions, including

retaliation against victims by their abusers, dual arrests, and the potential lack of cultural

sensitivity to victims and perpetrators" (Danis, 2003, p. 4). One of the greatest concerns

stems from the rapid increase in the number of women being arrested for domestic

violence (Erwin, 2006). Current estimates suggest that women now constitute

approximately 20% of those arrested for domestic violence (Henning & Renauer, 2005;

McMahon & Pence, 2003). DeLeon-Granados et al. (2006) report that between 1987 and

2000, women's rates of arrest increased by more than 500%. Although there are certainly

a handful of researchers and theorists who argue that this increase simply reflects the fact

that domestic violence is a behavior that both women and men perpetrate (Dutton &

Nicholls, 2005), most suggest that this increase reflects a tragic inability of the

monolithic criminal justice system to respond to the complexity of domestic violence

cases (Chesney-Lind, 2002; Melton & Belknap, 2003). For example, the fact that the

criminal justice system is "incident-driven", such that circumstances, meaning, and

motivations associated with violent action are irrelevant, has been credited by some with

the increase in female arrestees for domestic violence (Miller, 2001). "By following the

letter of the law, … law enforcement officers often disregard the context in which victims of violence resort to using violence themselves" (Miller, 2001, p. 1340).

Others explain the increase by alluding to the fact that there may be two qualitatively different forms of violence occurring within intimate relationships, common couple violence and patriarchal terrorism (Erez & King, 2000; Johnson, 1995; Melton & Belknap, 2003).

> Evidence from large sample survey research and from data gathered from
> women's shelters and other public agencies suggests that a large number of
> families suffer from occasional outbursts of violence from either husbands or
> wives or both, while a significant number of other families are terrorized by
> systematic male violence enacted in the service of patriarchal control. (Johnson,
> 1995, p. 283)

Proponents of this explanation suggest that one result of mandatory arrest laws is that women engaging in common couple violence are now being arrested under the guise of laws originally designed to protect them from patriarchal terrorism. Regardless of the explanation, arresting women who are violent in self-defense (Miller, 2001; Renzetti, 1994) is certainly an unintended outcome of the criminalization of domestic violence.

Another concern frequently raised in discussions regarding the impact of the criminalization of domestic violence stems from the shift of power that occurs when the state gets involved in private lives. Mandatory arrest and no-drop prosecutorial strategies have been identified as particularly disempowering to women (Grauwiler & Mills, 2004; McDermott & Garofalo, 2004; Ms. Foundation for Women, 2003; Orchowsky, 1999).

Mandatory processes do not allow women to make their own decisions about how

to address the violence in their lives, contributing to a feeling of powerlessness for

battered women. Some feel that the system exerts control over women's lives,

comparable to the batterer." (Ms. Foundation for Women, 2003, p. 6)

No longer are women able to choose whether or not to have their perpetrator arrested and

prosecuted. Originally designed to protect victims from having to make these tough

choices, as well as to protect them from retaliation for those choices (Jordan, 2004;

Mears, Carson, Holden, & Harris, 2001; Orchowsky, 1999), these policies have largely

taken control and power away from women (Ford, 2003).

Of particular concern is the fact that these policies may disproportionately impact

poor women who are more likely to be dependent upon their abuser's income for survival

(Iovanni & Miller, 2001). "Women who reach out to the court for protection may have

some ambivalence about having a partner arrested and may be fearful regarding the

ability to financially provide for herself and her children if she is financially dependent

on the offender" (Jordan, 2004, p. 1413). While women from lower socioeconomic

groups may be more reliant upon the criminal justice system to intervene (Hutchinson,

Hirschel, & Pesackis, 1992), often lacking other means and resources to leave an abusive

situation, they are also more likely to become victimized by the intervention they invite.

McMahon & Pence (2003) point out that the police are often the only options available to

poor women. Who else is "legally obligated to come and stop the violence?" (p. 60).

Unfortunately, when they do call for police assistance, they also turn over all decision-

making authority to the criminal justice system, often exacerbating their feelings of powerlessness (Ms. Foundation for Women, 2003).

The situation is equally, if not more complicated for women of color and immigrants (Erwin, 2006; INCITE!, 2003; Miller, 1989; Ms. Foundation for Women, 2003; Richie, 1996; Williams, 1998).

> The historic conflict and mistrust between the police and communities of color has its roots in U.S. slavery and is evidenced by the disproportionate number of people of color arrested and convicted of crime in this country. Therefore, women of color may be reluctant to request police intervention because it may be viewed as disloyalty to their race, and they often feel obligated to protect their batterers from police and the criminal justice system. (Danis, 2003, p. 4)

There are some who argue that women from some minority groups are more likely to call the police (Hutchinson et al., 1992), while others indicate that for a variety of reasons (e.g., concerns regarding deportation; institutionalized racism) minority women are often more relunctant to engage the legal system (Ms. Foundation for Women, 2003; Rasche, 1995; Ritchie, 2000). Whether they choose to engage the legal system or not, this choice is clearly impacted by the knowledge that the legal system involves fundamentally problematic terrain.

What about additional community solutions? In discussing the centrality of the criminal justice system in our response to domestic violence, The Ms. Foundation for Women (2003) and others have questioned what it would look like if other aspects of community were empowered to respond as well (Shepard, 2005).

What might it look like if communities had the resources to explore effective

interventions that keep decision-making power within the community, and make

it possible for women to stay in their community? Where might we be if

government accountability did not aim its efforts at criminal legal punishment, but

instead centralized responsibility for basic needs and human dignity, and affirmed

the human rights of all?" (Ms. Foundation for Women, p. 16)

Unfortunately, promoting human rights through vital services for women remains

woefully unfunded (Erwin, 2006; Hart, 1993). Emergency and temporary housing is

largely under funded, dependable child-care remains unattainable for many, flexible

employment opportunities remain scarce, and alternative forms of batterer accountability

such as restorative justice, reparation and community service remain largely underutilized

and untested (Hart, 1993; Ms. Foundation for Women, 2003). Until these services are

supported, criminal justice efforts may continue to target only the symptom of the

problem.

Legal strategies collapse if the consciousness of the community is not aligned

against violence, if emergency services and housing are not available to battered

women and children, if human service institutions are not cognizant of domestic

violence and are not employing strategies to safeguard victims and hold batterers

accountable, and if the family and friends of the battered women and the batterer

do not reject violence as an option in intimate relationships and offer support for

safety and change. (Hart, 1993, p. 27)

Most troubling perhaps is the fact that an over-reliance on the criminal justice system means that many victims of domestic violence go unserved (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). "Although a criminal justice focus is certainly a key component of fostering batterer accountability, it is important to recognize that many (if not most) survivors of domestic violence will not come into contact with the criminal justice system" (Allen, 2006, p. 61). Statistics suggest that only 2.5-15% of domestic violence is reported to the police (Bachman & Saltzman, 1995). Additionally, most forms of domestic violence (e.g., psychological abuse, financial abuse, emotional abuse, and verbal abuse) are not illegal. It seems reasonable to conclude that pursuing alternative intervention strategies that do not rely on these reports might enable a greater impact on domestic violence.

The trouble with standards. Though standardization is not a direct result of the criminalization of domestic violence, it has certainly been facilitated by this trend. As described in the previous section, state standards would have been hampered if an alliance with the criminal justice system did not exist. It is primarily because of the courts' willingness to sentence men to approved programs that enforcement takes place. Unfortunately, despite the fact that the movement towards standardization stemmed from well-intentioned efforts to prevent the development and sustenance of ineffective or damaging programs, many believe that too little is known about what works and does not work to demand adherence to guidelines (Buttell & Carney, 2005; Corvo & Johnson, 2003; Fagan, 1996; Feder & Wilson, 2005; Holtzworth-Munroe, 2001; Lehmann & Simmons, 2009).

Because no one treatment model of modality has demonstrated superiority over the others, it is premature for states to issue mandates limiting the range of treatment options for batterers. Battering intervention agencies are more likely to improve their services by adding components or tailoring their treatments to specific clientele, than by rigidly adhering to any one curriculum in the absence of empirical evidence of its superior efficacy." (Babcock et al., 2004, p. 1048)

Implied in the movement towards standardization is the premise that one type of batterer intervention is appropriate for all men (Lehmann & Simmons, 2009). This notion is consistent with the idea that the primary cause of men's violence is patriarchy (Dutton & Corvo, 2006; Lehmann & Simmons, 2009). Ironically, there is only minimal evidence to suggest that batterers have more negative attitudes towards women than men who are not physically abusive to their female partners (Crossman, Stith, & Bender, 1990; Date & Ronan, 2000; Moore & Stuart, 2005). Instead, batterers tend to significantly vary from non-batterers on factors that strongly correlate with general violence perpetration, such as mental illness and drug and alcohol use. Surprisingly, interventions for domestically abusive men have developed seemingly in isolation from what is known about general criminal recidivism (K. Henning, personal communication, February 27, 2007). It may be instructive to examine intervention successes with other violent crimes (i.e., assessing and responding to individualized risk and matching treatment to offender needs and learning styles, [Andrews & Bonta, 2006; Dowden & Andrews, 2000]). For example, within the field of sex offender treatment, there is a growing recognition that a one-size-fits-all model may be inappropriate given the

significant differences between the needs and treatment prognosis for low versus high

risk offenders (Andrews & Bonta, 2003; Conroy, 2006).

Matching domestic violence perpetrator profiles to treatment strategies holds

promise. Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart (2003) found

remarkable stability and predictability across previously identified subtypes of batterers:

family only, generally violent, and dysphoric or borderline personality batterers

(Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). These types were significant predictors of

treatment outcome and suggest the need to modify treatment approaches to meet some

specific needs of men.

> Thus, across the available studies of this issue, the data suggest that identification
>
> of subtypes of men who are martially violent is predictive of treatment outcome in
>
> standard batterers' treatment programs. A clinical implication of these findings is
>
> that treatment outcome might be improved by matching interventions to batterer
>
> subtypes." (Holtzworth-Munroe & Meehan, 2004, p. 1385)

There is also strong evidence to suggest that attending to the drug and alcohol issues of

perpetrators may directly affect the success of batterer intervention programs (Jones &

Gondolf, 2001, Stuart, 2005; Stuart et al., 2003; Stuart & Ramsey et al., 2003). "Data

suggests that batterer treatment outcome results could be dramatically improved with

integrated or adjunct substance abuse interventions" (Stuart, 2005, p. 390). For example,

in a sample of 840 batterers, Jones & Gondolf (2001) found that violence recidivism was

reduced by 30-40% if substance abuse treatment was provided in addition to batterer

intervention.

Chapter Two: Mapping the Terrain 60

It is not hard to speculate why men of color may not be best served by a one size

fits all model (Cervantes & Cervantes, 1993; Yoshioka & Choi, 2005). A message that

does not include an acknowledgement of and discussion of the role that

disenfranchisement from dominant culture plays in men's experiences perpetrating

domestic violence may not be as well received as one that does examine this complex

relationship. In 1997, Gondolf reported,

> A disproportionate percentage of court-referred batterers in urban areas are men
>
> of color, but few racially specific programs have been established and few
>
> experienced minority staff are available. Program staff … report that minority
>
> participants often perceive, interpret, and justify their abuse differently, and their
>
> experiences with the criminal justice system and social services in general are
>
> often different than those of other men in batterer groups. (p. 92)

In addition to concerns regarding standardization and the efficacy of a one size

fits all model of batterer intervention programs for men of color, concerns have been

raised about even utilizing the criminal justice system to intervene with minority men. Is

it appropriate, wise, and effective to draw upon a historically racist institution to

intervene with men of color?

> The link between race, ethnicity, and domestic violence … raises questions about
>
> the coordinated community response model. If either low-income levels or
>
> race/ethnicity predispose some men toward violent behavior, and our response is
>
> to create a system in which incarceration is a very likely outcome for men of color
>
> who are physically abusive, this is a highly problematic response in a social

environment that already overly criminalizes men of color. (Mederos, 1999, p.

143)

Has the domestic violence movement fallen victim to the ecological fallacy?

Finally, it may be worth exploring whether the criminal justice response

sufficiently targets the societal level for change and aligns at the level of analysis with the

dominant "patriarchy as cause" explanation. While it is clear that changes in the criminal

justice system can be understood as shifts in institutionalized patriarchy, it is also clear

that patriarchy does not exist solely within the criminal justice system. If the target of

change is patriarchy, then it seems reasonable to expect successful intervention to target

multiple institutions and engage multiple facets of society. Certainly information about

domestic violence has permeated other institutions such as the educational system, the

health care system, and the media. However the focus remains largely on recognizing

and intervening with victims and perpetrators of domestic violence through the criminal

justice system, as opposed to directly challenging patriarchy by shifting power dynamics

and socialization practices towards greater gender equality. It is interesting to note that

the Duluth model was never intended to be so reliant upon the criminal justice system.

Ellen Pence (1999) explains that,

> The DAIP staff saw the legal system as a starting point for community
>
> confrontation of domestic violence. Unfortunately, it has failed to expand its
>
> institutional reform work to other community institutions (religious, economic,
>
> medical, media, education), which in fact have a much more powerful impact on
>
> creating social norms than does the reactive institution of criminal law. (p. 33).

It is interesting to consider the degree to which the criminal justice response represents a societal level intervention. Although it can be effectively argued that bringing awareness regarding domestic violence to the forefront of the criminal justice system represents a significant change in that institution, it is also true that the system's response is ultimately aimed at individuals. The focus of most legal changes regarding domestic violence is on arresting, prosecuting, and mandating individual perpetrators to attend batterer intervention programs. The dominant discourse within the criminal justice system is that individuals (mostly men) choose to use violence and this choice is disconnected from individual (i.e., substance abuse, mental illness), group (i.e., peer culture, family culture), and ironically, institutional (i.e., patriarchy, race, class, education, employment) level forces. "Although the early days of the battered women's movement explicitly linked violence and gender subordination, this understanding has been transformed by increasing criminal justice intervention that introduces gender-neutral legal standards…" (Erwin, 2006, p. 199).

Evaluating Domestic Violence Intervention with Abusive Men

The domestic violence movement's hesitancy to embrace multi-faceted explanations for men's violence against women has gone hand in hand with somewhat restrictive intervention practices and limited evaluation findings (Corvo & Johnson, 2003). The fact that it has been so challenging to integrate multiple theoretical antecedents has likely delayed development of more complex, multi-faceted interventions just as concerns over dangerous intervention practices (e.g., couples counseling and anger management) prompted endorsement of theoretical explanations that made these

practices obsolete. Unfortunately, these trends in theorizing and intervention in men's

violence against women have contributed to a less than optimal state of research on

domestic violence intervention.

> For over 20 years, research on the effects of increased criminal justice
>
> involvement in domestic violence has emphasized systemic reforms and efforts to
>
> increase the rate at which legal sanctions are applied. Yet there remains
>
> inconsistent and inconclusive knowledge about the effectiveness of criminalizing
>
> domestic violence on controlling repeat victimization. (Fagan, 1996, p. 40).

Although written well over a decade ago, Fagan's (1996) concerns with the state

of research on the efficacy of domestic violence intervention with abusive men remain

remarkably legitimate. In particular, the existing body of research is characterized by a

preponderance of inconsistent findings regarding the impact of the criminal justice

system, For example, despite the well-intentioned push for mandatory arrest laws in

most states, the impact of arrest on future abuse remains uncertain (DeLeon-Granados,

Wells & Long, 2005; Kingsnorth, 2006). Early studies indicated that arrest functions as a

deterrent (Sherman & Berk, 1984), particularly for married, employed men, however

later research suggested that arrest for certain populations might actually increase the

rates of future domestic violence (Schmidt & Sherman, 1996; Sherman, Smith, Schmidt,

& Rogan, 1992). A recent re-examination of six high profile arrest experiments, known

collectively as the Spouse Assault Replication Program (SARPs), revealed a modest, but

consistent deterrent effect (equating to a 4-10% decrease) of arrest on future recidivism

(Maxwell, Garner, Fagan, 2001). Despite the adoption of no-drop prosecution laws in

many states, rates of prosecution vary, ranging from 5 to 70% for misdemeanor domestic

abuse cases (Fagan, 1989; Ford, 1993; Ford, 2003; Henning & Feder, 2005).   When

prosecution is pursued, there is not conclusive evidence supporting its deterrent effects

(Kingsnorth, 2006; Thistlethwaite, Woolredge, & Gibbs, 1998; Tolman & Weisz, 1995).

Fagan (1989) reported that men with prior arrest records or histories of severe intimate

partner violence were actually more likely to re-offend if prosecuted.

The findings on the impact of court mandated batterer intervention programs are

similarly unconvincing. Most men (between 50-80%) mandated to attend batterer

intervention programs never show up for their initial intake interview (Babcock &

Steiner, 1999; Gondolf & Foster, 1991; Gondolf, 2000). A similar number of men (60-

80%) who do attend one session never complete their assigned program (Gondolf &

Foster, 1991; Gondolf, 2000; Grusznski & Carrillo, 1998). Research suggests that

between 20 and 60% of those few men who do manage to complete the program by

attending the required number of sessions or activities will reassault a female partner

within 15 months after starting their program (Babcock et al., 2004; Buttell & Carney,

2005; Gondolf, 2002; Harrell, 1991; Henning & Holdford, 2006) and those most likely to

recidivate often have a history of substance abuse (Hamberger & Hastings, 1990), past

criminal behavior, and severe psychopathology (Gondolf, 2002; Grann & Wedin, 2002).

Recent experimental and quasi-experimental studies specifically designed to

clarify the impact of batterer intervention have produced mixed results. For example,

Feder & Dugan (2002) reported disappointing findings in the Broward County

Courthouse randomized experiment where 404 male defendants convicted of

misdemeanor domestic violence were either assigned to one year probation or one year

probation plus court mandated counseling. No significant attitudinal or behavioral

differences were noted between the control and treatment groups when self-report,

victim-report and police reports were compared one year later. Dunford (2000)

completed an experimental evaluation at a Naval base where 861 men were randomly

assigned to either a cognitive-behavioral group counseling program, couples counseling,

strict monitoring or a control group in which women received some safety planning and

men received minimal supervision. Producing results similar to Feder & Dugan (2002),

no differences in terms of repeat abuse and reassault during the one-year follow-up

period were found among the four conditions. On the flip side, Davis, Taylor & Maxwell

(2000) reported more encouraging findings from their Brooklyn experiment where 376

men convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence were either assigned to 40 hours of

community service or 40 hours of a Duluth Model intervention program. The men

assigned to the 26 week Duluth program were half as likely (10% versus 26%) to

recidivate as the men assigned to community service.

Attempting to draw some definitive conclusions regarding the efficacy of batterer

intervention programs, two meta-analytic reviews of existing experimental and quasi-

experimental studies were recently conducted. The conclusions reached by these reviews

suggest that batterer intervention programs have minimal impact. Feder & Wilson (2005)

reported a barely negligible effect size across 15 studies, particularly when evaluations

solicited victim reports and utilized pre-treatment control groups. "The results from the

meta-analysis do not provide confidence that [batterer intervention] programs will be

found to be effective. Therefore, it would prove beneficial for the criminal justice system

to begin looking at other types of interventions for addressing the problem of domestic

violence" (Feder & Wilson, 2005, p. 258). A meta-analysis conducted one year earlier by

Babcock et al., 2004 resulted in similar findings. Their review of 22 experimental and

quasi-experimental studies suggested a "small" effect size. Putting the effect size into

practical terms, they conclude, "there is a 5% increase in success rate attributable to

treatment. To a clinician, this means that a woman is 5% less likely to be re-assaulted by

a man who was arrested, sanctioned, and went to a batterers' program than by a man who

was simply arrested and sanctioned" (p. 1044).

One of the greatest challenges in interpreting these results is not specific to

research on batterer intervention programs, but is a limitation of experimental and quasi-

experimental designs. Experiments can only ascertain a program effect if participants are

actually exposed to the program. In other words, if we merely compare men assigned to

batterer intervention with men not assigned to batterer intervention, we may fail to find a

very legitimate program effect if the men assigned to the treatment group never

participate. "Program dropouts in the experimental group, which also includes

completers, may offset possible program effects among the completers and suggest that

the program treatment effect is statistically negligible or ineffective" (Jones, D'Agostino

Jr., Gondolf, Heckert, 2004, p. 1003).

It has been suggested that it may be more appropriate to compare men who

complete batterer intervention (or receive a substantial dose of the program) with men

who do not complete the program (Gondolf, 2002; Gondolf, 2001a). When researchers

compare these two populations, findings are a bit more promising. For example, Gordon

& Moriarty (2003) evaluated the impact of batterer intervention on 258 men, 132 of

whom received BI treatment. Comparing the two groups, there was no significant

difference in recidivism rates. However when they compared the treatment completers

(n=81) to treatment drop-outs (n=51), the men who completed were significantly less

likely to reoffend within the one year follow-up period. Hendricks, Werner, Shipway &

Turinetti (2006) also reported that program completers had significantly lower rates of

recidivism (10.6%) than those men who did not complete a mandated 14 week group

treatment program (38.8%). There are countless studies comparing treatment completers

to non-completers suggesting similar results (Dutton, 1986; Gondolf, 1997a; Gondolf,

2002; Hamberger & Hastings, 1990). In one of the more rigorous and respected studies

evaluating the impact of four different batterer intervention programs in four

communities on 840 perpetrators, Gondolf (2002) reported a 36% reassault rates for men

who attended at least two months of their assigned program compared to 55% for men

who had dropped out, even when controlling for demographics, personality traits, and

behavioral differences.

Naturally, a comparison of treatment completers to treatment drop-outs raises the

question of self-selection. Men who choose to complete treatment are known to be

different from those who drop out (e.g., more educated, more likely to be employed,

married, Caucasian, and court-mandated, and less likely to have a criminal record)

(Babcock & Steiner, 1999; Daly & Pelowski, 2000; Gondolf, 1997a). Additionally, it has

been determined that non-completers are more likely to be young, low income, less

educated, and consume greater amounts of alcohol (Cadsky, Hanson, Crawford, &

Lalonde 1996; Daly & Pelowski, 2000; Gondolf, 1999a). Attempting to determine

whether individual self-selection is responsible for lower rates of recidivism among

treatment completers as opposed to genuine treatment impact, remains challenging.

However, even if treatment completers are unique from treatment drop-outs in ways that

correlate with recidivism, this finding may not negate the impact of batterer intervention

treatment. Would men, who are perhaps more likely given their demographics to change,

be able to do so without the information, tools and support offered during batterer

intervention? More importantly, given that batterer intervention programs are currently a

mainstay of dominant intervention strategies with abusive men, might a more useful

question to consider be, what can be done to improve their efficacy?

Unfortunately, outcome focused evaluations have produced few suggestions for

how to modify and enhance programs. Even if these studies were not riddled with

methodological challenges, (i.e., difficulty maintaining random assignment, intention to

treat versus actual treatment, low response rates, and a decontextualization of program

impact [Gondolf, 2001a]) and their results could be tentatively accepted to imply that

current domestic violence intervention strategies do not seem to change violent men, we

have not learned anything about what might enable programs to intervene more

effectively with perpetrators of domestic violence. Furthermore, since most studies

isolate and evaluate one component of the coordinated community response at a time, we

know even less about how to improve domestic violence intervention with abusive men

as a whole.

Promising new directions in evaluation

In the last few years, researchers have recognized and begun to respond to these gaps by focusing on understanding how abusive men change during a batterer intervention program as well as attending to the impact of the coordinated community response as a system (Murphy et al., 1998; Pandya & Gingerich, 2002; Scott & Wolfe, 2000; Silvergleid & Mankowski, 2006; Wangsgaard, 2001). Exploring how men change, or documenting the processes of change, can identify candidates for improvement. If we understand and document what activities, experiences, and opportunities facilitate shifts in values, cognitions, reactions and ultimately behaviors, programs can be modified to incorporate and emphasize those processes (Silvergleid & Mankowski, 2006).

A small number of investigations have recently focused on the processes of change in batterer intervention, attempting to explicate the processes that account for program effectiveness (Pandya & Gingerich, 2002; Scott & Wolfe, 2000; Silvergleid & Mankowski, 2006; Wangsgaard, 2001). Studies have revealed the importance of overcoming denial and engaging new ways of thinking (Pandya & Gingerich, 2002), the impact of recognizing and taking responsibility for past abusive behavior, developing empathy for others, reducing dependency, including accepting full responsibility for changing abusive behavior and improving communication skills (Scott & Wolfe, 2000), and the role of having an emotionally safe treatment environment or "asylum", created through respect, "talk-share-common ground," and support from the other group members and the facilitators (Wangsgaard, 2001). Of particularly interest are results of a study conducted by Stefanakis (2000) who after interviewing 20 previously violent men

who were violence-free for two years reported the importance of environmental cues and supports as well as the men's own ability to utilize them.

> Ending one's use of violence is an interactive process. In other words, change requires both the individual and the environment to promote the end of violent behavior. The individual is responsible for attempts to change and for seizing (or not seizing) opportunities for change, but he is not responsible for the availability of these opportunities. (Stefanakis, 2000, pg. 130)

Silvergleid & Mankowski (2006) also found support for critical influences at multiple levels of analysis during interviews with 9 batterer intervention program participants and 10 program facilitators. Specifically, we identified processes of change at the level of the individual (i.e., new skills, self-awareness, deciding to change), the group (i.e., support and confrontation by other men, sharing and hearing stories, modeling and mentoring, and resocialization), the organization (i.e., program facilitators), and the community (i.e., criminal justice system).

Unfortunately, these studies have focused exclusively on one component of domestic violence intervention with abusive men rather than looking at intervention strategies in their entirety. Given the prevalence of the coordinated community response, it makes little sense to evaluate components of domestic violence intervention in isolation. The components do not operate in isolation; they operate as part of a collective and until we understand how that collective is working as a whole, we will not truly know much about the impact of our strategies. Gondolf (2002) concludes his large multi-site evaluation of batterer intervention programs by insisting that the "system" matters.

Subsequently it is no longer sufficient to evaluate batterer intervention programs in isolation, rather that they must be understood as only one piece of the intervention system. For example, Gondolf notes that the cultural climate (actions, values, and procedures of probation officers, district attorneys, judges) in which a program operates greatly impacts its effectiveness. For example, when men are required to appear in court 30 days after sentencing and show proof of program attendance, programs in the area are likely to see an increase in intake appointments (Gondolf, 2000). Similarly if probation departments monitor program attendance and issue arrest warrants for men who fail to complete the required number of program sessions, men are more likely to complete their programs (Dehart, Kennerly, Burke & Follingstad, 1999).

What might happen if intervention components were systematically coordinated and then evaluated? There is one study that explicitly attempted to assess the impact of the successive layers of the coordinated community response to domestic violence (Murphy et al., 1998). Murphy et al., (1998) evaluated the combined effects of the coordinated community response on domestic violence in Baltimore, Maryland. Tracking 235 men charged with domestic violence related offenses for 12 to 18 months, their results indicated that each successive layer of intervention correlated with a lower rate of recidivism. Men who were successfully prosecuted recidivated less than those who were not (23% versus 29%), those men who were placed on probation recidivated less than those who were not (21% versus 23%), those men who were prosecuted, placed on probation and ordered to counseling recidivated less than those not ordered to counseling (18% versus 21%) and those few men who actually completed court-ordered

counseling, were placed on probation and were successfully prosecuted had no recidivist charges. Murphy et al. (1998) conclude, "the current results provide evidence that coordinated interventions may have a cumulative effect on recidivism risk. The combined effects of prosecution, probation, and court-ordered counseling were associated with significant reductions in recidivism" (p. 278). Unfortunately, only 9 men (out of 235) actually received the maximum level of intervention and completed the court ordered batterer intervention program. Furthermore, more than 25% of the total sample did recidivate. It is regrettable however that this study focused narrowly on outcomes (rather than also on processes) in order to assess the coordinated community response, as very little information was garnered to assist policy makers in improving these results.

In the next chapter, I discuss opportunities that emerge when we embrace the holism of domestic violence in our conceptualization, intervention and evaluation. By focusing the field so narrowly on one theoretical explanation for men's violence against women, (i.e., "patriarchy as cause"), one approach for intervening in men's violence, (i.e., primarily criminal justice based), and one dominant strategy for evaluation (i.e., outcome and single component focused), much has been ignored. The value of a multi-level, ecological, systems approach when explaining, intervening and evaluating men's violence is explored.

Chapter Three: Perceiving the whole:

Advancing a systems approach to domestic violence intervention

In the previous chapter, I offered a critique of the dominant conceptualizations, intervention strategies, and evaluations of domestic violence intervention with abusive men. My concern, shared by a growing number of others in the field (Adler, 2002; Goldman & Du Mont, 2001; Gondolf, 1997b; Gondolf, 2002; Laing, 2002; Eisikovits & Edleson, 1989; Tolman, 2001), revolves principally around the restricted range of acceptable theories to explain men's violence towards their intimate partners, the stunted development of more inclusive strategies to intervene in men's domestic violence, and the limited diversity of evaluation methods engaged to study the impact intervention has on men's perpetration of violence. I then suggest that this constriction within the domestic violence field may be partially responsible for the limited effectiveness of our intervention strategies. To achieve optimal intervention effectiveness we must align the levels of analysis between our problem definition and our solutions (Watzlawick et al. 1974), a process that is enhanced by the availability of theories and interventions at many levels of analysis. Currently in the field there is a trend towards endorsing a single-level theory to explain men's violence, one that defines the problem primarily at the institutional/societal level (i.e., patriarchy), as well as a push towards a somewhat single-level criminal-justice based intervention which manifests primarily at the individual level (i.e., arrest, conviction, and sentencing individual men to treatment). Subsequently, not only is the field reduced to one level of analysis both in terms of theory and practice, but the levels are mismatched. "It is paradoxical that despite the wide acceptance of socio-

political explanations for domestic violence most interventions with men who perpetrate violence in intimate relationships have been individualized" (Laing, 2002; p. 3)

Unfortunately, the dominant evaluation methodology utilized in the field provides few empirically based suggestions for how to enhance the success of current strategies. As previously indicated, most of the studies conducted to date have utilized individual outcome measures of recidivism to determine efficacy and have narrowly focused on one component of domestic violence intervention at a time, rather than attempting to represent, capture, and evaluate domestic violence intervention as a system. Even the recent trends to study processes of change in batterer intervention and the systemic impact of the coordinated community response to domestic violence typically get reduced to a study of individual men's process of change or the effects of coordination on individual men's recidivism outcomes (Murphy et al., 1998; Shepard, Falk, & Elliott, 2002). In lobbying for the need for more holistic, theory-based, systems oriented evaluations of domestic violence intervention, Adler (2002) lamented that, "evaluation studies typically focus on assessing the performance of programs within various components of the system (judicial, crisis intervention, social services, health care)…[as opposed to] modeling the structure of, and linkages among, the system components" (p. 203).

Embracing the Ecology of Domestic Violence Intervention

The relationship between conceptualization, intervention and evaluation is not discrete or linear; therefore it is incorrect to place responsibility for the constriction affecting all three solely on the shoulders on any one area, but rather it is important to

recognize the ways in which choices and decisions in each area impact the others.

Certainly evaluation methods that privilege the role of the individual, primarily assess

outcomes, and focus exclusively on criminal justice responses to domestic violence

compound the problem by legitimizing the current paradigm. For this reason, it seems

especially important that evaluators strive to conduct research that opens, rather than

closes conceptual and intervention pathways.

It has been suggested that invoking an ecological analysis to understand the

causes of men's violence against women and assess the limitations of current intervention

strategies would better acknowledge the multi-leveled complexity of domestic violence

(Phillips, 2000; Tolman, 2001). Ecological theory recognizes that social phenomena do

not exist in isolation, but are inextricably embedded within its environment. This

embeddedness is dynamic such that a fundamental interdependence exists making it less

meaningful to study phenomena without attempting to explicate and appreciate the

impact of the relevant context or environment. Urie Bronfenbrenner (1979) is often cited

for his innovative description of the levels of environmental influences on individuals,

though he was certainly not the first to suggest equalizing the importance of the

environment and the individual when studying behavior. Kurt Lewin (1942), often

considered the founder of social psychology, was among the first to articulate the critical

role that environment plays in understanding behavior. In his famous field theory,

symbolically expressed $B=f(P,E)$ Lewin suggested that human behavior is a function of

both the person and the environment. Years later, Bronfenbrenner more specifically

articulated the role of environment on human behavior by describing several nested

layers of influence. Bronfenbrenner suggested that we must remain aware of at least four

layers of environmental influence: the microsystem which involves each direct contact

that an individual has with others, the mesosystem which involves the connections that

exist among the various microsystems that involve the individual, the exosystem which

includes those systems or organizations which indirectly impact the individual's life but

do not include the individual, and finally the macrosystem which includes institutional

and cultural contexts which shape and influence exosystems.

Several authors have articulated the benefits of applying an ecological model to

the problem of domestic violence intervention (Corvo & Johnson, 2003; D. Dutton, 1995;

M.A. Dutton, 1992; Edleson & Tolman, 1992; Phillips, 2000; Tolman, 2001). Tolman

(2001) suggests that an ecological analysis can help evaluators explain failings of the

coordinated community response to domestic violence. He claims that the coordinated

community response requires several mesosystems (probation, courts, program staff) to

interact regularly in order to hold individual men accountable. The intervention's success

is compromised if these systems fail to collaborate; for example, if program staff neglect

to notify probation officers of participant truancy or probation officers fail to follow up

when they receive paperwork suggesting that one of their charges has not been attending

the court-mandated program. In other words, Tolman suggests that failure often is not

the responsibility of one individual component of the system, but rather the lack of

connection between components in the system or the ecology enveloping the perpetrator.

Deborah Phillips (2000) suggests that more comprehensive domestic violence

interventions might be developed if we matched our policy responses to our problem

definitions at multiple levels of analysis. She, like O'Neil and Harway (1999), articulates

a problem definition at several levels of analysis: individual (e.g., unaddressed mental

health and substance abuse problems), microsystem (e.g., dysfunctional family

interaction dynamics), mesosystem (e.g., lack of appropriate social supports and

controls), exosystem (e.g., poverty and associated strains, and dependency), and

macrosystem (i.e., social, cultural and gender norms that condone violence and male

domination). Phillips then suggests that intervention success will be greater if each of

these levels or antecedents is sufficiently addressed. For example, at the individual level

she suggests that mental health and substance abuse services might be necessary in order

to stop the perpetration of domestic violence, whereas at the exosystem level, where

factors such as economical climate and social support may be contributing factors,

income support may be necessary. She also suggests responding to macrosystem

contributors to domestic violence through the use of community-wide education and

prevention programs as well as policies that equalize power and resources between men

and women in our society (e.g., the Family and Medical Leave Act and the Equal Pay

Act).

A handful of ecological models, in line with Phillips' suggestions, for intervening

in domestic violence do exist. While on the periphery and typically oriented towards

marginalized populations, some innovative approaches are being implemented (Bowen,

Gwiasda, & Brown, 2004; Sabol, Coulton, & Korbin, 2004). Almeida & Dolan-

Delvecchio (1999) in their article, "*Addressing Culture in Batterers Intervention: The*

Asian Indian Community as an Illustrative Example", highlight a model of batterer

intervention that recognizes and embraces a man's unique cultural community and

effectively utilizes that community to confront his violence and power abuse. The

Cultural Context Model (CCM) that Almeida and Dolan-Delvecchia review evolved from

a desire at the Institute for Family Services to more adequately address "social justice

concerns arising from differences of race, gender, class, ethnicity and sexual orientation

[that are at] the heart of family therapy" (p. 668). Recognizing that the impact of culture

on domestic violence is not "additive", in other words it can not be effectively addressed

by simply adding a didactic lesson on the ways in which race, ethnicity, and or class may

influence men's violence, they describe the need for a more integrated, multi-layered

approach.

The CCM involves seven resocialization components or layers: sponsorship,

socio-education, men's and women's culture circles, couple, individual, family or origin

and family sessions, children's and adolescents' culture circles, graduation, and

community outreach. Men who are mandated to the Institute for Family Services for

battering are first assigned a sponsor. "A sponsor is a person of the same sex as the client

whose role is essentially to connect the client to the collective experience of his or her

gender, racial and cultural group" (p. 669). One of the critical roles of sponsorship is to

dismantle the privacy that typically surrounds and covertly supports men's abuse of

power within the home, instead providing an immediate source of accountability and

connection. During the socio-education component, didactic material is presented in an

effort to raise consciousness regarding gender, race, culture and sexual orientation.

The difference between CCM and dominant approaches to batterer intervention is that attempts are made to raise consciousness not just about the impact of men's violence on women, but rather the impact of men's violence on women within specific cultural contexts. Explicit discussions are held regarding how a video-clip scenario might be different if the characters were Black instead of White or poor instead of middle-class. Discussions are facilitated about how race and class impact not only the victim differently but the perpetrator. Socio-education takes place during same sex meetings, called culture circles, modeled on the work by Paolo Freire (1972). "Culture circles are where men and women, with the facilitation of a team of therapists and with the support of same-sex sponsors, work toward expanding their definitions and experiences of socially prescribed roles" (p. 677). After perpetrators demonstrated a consistent ability to be fully accountable for their abuse of power, and victims agree, couple sessions are scheduled. These sessions are often held within the context of the culture circles to ensure greater support for the victim and greater accountability for the perpetrator.

The fact that CCM includes space for maintenance and integrity of the family diverges from the traditional approach to domestic violence intervention where victims are encouraged to leave their abusers, retreating to the safety of hidden, woman only spaces, while men are sent to male-only intervention programs and couples counseling is strongly discouraged (Grauwiler & Mills, 2004). CCM recognizes that the unity of the family is an important cultural value in the Asian Indian community and works to embrace that value by striving to achieve safety for all members of the family. Appreciating the inter-generational transmission of violence, CCM also works directly

with children and adolescents. "Culture circles for adolescents and children explore

issues of power and control, presenting didactic materials for socio-education that reach

children at their age-appropriate levels of understanding" (p. 679). Recognizing that men

who have abused power with their wives, have likely also abused power with their

children, the CCM provides space for fathers to visit their children's culture circles and

are coached regarding how to parent more effectively without resorting to power over

behaviors and attitudes. Completing the "program" signifies more of a beginning than an

ending. Men and women who graduate or finish the formal process often stay involved

as sponsors and many become quite engaged in community outreach and education.

Despite the fact that CCM is offered by Almeida & Dolan-Delvecchio (1999) as a

model that more appropriately meets the needs of men of color, or men not a part of the

dominant culture in the United States, I believe this program is an example of how

interventions might more fully recognize and address multiple antecedents of domestic

violence while simultaneously drawing more deeply on community resources to intervene

with abusive men.

Adopting a Systems Approach to Evaluate Domestic Violence Intervention

What does it mean to adopt a systems approach, and how does a systems

approach more adequately create space for acknowledging the social ecology of domestic

violence? I will begin by establishing what I mean by a *system*. Drawing on a definition

articulated by Lendaris (1986), "a system is a) a unit with certain attributes perceived

relative to its external environment and b) a unit that has the quality that it internally

contains subunits and those subunits operate together to manifest the perceived attributes

of the unit" (p. 604). Lendaris goes on to suggest that "systemness" is in the eye of the beholder, such that how a system gets defined, what constitutes the relevant environment, the unit, and the subunits is determined largely by the perceptual filters of the beholder. Though there are countless implications of this definition of system for a systems approach to evaluation, I will be focusing on three key ideas: the importance of context, processes, and multiple perspectives.

At no place in Lendaris' definition of system is there room to understand a unit discrete from its environment. The very essence of a system according to this definition is that it possesses certain attributes in relation to its environment. In other words, the system attributes only have meaning when understood in their relevant context. This idea clearly embraces ecological theory, which suggests that individuals are inextricably connected with their environments such that it is difficult to understand them in isolation (Kelly, 2006). If we apply Lendaris' definition of a system to our subject of study, we notice that our unit, domestic violence intervention with abusive men, has the attribute "limited effectiveness" perceived relative to goals of the domestic violence movement. The only way that we can understand the system of domestic violence intervention having the attribute of limited effectiveness is because the domestic violence movement or the context for this unit desires to stop all battering. When there was not a domestic violence movement in this country with the desire to end violence against women, this particular system or unit would not have existed because domestic violence intervention would not have been perceived as limited.

The second lesson we can glean from Lendaris' definition of system is that processes matter. If one examines the second requirement of his definition, one recognizes that what is critical is not necessarily the individual subunits, but rather the way in which they operate together to manifest the attributes of the unit. The processes among and between the subunits are key. When domestic violence intervention is perceived as limited relative to the goals of the domestic violence movement, it is not only the subunits themselves that matter, (i.e., the dominance of the "patriarchy as cause" explanation, the criminalization of domestic violence, and the absence of alternative community based strategies) but also the ways in which these subunits operate together to manifest the perceived attributes of the unit. Adopting Lendaris' definition of system suggests that it is important to understand what is happening when the various subunits work together rather than simply focusing on individual subunits and their relative success or failure. This perspective allows us to ask, for example, what is it about the way in which these subunits interact or the processes among and between them that leads to the attribute limited effectiveness?

Finally, Lendaris' definition suggests that more than one perspective on the problem may be necessary. Each beholder possesses a unique set of values, beliefs, and experiences, which function as perceptual filters and affect what he or she sees and understands. Specifically, these filters affect what the beholder identifies as the unit, the relevant environment, the subunits and the system attributes. Lendaris suggests that, "every system has a subsystem… and every system is an element of a suprasystem" (p. 605). Simplified, this means that for every beholder who perceives a system relative to

its external environment, there is a beholder that perceives that external environment as a system with its own relevant environment and its own subunits, one of which is the first beholders' system. Similarly, for every subunit perceived by a beholder, there is another beholder who perceives that subunit as the unit, with its own subunits. As a beholder, I view domestic violence intervention as a unit with the attribute unsatisfactory effectiveness relative to the environment of the goals of the domestic violence movement with various hypothesized subunits which operate together to manifest marginal effectiveness in reducing men's abusiveness towards their intimate partners (see Figure 3).

Figure 3

Lendaris' (1986) definition of a system applied to the proposed subject of study.

Environment = Domestic Violence Movement
(Goal of eliminating violence against women)

System (A level) = Domestic Violence Intervention
Attribute: Limited effectiveness

Subunits (B level) = Units that operate together
to manifest the limited effectiveness
of domestic violence intervention

Dominance of single level, "Patriarchy
as Cause", explanation for men's
violence against women

Criminalization of domestic violence
and subsequent centrality of criminal
justice responses to domestic violence

Absence of alternative, multi-level,
community based intervention strategies
for abusive men

Dominance of outcome focused
evaluations providing little guidance for
how to improve current strategies

In order for the domestic violence movement to exist as a suprasystem or environment for my unit, there must exist a beholder who views the domestic violence movement with the desire for ending domestic violence as a unit with its own relevant environment, such as the feminist movement. Similarly, there need to be beholders who view my subunits (i.e., dominance of "patriarchy as cause", criminalization of domestic violence, and absence of alternative strategies) with their own subunits, which operate together to manifest those attributes. For example, the "criminalization of domestic violence", which I perceive as a subunit in my system, is perceived by a different beholder as a unit, perceived relative to the external environment domestic violence intervention, and possessing the subunits of mandatory arrest laws, pro-prosecution policies, and punishment versus rehabilitation focus.

In adopting a systems approach to the understanding or evaluation of domestic violence intervention with abusive men, I acknowledge context, focus on processes and engage multiple perspectives in my methodology. Specifically, I acknowledge context by recognizing domestic violence intervention to be an embedded, multi-faceted phenomenon that can best be understood within its relevant environment. I privilege processes by focusing on how various aspects of domestic violence intervention interact to limit effectiveness as opposed to either measuring individualized outcomes or evaluating pieces of the dominant strategy in isolation. Finally, I engage multiple perspectives by recognizing that each member of the domestic violence intervention system possesses a unique and valuable perspective and that a systems analysis of the

limitations of the current strategies requires that these perspectives be explicated and synthesized.

As reviewed in the introduction, I have three goals for this study: to describe and critically analyze limitations of current domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men, to identify and describe additional opportunities for engaging community resources in domestic violence intervention with abusive men, and to create opportunities for key stakeholders within the domestic violence intervention system to dialogue about its limitations, and by doing so, facilitate possibilities for action and change. To best accomplish these goals, I endeavored to answer five research questions: 1) What do key stakeholders within Portland's Coordinated Community Response (CCR) identify as current domestic violence intervention with abusive men? 2) What do key stakeholders within Portland's CCR believe limits the effectiveness of domestic violence intervention with abusive men? 3) How do key Portland CCR stakeholders make sense of any discrepancies between theorized antecedents for men's domestic violence and the current intervention strategies? 4) How do key Portland CCR stakeholders make sense of any discrepancies between the Duluth Model of coordinated community response and current intervention strategies for domestically abusive men? 5) What do key Portland CCR stakeholders believe the role of community should be in domestic violence intervention with abusive men?

The rationale for my first question is relatively straightforward. I was interested in mapping the perceived terrain of domestic violence intervention with abusive men in Portland, Oregon. I believe it is essential to establish an understanding of how key

stakeholders define efforts to intervene in domestic violence, as this provides the context

for any critique. My second question was designed to generate candidates for the

subunits of the domestic violence intervention system, (e.g., the subunits that together

manifest the attribute limited effectiveness). I recognized that there were likely

implementation explanations such as funding, resource limitations, and communication

breakdowns, but I also suspected that there might be some philosophical barriers to

greater success and I was interested in ascertaining what key stakeholders perceived these

to be. This interest also compelled questions three and four. Given my discussion of the

theoretical restriction in explaining men's violence against women, the possibility that the

field has fallen victim to the ecological fallacy, and the unintended consequences of the

criminal justice response to domestic violence, I was specifically interested in

ascertaining what challenges key stakeholders identify with the current approach, and if

they recognized discrepancies, how they manage them in their day-to-day work. My

final question stemmed from a critique of the coordinated community response. Though

the term *community* is used to signify the importance of collaboration among various

subunits of the domestic violence intervention system, these subunits traditionally include

components of the criminal justice system and rarely involve other community

organizations such as churches, synagogues, schools, neighborhood associations, or

workplaces. I was curious whether key stakeholders believe that there is a role to be

played by any of these other mediating community structures (Berger & Neuhaus, 1977)

and perhaps whether their absence in the current strategies accounts for some of the

system failure.

It is my contention that engaging a systems approach begins to ameliorate some of the limitations I illuminated in Chapter Two regarding existing evaluations of domestic violence intervention with abusive men. In the next chapter, I move beyond offering a rationale for utilizing a systems approach for exploring this subject and describe the exact methods I engaged.

Chapter Four: Methodology

This study enlists a systems approach to describe and analyze limitations of current domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men. As executed, this query most appropriately fits under the rubric of "process evaluation", as opposed to a more traditional outcome oriented evaluation. Process evaluations typically focus on the *how* or the internal workings of a program (Patton, 1990), rather than documenting its output. Researchers conducting process evaluations strive to produce information regarding the interaction and dynamics that enable or interfere with program operation (Chen & Rossi, 1983; Johnson, 1998). This characterization of my study seems most appropriate, given my focus on exploring whether there are conceptual or implementation processes interfering with optimal domestic violence intervention with abusive men in our community.

Process evaluations are particularly well served by the techniques of naturalistic inquiry (Patton, 1990). Naturalistic inquiry assumes a world that is multiple and constructed, where causality is mutual rather than linear, and context is privileged (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Additionally, naturalistic inquiry embraces, rather than reduces, complexity and is therefore particularly appropriate for the study of processes. Finally, naturalistic inquiry's fundamental assumption that reality is constructed such that no single truth exists about any particular phenomenon of study, suggests the need for a multiplistic approach (Cook, 1985). As such, this form of inquire shares many of the fundamental ontological and epistemological assumptions of a systems approach. Of particularly note is the fact that naturalistic inquiry parallels a systems approach in its

focus on context, processes and multiple perspectives. Engaging these methods enabled

me to remain focused on domestic violence intervention as a system embedded in

multiple relevant environments while simultaneously creating space for me to explore the

nonlinear processes occurring among the various subunits or system components that

working together create less than optimal effectiveness.

Naturalistic inquiry traditionally employs the use of qualitative data collection and

inductive data analysis, both of which are considered adept at describing processes and

context dependent phenomenon (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Qualitative data collection can

involve individual interviews, group interviews, direct observation, or written documents

(Patton, 1990). The goal with qualitative data collection is to gather in-depth, rich and

detailed information from a small number of participants, as opposed to gathering

discrete, structured information from a large number of participants. Qualitative data can

be particularly useful during exploratory research where little is known about the target

of study. Qualitative data collection methods are considered highly flexible, capable of

accommodating and responding to unexpected material in ways that quantitative data

collection often cannot. Given that I was interested in exposing previously unidentified

barriers to more effective domestic violence intervention as well as revealing additional

opportunities for engaging community resources in our strategies with abusive men,

qualitative data collection seemed most appropriate.

Collecting information from multiple sources is indicated by both a systems

approach and naturalistic inquiry. "Naturalistic inquirers focus upon the multiple realities

that, like the layers of an onion, nest within or complement one another. Each layer

provides a different perspective of reality, and none can be considered more "true" than any other" (Guba & Lincoln, 1981, p. 57). Gathering multiple perspectives, or triangulating, does not discount any one specific experience, but does help facilitate a fuller and potentially more trustworthy understanding of the phenomenon (Cook, 1985; Johnson, 1997). "Much of the credibility of qualitative findings [on domestic violence] hinges on the ability to contrast or combine different subjective perspectives (Murphy & O'Leary, 1994, p. 214).

Linstone (1999) suggests consciously engaging at least three specific perspectives when assessing complex socio-technical systems: a technical perspective, an organizational perspective and a personal perspective. Each perspective yields unique insights and the triad provides a prescription for collecting, organizing and synthesizing a vast amount of information from a variety of sources. When viewing the system from the technical perspective (T), one focuses on quantifying and reducing data. For example, when evaluating the limitations of domestic violence intervention, the technical perspective might calculate how many men are arrested, how many men attend batterer intervention and how many men recidivate after interfacing with the system. The technical perspective might also point to the number of times batterer intervention programs fail to notify probation when a man drops out of treatment or the number of times police officers are mandated by law to arrest a woman they believe is the primary victim. Linstone argues that the technical perspective alone is not sufficient for understanding complex systems. He suggests that it is also necessary to engage an organizational perspective (O), which focuses on processes within an organization that

affect decision-making such as standard operating procedures, policies, and organizational culture. The organizational perspective can also capture pressures that are exerted from outside the system and which significantly impact decisions within the system. Specifically, the organizational perspective seeks to reveal power dynamics and value struggles. Finally, Linstone advocates for gathering information and viewing the system from the personal perspective (P). This perspective focuses on viewing the system through the mental processes of individuals; it focuses on intuition and feeling, and can provide a story for understanding what is happening within the system. Consciously engaging Linstone's T.O.P. framework proved particularly useful given my interest in both the implementation (technical) barriers as well as the conceptual barriers (which might include both personal and organizational) to more successful domestic violence intervention with abusive men.

In selecting populations from which to draw participants, I privileged two criteria: adequate involvement in the system of study and the ability to provide either a technical, organizational, or personal perspective on the system. In qualitative inquiries, sampling criteria depends most significantly on appropriateness rather than representativeness (Morgan, 1997). Can potential participants talk articulately and with detail about the target phenomenon, current domestic violence intervention? Additionally, does the sample include knowledgeable informants who are similar enough in their experience so that relevant similarities and themes can surface (Morse, 1991)? Obviously, it is useful to gather data from sources close enough to the phenomenon of interest to have meaningful insight. This approach is often labeled purposeful sampling (Morgan, 1997; Morse,

1991; Patton, 1990). Second, given the complexity of my target, and my interest in both concrete as well as more abstract limiting factors, I wanted sources that had the potential to speak to the three perspectives identified by Linstone (1999). In other words, I wanted to access sources likely to possess detailed technical, personal or organizational information regarding domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men.

At least six groups of people met both of my conditions: police officers who arrest abusive men, probation officers who supervise abusive men, victim advocates who work with women who have been abused by their intimate male partners, victims/survivors of domestic violence, facilitators of batterer intervention programs, and abusive men who have been arrested and mandated to attend batterer intervention. Representatives from each of these populations view the system or unit, domestic violence intervention, with distinct perceptual filters (e.g., technical, organizational or personal). By gathering data from these different stakeholder groups, I was able develop a fuller description of the barriers they perceive, as well as compare and contrast the perspectives that each group offered, yielding useful information regarding dynamics within the system.

To best capture collective attitudes from my stakeholder groups, I decided to rely on focus groups (Morgan, 1997) for data collection. Focus groups are perceived to be particularly useful for extracting in-depth collective knowledge from a homogenous group of people (Hughes & Dumont, 1993). As I was particularly interested in a generalized script containing a range of beliefs, as opposed to what just a few individual probation officers or victim advocates believe limit the effectiveness of domestic violence intervention with abusive men, focus groups seemed especially appropriate.

"Focus groups are invaluable for examining how knowledge, ideas, story-telling, self-presentation and linguistic exchanges operate within a given cultural context" (Barbour & Kitzinger, 1999; pg. 5). In arguing the benefits of focus groups, Wilkinson (1998, 1999, 1999a) asserts that they are a contextual method in that they allow us to examine phenomena within an interactive social context, rather than in isolation. In a focus group, members are able to correct each other (Morse, 1991), as well as concur with each other, thereby providing the researcher with a wider range of information (Hughes & DuMont, 1993) and a window into the collective construction of meaning. For this reason, focus groups appear particularly suited to a systems approach.

Collecting data through focus groups also increased the potential to fulfill my commitment to community-based action research. Focus groups "shift the balance of power away from the researcher towards the research participants" (Wilkinson, 1999a, p. 64). As they are less structured and the interest is on the dialogue among participants rather than between the researcher and participants, control is more easily shared. This enhanced empowerment means that focus groups have the unique potential to serve as interventions (Vaughn, Schumm, & Sinagub, 1996). As stakeholders come together to discuss challenges or inadequacies in the current intervention approach, discourse can shift, creating opportunities for new approaches. "For the researcher, the new knowledge generated in focus groups comprises 'data'. For participants, the outcomes may be future action and altered perceptions of self, peers, or others involved in the research project" (Baker & Hinton, 1999; p. 97). When individuals come together and begin to recognize

that others share their frustrations, they often are moved to organize and initiate change

(Barbour & Kitzinger, 1999).

As recommended by experts in focus group methodology, I made every attempt to

collect data during naturally occurring groups, "networks in which people might normally

discuss (or evade) the sorts of issues likely to be raised in the research session" (Barbour

& Kitzinger, 1999, p. 8). Barbour & Kitzinger (1999) suggest that whenever possible, it

is advisable to conduct research during established meetings. It can prove quite

advantageous for recruitment purposes not to have to persuade informants to attend an

additional meeting. More importantly, having some degree of rapport among the

participants can facilitate communication and discussion. I feared that police and

probation officers, victim advocates and program facilitators might be apprehensive

about voicing their concerns, since they are such integral components of the domestic

violence intervention system, and I hoped that this apprehension might be mitigated by an

existing sense of trust and camaraderie among the focus group members. If I had thrown

participants who did not know one another together and asked them to dialogue about

potentially provocative material, there was a chance that only what was considered "safe"

would have emerged. I believed this to be particularly true of the men attending batterer

intervention and the victims/survivors participating in support groups. My experience

with men in perpetrator programs is that they develop a very strong attachment to their

particular group. Within their group they feel a sense of trust and shared experience that

does not appear to easily generalize to men in other groups. For victims/survivors, I also

believed that they would be more comfortable discussing their concerns, fears,

frustrations and hopes in a room filled with women with whom they have already shared so many difficult details. For these reasons, I utilized naturally occurring groups whenever possible.

The specific number of focus groups was influenced by saturation or information redundancy and available resources. Saturation is a term used by qualitative researchers to describe the point at which new information is no longer being produced by additional interviews (Morse, 1991; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Ideally, saturation is an emergent process in that the exact number of data collection opportunities is not predetermined. Unfortunately, resources (time, money and capacity) dictated that I pre-set the number of focus groups conducted with each stakeholder population to two. However, in order to remain faithful to the principles of saturation, I did create space in my data collection plan for the possibility of conducting additional groups if during the second group I found myself noting widely divergent ideas regarding limitations to more effective domestic violence intervention, the criminal justice response to domestic violence or the role of community in intervening with abusive men. As it turns out, the victim advocate population was the only stakeholder group that I would have preferred to have queried a third time, not because the material provided in the second group diverged significantly from the first group, but primarily due to the relatively small number of participants. Unfortunately, given how difficult it was to secure attendance at the first two meetings, it was determined that organizing a third group within this population would prove too challenging.

In order to insure greater sampling success, as well as develop more appropriate focus group questions and advance more legitimate interpretations, I assembled a small advisory group composed of representatives from the professional populations. Developing an advisory board of this nature is highly recommended in community-based action research (Kaufman et al., 2006) and responds to Williams (2004) and others who have "suggested that the researchers take steps to ensure the active involvement of advocates, practitioners, and survivors in the research especially in formulating questions, determining the research design, and participating in discussion and dissemination of findings" (p. 1352). Not only does it lend greater credibility to the research when members of the targeted study populations are represented during design, implementation and interpretation, but it greatly facilitates the recruitment of appropriate samples. Functioning in some ways as gatekeepers, these community representatives can facilitate sampling in several ways: by direct invitation, by providing accurate contact information, and by offering suggestions for how best to approach potential study participants.

My initial advisory group comprised a batterer intervention provider, an executive director of a victim advocacy organization, and a probation officer from a domestic violence unit. In addition to consulting with each member individually during project development, I met with them as a group in December 2003 to review my proposed methodology, research questions, and discussion guide. Following this gathering, their feedback regarding relevance of the questions, proposed sampling and language accessibility was integrated. Community advisors from these three professional domains

continued to provide feedback and assistance throughout the project. In particular they

assisted with recruitment of focus group participants and analysis of focus group data.

The Research Environment

Focus groups were conducted with police and probation officers, victim

advocates, victims/survivors, program facilitators and program participants from within

the Tri-County Portland Metropolitan Area. As of the 2000 census, there were

approximately 338,000 residents in Clackamas County, 666,000 residents in Multnomah

County, and 445,000 in Washington County. In 2004, 1009 incidents of domestic

violence were reported to the police in Clackamus County, 4551 in Multnomah County,

and 1017 in Washington County (A. Neal, personal communication, February 2, 2007).

Twelve batterer intervention programs are recognized within the Tri-County area and in

2004 they served approximately 891 men (Huffine, Moore, Moore, Johnston, Llohn &

Mankowski, 2004). There are 16 organizations specifically providing services for

battered women and their children within the Tri-County area and in 2005, these

organizations provided shelter or support services to approximately 10,000 women and

children (Oregon Department of Human Services, 2005).

Study Participants

Police and Probation Officers

Police officers are often the first members of the coordinated community response

to interact with abusive men and have great technical (T) knowledge of the system. They

respond to the 911 calls, most often initiated by victims, and actually implement many of

the laws, including mandatory arrest. They are also often the first system members to

witness its failings when they are called out to make arrests after perpetrators recidivate.

Subsequently, I presumed they would have provocative insights regarding the impact and

limitations of current strategies.

Once a man has been arrested for a domestic violence assault, he is likely to either

receive probation in addition to being mandated to attend batterer intervention, or in some

cases is given the option of deferring probation if he completes a required program. In

most cases, he is assigned a probation officer whose job it is to insure that he either

attends his mandated program or is held accountable for his absence by the court. As an

integral part of the criminal justice response to domestic violence, probation officers are

in a unique position to speak about what limits the effectiveness of current strategies.

Furthermore, as part of the coordinated community response, it is expected that they have

some contact with victim advocates, representatives from the district attorney's office,

police, batterer intervention providers and other subunits of this system.   As such, they

were presumed to possess both technical and organizational (T and O) perspectives on

the system.

I conducted two focus groups with police and probation officers who work with

domestic violence offenders in Clackamas and Multnomah counties. I chose to combine

representatives from these two stakeholder groups primarily due to sample availability.

Police and probation officers assigned to work with domestic violence cases are typically

in smaller units (2 to 3 officers) and it would have been difficult to organize a large

enough focus group if I did not combine them. I began by securing contact information

from my advisory group members for the gatekeeper or coordinator for two teams of

police and probation officers that meet regularly to discuss domestic violence cases.

Once I made initial contact with each of these coordinators, I broached the idea of

convening a focus group at one of their upcoming meetings. See Appendix A for script

that I used when I approached these gatekeepers. The first probation/police officer focus

group (FG 3) was assembled by the coordinator of the specialized domestic violence unit

and took place in one of their regular meeting rooms. The gathering included 2 probation

officers and 3 police officers, all between the ages of 36 and 55, four with bachelors'

degrees and one who completed 12th grade. The participants were all female and White

and had been serving in their positions for an average of 13.8 years. The discussion

lasted for 68 minutes. The second focus group (FG 9) was assembled by the acting

coordinator of the specialized domestic violence unit and took place in one of their

regular meeting rooms. This group included 7 participants, ranging in age from 26-55,

six with bachelors' degrees and one who completed 12th grade. The participants included

3 male and 4 female officers, six of whom identified as White and one who identified as

Black or African American. Participants had served in their positions for an average of

5.2 years. The discussion lasted for 59 minutes.

Victim Advocates

I conducted two focus groups with victim advocates employed within the Tri-

County Portland area. As representatives of the movement that has consistently been in

the forefront both in terms of theorizing and practice when it comes to domestic violence

intervention, victim advocates have valuable insight on what may be preventing greater

intervention success. In addition to the unique perspective that they possess as innovators

of the current intervention approach, they are also vital participants. Victim advocates

are key members of the coordinated community response and subsequently have ongoing

contact with police and probation officers, district attorneys, and batterer intervention

providers, offering a unique organizational perspective (O). Finally, victim advocates are

first and foremost the spokespeople for the intended beneficiaries of the domestic

violence intervention.

 I solicited victim advocates in a manner similar to the police and probation

officers in that I first contacted gatekeepers for regularly scheduled meeting of advocates;

the gatekeeper's names were once again provided to me by my advisory group. The first

focus group (FG 4) included members of a DVERT (Domestic Violence Emergency

Response Team) team that meets regularly as well as additional advocates that

occasionally work with the team and was conducted in a meeting room frequently used

by the DVERT program. The second focus group (FG 6) was a subset from a larger

group of advocates that convenes on a monthly basis and was conducted in their regular

meeting room.

 There were 5 advocates present during the first advocate focus group (FG4), three

were members of a DVERT team and two were from partnering domestic violence

advocacy organizations. Four of the participants were between the ages of 26 and 35,

and one was between the age of 56 and 65. One of the advocates had her master's

degree, three had bachelor's degrees and one had completed high school. Four of the

participants were White and one identified as Spanish/Hispanic/Latino. The advocates

had served in their positions for an average of 8.4 years. The discussion lasted 75 minutes.

There were 4 advocates present during the second focus group (FG6), though seven had originally confirmed their attendance. Three of the advocates were between the ages of 26 and 35, and one was between the ages of 36 and 45. One of the advocates had her masters' degree, two had their bachelors' degrees and one had completed high school. The women all identified as White and had been in their role for an average of 5 and ½ years. The discussion lasted 77 minutes. This is the one stakeholder group that might have benefited from a third group. While in one sense saturation was achieved, in that the material I collected from the second focus group confirmed and overlapped material I collected in the first group, it would have been nice to have been able to conduct at least one additional group as several advocates cancelled from the second gathering at the last minute. It is possible to speculate about the reasons why it was more difficult to get advocates to participate; perhaps it is because traditionally victim advocates are woefully overworked or perhaps it is because victim advocates are not compelled to prioritize research on intervening with abusive men. One advocate, who was unable to attend the victim advocacy focus group due to a time conflict, attended one of the batterer intervention providers' focus groups (FG5). Her comments were indexed and analyzed along with the advocates. She identified as being between the ages of 26 and 35, holding a master's degree, White and serving in her role for 3 years.

Victims/Survivors

I conducted two focus groups with women who identify as victims/survivors and who participate in a domestic violence abuse support group within Clackamas, Washington, or Multnomah County. Ultimately, victims of domestic violence are the reason the domestic violence intervention system exists. The primary goal of most intervention strategies is to respond to the abuses they have suffered and attempt to prevent future abuses. Consequently, it is essential that their voices and their personal perspectives (P) are represented. Victims/survivors of domestic violence are in a unique position to talk about what they perceive as effective and ineffective. They are directly impacted by most, if not all, of the strategies being analyzed and critiqued in the current proposal. They are frequently the ones contacting the police for assistance, struggling with whether to engage the criminal justice system in their intimate relationships, and facing the consequences when their partners/perpetrators are arrested and sent to batterer intervention programs.

I approached two agencies that serve domestic violence victims/survivors within the Portland Metropolitan area and asked if they were willing to let me conduct a focus group at one of their upcoming meetings in lieu of their regularly scheduled program activities. A member of my research team was a support group leader at one of the agencies and agreed to approach one of her groups regarding participating. At the other agency, an advocate intrigued by my project agreed to approach one of her support groups. I asked both gatekeepers to think carefully about which of their groups would provide the richest material. It is imperative in purposeful sampling that participants be willing to provide detailed information. Once groups were identified, I asked both

women to present information about the study and garner approval for the focus group at their next scheduled meeting. See Appendix B for script that I provided to guide the advocates when they introduced the focus group idea to their group members.

Nine survivors participated in the first focus group (FG7) which was co-facilitated by my colleague (their regular group leader), conducted during their regularly scheduled support group meeting time and took place in their regular meeting room. Three of the women were between 18 and 25, five of the women were between the ages of 26 and 35, and one of the women was between 36 and 45. Five of the women had not completed high school, two graduated from high school and two of the women held bachelors' degrees. Eight of the women identified as White, one woman identified as "other". When asked how long they had been involved in the role of "victim/survivor of domestic violence, participating in a support group", they answered on average 3.9 years. The discussion lasted for 62 minutes.

Four survivors participated in the second focus group (FG8). The focus group was conducted during their regularly scheduled support group meeting, in their regular meeting room. One woman identified herself as between the ages of 26-35, one woman identified herself as between the ages of 36-45 and two women were between the ages of 46-55. One woman had not completed high school, two had completed high school and one woman held a bachelors' degree. One woman identified as White, two identified as Black or African American and one woman identified as both White and American Indian (Blackfoot tribe). When asked how long they had been involved in the role of "victim/survivor of domestic violence, participating in a support group", they answered

"off and on since I was three years old", "way too long and off and on", 1.5 years and 4.4

years. The discussion lasted for 75 minutes.

Batterer Intervention Providers

I conducted two focus groups with batterer intervention program facilitators. My

selection of batterer intervention program facilitators was motivated by their critical role

in domestic violence intervention with abusive men. Many men arrested for domestic

violence are frequently mandated to attend a batterer intervention program. These

programs are delivered in weekly groups by trained facilitators. These facilitators are in

the unique position to "witness" change when it occurs, or fails to occur. They are not

only privy to weekly interactions with the intervention targets, abusive men, but

frequently interact with other members of the coordinated community response. They are

able to offer both technical and organizational perspectives (T and O).

A member of my advisory group coordinates monthly meetings of the Tri-County

Batterer Intervention Providers Network, a group that I participated in for many years. I

was subsequently able to propose conducting a focus group at one of their regularly

scheduled meetings. They were eager to participate and this gathering constituted FG5.

Not all of the local batterer intervention providers regularly attend this group. In order to

better represent the batterer intervention community, I personally contacted each program

within the Portland Metropolitan area not represented at FG5 and directly solicited

participation over the phone (see Appendix C), asking them to send a representative to a

separate gathering (FG10). I was able to successfully draw upon personal contacts and

relationships that I'd developed over the years to bolster attendance at this group.

There were 12 participants in FG5 (one of whom identified as primarily a victims advocate and her comments were indexed as such). Of the remaining 11 participants, three indicated that they were between 26-35 years of age, five indicated that they were between the ages of 36-45, two indicated that they were between 46-55 and one identified as being between 56 and 65 years of age. Two of the participants completed high school, three held bachelors' degrees, five held masters' degrees, and one held a Ph.D. Six of the participants were female and five were male, nine were White and two were Black or African American. Participants identified that they had occupied their role as batterer intervention providers for an average of 6.1 years. The discussion lasted for 102 minutes.

There were 5 participants in FG10. Three of the participants were between the ages of 46 and 55, and two of the participants were between the ages of 56 and 65. Two of the participants held bachelors' degrees and three of the participants held master's degrees. The participants identified as White men who had served in their role as batterer intervention provider for an average of 8.8 years. The discussion lasted for 53 minutes.

Perpetrators

I conducted two focus groups with men enrolled in a batterer intervention program within Clackamas, Washington, or Multnomah County. I was interested in speaking with men court-mandated to attend batterer intervention because as the intervention targets they are uniquely capable of talking about ways in which domestic violence intervention has been successful for them as well as ways in which it seems to have failed. Though they may not be able to reflect as generally about the domestic

violence intervention system, their personal perspectives (P) and experiences shed

valuable light on why intervention efforts are not more successful.

I approached two different programs within the Portland Metropolitan area and

asked their facilitators if they were willing to have me conduct a focus group at one of

their upcoming meetings in lieu of their regularly scheduled program activities. As with

the victim advocates, when they agreed I asked them to think carefully about which of

their groups would provide the richest material. It is my experience that program

facilitators are adept at identifying which groups possess the necessary culture and

experience (i.e., they have been in the program long enough to be willing to open up and

talk with one another) to satisfy this criterion. Once each facilitator identified a group, I

asked them to present and obtain approval for the idea at their next scheduled meeting.

See Appendix D for script that guided facilitators when they introduced the focus group

idea to their group members.

There were 9 participants in the first perpetrator focus group (FG1). Two of the

men identified as being between 26-35 years of age, five of the men indicated they were

between 36-45 years old and two of the men indicated they were between 46 and 55 years

old. Four of the participants indicated that they completed high school, three of the men

wrote in that they completed high school plus a two year degree, and two of the men had

earned bachelors' degrees. Seven of the men self-identified as White, one man identified

as Spanish/Hispanic/Latino and one man identified as Native Hawaiian or other Pacific

Islander. The participants had been involved in batterer intervention for an average of 6.3

years. The discussion lasted for 110 minutes.

There were 12 participants in the second focus group (FG2). One man was between 18 and 25, five men were between 26 and 35, three men were between 36 and 45, and three men were between 46 and 55 years of age. Three of the men did not complete high school; the remaining nine participants completed all 12 grades. Eleven of the men self identified as White and one man self identified as Black or African American. On average, they had participated in batterer intervention for nine months. The discussion lasted for 94 minutes.

Procedures

The focus groups were semi-structured in that a discussion guide (see Appendix E) was used to direct the discussion towards my specific research questions (Hughes & Dumont, 1993). The discussion guide was developed with assistance and input from my advisory group. As the moderator, I made every effort to create an atmosphere of safety and self-disclosure in order to maximize the range of individual responses and yet balance this focus with the desire to determine some of the underlying shared experiences of the population. Self-management of the group was encouraged in order to facilitate lively discussion and interactions among the group members.

For almost every focus group (FG 10 was the only exception), data collection took place in the same room as one of their regularly scheduled meetings. This was done in order to enhance participants' attendance, comfort and convenience.

Researchers should choose a venue easily accessible to the people they wish to include in the research. In our experience, people are more likely to turn up for a

group which takes place in a familiar venue, rather than having to travel to an

unfamiliar place (such as the university)." (Barbour & Kitzinger, 1999, pg. 11)

Participants were asked to budget between 90-120 minutes for the focus groups;

however, each group imposed their own restrictions based on their availability. For

example, the second police/probation officer group and the second batterer intervention

provider group were only able to allocate 60 minutes for data collection. As a result,

groups lasted 77 minutes on average. They were digitally recorded with multi-directional

microphone and later transcribed by a professional transcriber. Prior to beginning each

group, a consent form (Appendices F, G, & H) describing the general focus of the

program of research as well as the fact that the participants could leave the group at any

point, was reviewed orally and signed by each participant. Participants were also asked

to complete a short demographic survey, soliciting information such as age, birth country,

educational background, race/ethnicity, and role in the coordinated community response

(Appendix I).

Focus Group Guide

An eleven-item discussion guide (Appendix E) was developed for use in the focus

groups. The guide was produced with assistance from the advisory group and piloted

with a domestic violence intervention research team. It served as a template for each

focus group, providing structure and consistency. "The structure that a guide imposes on

discussions is valuable both in channeling the group interaction and in making

comparisons across groups in the analysis phase of the research" (Morgan, 1997, p. 47).

Each question in the guide was designed to elicit responses addressing one or more of the project's five research questions. For example, responses to "what are the dominant strategies for intervening in men's violence against women" helped map the terrain of what stakeholders identify as current domestic violence strategies, the domain of research question number one. Responses to "in your opinion, why isn't domestic violence intervention with abusive men more effective" directly correspond to research question number two which focuses on what key stakeholders believe limits the effectiveness of domestic violence intervention with abusive men. "What discrepancies, if any, do you perceive between the dominant conceptualization of domestic violence and our current strategies for intervening in this violence" directly correlates to research question number three regarding how key stakeholders make sense of these discrepancies. Similarly, "what discrepancies, if any, exist between the Duluth Model of coordinated community response and current domestic violence intervention strategies for abusive men" equates directly to research question number four. Finally, "what strategies or interventions for domestically abusive men do you wish were being implemented in addition to the current strategies and what resources in our community do you think should be involved in intervening in men's violence against women" provided material for research question number 5, which focused on discerning what key stakeholders believe the role of community should be in domestic violence intervention with abusive men.

In projects of this nature, employing naturalistic inquiry and stemming from a commitment to community based action research, it is important to recognize that the

precise questions shift over time in response to material revealed or not revealed during

early focus groups. Additionally, the exact phrasing of each question was modified as

appropriate for accessibility within each specific focus group and some questions were

withheld from certain groups. For example, I quickly discovered that the perpetrators

and victims/survivors did not appear to understand the term "coordinated community

response", necessitating that I remove that phrase from my questions. Furthermore, these

two stakeholder populations really struggled in response to questions that required them

to compare two abstract concepts (see questions 4 and 7). In order to maximize

discussion flow and minimize disempowering dialogue, I removed or modified the

comparison questions from the focus groups with perpetrators and victims/survivors.

Chapter Five: Analysis and Findings

Adopting a systems approach to evaluate domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men shaped my understanding of the problem, as well as my selected methodology. In particular, I drew on three key ideas: context, processes and multiple perspectives from Lendaris' (1986) definition of a system to guide my project. Acknowledging context encouraged me to recognize the ecology of domestic violence, shaping how I defined the problem. It also influenced how I chose to gather data. Focusing on processes suggested engaging methods consistent with process evaluation, such as naturalistic inquiry and focus groups, both of which strive to capture rather than ignore dynamics within the system. Recognizing the role of the beholder and the benefits of consciously invoking multiple perspectives to understand complex systems led me to select stakeholders who were poised to provide technical, organizational and personal perspectives. In order to engage a systems approach during analysis, I needed to employ a technique that could acknowledge and embrace context, focus on processes, and recognize that information is ultimately constructed from human understanding.

Constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 1995) is an iterative, subjective analytic process that enabled me to embrace Lendaris' (1986) key ideas while assessing my data. Charmaz (1995) describes constructivist grounded theory as a compromise between the positivism of grounded theory which some have argued relies too heavily on deduction, and the total relativism of post-modernism which suggests that there is only induction. "Constructivism assumes the relativism of multiple social realities, recognizes the mutual creation of knowledge by the viewer

and the viewed, and aims toward interpretive understanding of subjects' meanings" (p.

510). With a constructivist grounded theory approach, data and induction are privileged

over hypotheses and predetermined categorization, but there is a critical recognition that

the inductive process is constructed.

> A constructivist grounded theory recognizes that the viewer creates the data and
>
> ensuing analysis through interaction with the viewed. Data do not provide a
>
> window on reality. Rather, the "discovered" reality arises from the interactive
>
> process and its temporal, cultural, and structural contexts. The viewer then is part
>
> of what is viewed rather than separate from it (Charmaz, 1995, p. 524).
>
> Constructivist grounded theory parallels fundamental assumptions of a systems

approach; in particular, the assertion that analyses are contextual (as opposed to abstract),

dynamic and interactional, and do not exist distinct from the beholder.

Given my role as the beholder or investigator in first defining the system or unit of study

and then constructing the information gathered related to that system, it was necessary

that I remain conscious of my own perceptual filters during the analytic process. A

practice of self-reflexivity or "critical self-reflection" is common in naturalistic,

qualitative endeavors and is considered essential for establishing trustworthiness and

credibility (Kidder & Fine, 1997). According to Merrick (1999), "assumptions that all

findings are constructions incorporating one's personal view of reality and that these are

open to change and reconstruction entail the need for qualitative researchers to make

explicit the process through which their understandings were formed" (p. 32).

In order to assist in the explication of my values, I maintained a field journal in which I documented my reactions and insights related to the focus groups that I conducted and the analyses I developed. This field journal provided a structured venue where I could acknowledge and process personal responses on an ongoing basis. As my analytic framework took shape, I found it valuable to review this journal and acknowledge the ways in which my views, values, and experiences might be shaping my understanding of the material. For example, my professional and personal experiences are unique with respect to domestic violence in that I have been closely involved with both victims and perpetrators. I have worked directly with victims as a shelter night manager and crisis line volunteer and I have spent significant time observing and interviewing perpetrators. These professional vantage points as well as my own personal experiences as a survivor allow me to feel empathy for both victims and perpetrators.

Having endured the challenge of deciding whether and when to end an abusive relationship, and having negotiated the many internal and external barriers that exist when attempting to make that departure, I can easily relate to the plight of victims/survivors. Additionally, having observed so closely the pain and struggle that my abusive partner experienced trying to make different choices, it is not possible for me to define the causes for his violence (and subsequently the solutions) in simplistic terms. It is clear to me that my own experiences influenced my reactions to what was expressed during the focus groups with victims and with perpetrators and prompted me to hear their complaints and frustrations with potentially greater compassion than someone who has not had as much close contact with either population.

Finally, my position as a feminist researcher positioned outside the criminal justice response to domestic violence affords me a certain freedom and latitude from which to offer critiques and express concerns. The fact that I have not directly toiled to secure criminal justice system strategies as a key component of the coordinated community response to domestic violence surely influences my eagerness to assess their unintended and undesirable consequences. Had I, for example, spent the past twenty years lobbying for mandatory arrest laws and no-drop prosecutions, I would likely be less inclined to critically reflect on their problematic effects.

Self-reflexivity is not the only practice suggested in order to enhance the trustworthiness and credibility of qualitative research. Guba & Lincoln (1988) have suggested that in qualitative inquiry, trustworthiness and credibility can be enhanced by several activities, including prolonged engagement in the environment of study, triangulation, and peer debriefing (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). To one degree or another, I engaged all three of these activities throughout the research process. First, in keeping with Lincoln & Guba's (1985) suggestion, I have been engaged in the research setting for a prolonged period of time. For four years, I was actively involved with the batterer intervention community in Portland, conducting collaborative research on processes of change in batterer intervention, actively participating in the Tri-County Batterer Intervention Provider Network, and presenting to groups of victim advocates, probation officers, program providers, and court representatives on the effectiveness of batterer intervention. My motivation for this project grew out of my exposure to this domestic

violence intervention community, and my interpretations are likely affected by my regular interactions with key stakeholders.

I applied the principle of triangulation not only in terms of multiple data sources (police and probation officers, victim advocates, victims, batterer intervention program providers, and program participants) but also in terms of Linstone's (1999) three distinct perspectives that I consciously invoked to interpret the data. For example, when analyzing results from the focus group discussions, I summoned first a technical, then organizational, then personal perspective. I made efforts to understand what was being said through these three lenses and attended to information that spoke to these perspectives. I attended to quantification when invoking the technical perspective, focused on power dynamics, value struggles, and norms when invoking the organizational perspective and attended to intuition, feeling and individual stories when invoking the personal perspective. I believe that engaging these three distinct lenses enabled me, as the beholder, to construct a more complete understanding of the system of study.

The process of peer debriefing or peer review, in which I discuss my interpretations with others, both knowledgeable and naïve about the project, was engaged throughout the data collection and production phases. I met with representatives from a domestic violence intervention research team at Portland State University, members of which also served as focus group assistant moderators, as well as members of the stakeholder advisory group to discuss my experiences and reactions to the material.

In his widely cited text on qualitative evaluation, Patton (1990) synthesized the analytic process by saying that "the challenge [of qualitative inquiry] is to make sense of massive amounts of data, reduce the volume of information, identify significant patterns, and construct a framework for communicating the essence of what the data reveal." (p. 372). Below, I outline the steps that I took towards this endeavor. Immediately upon completing each focus group, I met with my assistant moderator to review our field notes and answer the following set of questions suggested by Krueger (1998). "What are the most important themes or ideas discussed? How did these differ from what we expected? How did these differ from what occurred in earlier focus groups? What quotes should be remembered? Were there any unexpected findings?" (p. 50). This debriefing was digitally audio-taped. Within two days of each focus group, I listened to the recording of the discussion in order to insure complete data collection. At that time, I recorded in my journal reactions, thoughts, ideas, and interpretations of the discussion as well as made notes to myself regarding upcoming groups. For example, I noted if a question seemed difficult for the group to answer or if the timing or ordering of the questions needed adjustment. A professional transcriptionist then transcribed the recordings. Once the transcripts were available, I listened to each focus group audio-tape while reviewing and correcting each transcript. There were numerous small errors that needed to be amended and several observational comments provided by the assistant moderator that needed to be inserted. For example, if the assistant noted that five focus group members nodded vigorously in agreement with a comment that was made by one member of the group, I noted this within the typed transcript. I also relied on the assistant's notes (and my own

memory) regarding which participant was linked with what comments and was able to identify and numerically label speakers within the transcripts most of the time. Later, speaker identification enabled me to assess whether a collection of comments about a particular topic was made by multiple speakers or just one. It was during this second re-listening process that I began to develop a running list of emergent themes which I shared with my dissertation chair at three week intervals.

Once I re-listened to all of the focus group discussions, I began a more structured process of identifying and categorizing themes. I began by reading and re-reading the transcripts, noting frequent or significant discussion topics related to my five research questions -- 1) What do key stakeholders within the Portland Coordinated Community Response (CCR) identify as current domestic violence intervention with abusive men? 2) What do key stakeholders within the Portland CCR believe limits the effectiveness of domestic violence intervention with abusive men? 3) How do key Portland CCR stakeholders make sense of any discrepancies between theorized antecedents for men's domestic violence and the current intervention strategies? 4) How do key Portland CCR stakeholders make sense of any discrepancies between the Duluth Model of coordinated community response and current intervention strategies for domestically abusive men? And finally, 5) What do key Portland CCR stakeholders believe the role of community should be in domestic violence intervention with abusive men? I then compiled a list of these emergent themes and organized them into logical groupings (Krueger, 1998).

On the advice of my dissertation chair, I developed an index tree anchored around each of my five research questions. In other words, my initial tree had 5 nodes (1 per

research question), and several sub-nodes reflecting emergent themes. The decision to

structure the index tree around my research questions rather than around emergent themes

was primarily a data management decision due to the quantity and type of material that I

had gathered. The semi-structured nature of the focus group discussions meant that

stakeholders frequently addressed more than one research question simultaneously. For

example, when stakeholders were asked to describe current intervention strategies

(Research Question 1), they would often do so by critiquing current strategies, thereby

providing material relevant to Research Question 2, (What limits the effectiveness of

current intervention strategies?). Subsequently, we felt that it would be prudent to

organize the material in such a way as to insure that I would ultimately be able to respond

to each of my original questions.

Once I developed an initial index tree, I imported the focus group transcripts into

NUD*IST (Non-numerical Unstructured Data Indexing Searching and Theorizing), a

qualitative data analysis program (Richards & Richards, 1994) and began scanning for

and indexing material that addressed each of my nodes and sub-nodes. Software such as

NUD*IST is considered particularly useful when managing large sets of text (Krueger &

Casey, 2000). As I began working my way through the transcripts, my index tree

expanded in order to accurately describe the material. When I read a passage with a

significant idea that was not easily encapsulated by one of the existing nodes or sub-

nodes, I would simply create a new node. The final index tree included 16 sub-nodes

supporting the five major research question nodes (see Figure 4).

Figure 4

Final NUDIST index tree

1 – What is current intervention?

2 - What limits effectiveness?
      2 1 – Society's general acceptance of violence
      2 1 1 – Male norms
      2 2 – Punishment vs. rehabilitation
      2 3 – One size fits all vs. individualized approach
      2 4 – System's level of involvement is too little/lenient
      2 5 – System not coordinated (parts not whole)
      2 6 - System's level of involvement is too much
      2 7 - Invisibility of perpetrators
      2 8 – Victim blaming
      2 9 – System components are failing

3 – How make sense of the discrepancies between antecedents and interventions?

4 – How make sense of discrepancies between CCR in theory and CCR in practice?
      4 1 Human factor
      4 2 Women being arrested instead of men
      4 3 Money
      4 4 DV is messy and complex

5 – What should the role of community in DVI be?
      5 1 – School education
      5 2 - Media

Faced with the task of moving from dozens of pages of quotes in support of each node to an organized and reasonably concise presentation of the findings, I set out to create summary statements for each research question. I began by reading over the material I had indexed for a particular node and its corresponding sub-nodes. While reading, I identified and in a new document typed key quotes or paraphrases from the material. For example, under Research Question 1 "What do stakeholders identify as current domestic violence intervention with abusive men?" for the stakeholder group "Perpetrators", I typed "relationship counseling" "post-attack response" "we get counseling", etc. Once I had typed up all the significant comments, phrases, and ideas for a particular node for a particular stakeholder group, I drafted a summary statement to capture and describe what that stakeholder group had to say about that node/research question. In other words, I wrote a paragraph describing what each key stakeholder group seemed to be saying in response to each of my five major research questions. Once I completed summary statements for all five stakeholder groups for a particular node/research question, I wrote a final summary statement for that research question. For ease of reading, I then compiled all of my summary statements in a "Summary, Summary" document.

At this stage in analysis, four sub-nodes seemed particularly salient and I had a tremendous amount of material indexed for each of them (punishment vs. rehabilitation, one size fits all, invisibility of perpetrators/victim blaming, and human variance). While I was not sure how these sub-nodes would ultimately fit into my final thematic presentation, I felt they were important enough to single out and so I completed a similar

process to the research questions for each of them. In other words, I noted quotes, phrases, ideas that each stakeholder group offered in support of each of them and then wrote summary statements. In the end, I had summary statements for each stakeholder group for each of the four sub-nodes as well as an overarching summary statement for each sub-node.

In order to help me synthesize the material even further, I then produced a series of matrices (Richie & Lewis, 2003). I started by creating a matrix with stakeholder groups on the X axis and research questions on the Y axis (see Appendix J). Within each box, I inserted summary statements and phrases taken directly from my "Summary, Summary" document. Next I created a matrix with stakeholder groups on the X axis and the four sub-nodes on the Y axis (see Appendix K), again inserting summary statements and phrases within the corresponding boxes. Finally, I created a matrix with TOP on the X axis and my five research questions on the Y axis (see Appendix L). It was during this process, that it became clear to me that I did not need to create a matrix with TOP on the X axis and the four sub-nodes on the Y axis because the four sub-nodes were adequately encompassed by the summary statements for the five research questions.

Qualitative data collection produces a tremendous amount of material. For example, this project produced over 450 pages of typed transcripts. It is the job of the investigator or beholder to make sense of that material and share it in such a way that the reader can resonate with and subsequently trust in the conclusions that are being drawn. Navigating the balance between simply presenting the transcripts in their entirety and presenting only summaries or conclusions of the transcripts can be difficult. Summarize

the findings too much and the reader will feel disconnected from the participants. Present

too many quotes and the reader will feel discombobulated and disoriented, unsure of what

the findings ultimately reveal (Krueger, 1998). I've attempted to remain mindful of this

challenge by alternating between summarization and raw data throughout my

presentation. I begin by providing a general summary response for each research

question, followed by a more detailed account of what each individual stakeholder group

reported, illustrating with quotes as often as possible. In order to demonstrate consensus

or agreement, I often supply more than one quote to support an idea. When I do this, I

use new quotation marks to differentiate between speakers. So while I might place two

quotes next to each other in order to illustrate the dialogue that ensued, comments by

different stakeholders are demarked by the start and end of each set of quotation marks.

When applicable, I note differences among the stakeholder groups, as well as

differences within each group. I remained continuously mindful of the context in which I

collected the data and regularly represented whether or not a comment appeared

supported within a group or was an outlier. Barbour & Kitzinger (1999) provide a key

suggestion for those wishing to analyze focus group data.

> Analyzing focus group data involves essentially the same process as does the
>
> analysis of any other qualitative data. However, the research needs to reference
>
> the group context. This means starting from an analysis of groups rather than
>
> individuals and striking a balance between looking at the picture provided by the
>
> group as a whole and recognizing the operation of individual voices within it.
>
> The researcher should try and distinguish between opinions expressed in spite of,

or in opposition to, the group and the consensus expressed or constructed by the

group (p. 16).

In addition to informing the reader of these dynamics throughout the findings section,

pointing out if a comment was well endorsed by the group or if it was a unique

perspective, I also include a review of the negative case analysis I conducted in order to

insure that outlying perspectives are adequately represented in my presentation.

I conclude the chapter with an assessment of the findings from a system

perspective. By consciously invoking Linstone's (1999) technical, organizational and

personal lenses, I was able to synthesize the vast amount of material that I collected and

present a "final framework" for understanding what stakeholders reported about current

domestic violence intervention with abusive men. This final framework involves seven

sub-unit candidates that, according to key stakeholders in the Portland Tri-County area,

appear to be operating together to manifest the attribute "limited effectiveness" of

domestic violence intervention with abusive men.

During analysis and especially as I began to write up the results, it became

exceedingly clear that Research Questions 3, 4 and 5 are best understood as follow-up or

subset questions of Research Question 2. They are essentially my hypotheses about what

might be limiting the effectiveness of domestic violence intervention with abusive men.

Research Question 3 assumes that perhaps the mismatch between our conceptualization

of men's abusive behavior and our interventions for this behavior may be limiting the

system's effectiveness (i.e., the ecological fallacy), just as Research Question 4 assumes

that whatever is standing in the way of implementing an ideal version of the CCR may be

limiting the system's effectiveness. Research Question 5 asks participants to describe how else they think the community should be involved in domestic violence intervention, implying that the limited utilization of community might be partially responsible for the less than optimal effectiveness of current strategies.

Given the interrelated nature of these research questions, it is not altogether surprising that stakeholders often provided responses addressing Research Questions 3, 4, and 5 while addressing Research Question 2. In other words, when they talked about what limits the effectiveness of domestic violence intervention with abusive men they frequently discussed challenges created by not aligning intervention strategies to their conceptualization of the problem, or challenges to realizing the Duluth model of CCR, or limits created by a restricted utilization of community. However, in an effort to reduce redundancy, I have chosen to separate as much as possible the material and only report themes or ideas in response to one research question at a time. Obviously, complete separation was not possible or even desirable given the fact that the participants did not respond in perfectly segmented chunks. However, to the best of my ability, I focus in each section on quotes and themes that best capture their responses to that particular research question and which are not more fully addressed in response to a later question. Clearly, this separation is somewhat artificial; however, I feel it is helpful in order to retain clarity and distinction between and among the research questions. Ultimately, a complete picture of what stakeholders discussed during the focus groups is constructed (see Appendix M for summarization of findings) and a framework or for organizing and making sense of their comments is discussed.

Research Question One:

What do key stakeholders within Portland's Coordinated Community Response identify

as current domestic violence intervention with abusive men?

Stakeholders were not interested in spending a great deal of time identifying elements of current domestic violence intervention with abusive men; they were far too anxious to begin talking about the challenges or limitations of the current system. When pressed to describe current intervention strategies with abusive men, most stakeholders responded similarly, frequently identifying a combination of victim services and criminal justice system involvement in the form of arrests, probation and mandated batterer intervention programs. Additionally, several stakeholder groups expressed that current strategies were primarily reactive (i.e., responding to domestic violence assaults after the fact) as opposed to preventative in nature (i.e., school based education programs focused on dating and relationship violence). There was a great deal of homogeneity within stakeholder groups (i.e., officers tended to agree or concur with other officers and victims tended to concur with other victims, etc.), though a few differences did emerge and are noted below.

Police and Probation Officers

When asked about current intervention strategies for abusive men, police and probation officers began by explaining that current efforts are often reactive, "I think it's reactive. We're just reacting to it. We're not, I don't think the whole preventing part of it, we're not doing a whole lot on that part." They acknowledged that a component of current strategies involves reaching out to potential victims, providing information and

resources; however they immediately questioned the effectiveness or impact of these

preventative efforts. "Yeah. I was gonna say, there's certainly a level of outreach in

communities. I don't think it is sufficient by any means; and I don't know how you

would measure prevention. How many people did you prevent from getting involved in

domestic violence by passing out 400 leaflets at a Take Back the Night? There's no way

to account for that."

When pressed to describe what else is being done locally to intervene with

domestically abusive men, probation officers discussed the traditional criminal justice

response coupled with batterer intervention treatment. "They're arresting him and either

they get prosecuted or they don't get prosecuted. If they get prosecuted and they come to

us, they're usually mandated to do some type of treatment, which we have treatment

programs that we refer them to." There was no discussion by the police and probation

officers of intervention strategies beyond victim outreach, the criminal justice system,

and batterer intervention programs.

Victim Advocates

Victim advocates spent significantly more time than police and probation officers

discussing current intervention strategies. After a cursory mention of the police response,

probation, and batterer intervention programs, the first focus group turned their attention

to the Department of Human Services: Child Welfare and what it means for victims when

that particular system gets called in as part of the larger intervention response. "I think

when child welfare is responding, it means a lot of services for the women. So, support

groups for the women, parenting classes for the survivor." Other advocates readily

agreed and explained that the system's current response to perpetrators' violence is to focus on mandating services for victims. "That's their response to men's violence against women. Women have to jump through all these hoops." Another advocate explained, "I feel like I've seen a lot of women referred to domestic violence specific services and to services about parenting and men tend to be referred to anger management or not as many services. It's just interesting, like the focus definitely seems to be on women or on mom."

In the second focus group, advocates similarly discussed services for victims in addition to services for perpetrators, but were more inclined to view this balance as helpful. "Then there's you know, victim based services, services for kids, services for kids and services for adults. In Multnomah County, for example, it's pretty holistic. We try to reach each different group. We try to work together. Like, batterer's intervention program, victim's services, and I think it's important because it's really helping to serve better. To do services better for them and for us. We look at family as a whole. Different parts of abuse. We're looking at both sides of the equation. Three sides, children also."

This group also discussed the fact that current intervention strategies involve trying to get information about domestic violence out into the larger community and into organizations that are likely to regularly interface with victims/survivors, such as the medical community. However, they acknowledged that efforts to this end are pretty limited. "I think there's been some movement to go sort of multidisciplinary, to try to get out to places that see survivors of domestic violence. So medical is one thing I think

of. And yet, I think sometimes we are very insular [laughs] and talk a lot with each other."

Victims/Survivors

When asked what was being done locally to hold domestically abusive men responsible for their behavior or to stop these men from being violent, victims expressed disappointment and frustration. They essentially identified that little or nothing was being done. When I asked about current efforts, "Nothing!" was voiced loud and clear by several women. "A month in jail and then nothing" was offered by another. When asked directly about the police, victims offered that the police do not help. "Police will say, 'just leave or go home and work it out'". When prompted by me to think through different aspects of the criminal justice system's response to men's violence such as "batterer intervention, the police", I was interrupted by a victim who said, "Not the police" to the chorus of vigorous head nodding.

Batterer Intervention Providers

Standing in sharp contrast to the responses offered by victims, batterer intervention providers identified a coordinated, multi-faceted response to domestically abusive men. They identified a strategy that includes arrests, adjudication, batterer intervention programs, Department of Human Services, services for victims, Family Violence Coordinating Council (FVCC), Domestic Violence Enhancement Response Team (DVERT) as well as community awareness building and prevention education. In general terms, they spoke of "putting men in the system, you know? The system enters their lives in one way or another and then they're required to do a variety of things."

When asked to provide more detail, they explained, "That would include the police making the arrest and the district attorney pursing charges, the judge adjudicating those charges and the probation supervising those men. Those would be some of the parts of that system." They discussed momentum in the field towards coordinating services for victims and perpetrators, though noted that the police are not always as involved as other partners. An example would be the "Family Violence Coordinating Counsel, where we have monthly, usually monthly meetings and you have hopefully, hopefully, representatives from every different aspect of the field. Ours has some problems getting law enforcement involved, police officers, specifically, probation and parole are involved."

More than any other stakeholder group, batterer intervention providers spoke about a response that included more than just the domestic violence and criminal justice communities. They talked about how many of them were targeting the faith community and mental health professionals with training and information in an attempt to build a larger and more effective community safety net. "The bulk of it, though, is to do community outreach training. The culture that we're working with, faith culture, to train those leaders who have influence in these people's lives."

Perpetrators

When asked about current intervention with domestically abusive men, perpetrators in the first focus group talked about the system's response being reactive, "Post-attack, after the attack", occurring after the violence, and most often consisting of counseling. "We get counseling". They also mentioned that the criminal justice system

is the vehicle that brings them to the counseling. "The justice system is just trying to do what they can do to get us to the counseling."

Perpetrators in the second group expressed tremendous resentment towards current strategies, so much so that they had difficulty describing the current response without simultaneously criticizing it. Embedded in their critical comments are references to the use of arrest, adjudication and mandated counseling. They began by suggesting that they were unfairly arrested. "To just throw you into the system when you and another person are involved in something, they say it takes two people to fight. Your part in it may not have been right, but it still takes two people to fight, two people to have domestic violence." Next they discussed how district attorneys invent charges to unjustly persecute them. "District attorney gets the report, then they pad it up and then you got a bunch of charges against you and they just kind of throw all this other crap on." They then commented on the fact that what happens to them in court is determined by people who are not qualified. "Lawyers and people who know the law, these aren't, these aren't marriage counselors. These aren't psychologists." Finally, they remarked on the fact that the current strategies require excessive attendance in batterer intervention programs "48 weeks for a one time mistake".

Summary Research Question One

Stakeholders' descriptions of current intervention strategies with abusive men were somewhat truncated due to their strong interest in beginning to identify their perceptions of their limitations and challenges. However, when urged, most stakeholders identified a primarily criminal justice based strategy (i.e., police respond, make arrests,

the DA prosecutes, men get assigned to probation, and then mandated to batterer

intervention programs). Additionally, officers, advocates and providers mentioned the

availability of victim services and community outreach.

Most interesting perhaps are the areas of distinction among the stakeholders.

Police and probation officers focused on the reactive and potentially futile nature of the

response, while victim advocates talked about the Department of Human Services: Child

Welfare and the challenge this system's involvement often presents for victims/survivors.

Victims were sarcastic and expressed so much frustration over the inadequacies of the

current system that they essentially stated that there is no meaningful response to

perpetrators. Batterer intervention providers talked about current efforts towards

coordination and collaboration among the multiple partners involved with domestic

violence including victim services, the mental health community and the faith

community. Finally, perpetrators emphasized that the current response unfairly and

excessively punishes them.

Research Question Two:

What do key stakeholders within Portland's Coordinated Community Response believe

limits the effectiveness of domestic violence intervention with abusive men?

As noted above, stakeholders were extremely eager to discuss factors that they

believe limit the effectiveness of current domestic violence intervention strategies with

abusive men, frequently struggling to answer my opening question related to mapping the

current response without offering commentary on what is not working well and why. At

no point did stakeholders struggle to offer constructive criticism of the existing strategies,

stating for example that "nothing" limits the effectiveness. Each group was quite clear that the current system response, while perceived by some as an improvement over historical responses, is far from adequate.

In general, stakeholder's concerns were more similar than they were dissimilar. For example, police officers, victim advocates and victims all discussed the impact of insufficient accountability for perpetrators, ineffective and potentially dangerous batterer intervention programs, and rampant victim blaming. Additionally, officers, advocates, providers and perpetrators questioned the effectiveness of using a punishment based system for inspiring long term behavior change in abusive men and in one way or another each stakeholder group questioned or expressed concern about utilizing a "one size fits all" approach to perpetrators.

A couple of distinctions among the stakeholders' responses are particularly noteworthy. Victim advocates and victims were incensed about the re-victimization that occurs for abused women when the "system" enters their lives and batterer intervention providers spent a great deal of time discussing the debilitating impact of societal messages that condone or even encourage intimate violence as well as the challenge of providing treatment for perpetrators when they are vilified or ignored by other parts of the system. Finally, perpetrators discussed at length the ways in which they are unfairly treated by the criminal justice system and insisted that they will only change when they decide to do so.

Police and Probation Officers

Police and probation officers expressed a great deal of frustration with the system's current response to men's abusive behavior, identifying several components that they believe limit the effectiveness of current domestic violence intervention. They articulated concerns with incarceration, "no contact" orders, and batterer intervention treatment programs, suggesting that we still have not found the prescription to altering a perpetrator's violent behavior. "It just seems like we're not really hitting what the root cause is, what the problem is. So, there are sanctions, there are consequences, to some degree, not that they're great or consistent, even. But what is happening from the standpoint of altering a batterer's behavior. I don't see anything that has significantly worked." Additionally, they discussed how a one-size fits all approach limits the effectiveness of domestic violence intervention by failing to adequately meet the diverse needs of their clients. Finally, they commented on the pervasiveness and ramifications of victim blaming attitudes in their departments, in the courts, and in society at large.

The problem with punishment. Police and probation officers discussed with some resignation the criminal justice system's limited ability to change men's abusive behavior through punishment based strategies such as incarceration, acknowledging that prison is not an ideal environment for abusive men. "Prison isn't gonna, they're not gonna get it there. They're not going to learn how not to be assaultive or abusive. They're going to learn how to be more abusive and assaultive." Even if the goal is for prison to merely separate perpetrators from victims, the problem, according to many officers, is that the separation is not nearly long enough. "It's not like it's a solution to just say, 'we're going

to put him in jail and everything will be okay,' because they're going to be out in six or seven months and it could be even worse then." In other words, the criminal justice's system's ultimate punishment is not effective because it does not help men learn how to be non-abusive, it usually does not protect victims for very long, and when men are released they often retaliate against their partner for getting them arrested in the first place.

Their ambivalence regarding the success of punishment based strategies was not limited to prison. Police and probation officers also questioned the effectiveness of mandating treatment as a condition of probation and broad utilizations of "no contact" orders, specifically discussing how challenging it can be for perpetrators to fulfill these probation requirements. In their opinion, the system is setting perpetrators up to commit probation violations, rather than setting them up to change. "They don't have money to pay for the treatments, so they don't go and then they get arrested and back to court." According to these officers, the strain of paying for treatment, while in many cases also maintaining a second household apart from the victim in accordance with a "no contact" order, does not appear to be helping perpetrators make more constructive choices. Many violate their probation by not attending classes or by having contact with their victim or both, which ironically leads to more probation and more expensive treatment which they cannot afford. "They have this 52 week batterer's intervention program they have to go through, but in the meantime their whole life is destroyed. I mean, the fact that they have committed a crime, that's a given. There's justice in that. They've gone to court, now their whole life is being flipped upside down. They can't see their children, they don't

have a place to live and you don't really know how much they're abiding by the 'no

contact' order, anyways, so it seems like half the time they seem to ignore it and probably

violate it weekly."

Clearly, officers are concerned that the punitive aspects of the criminal justice

system response may not actually be deterring additional crimes or violations. In fact, in

their experience, mandatory participation in batterer intervention programs as a condition

of probation often leads to probation violations when men simply cannot afford to

continue to attend. Additionally, for some families, the financial strain of the "no

contact" order is so great that the victim actually encourages her perpetrator to violate the

order in order to make ends meet. "So now he has to support himself, pay for an

apartment or a motel or pay rent at his uncle's house or something to where now you're

taking money away from that household. And the wife is going bankrupt or is gonna

have to sell the house. It causes all kinds of problems financially because maybe the wife

is a stay-at-home mom and if you take him out and he's gotta pay to live somewhere else

and now they have nothing. They don't have money to put food on the table." Probation

officers talked about how frequently they receive phone calls from victims begging them

to release the "no contact" order so that the probationer can stop dividing the income of

the family and return home. If they are not able to or willing to try and get the "no

contact" order lifted, probation officers were quite clear that their probationers simply

violate the order. Obviously, the issue of whether the "punishment" of mandated

treatment and "no contact" orders is effective is intertwined with the issue of money; a

limitation that I'll return to more fully in response to Research Question Four.

The trouble with treatment. The fact that the fees to attend batterer intervention treatment are cost-prohibitive for some men was not the only concern that officers expressed with respect to batterer intervention treatment; they were equally dissatisfied with the treatment programs themselves. Some officers went so far as to suggest that the programs might be doing more harm than good. "All of corrections should be evidence-based right now and there is no data indicating that domestic violence intervention programs are evidence-based, that they reduce recidivism, that they work. Actually, there is data evidence indicating that they could be making them worse."

Not all the police and probation officers attributed batterer intervention treatment's lack of success to the programs themselves. Many were empathetic to the fact that treatment is not going to work if the participant is not ready. "In thinking about my guys …and why this hasn't worked for them, I think some of it is because they're not ready to hear the message. They're not ready to learn it. They're not at the stage where they're open to saying, 'I'm really screwing up my life,' and it's catching them at that moment where that message will click and you can get your most work done." Others agreed that change most often occurs when a client is receptive to the treatment. "Sometimes it happens, if they're ready. It's sort of like the alcoholic that hits bottom. If they're ready to change, then they can change and it's successful." Officers went on to explain that this internal "click" is not something that can be mandated and therefore for many men, mandating treatment may not be effective.

For some police and probation officers, the problem is that the treatment is not long enough given the complex nature of the material and the tenacity of behaviors built

over a lifetime. "It seems like we send people to batterer intervention every day. And they can go, but it's sort of a learned behavior from childhood. A lot of times, they've witnessed it, they've seen it, they've experienced it and we can send them once, and I just think sometimes that's just not enough because they really have to approach, change their whole way of being, have to learn how to talk about things and express their emotions. It takes the victim that long to leave, sometimes maybe seven times. It takes these guys a long time to catch on to the material." Others concurred and lamented that "we aren't treating domestic violence in the same way that we treat mental health or a medical issue. There isn't a program that is sufficient enough or time intensive enough to make a change in thinking that might then change behavior." Obviously, officers were somewhat ambivalent with respect to whether programs should be shorter or longer. Some felt that the difficulty of the material and the entrenched nature of the behaviors warranted longer programs. "Personally, I think they should be in groups for two or three years…because I think it takes that long for people to start grasping those kinds of concepts." However, others expressed concerns with how long they currently are, given how expensive they are for their clients. "I think a huge gap is some kind of treatment that works, that's effective. I mean because the treatments that we do have are so long and they cost the offenders quite a bit of money. They have to present their homework and it takes you know, 20 weeks for them to present one piece of homework and so a 52 week program gets pushed out to 80 weeks, while they pay the whole time."

Finally, officers expressed concern that because the treatment is mandated by the courts and therefore perceived as a punishment, clients are simply concerned with

successful completion rather than actually changing their behavior. "And these are skilled group participants often, so the other thing that happens is that they become very, very tactful about what to say, how to say it, how to successfully complete the program. How much behavior modification is being internalized when all of your energy is spent trying to out-think the program's rules and requirements?" The bottom line appears to be that police and probation officers do not have a great deal of confidence in batterer intervention programs to change men's abusive behavior and are therefore speculating about whether the problem is that the programs are too short, too expensive, or too "punitive".

Negotiating punishment and rehabilitation. As indicated above, police and probation officers struggled to balance the criminal justice system's punishment-based approach to abusive men with the goal of rehabilitating perpetrators. In addition to discussing their concerns with incarceration and with the impact mandatory participation has on men's ability to engage in treatment, they discussed the impact that navigating these two intentions can have on stakeholders and implied that this tension is a potentially limiting factor in the effectiveness of the system's response to domestic violence. "As we mentioned, and everybody kind of agreed that, the response of probation and the correction system is typically reactive and mostly punitive like, 'Caught you having contact with the victim. Bad. Shame on you. Go do this, as a punishment for that.' Those kinds of things. And, the introduction of people participating in batterer's intervention programs, everyone that's being referred is being referred to a 52 week program, 48 weeks with after care. You know, what that program is about, from my

understanding, is about changing behavior. It's a very, very time consuming, tedious

slow process. One that requires a lot of flexibility. And I think when you have a person

who's coming from approaching their work purely reactive and punitively and then to put

on this sort of, in my case I view it more social worky counselor kind of, 'Come on,

we're gonna introduce new ideas about how to think about women. We're gonna

introduce new ideas, new language about how to refer to partners, you know?' That kind

of a roll. It's challenging, and I think there's, there's a lot of confusion that floats to the

surface in trying to do both of those things."

One size fits all. In addressing questions regarding what limits the effectiveness

of domestic violence intervention with abusive men, police and probation officers were

quick to suggest that the current approach is not individualized enough to be successful.

They insisted that each situation and each perpetrator may need something different and

the system just is not set up to respond. "I don't think we're a one-stop shop for

everybody. I think each situation is individual in itself and may need something different

than somebody else." Several officers suggested that what is most needed is a better

assessment protocol enabling a more tailored response. "We need better assessment at the

beginning, a more accurate, in-depth, clinical way to assess probably more factors than

we look at now." Some suggested that in the absence of a screening device, the approach

feels somewhat random and uniformed. "I think if the orientation component of domestic

violence supervision was way more intense and way more in-depth, then we might be

able to extract from that some better interventions and tailor things more appropriately to

the person than we are doing now, which is to throw all the spaghetti against the wall and

hope some of it sticks." Others, responding to differences that they experience or witness

between and among clients, suggested that not only is every perpetrator unique, but every

situation is unique as well and warrants consideration. "There needs to be differences in

the type of treatment based on assessment and based on the type of charges they have and

who the victim is." It might be a dosage differentiation (i.e., how many groups) or a

treatment differentiation (i.e., batterer intervention treatment model) that is needed, but

regardless, it is their assertion that treating each perpetrator with the same response is not

effective. "Evidence-based practice suggests that it doesn't work to put everybody in the

same square peg."

Police and probation officers' frustration with a "one size fits all" approach was

not limited to treatment. As described earlier, they were particularly concerned about the

limitations of uniform issuances of "no contact" orders given the financial strain that

these orders can cause. "The 'no contact' order is definitely something that becomes

emotional for everybody involved because you don't want to cause, you want to see

people be safe, but you don't want to cause more damage than was there before."

Officers suggested that for some perpetrators having contact with their victim, remaining

in their homes might enable them to focus on their treatment and actually make

improvements that they might otherwise not be able to make. "One of the things that

contributes to [DV intervention] not working is uniform application of the 'no contact'

order by the court. I think in some cases forcing the partners to be apart creates or can

have the potential to create some additional barriers that might now come on the scene...

Like if that guy could stay there, regardless of even how dysfunctional it is, where he's

receiving support from the primary victim and if in that comfortable dysfunction he

would participate in the batterer's intervention program and maybe actually show up for

it in a different way than being completely stressed out and freaked out and I don't know

where I'm gonna live and I don't have bus tickets and all so I'll just take off? Might that

be better?" Another officer agreed that one benefit of having perpetrators remain in the

home is that they could continue to work on real time issues that come up in the

relationship, something that would be particularly beneficial if the couple is planning to

reunite at some point. I cannot help wondering if the officers would still support the idea

of perpetrators remaining in the home if the "dysfunction" and "real time issues"

involved violence and abuse.

      Victim blaming/Invisibility of perpetrators. When asked what limits the

effectiveness of current domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men,

police and probation officers were quick to identify the persistence of victim blaming

attitudes and beliefs within society at large, as well as within their departments. "I think

in our country, maybe everywhere, there is still a lot of blame that's placed on the

survivor in the situation, or the victim in the situation. And I think that's still the case

here, even among police officers." Officers suggested that societal attitudes were

particular problematic when victims reach out for help from friends and family. "I think

society, too… I mean, when a woman calls her mom and her mom says, 'What did you

do to provoke it?' I think there's still a piece of that running around out there. It's better,

but it's real slow going." The implication in this statement is that that when family

members reinforce the idea that victims are responsible for their abuse, it creates barriers

to successful intervention. A woman who hears that she is to blame from someone close to her is perhaps less likely to reach out for support from either a victim services agency or the police.

Unfortunately, even if a victim does reach out to the police, officers were clear that she will not always be met with the support she needs. In fact, they explained that the "perception within the police department is that it is mostly the victim's fault, almost all the time." Apparently the belief that the victim is responsible is particularly acute if there are children involved. "There is a cultural attitude within the police agency about domestic violence. A lot of responsibility is portrayed and it might not be completely overt, but in sometimes very subtle ways, [that] the whole situation is the responsibility of the victim. Particularly if there are kids involved." The officers I interviewed did not seem proud of this cultural norm among their peers, but were being honest about what they know victims experience.

One place where officers identified that victim blaming has a particularly devastating impact is with respect to dual arrests. The officers that I interviewed recognized the problems inherent in dual arrests and the benefits of identifying a primary aggressor. They were resigned, however, to the fact that there are some officers within their departments who will never be convinced that it is harmful and unjust to arrest a women who is violent in self-defense. "We try to train vigorously about not doing dual arrests and why they're bad, but you're always going to get them for whatever reason. And it seems it kind of comes in waves where we'll see a bunch of them for a while and then you won't see so many. Or you'll see the female has been battered for years and

finally maybe fights back in self-defense, but then ends up getting arrested because they were the ones that don't have the injury. So it's just training. It's pretty much pounding that in that it doesn't do anybody any good. But you'll get officers that just insist [on making a dual arrest]. That person committed a crime and that person committed a crime and they're both going to jail."

The picture that the officers painted of victim blaming beyond their departments was not much brighter. The courts were specifically mentioned as a place where victim blaming abounds, with judges often demonstrating significant ignorance when it comes to domestic violence dynamics. "I think sometimes it's the courts…. Sometimes the court isn't educated itself on domestic violence issues. I remember going to DVERT and hearing them, they have quotes that judges said that were really insensitive to women, but also insensitive to the issue of domestic violence, so I think there's an education piece that needs to happen on that end."

Ironically, despite their articulation of the presence of victim blaming and their assertion that attitudes that hold victim's responsible for their own abuse limit the success of domestic violence intervention strategies, the officers demonstrated a subtle form of victim blaming themselves when they were unable to suggest alternative strategies for how to deal with abusive men and instead chose to talk about how they would prefer to work with victims. In fact, the police and probation officers I spoke with were unable to even brainstorm about how they would intervene with abusive men if they had unlimited resources. When I asked them point blank, "what would you do with perpetrators if you had unlimited resources", there were no answers and a little laughter. Finally, an officer

said, "I think another way I look at it is offering more services to victims and empowering them to make the right, to make the right choices for themselves. I guess I feel like the best thing I can do sometimes is to empower the victim and to get services for that victim because I guess sometimes I see more of a benefit of working with the victim than in trying to change this person over here." Whether the officers realize it or not, implicit in this response is the idea that victims can somehow control the violence in their lives by making better choices, and that there is little or no hope for rehabilitating perpetrators.

In sum, police and probation officers expressed disturbed resignation regarding the limitations of current domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men and described several significant challenges to success. Their criticisms can be loosely grouped into two primary categories: insufficient and ineffectual response to perpetrators and inappropriate victim blaming. Perhaps more than any other stakeholder group, they expressed ambivalence regarding the efficacy of "punishment" based criminal justice strategies to alter a batterer's behavior. They suggested that prison is not effective because perpetrators are neither rehabilitated while they are incarcerated, nor contained long enough to provide any real safety for their victims. They were similarly unenthusiastic about the efficacy of treatment, concerned that it is too punitive (i.e., mandated and expensive), not evidence-based, and not long enough. Police and probation officers were consistently disturbed by the "one size fits all" approach currently in place for perpetrators, both in terms of the criminal justice response, particularly with respect to "no contact" orders, as well as the batterer intervention treatment. They were

particularly frustrated that this homogeny persists in the face of their belief that evidence-based practice data exists to suggest that this is not the most appropriate approach. The officers suggested that conducting a more thorough initial assessment and then making a more informed and specific placement according to that assessment would be more effective. Finally, they discussed the fact that victim blaming is still rampant throughout the police and probation departments, the courts, and society and that these attitudes and beliefs significantly affect the efficacy of domestic violence intervention strategies.

Victim Advocates

Victim advocates were exceptionally eager to discuss their analysis of what limits the effectiveness of current domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men and were animated and emotional while addressing this topic. They readily agreed with one other regarding the severity of the challenges associated with the current response and the detrimental impact these limitations have on their clients. They spoke at length regarding the challenges to effectiveness posed by insufficient and inconsistent accountability within the criminal justice system for perpetrators of domestic violence, ineffective and potentially harmful batterer intervention treatment, and the absence of a victim-centered approach.

Insufficient accountability for perpetrators. Advocates uniformly expressed concern about the lack of sufficient punishment or accountability for perpetrators of domestic violence, specifically noting how frequently the system inappropriately holds their clients responsible for stopping the violence. One advocate offered this reflection. "I think there's still not a lot of accountability within a lot of systems for men. I think

systems still look to the women to protect herself rather than looking to the men to stop

the violence or stop the abuse." Another advocate agreed and spoke specifically about the

fact that the system inappropriately depends on victim's participation to hold men

accountable and that this dependence is a limitation. "Well, for the law enforcement

aspect, so much emphasis is put on the victim, that without her participation in this, then

he's not going to be held accountable. And that means even less men are being held

accountable."

Advocates spoke at length about the challenges created by truncated prison

sentences for perpetrators, noting that not only do short incarcerations pose a significant

physical hazard to their clients, but they send a harmful message to the community

regarding the seriousness of domestic violence. Advocates described how stunted

sentences or overnight holds fail to adequately provide any sense of security or safety for

victims. "It seems like short sentencing is a limitation. Because as far as reporting and

having batterers go to jail, women can report, an incident can happen, they can call the

police, the person's arrested and then released the next day. So then, that's really scary

for a woman to know that she can call the police and he's only going to stay in jail

overnight and then maybe not get more jail time. It seems like sentencing is really,

really, short. So there's no safety for the survivor." This concern was echoed by every

advocate in both focus groups. Not only are victims protected for insufficient periods of

time when perpetrators are released so quickly, but according to the advocates I

interviewed, they are at greater risk of retaliatory injury when perpetrators are released

than if they had never been locked up in the first place. "I just feel like there's issue with

how much time an abuser gets. So he gets arrested and he's released the next day after arraignment and then she gets it even worse when he gets back." Advocates went on to explain that the impotence of the current response results in worse consequences for their clients both immediately (when he is released) and in the long run when clients will not reach out for help because of what did or did not happen the last time they contacted the police. "Like I said, she often gets it worse. So then women often won't call the police. So [there's] an escalation of violence because of intervention."

In addition to fearing for the immediate and future safety of their clients, advocates were concerned about the message that is being sent to their clients, to perpetrators of domestic violence, and to society at large by short incarcerations. They suggested that part of the problem is the fact that the laws concerning domestic violence are not strong enough to result in longer sentences. "I also feel like the laws that are in place around domestic violence… I feel like they're not very strong. Like, I know that for a long time there was no law specifically regarding strangulation and that a lot of us in the field advocated for that to happen…. Strangulation is [now] a Class A misdemeanor. I mean strangulation is a pretty big freaking deal, and within the field, it's one of the ways we assess someone's danger, it's a risk assessment and for it to not carry much weight…" The crime of strangulation was discussed for some time, with one advocate telling a story to illustrate how ludicrous it is in her opinion that this crime is identified as a misdemeanor. "A woman I work with always tells the story of how she worked with a woman who was strangled six times, passed out, in one evening and he would wake her up. He would slap her to wake her up, strangle her again, and he was

charged with a misdemeanor because he obviously didn't want to kill her because he would slap her to get her to wake back up. And so for that to be a misdemeanor is just ridiculous."

Advocates lamented the fact that domestic violence crimes do not appear to be taken seriously and suggested that the fact that domestic violence offenses do not warrant severe consequences by the criminal justice system sends a problematic message about the acceptability of domestic violence to the public. Their fear is that what gets communicated to victims, perpetrators and the society at large is that domestic violence is not a serious crime. "Yeah, it really feels like the message is that it's not taken all that seriously, you know? And that's a message that batterers and abusers get loud and clear all the time." Another advocate suggested that "maybe if the criminal justice system took it more seriously and jail sentencing was higher, the whole community would take it more seriously? See it as more of an issue." In the end, advocates expressed that short sentences simply do not constitute sufficient punishment for the crime of domestic violence. "What is the worst that can happen with abusive men, he will spend a couple days in jail, that's it. In my opinion, there's not enough punishment."

Advocates did not unilaterally suggest that increasing prison sentences would solve the problem. Several were ambivalent as to whether or not extending or expanding prison sentences would be helpful in preventing and intervening in men's abusive behavior. Their concerns stemmed partially from the fact that a disproportionate number of men of color are incarcerated and partially from the fact that they, like the police and probation officers I interviewed, are unconvinced that prison rehabilitates perpetrators of

domestic violence. "Jail, prison? I just feel like the state of that in our country is in bad shape just in terms of the disproportionate men of color and poor men who are jailed, as opposed to, sort of, who's predominantly doing crimes, committing crimes. And then also, there's never really been, in my mind, a decision as to whether or not prison is punishment or rehabilitation."

One size fits all. Victim advocates expressed frustration with what they perceive to be an inconsistent response from the criminal justice system to perpetrators of abuse, particularly when it comes to probation. "What I notice at the parole and probation office, and it makes a lot of sense because they have huge caseloads, but that guys are required to do lots of really different things. Like, for example, one person might require the guy to have anger management, whereas someone else is always recommending [a local BIP program], or somebody else is recommending some other group in the community. So some sort of consistency around how we are going to respond to these guys, I feel that is important." Contrasting the concern expressed by police and probation officers that the current response is not individualized enough, advocates were primarily concerned that the current response is not consistent or uniform enough (i.e., perpetrators are not held equally accountable). They related that in their experience a man can commit one act of violence and end up in jail, where other men can repeatedly violate restraining orders and not be prosecuted. "I don't see a pattern. Is pattern really not connected to crime? It's just this guy was unlucky enough and another was lucky. My opinion is that it should be handled with consisten[cy]."

While most of the advocates acknowledged that the response often appears inconsistent, one advocate, echoing opinions expressed by the officers, did suggest that a "one-size fits all" response might not be ideal either, offering instead that each perpetrator might need a more tailored or individualized response. "I think it's consistency in the message, not necessarily in the intervention. You can have a consistent message about the way things are done or not done, and yet know that individual kids learn differently, so you interact with them, you treat them differently."

The trouble with treatment. Advocates described two distinct limitations associated with batterer intervention treatment that they believe contribute to the inefficacy of the current response. Specifically, they expressed concern about whether batterer intervention treatment was rehabilitating or enabling perpetrators and discussed the fact that mandating attendance often translates into an intensification of anger by perpetrators towards victims.

In their experience, it seems as though the programs often appear to support, enable and sometimes enhance the perpetrator's abusive behavior. In other words, according to advocates, batterer intervention programs do not appear to sufficiently challenge participants' attitudes, beliefs and behaviors. "When they talk with each other, it almost sound like a support group for them." This particular advocate went on to suggest that instead perpetrators should be placed in a group with men who do not condone their abusive behavior in order to show them that society at large does not support and will not tolerate their abuse. "Batterer's intervention classes, I understand them, but if one batterer [was] invited to a group of men who is like church group or

some kind where he feels more comfortable, but [the participants] are not having this

issue [are not batterers] and he is by himself then maybe can be turned around. He will

feel like he is isolated, like he's by himself. Nobody shares his opinion, shares his view,

you know?" Another advocate chimed in and agreed that it was necessary to, "show them

how society doesn't accept it, so they know that they are not supported."

Additionally, advocates expressed concern and frustration over the fact that often

the programs seem to increase the likelihood that their clients will be abused. "One of

my clients called me and said, 'can you please explain to me what they are doing in these

classes? Because he comes home every time more angry.' She said he become[s] just

evil when he comes back from these classes." In this particular situation, the victim's

partner was specifically angry about not only having to attend, but having to pay for the

classes.

The current response is not sufficiently victim-centered. In discussing limitations

of the system's response to abusive men, advocates spent the bulk of their time talking

about the ways in which domestic violence intervention strategies re-victimize their

clients as opposed to protecting, assisting, and empowering them. They talked at length

about how the treatment that victims receive at the hands of the criminal justice and child

welfare systems often mirrors how they were treated by their abusive partner. Advocates

reported that victims are regularly bullied by the system to participate in holding their

perpetrators accountable, deprived of a voice in determining the fate of their

relationships, not communicated with openly and directly, blamed or held responsible for

the abuse that is perpetrated upon them, and more and more often being arrested for defending themselves.

Advocates expressed dismay when reporting that their clients are often bullied into helping the criminal justice system hold their perpetrators accountable even if they are not interested in being part of the process. Victims' reasons for not wanting to be involved may vary from concerns regarding retaliation to the need to emotionally distance themselves from their abusive situation. Regardless, their reasons do not appear to be respected by representatives of the criminal justice system, a failure that infuriates advocates. "I think a lot of times, women, we've talked to a lot of women who have made a report but then want to drop charges or don't want to testify or are fine with charges being pressed, but they don't want to be a part of it, and they get really bullied into it. One woman said she felt like the DA's office was stalking her because they were calling her, like, three or four times a day. And you know, they subpoenaed her, threatening to arrest her if she didn't testify. And she felt scared, and she just wanted to be done with it. Like, she didn't want anything to do with him. She was fine if they wanted to go forward with that, but she didn't want to be part of it."

Knowing that their clients are often treated this way by the district attorney's office creates an uncomfortable dilemma for victim advocates as they struggle to advise victims whether or not to call the police. "Some women just want it documented so if later they want to do something, they have that paper trail. But then, like, once you make the report, it's out of their hands. That's one of the hardest things I have to explain is that, next time, if you really don't want anything to happen, maybe not making that

report. Having to do that kind of talk with her so you don't get harassed by the DA's

office or by the police because you know what's the safest thing for you." Advocates

lamented that victims truly have no clear path with respect to reporting. If they report,

but do not want to prosecute or participate in the prosecution, they are harshly judged by

members of the criminal justice system, but if they do not report, they are also criticized

by those same members down the road if they ever do decide to come forward.   "You

hear victim blaming from [not reporting] …'well, why didn't she report all those other

incidents that took place?'"

Advocates were particularly aggravated by the fact that victims have very little

voice within the system. In other words, they are given very little authority to determine

the best course for their lives. While no woman wants to be abused, it is not always a

clear-cut solution to simply remove the perpetrator from their homes. For many women,

the decision to take that action can be complicated by her financial situation and

sometimes by the fact that she loves her abuser. Unfortunately, as it stands now,

advocates do not feel as though victims are given space within the system to negotiate

these complexities. Most frustrating is the fact that the system often makes the decision

to act without any provision for how she is supposed to manage the fall-out. "You know,

many of those women didn't want the guy arrested in the first place or didn't want

anything to happen, and it's out of their hands, basically. And now, he's been asked to

move out, right? And there he is on probation and she's in the house by herself having

the pay the rent and having to take care of the kids on her own and is calling. I mean, the

probation officers get very frustrated that victims call them all the time asking them to

drop the "no contact" orders and asking them to let them have contact with the offender. And I think again, that whole piece is missing for [probation officers] around why would a woman do that? …and I'm like, she really needs him to help her pay the rent and take care of the kids."

The criticism that victims do not have a voice in the criminal justice system was echoed repeatedly throughout the advocate focus groups. By not giving victims a voice, the system not only deprives them of the opportunity to chart the course of their own lives, but it also completely disempowers them, much like their perpetrators did. Victims often come away feeling used by the system, involved only to the extent that it serves the needs and objectives of the system. "The victims don't really have a voice in the criminal justice system. Like, they make a report and then it's whatever the officer decides to put in that report. And she can talk to the DA, but the DA's gonna do whatever they want. I mean, really, the only time that she can really openly speak is when he's sentenced and having a victim impact statement. And that's really frustrating for survivors because they want a say in what's going on, and they want to know what's going on, but nobody's really paying [attention], [the DA] just want[s] to keep her on board. That's all they want. They just want her to participate."

As suggested in the quote above, advocates' concerns extend beyond bullying and disempowering clients. They are aggravated by what they perceive as a lack of communication between the "system" and victims, demonstrated by the fact that victims often have no idea what is happening with their own cases. They do not know what their perpetrators have been charged with and they frequently do not know or understand why

some charges are dropped and others are added. Advocates suggested that the system

needs to be more engaged with victims, involving them throughout the process. "I don't

think women know, often, going in, sometimes they're told. But I think other times, they

have this expectation that he's going to be charged with what he was arrested for. And

then charges get dropped, he pleads out, so he may have been arrested, and he was

arrested for assault 4 and strangulation and whatever, like menacing. And then it gets

dropped to menacing or harassment. Or sometimes the DA's office will choose to

prosecute on a crime that's not even DV related because it can get him more time, like

burglary or something like that. So then there's no accountability for domestic violence

or it's just a plea down to a level where he gets probation and that was not what she

thought she was walking into. At the very least, let the woman know up front that this is

the way that it is probably going to happen." As a result of this poor communication,

victims often experience alienation and confusion. For example, advocates explained

that victims are often just told "no" in response to a request to drop a "no contact" order,

but they are not told "why". "I think the most important thing is that it's articulated to

her in a thorough manner, why the probation officer doesn't feel like it's safe for him to

lift the 'no contact' order. So that it is explained because I think in some cases what gets

frustrating is a survivor being told, 'No, no, no, no. That's not possible.' or 'This is the

way things are.' but not told why. Or sort of given a reason why."

Advocates then suggested that enhancing communication between system

partners and victims could really enhance the efficacy of the intervention. Not only

would victims feel better served by a system designed to protect and provide for them,

but these conversations might provide system stakeholders with vital information. As an example, several advocates felt that it would be advantageous for batterer intervention program facilitators to speak to the partners of the men participating in their programs in order to get their perspective on the changes that may or may not be being made as a result of the groups. "I think it makes a really big difference if the counselors in the program specifically speak to survivors. If they're just hearing the man's side of the story, then they may also be really manipulated by him. I just feel like it's really important to speak to survivors too about what's happening at home."

According to the advocates I interviewed, a truly victim-centered approach would not involve bullying victims to participate in prosecuting their perpetrators if they do not want to be involved, would not deprive them of a voice, and would not ignore them or avoid communicating with them throughout the process. It would be focused on achieving their safety, maintaining that safety by insuring they either have the resources to live independently or can navigate the necessary hoops and programs to get them. "Ideally, it would be consistency in terms of a victim-centered response. So that you're looking at what's going to be safest for her. And not only what's going to be safest for her, but how it's going to be possible for her. Because it's not only fear of escalation in terms of, like, why women don't testify. It's also other reasons, like financial reasons. So if she doesn't have any resources and he's been the one bringing home the money and her options are him going to jail or her not be able to pay the rent or buy food. I think for most of them, the choice is obvious." In other words, according to advocates, a victim-

centered response would be sensitive and responsive to the fact that often victims simply

do not have the resources to leave their abusive partners.

Concurring with police and probation officers, victim advocates repeatedly

suggested that the effectiveness of the current domestic violence intervention system is

negatively impacted by rampant victim blaming. According to their testimony, victim

blaming (i.e., holding victims responsible for their own abuse) by the police and

probation departments as well as the courts is distressingly prevalent and is both a

symptom of and contributor to the pervasiveness of domestic violence. "I think there's a

lot of victim blaming. We talk about it a lot, and we see it a lot. Like, we hear women

say a lot that they're blamed by different systems. And I think again, as long as the

woman's being blamed, then there less of a need, I think the system feels less of a need to

jump in and help because they see it as her fault and like, 'she's not helping herself, so

why should we help?'" Advocates reported regularly hearing comments revealing that

critical stakeholders in the system believe that victims should be doing something

differently in order to stop the violence, and that fundamentally they are responsible for

their own experiences of abuse because of their poor choices. "I've had several women

say that they've been told that they just don't know how to choose men." Others agreed

and offered similar examples, "Their picker is broken." "Yeah, even by counselors or

therapists saying, 'you lack the skills to make safe choices for yourself around

relationships.' Rather than addressing that there are so many unsafe people out there."

Advocates were particularly frustrated by the way these stakeholders focus on the

victim's poor choices, rather than the perpetrator's poor choices. "Like maybe child

welfare blaming her for not keeping her kids safe, rather than looking to who's really the danger to them."

In a particularly disturbing example of victim blaming, one advocate reported that not only does she hear that victims make poor choices by selecting batterers, but that they make these choices because they enjoy the abuse. "I hear some pretty horrendous victim blaming statements on a weekly basis. I recently was talking to a probation officer who was referring a victim to me and she was going to have to go in and have brain surgery because of the assaults that had happened, that he had done to her. And the PO told me that this woman obviously feeds off this abuse and being treated this way. Like, nobody feeds off of that. That's not [laughs], it's just not the deal."

Advocates pointed out that when victims are "blamed" by the system, the comments they hear often mirror, and subsequently in a sense, confirm abusive comments they heard from their batterers. "Many of those factors that people are using to determine sort of who gets great services and who gets really not so great services are those same issues of oppression that batterers have already been telling them. 'No-one's going to believe you. You were an addict for 20 years.' And then she walks into the courthouse and it's "Miss So and So, you were an addict for 20 years.' So it just plays true and survivors will so often really be able to articulate, like, just what he said was going to happen, happened. And that's heartbreaking because he's saying that. We know why he's saying that, but there is no excuse in my mind for other systems to say those very same things."

According to victim advocates, the end result of these oppressive victim -blaming attitudes is that victims are not being appropriately served. If victims are blamed for their abuse, it takes the onus off the system to do something about it. "So stuff's not getting done. Survivors are not getting treated with the respect and dignity that they deserve and abusers are not being held responsible or accountable for their actions because there's just this general sentiment like it's not that big of a deal. 'If it was that big of a deal, she would leave anyway. I don't know what her problem is. She seems blankety, blankety, blank.' Whatever those kinds of things are, and therefore she's less deserving of safety, respect, dignity, whatever that is. And that pervades all of our systems. And I think, probably, the domestic violence advocacy system as well, if we are honest with ourselves."

Finally, advocates described how more and more frequently victims are arrested for crimes they commit while defending themselves, echoing comments by police and probation officers. "I'm thinking of things like the police responding to a call and the woman being the one who is arrested because she maybe struggled to get away from him or whatever. But maybe she even smacked him or something because he was assaulting her and she was trying to get away. And so he's got a mark and so she gets taken away."

Invisibility of perpetrators. It is interesting that while advocates expressed frustration towards others in the system for blaming victims and not holding men accountable enough, they were equally guilty of having no ideas or suggestions for what to do with abusive men. In response to my question, "what strategies or interventions do you wish were available for domestically abusive men?" The rooms became very quiet,

and then there was a little laughter. Finally, someone said, "I don't know. It's a hard question for me. I feel like I don't know enough about that part of the system to know what else to try or whatever would work." As I suggested earlier with respect to the police and probation officers, I believe this resistance effectively translates into victim blaming. By choosing to not focus on "what to do with abusive men", the focus inevitably shifts primarily to abused women.

In sum, victim advocates offered multiple candidates to account for the limited effectiveness of current domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men, most of which can be loosely grouped within two umbrella categories: insufficient and ineffective accountability for perpetrators and insufficient support for victims. Victim advocates felt strongly that current sanctions for men were neither intense enough nor effective. For example, they expressed great disappointment regarding the lack of punishment or accountability for perpetrators as evidenced by paltry criminal justice consequences. Furthermore, they suggested that arrest, prosecution, short sentences and attendance in batterer intervention programs may actually cause more harm than good for victims. Victims are likely to suffer both physically and financially when their perpetrators return home after being in jail for 12 hours, or are issued a "no contact" order, or return home after attending batterer intervention groups where they bond and receive tacit approval from other abusers or become angry about paying the program fees. Advocates also expressed concern that the criminal justice response is not consistent across perpetrators and crimes, with some men receiving lighter sentences than others. Advocates were particularly distressed by their perception that victim safety and

empowerment is not paramount within the current response and that victims are not given

a voice within the system. Finally, they spoke at length about the prevalence of victim

blaming and the many ways in which these attitudes and beliefs within the criminal

justice and department of child welfare systems limit the effectiveness of domestic

violence intervention.

Victims/Survivors

The victims/survivors that I interviewed were deeply distressed about the current

state of domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men and were quite eager

to share their frustrations with each other and with me. The stories they told resonated

with the concerns expressed by both officers and advocates, particularly with regard to

the inability of existing strategies to hold perpetrators sufficiently accountable, the

absence of successful treatment or rehabilitation for perpetrators, and the lack of a

fundamentally victim-centered approach. Although there was substantial consensus

within each stakeholder group regarding limitations of current domestic violence

intervention strategies, this phenomenon was particularly evident when I spoke with the

victims/survivors. During our conversations, the woman exhibited tremendous solidarity,

often sharing in unison to get a point across. In this section I attempt to capture this

dynamic of cross-talk and support by presenting more of their uninterrupted dialogue.

Insufficient accountability for perpetrators. Unquestionably, victims/survivors

lodged their most articulate and disturbing complaints against the police. Their

frustrations centered primarily on the fact that the police either did not respond to their

calls for help or responded in such a way as to worsen the situation. "Every time that I

called the police with my ex, they wouldn't do anything. He'd always talk them around it and say that it was all my fault. So I stopped calling the police. I stopped calling the police for years and years. I finally called them once about ten years later. It didn't do anything so I stopped calling again. They don't do anything when you call most of the time. If they do arrest him, they're out within anywhere between an hour and 12 hours and they're back at your door and they're doing the same stuff to you again. And it's worse for you." Others concurred, offering several statements in support of the idea that the police either do not arrest perpetrators after arriving on the scene or if they do arrest them, they are released so quickly that they are able to easily and swiftly retaliate. "When we call, it makes it worse. And they release them and they let them go back. And it pisses them off more and it makes them hurt us more. And the police don't care. That's the biggest issue. Police don't care."

Victims/survivors went on to describe several incidences where police officers either failed to protect them or appeared to make questionable decisions about how to proceed given the presenting circumstances. "There were two different incidences in my home where the police came to the scene and they saw him reach in his pocket and immediately ran over [and put] cuffs on him. And in his pocket was a pocket-knife. You know, these domestic violence guys, they're survivors. And what, and they're gonna, they're not gonna go to jail. And, you know, police were really mad that he'd stuck his hand in there and then found a pocket knife in there, but they didn't do anything about it. After he calmed down, they just took the handcuffs off [laughs] and just told him, 'You need to leave. Get your clothes. You're out of here. You've got five minutes.'"

Clearly, the victim/survivor who shared this story was surprised that the police did not arrest her perpetrator given the concealed weapon and her allegations of abuse.

Another woman described how when the police arrived on the scene they asked her and her children to leave their home as opposed to asking her abuser to leave, despite the fact that he was not a resident of her home or on the lease. "I called the police on my children's father and he was at my home and I called and they came out and don't you know, they were gonna make me and my children leave my home and let him stay there? I thought that was just wrong, you know? That's my home. He wasn't even on the lease or anything and they were gonna make me and my children leave my home and let him stay there."

In another haunting tale, a victim/survivor recounted how her perpetrator verbally threatened a police officer when he responded to her distress call and instead of calling for back-up, the police officer left her alone with her abuser. "He told the police office he needed to take his a-s-s and get back on his motorcycle and leave. He said [to do it] before he find himself lying on the pavement … and I just knew right then and there [the officer] was gonna call for back up and they were gonna take [my abuser] to jail. The officer got on his motorcycle and left. I couldn't believe it. He talked so crazy to that police officer, and I just knew he was gonna call for back-up and he didn't. He got on his motorcycle and left."

I selected these three examples because they typify the complaints registered by the victims/survivors I spoke with: police officers either down-playing the seriousness of domestic violence by allowing perpetrators to leave the scene rather than arresting them,

unjustly burdening victims by asking them to flee with their children rather than removing perpetrators, and finally abandoning victims to endure the violence and abuse. In sum, according to the victims/survivors I interviewed, part of reason domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men are not more successful is because officers do not make arrests when they should and they do not protect the rights of victims. It is worth noting that the women who shared these particular tales were African American. It is quite possible that the police indifference they experienced was partially attributable to their race. As was reported earlier, police have a long history of responding less ardently to the complaints of lower-working-class African American women (Messerschmidt, 1993; Young, 1986)

The message that victims/survivors receive loud and clear is that their safety and well-being is not a priority for the police. In fact, not only can contacting the police be dangerous for them with respect to retaliation, but when they call the police, they also run the risk of being arrested themselves. At one point, as a way of summarizing, I reflected back to the group "so most of the time they're not arresting, is that what I'm hearing?" A resounding "NO" echoed from the group. After a brief pause, they informed me that actually it is even worse than "no", because instead of arresting perpetrators when they should, the police are often arresting victims who defend themselves. "Or they're taking the woman away." Several women went on to talk about the fact that they've had friends who have called the police, seeking protection from their abuser and have been arrested instead. "It's the woman who calls, [yet] she's the one who gets hauled off and they leave the kids with the abuser."

Given the role of "no contact" orders within a coordinated community response, I

asked specifically about their enforcement and was told, "They're not enforced." If

victims complain to probation officers, they are told, "Well, he won't do it again. We'll

talk to him." One victim reported that her perpetrator calls her all the time and when she

reports it to the probation officer, she is told, "Well, he's not supposed to." These

victims/survivors shared the resignation expressed by the police and probation officers

about law enforcement's ability to enforce the orders. "They can't catch him in it;

they're not gonna do anything about it." Victims also spent time talking about how

restraining orders also do not actually protect them since their perpetrators can torment

them and stay within the law. "Your perpetrator can sit across the street from your house,

but because it's a public street, it's okay." Another participant agreed. "Yeah, they're not

coming onto your property, so it's okay. They're within the law."

Victims/survivors' frustrations with the criminal justice system did not end with

the police and probation department. They were also significantly disturbed by their

interactions with the district attorney's office and with the impotency of the courts. Of

particular concern was the fact that charges do not appear to be pressed against

perpetrators as often as victims/survivors are led to believe that they will be. "District

attorneys, they don't file. They never file against them. That's the problem. They never

file against them." Apparently, victims/survivors are often told that charges will be filed

but then later are informed that due to insufficient physical evidence, they actually cannot

proceed. "I've had police officers, some of them will come out and be like, 'well, what

happened ma'am?' and I'll give the report, 'Oh, yeah, he beat me up la da da.' and they'd

be like, 'Okay, well do you want to press charges?' 'Yeah.' They'll be real sympathetic

and then they'll call you back, 'Well, we can't press charges because there's no bruising.'

And I'm like, 'You know what, you just sat there and felt my head, felt the lumps on my

head, and you're gonna tell me you have no evidence?'" Others agreed. "Yep. I had the

same problem." Victims/survivors were particularly frustrated by the seeming lack of

clear or honest communication from the district attorney's office, a challenge also noted

by victim advocates. "The district attorney will tell you that, 'I don't need you to file

charges. I can do it myself, and I can make happen it.' Never happens."

Of course, pressing charges is not necessary a pathway to deliverance according

to the victims/survivors I interviewed because once their case reached the courthouse,

they were often displeased with the outcome. "It takes about a year to go through the

thing. Then they finally go to court and he wants a jury trial and the last minute it says

on the piece of paper that you need to be aware that if this does go to court, the jury can

find you guilty. Then [the perpetrators] go, 'Oh my god, no. That can't happen, so I'm

not gonna contest the charges, but only if you dismiss all the charges but one.' So then

the district attorney and the judge, they dismiss all the charges so that he will say, 'I'm

not going to contest the charges.' That's ludicrous. You go through a whole year of this

crap, go through the court system, you go through… the restraining order, you press the

criminal charges and then the judge and the district attorney dismisses the charges. And

nothing gets on his record. It makes no sense." In the eyes of the victims/survivors I

spoke with, it appears as though when the case finally does reach the judge, their

perpetrators are able to plead to such nominal charges that the severity of what they did

dissipates and the victim is left feeling frustrated and confused. It seems to particularly

aggravate victims/survivors that decisions to reduce the charges are made by the DA and

the judge.

Victims/survivors were further discouraged by the fact that perpetrators seemed to

be able to deceive the court and evade taking any personal responsibility for the violence

they committed. "And I didn't see one changed person in all the times I've been to the

courthouse. And I've been to the courthouse a lot of times. None of those people are

humbled, none of those people are changed and none of those people are telling the truth.

My husband didn't and every person I've talked to has told me the same thing, they don't

tell the truth. They get up there and just go through the motions." Others agreed,

expressing disappointment with the fact that the system does not require perpetrators to

publically accept responsibility for their actions. "During this whole process, the abuser

doesn't have to stand up and say, 'I'm an abuser. I hit her' because the criminal has

rights." "And the victim doesn't [another woman interjected]." One victim/survivor

suggested that "maybe the judge could ask the batterer, ask the batterer, 'do you realize

that you did something wrong?' Make them held accountable and let them know that this

is a serious thing. They are not letting the general public know and the batterers that this

is serious."

As evidenced by this last comment, victims/survivors are ultimately left to

conclude that the crime of domestic violence is not taken very seriously by the criminal

justice system. "It's just not taken serious…. It's just like, 'Oh, you shouldn't have done

that. Now you're bench probation for a year. Stay away from her. You can still see your

son, you know?" The revelation, by victims/survivors, that the crime of domestic violence does not appear to be taken very seriously by the criminal justice system was extremely painful and the women frequently became tearful when sharing specific examples. For example, one victim/survivor talked about how her perpetrator caused her near fatal injuries and yet did not go to prison. Another talked about how the court failed to follow through with a lengthy prison term even when it warned her particular perpetrator that he would receive the maximum sentence if he harmed her again. "The judge said to him that the next time he committed a new crime that he's looking at the max of 17 years. And [I] go back to court in front of the same judge, not but two months later, he only gets 23 months in the pen. That's it."

Of course, according to victims/survivors, securing longer prison sentences might not necessarily solve the problem. Echoing concerns expressed by officers and victim advocates, victims/survivors suggested that placing perpetrators in jail with other men who have abused their partners can sometimes be more harmful than helpful. "It is not helpful to have them incarcerated [with] other men who think the same way, act the same way." Others agreed and were particularly concerned that perpetrators learn how to be better perpetrators when they interact with each other. "They are just learning new ways of doing it, new manipulation ways." Finally, they expressed concern that while in prison, their abusers are not receiving the treatment that they need, particularly with respect to drug and alcohol treatment. "And they're just being put in this place and not having special treatment for it, you know? They need to get drug and alcohol treatment."

One size fits all. In identifying that some of their perpetrators might need specialized treatment, such as therapy for drug and alcohol abuse, victims/survivors seemed to partially agree with police and probation officers regarding the need for individual assessment and corresponding response to perpetrators. However, victims were primarily concerned that the one-size-fits all approach by the criminal justice system does not hold men accountable enough for their specific crimes. "You know, the judge, you go into the courtroom and it's filled with all these people, you know? And you have all these restraining orders stacked up and the judge says their little speech, you know? And it is pretty much the same thing every time and every case." They discussed the fact that the court's response to perpetrators appears standardized and in most cases insufficient. "They put them all in a mold, so when they go into… and the judge says, 'oh, it's standard.' You know? Go on probation, go to your domestic violence counseling. Go to this for six weeks, whatever it might be. They're just like, 'oh, slap on the wrist.'" It appears as though victims/survivors assume that a more individualized response might translate into more punishment or longer sentences for their perpetrators.

The trouble with treatment. Paralleling critiques offered by officers and advocates, victims/survivors expressed a sense of hopelessness about the system's ability to change their abusers, either through the process of arrest, adjudication, prison or through mandated batterer intervention treatment. When I asked them whether or not they felt perpetrator treatment worked, they expressed uniform disappointment with the efficacy of these programs, responding with "NO", "NO", "Oh, god no.", "Not even close.", "Are you kidding?" One problem with batterer intervention identified by

victims/survivors is that their abusers do not take the programs seriously. "They get ordered to batterer intervention, they go through the classes just so it doesn't get on their record. It's a joke to them." They mused together about what could actually be sufficient punishment or significantly uncomfortable for their batterers to instigate a change. Some suggested that the problem may be that treatment does not feel like enough of a burden or enough punishment to be taken seriously and suggested that perhaps the mandate to attend treatment should be coupled with additional requirements, such as community service. "Included with batterer intervention, have community services tacked on because that's more like a sentence. That's more like a judgment has been [made]."

Victims/survivors were very clear that their perpetrators know how to manipulate the system in order to not get caught and that these skills are often enhanced by attending batterer intervention programs. "They know how to manipulate us and they also know how to manipulate them so they don't get themselves into much of a predicament, because they know how to weasel through." When I asked them to clarify whether they were talking about manipulating their batterer intervention program facilitators or the men in the group, I was told "from both." Others expressed grave concerns about the fact that from group they learn how to become better manipulators. "They learn how to be better abusers. They learn how to get away with more. They learn how to manipulate the situation to their benefit. Punching your back, underneath your clothing. Pulling you by the hair. They learn to go with you to the hospital to make sure… that they're in the hospital room with you, to make sure that you don't tell on them. So you don't say anything. And the doctor's like, 'Would you like them to be removed? And they're

looking at you like, 'Bitch, don't even.' Because you know you have to go home with them sooner or later." Others agreed and added "but it isn't just the physical stuff, though. They learn manipulation through those classes like how to come home and expect their dinner, expect their clothes, expect all this stuff and they can belittle you or expect you to be in bed when they want and how they want, you know? And not just the physical. That's pretty easy to learn. But the manipulation of mental and emotional is something that they don't always know, and I think they learn to fine tune it a little more." Clearly, it was the experience of these victims/survivors that not only did batterer intervention programs fail to change their perpetrators for the better, but in fact, they actually made them more sophisticated abusers.

Ironically, despite these criticisms of batterer intervention programs, some victims/survivors felt they should be longer. "I think they need to go for a longer period of time and there needs to be interaction with that person so they can find out what kind of personality this person is." "and they should have to check in every so often for several years." It was unclear whether or not they felt longer programs would somehow ameliorate their other concerns or if they were simply trying to suggest something that might work better.

The current response is not sufficiently victim-centered. Resonating with concerns articulated by police and probation officers as well as victim advocates, victims/survivors lamented that at a fundamental level, current domestic violence intervention is not sufficiently victim-centered. In particular, victims/survivors were disturbed by the preponderance of victim blaming they endure and by the lack of clear and honest

communication they receive. Victims/survivors were especially passionate while describing the victim blaming comments and attitudes they encounter when interacting with police officers. "I've had a police officer tell me, 'Hey, that's what you get if you choose to be with him.'" The attribution of blame by police officers frequently escalated to the point where victims/survivors reported being asked point blank what they did to instigate the abuse. "How'd you initiate it? What'd you say to him? What did you do to piss him off?"

In an effort to try to explain why the police treat them this way, one victim/survivor sparked an intense dialogue when she speculated that "I think some of the police officers are abusers themselves." Others agreed. "Yeah" "Because if they're talking to you that way in regards to why he's doing it, I feel like they're abusers themselves. And it's been proven in this state that cops have been arrested because they're beating on their women. That they've killed their wives. You know? So, a majority of them out there, I believe are abusers themselves." Another offered, "I think their opinion is that women that are in domestic violence are all dogs. I think they just put you in a category no matter who you are. No matter what kind of person you are or what your opinion is, they put you in a category or number you, and that's where you're gonna stay. And they know nothing about you. Kind of like their bedside manner or it's like their real personality comes out when they come into your home. You can see it in their attitude, you can see it in their body language." "It isn't what they say. It's the way they treat you. They talk down to you."

It was not only the blatant victim blaming that disturbed the victims/survivors, but also the general insensitivity to their plight. With a great deal of passion and cross-talk, one group discussed how a minor change in policy could result in a far more effective intervention. "When you call the police and they come to your house and it's a domestic violence and they know that a man and a woman are involved, or a husband and wife, a woman officer should be with the man." "Yes. I agree with that" chimed another participant. A third woman offered, "because you need to show your bruises or where he's hit you and I wasn't about to take off my clothes or lift up my shirt and show them. Because men are..", "they're pigs [a fourth woman interjected]." "Exactly!" exclaimed the first speaker, "because in that situation, you don't want to be around another man, afterwards." The third speaker added, "It's even worse trying to show another [man] what that man had just done to you."

In addition to identifying victim blaming attitudes and insensitive policies as a limitation of current domestic violence intervention strategies, victims/survivors were equally dissatisfied by the poor communication they receive from representatives of the criminal justice system. Victims/survivors reported that they are frequently discouraged by the lack of information or attention they receive, particularly with respect to the criminal courthouse. "You are given the run around. You keep getting hung up on. You're transferred and transferred and finally hung up on, and you finally give up."

Often it seems, victims/survivors thought they were taking the necessary action to pursue filing charges, only to learn later that there were other steps they needed to complete. "I went and I thought I was filing charges against him and I didn't know you

had to go to the district attorney's office and file charges." Another woman shared that

she had been similarly confused by the process. "In my situation, I would have pressed

charges had I been informed correctly that I did not have to involve my child in the

process of pressing charges. That was not explained to me.   I was told that if I pressed

charges, I had to put my eight year old on the stand. I refused to do that. No-one

explained to me until it was all said and done and he got his three years of probation that

to get more time I'd have to put my son on the stand. As long as you got on the stand, he

would have got his 25 years. To me, 25 years in prison and three years probation is a big

fricking difference."

It was clear from their statements that victims/survivors frequently felt betrayed

by the district attorney's office. Not only did they report receiving inadequate or

inaccurate information, but they often felt blatantly deceived. "They lie to you. They

totally lie to you. They go in there and they dismiss all the charges. They lie to you all

the time." I was so distressed by their stories and the pervasive sense of hopelessness

that I finally asked, "Aren't there advocates here in town that do support you through the

process?" Their responses shocked me. "No" "Not really" "No" "No. I was supposed to

have [advocate's name] from [DV program's name]. She was going to come out to my

house and everything. She kept saying that. She never came." These women clearly fell

through the cracks of the system, failing to receive support and guidance either from the

criminal justice system or from victim advocates.

In sum, when asked what limits the effectiveness of domestic violence

intervention with abusive men, victims/survivors discussed the inability of the criminal

justice system to protect or empower them, expressed cynicism with respect to the ability

of batterer intervention treatment programs to improve their batterer's behavior towards

them, and described their dismay with regard to the victim blaming attitudes and beliefs

they regularly encounter. It was clear from their comments that most victims/survivors

feel as though the criminal justice system is not working on their behalf, primarily due to

insufficient accountability for perpetrators and pervasive victim blaming/alienation.

Encounters with the police regularly involved inadequate or inappropriate responses (i.e.,

not arresting when indicated or arresting women/victims for defending themselves)

followed by incredibly short imprisonment which frequently lead to escalating violence

when their perpetrators return home. Victims expressed utter confusion and frustration

regarding the district attorney's office and the courts. In general, they felt isolated in the

process, not understanding what charges were being filed, their role in filing and

prosecution, and the decisions to drop charges. Their opinion of the effectiveness of

batterer intervention programs was equally grim, citing the damage that is often done

when their perpetrators spend time bonding with and learning from other perpetrators.

Specifically, victims/survivors noted that their abusers frequently learned how to better

manipulate the police, probation officers, program facilitators and other service providers

(such as emergency room physicians/nurses, etc.) from their fellow group participants.

Overall, it was clear that victims do not feel as though their safety is paramount within

the system and frequently experience being blamed for their abuse and then

disempowered by poor or limited communication with representatives from the domestic

violence intervention system.

Batterer Intervention Providers

Batterer intervention providers eagerly offered candidates when asked to describe what limits the effectiveness of domestic violence intervention with abusive men. Interestingly, their responses differed from those of police and probation officers, victim advocates and victims in that they spent significantly less time talking about insufficient accountability for perpetrators, challenges and drawbacks of a "one size fits all" approach, and the pervasiveness of victim-blaming and much more time talking about the specific barriers they encounter when trying to change men's attitudes and behaviors. For example, batterer intervention providers discussed the impact of persistent violent and sexist societal attitudes on their ability to change men's attitudes and behaviors in group. They also spoke about unresolved tension and concern they have over the primary intent of the intervention (i.e., whether to punish or rehabilitate), and they spoke with great emotion about the impact of the vilification and invisibility of perpetrators on their ability to do their jobs effectively.

More than any other stakeholder group, batterer intervention providers discussed the challenges to success created by weaknesses in the local coordinated community response, challenges such as scarce resources which make it difficult for them to fulfill state standard requirements and make it difficult for probation officers to adequately monitor their probationers. They also talked at length about the problematic impact of high turnover, variability in terms of job performance, knowledge, and training, and spoke with great frustration and sadness about the lack of teamwork they experience when trying to collaborate with probation officers. For the sake of organization and

clarity, I've decided to group their comments about the CCR with other similar comments addressing Research Question Four. However, given the fact that they spontaneously discussed them in response to my questions about what limits the effectiveness of domestic violence intervention strategies, I felt it was important to acknowledge them here.

Societal attitudes do not support successful intervention. Batterer intervention providers were quick to point out that the success of domestic violence intervention is limited by societal attitudes that essentially endorse violence, power over conflict resolution, and misogyny and that these pervasive attitudes and beliefs make it difficult to shift individual men's attitudes and beliefs during group. "Our society, speaking particularly of America, is so pervaded with violence. TV, shock radio, newspapers. It doesn't matter where you go or what you look at. It's just violence. And it is 'who is the biggest', 'who is the baddest' that's gonna win, and winning is all that matters. There is no idea of state craft, not trying to bring in political stuff, but there's no idea about, we do not teach our kids how to talk to each other. It is win or lose and they pick that up very, very little."

Providers lamented that even though a more enlightened conversation about gender roles has been occurring for decades now, they see very little translation of these conversations into the attitudes, beliefs and behaviors of the young men entering their programs. "The younger people are being taught better about equality and so the expectation and theory would be we'd see fewer younger people and that they'd be moving away from battering and more toward quality based relationships, but the young

people we get coming into our program have the same attitudes, same beliefs, same behaviors, and it's not changed. And they may talk something, but the belief, the sociological change hasn't happened." Another provider concurred and explained that misogyny persists in the populations that he serves. "I think there is a lot of support for misogyny. I do groups with cowboys and farmers and they have a lot of sexist attitudes. They really just think they're the head of the household, king of the castle and that's how it should be." Batterer intervention providers went on to acknowledge the challenge that these oppressive attitudes present to the work they are trying to do with perpetrators, asserting that they unquestionably limit the effectiveness of domestic violence intervention.

Punishment versus rehabilitation. Batterer intervention providers, echoing comments offered by police and probation officers, talked about the tension that they experience in the field with respect to whether or not domestic violence intervention should focus on punishing perpetrators or rehabilitating/treating them. They suggested that while punishment might serve to impact behaviors in the short term, long term attitude change requires treatment or therapy. "I don't think a punitive, authoritarian approach to people really works as a way to create attitude change." For many providers, attitudinal changes require therapy and in order for therapy to be successful, establishing a sincere, non-punitive, connection with the client is necessary, since it can often be difficult for people to engage the material if they feel resentful and coerced. "To tell the person, 'Ignore your friends and listen to me even though you're

gonna resent anything, at least initially, that I present because you're arm is being twisted

behind your back to be here'[is difficult]."

Providers spent a great deal of time talking about how important it is for them to

separate the person (or man) from their behaviors in order to establish a positive

connection. The Christian tenet, "love the sinner, hate the sin", was repeatedly echoed.

Many felt it was critical to avoid objectifying men who batter, in part, because a great

deal of the work they do involves stopping these men from objectifying their partners.

"When we categorize people, put them in a box, what kind of role model are we being for

men who want to put women in a box and say, 'Oh, they're all like this.' It's the process

of objectifying that allows so many individuals to do behaviors. I can't objectify my

client and if I call him a batterer, then he becomes an object. I have to individualize. I

have to find the human being there."

For some providers, believing batterers' can change is central to their ability to

work as providers. "I remember the first training that I went to I was told that there was a

zero effectiveness rate. Zero. And I remember that I asked, 'Well, so why do you do this

work?' and the person responded back, 'Because I get to tell these guys something that

nobody else gets to tell them' which sounded kind of like a power play in and of itself. I

couldn't do this work if I didn't believe that a person could change." Another described

how important it was from a therapeutic perspective to hold out hope for the men. "I'm

trying to present that hope, you know? Say 'in order to be here, you can't do these 55

[things],' you know? 'We have to work at what's your goal? Do you want a healthy

marriage? Do you want a healthy relationship?' It could be looked at as colluding by

other perspectives, but what else do we have? 'You're hopeless. Come sit for a year while we discuss your emotions.'"

There was one provider who spoke up in opposition to the idea that batterer intervention programs should resemble therapy. This provider articulated that he works under the belief that domestic violence is a choice and therefore education is a sufficient response. "Well, I certainly agree that there are those with mental health issues just as any populations can have those with mental health issues. But it's my opinion anyway, that the preponderance of the folks are not mentally ill." This provider went on to explain that this is why his program chooses to focus on educating men about the choices they have made, rather than providing treatment or therapy.

Despite the preponderance of concern expressed about the impact that coercion might have on therapy, providers were not advocating for less punishment for perpetrators from the criminal justice system. In fact, they talked a great deal about how police and probation officers are failing to hold men sufficiently accountable. "I do a lot of DV therapy in Happy Valley/Clackamas area and I work with a lot of women who are abused and their husbands are not taken out of the home and often there's conversations about calming down and all those things." This provider went on to talk about how in these communities, children call to report domestic violence and nothing happens. Providers attributed these failings to insufficient resources, specifically training for police officers. Providers then went on to talk about the challenges that result from the insufficient resources for probation departments, specifically with respect to adequate monitoring, challenges that I'll return to fully in response to Research Question Four.

Invisibility of perpetrators. Batterer intervention providers talked at length about the tendency within the domestic violence field to ignore or vilify perpetrators, a trend that often results in an inappropriate focus on victims. Echoing my focus group experiences with both officers and advocates, one provider observed the following. "I think the quickest way to silence some people is to say, 'so what are you going to do with the perpetrator?' And they don't have anything they can realistically say, and I think it's a great way of silencing them because that's the real problem. You can keep rescuing the drowning children from the river, but eventually you've got to go upriver and say, 'Who's throwing them in?'"

Providers talked about the fact that, for them, working with the perpetrator is an attempt to get to the root of the problem. "One of my focuses has always been working with the batterer. Because you can work with the woman and work with the woman, but if you don't work with the batterer, it doesn't really matter. I mean, he's gonna go batter somebody else." Providers reported sometimes feeling shunned for choosing to work with perpetrators. "I work with young men. But what happens is that it's not the favorable thing to do. It's not the popular thing to do, to work with the batterer. People try to shove it under the rug. I had a huge contract with DHS, but it's not favorable to say, 'I can work with this woman all I want, but this man is not going anywhere. He's not in jail. He's gonna still be menacing. Let's try to figure out how to get him help." One provider tried to explain why she believes there is so much resistance to working with perpetrators. "I think the focus on women and the extreme cases of domestic violence are sort of making people hate batterers rather than want to work with them.

That's been my experience about why there's resistance to working with men. Because they're criminals." "And there's no hope for them [interjected another group member]." The prevalence of the vilification of perpetrators was frustrating to some providers because they feel that it really inhibits the efficacy of intervention, particularly when these views are expressed by other providers.

Victim blaming. For the most part, providers expressed frustration with the victim blaming they encounter when working with other system partners, particularly DHS. Several specifically noted that DHS places so much responsibility on women for maintaining their safety that they essentially refuse to work with perpetrators, an approach that providers find short-sided. "For me, it's just been a personal process of really getting the whole domestic violence thing, but understanding that we are putting so much emphasis on women. I also had a contract with DHS where so much emphasis is put on women, what they had to do in order to stay safe, which didn't even make any sense."

However, some providers clearly struggled with whether or not victims are in need of mandated services. One provider suggested that, "I'd like to see some victims. I don't know if it's required or not, but victims need treatment just like guys need treatment. They need treatment for their victim's issues. There are victim's issues just like there are perpetrator issues." Another provider disagreed. "I disagree that they, they need some, for some victims it might be beneficial, however it's up to them whether they need something or not." To which the first speaker countered, "is it up to the batterer to decide whether he needs it or not?" But the second speaker argued that "he's the one that

took action. The victims haven't done anything wrong." The original provider

concluded, "That doesn't mean that we should deny them services as well. I know that at

this point, you can't make them take services, but you can look at things in terms of those

who have histories of picking more, another abusive man, in line. Any information they

can get there would be so helpful to them."

While most providers seemed to agree that mandating services to victims was

inappropriate, they also felt that empowering and educating victims was important. In

fact, several went on to suggest that educating victims might have a greater impact on the

effectiveness of domestic violence intervention than either the criminal justice system or

batterer intervention programs. "Probably after the courts and DHS, the most common

mandating authority for these men are their partners. And these are women who have

really come to understand what abusive behavior is, to some extent at least. They have

found, and sometimes, it is hard, but a lot of times it's psychologically hard to say, 'I'm

serious. You need to do something about this. I love you, but I will not tolerate this.'

And she was able to say it to him in a way that he can hear it." Several additional

comments seeming to place responsibility for successfully intervening on victims'

shoulders were then offered. "As we continue to educate and empower women, I think

we're gonna have more and more of them holding their partners accountable,

encouraging their partners to get the help that they need to, to be different in

relationship." One provider went as far as to suggest that through more calculated

partner selection, victims could breed out abuse; "Putting responsibility on women to

breed a non-violent culture of men."

In summary, batterer intervention providers suggested that domestic violence intervention is limited in its success by the pervasiveness of societal violence and rigidly proscribed gender roles for men and women, the vilification and invisibility of perpetrators, and confusion about what to do with victims. Providers talked about how difficult it is for them to essentially work "upstream", encouraging the men in their groups to challenge traditional ideas about masculinity and femininity, power and control, and the use of violence as a negotiating tactic. They also acknowledged that they struggle with the punitive aspect of the current response to perpetrators, suggesting that punishing "bad" men is in some ways a quick fix, while rehabilitating men who made "bad" choices takes much longer. According to these providers, lasting attitudinal change requires therapy and therapy requires a therapeutic alliance, something that is particularly difficult to establish when participants feel coerced into participating. Providers then spent a great deal of time talking about the difficulty they experience trying to earn respect for the work they do and for the men they work with. They repeatedly recounted the fact that perpetrators are either rendered invisible as human beings or shunned as hopeless criminals, attitudes which they find neither productive nor helpful. Despite the fact that they frowned on the fact that key collaborators, such as the Department of Human Services: Child Welfare often place excessive responsibility on victims, they too struggled with the appropriateness and usefulness of mandating services for victims in order to break the cycle of violence.

Perpetrators

In general, perpetrators expressed dissatisfaction with and resentment towards current domestic violence strategies and identified several factors limiting their effectiveness. Articulating some of the same concerns described by officers, advocates, victims, and providers, perpetrators suggested that the system is over-involved in their lives, confused about how to simultaneously punish and rehabilitate them, insufficiently tailored to meet their individualized needs, not consistent enough, and not spending sufficient time dealing with "the other half of the problem" (i.e., the victims).

Without a doubt, the dominant theme of our conversations was that the system is inappropriately punitive and intrusive, disempowering them and their victims with unnecessary "no contact" orders and excessive batterer intervention treatment. Perpetrators, like officers and providers, discussed the tension and confusion they experience when interfacing with a domestic violence intervention system that seems conflicted about whether it should focus on punishing or rehabilitating them? If designed to punish them, perpetrators questioned the utility of that approach, since in their opinion punishment is not an effective way to deter or prevent future violence. If designed to rehabilitate them, the men I interviewed were pessimistic about the ability of batterer intervention treatment to positively impact their future behavior. Ultimately, perpetrators pointed out that neither approach is likely to be particularly effective, given their belief that they will only change if and when they want to. Perpetrators also suggested that the effectiveness of the domestic violence intervention system is limited by two contradictory weaknesses: insufficiently individualized assessment and treatment and insufficiently

consistent response from the district attorney, judges, and probation. Finally, many perpetrators were heavily focused on their victims' behavior and her unfulfilled need for treatment/education.

The problem with punishment. Perpetrators overwhelmingly expressed frustration with the destructive level of involvement the system has in their lives. While willing to acknowledge they did something wrong, most suggested that the punishment they were enduring exceeded their crime. "I found the system a little overkill. My crime was wrong, but make the sentence fit the crime. I should have been given a chance. I taught my boys, my children, all their lives that everyone deserves a second chance to prove themselves. Not me. One time and things are going downhill real fast. And I was wrong, man. I was wrong. Absolutely wrong. Does my family have to be destroyed? My life destroyed?" Others agreed that their actions did not warrant the response they received. "A lot of us are getting stepped on and kicked around for doing very little."

Perpetrators attributed much of this "overkill" to zealous district attorneys, who, according to the men I interviewed, rack up false charges in order to pad the case against them and insure that they are ultimately convicted of something. "As far as the courts are concerned, the DA, I feel that sometimes they can overstep their bounds as far as how many things they can charge you for. I know they try to go for as many things as possible and then you have to negotiate." Others concurred and suggested that they should only be charged with one crime, rather than stacking up lots of charges to be used as chips during plea bargaining negotiations. "I would like to see a little more hard line where this is what you're charged for, this is the only thing that you should be charged

for instead of three other charges that all they're gonna do is they're just using that to negotiate down to whatever you end up with."

In part, their concerns mirror comments offered by victim advocates and victims who also expressed frustration with the bucket list of crimes that men get charged with during arraignment. The difference, of course, is that victims and advocates were frustrated by the fact that often it is the domestic violence charges that ultimately get dropped, leaving the victim to feel as though the crimes against her are less important than the crimes against her property. For the perpetrators, the laundry list of charges is just another example of how they are victims of a bogus and unfair prosecution process. "District attorney gets the report, then they pad it up and then you got a bunch of charges against you."

Perpetrators ardently recounted how the system's involvement was destroying their lives. "As far as I'm concerned, they tore my life apart. They tore my marriage apart. And they're not allowing me to save my marriage, which I want and which she wants. They're not allowing it." At times, the men were almost incredulous regarding the degree of involvement the system now had in their lives. One man talked about how his probation officer requires that any woman he date call in and report that she has been made aware of the fact that he has committed the crime of domestic violence. "Does everyone have to ask their PO for permission to get in a relationship with someone? Every time I get a new girlfriend she's supposed to call my PO and say, 'Yeah, I know that he has a domestic violence charge.'" The rest of the group expressed shock and

disdain for this policy, clearly not appreciating why this man's probation officer might want to warn his potential partners of his past violence.

According to the perpetrators I interviewed, the system's heavy involvement in their lives is often against the will of the victim. Perpetrators talked about how victims are being hurt, either because they are unable to release "no contact" orders when they want to or because they are often the ones personally paying for their perpetrators to attend treatment. "There should be something in there that the female could put the restraining order on and she can take the restraining order off. My wife called and called and called. She blew up on my first PO's phone. And then as soon as I got the new PO, she blew her phone up, you know?" Apparently, this man's victim/wife repeatedly contacted his probation officer requesting that the "no contact" order be lifted.

Several men commented on the fact that their victims were actually paying for them to attend treatment. The irony of this situation was not lost on the group. "I have a question here: who is the victim? The state or the person that you victimized? So why is the state getting the money for the victim? Is the victim being helped out here? In my case, the victim is paying for this class. Has been since I started. So how's that helping? …. The victim is paying for the victimizer." It is noteworthy that the men align their "counseling" programs so closely with the criminal justice system that they often do not realize that they are separate entities. In the United States of America, batterer intervention programs are traditionally independent for-profit businesses that do not receive compensation from the state.

Punishment versus rehabilitation. Like officers and batterer intervention providers, perpetrators talked about the challenges of combining punishment and treatment in the effort to change their behavior. They articulated quite clearly their conviction that attitudinal and behavioral change cannot be forced. One participant described the relatively small impact that the criminal justice system (i.e., punishment) has on perpetrators of domestic violence, suggesting that interventions such as "no contact" orders are useless if someone wants to continue committing violent acts. "The 'no contact' comes from the judge, okay? That I don't understand because if I'm gonna go and hurt my wife, then I don't need a 'no contact'. And a 'no contact's' not gonna help anyways… You can tell me no contact all you want, but if I want to kill the bitch, she's dead. See what I'm saying?"

There were so many comments shared about the ineffectiveness or pointlessness of the criminal justice system that at one point I felt compelled to ask, "So you don't think that arrest, probation or jail time would impact or stop someone who has a pattern of domestic violence from doing it again?" "NO!" (According to my co-moderator, 4 or 5 other men also said no and shook their heads "no".) Although clearly in the minority, one group participant shared that for him the criminal justice system did make a difference. "If I wouldn't have had police interaction and me go to jail over the situation, I wouldn't change. I'd still be the same person I was before and I know I'd be divorced. I know that I'd still be the same person who wouldn't have learned about how to be able to control myself and how to deal with, take ownership for my interactions with other people."

Perpetrators overwhelming reported that in their experience, the system is only interested in punishing them rather than rehabilitating them. As an example, perpetrators pointed out that probation officers used to be there to help probationers and now are just focused on punishing them for violations. "Years ago they would help, that's what the probation officer was for, to help. Help you get a job. Now they've got a sign that says, 'I'm not here to help you, I'm here to watch you.'" Another participant agreed, "Yeah, right. [My probation officer told me] 'I'm not here to be your friend. I'm not here to help you. If you mess up, that's what I'm here for.' " "I'm here to catch you [interjected another group member]." The men communicated a distinct sense of victimization, explaining that they are not being encouraged or helped to change their abusive behavior. Instead, they are being excessively and destructively punished. "I think that what they've done has taught me a lesson. Right. Because it's not rehabilitation for me. This is a destruction. I was wrong, yes. Punish me. Does it have to go this far? I think that it's overkill, it's really bad."

I was curious whether this sentiment carried over to their impressions of batterer intervention programs and so I directly asked them if they thought the treatment program was rehabilitative? I was told quite clearly "No". It seems as though a great deal of their resentment towards the group treatment is linked with the fact that they feel it is a punitive and excessive sentence. "I'm being forced to do this and because there's such stiff penalties for this, I spent six months in jail before I even stepped foot in this class. Because I yelled at my wife. Six months in jail because I yelled at my wife. Not a bruise on her. She told the cops I didn't touch her. You would think my punishment was done

after six months in jail. Hell no. So, am I angry? Yeah." The length of the batterer intervention programs was definitely a hot button for many of the men. One man commented that, "We all need skills. And this class does give us some skills, but a lot of us really need [only] a few skills. A lot of us don't need 48 weeks plus three months worth of skills."

In addition to being excessive in length, many perpetrators expressed frustration over the fact that in their opinion the classes are completely useless. "In reality, you do nothing except for sit here for 48 weeks and pay 60 bucks." Not everyone agreed; one participant argued ardently that the classes were tremendously helpful for him. "I don't know what he is talking about. I changed my life since I've been here." Still determined to make his point about the pointless nature of the classes, the original speaker questioned, "Okay, maybe you changed your life, but was it going to jail or was it this class that made you change your life?" The first man responded that going to prison made him realize that he needed to change his life, but the class gave him the tools to change his life.

In the end, the one thing perpetrators seemed to really agree upon was the idea that the system (whether punitive or rehabilitative) could not make them change. "Til you're the one to accept it, then you're not gonna get fixed." Change was something they had to want. "Until you want to make it better for you, not because I almost killed my wife, not because I almost lost my children and everything, but because I care about me [you aren't going to change]." Perpetrators confirmed statements made by officers, victim advocates and victims that it is possible for them to simply go through the motions

of intervention. In order for it to make any difference at all, they had to choose to engage the material, choose to change. "Domestic violence [intervention] is not more successful because deep down you have to want to change your life. And if you're not willing to step up and say, 'okay'. Because I do learn stuff in this class. I learned that I did have thinking problems that caused me to drink. You know? They, and then I went down the wrong road. And so I had to look deep inside myself and say, 'well, do I want to change these things that I now see are in my life?' And if you don't want to change those, you can go through the motions, show up to class, pay your sixty bucks, sit there, take off and come here and not learn crap, go back out and say, 'well, I just wasted my time for 10 months, 15 months and I'm not gonna change anyway.'"

Due to the boundaries of the project, I did not spend a great deal of time trying to discern what might inspire them to change, however they did hint at the idea that a positive therapeutic relationship with their program facilitator can make a difference. Confirming comments made by batterer intervention providers, they discussed the importance of having someone hold a "hopeful" vision of them. "[Facilitator name] makes us feel where I'm important enough to change for my choices. So my choices can be different." One group in particular identified that their facilitator's lack of negative judgment (i.e., vilification) opened them to the process of change. "[Facilitator name] looks at, I think, more from a clinical point. I mean, he's not judgmental. He wants to help you understand why you did this so you can better get a grip on not ever doing it again."

One size fits all. Most perpetrators were outraged by the lack of individual assessment and correspondingly appropriate treatment for domestic violence. The popular opinion was that the punishment (i.e., a 48 week BIP with 3 months of aftercare) was too severe for their crimes. According to the men I interviewed, there might be some men who need 48 weeks of treatment, but they didn't. "48 weeks for a one time mistake is kind of extreme compared to 48 weeks for somebody that beats his wife every week."

It is clear that the men I spoke with believed that an individually tailored response would benefit them. In other words, perpetrators were lobbying for more individuation because they felt it would reduce, as opposed to lengthen, their sentences. They explained that they were suffering the consequences of the system needing to protect itself from the possibility of truly devastating crimes. "I think we all get put into the category. They got a couple of instances where guys came back and ended up killing the person they were with and well, it seems like we are all put into that category."

Perpetrators suggested that it was particularly important to consider the nature of the initial crime they had committed, believing that each person's crime warrants a different response. "I think it'd be the best thing for this program if they looked at everybody's cases and individual cases rather than going, grouping us all into one big group and saying, 'okay, this is the way we're gonna do it.' Each person has a crime, each person has something that they did and they need to go and take each person's case and treat them accordingly. Not everybody deserves to be here for 48 weeks, you know?" They went on to suggest that there is a big difference between someone who is a habitual offender, committing extremely violent crimes, and someone who makes a one-

time mistake. "I think it might be a good idea for the system to put more emphasis on the

indiv[idual], on discerning what's a pattern and what was an isolated thing." One man

recounted his relief and appreciation when his facilitator finally asked him about the

incident that got him arrested, explaining that "There's reasons for that initial action and I

think that would help distinguish the people that are habitual domestic violence and

something that happened at that moment which was wrong. …. I think that would help

by asking that question at least during evaluation to try and determine who is really the

wife beater and then who made a one-time mistake." In addition to frequency of abuse,

perpetrators suggested that the intensity or severity of the abuse should be considered as

well, with more severe crimes leading to lengthier sentences. "I moved mine [my partner]

two inches against her will, but yet we're all treated like we were the guy that took her

out back and kicked her ass."

In critiquing a "one size fits all" approach, perpetrators, like police and probation

officers, were concerned about the ramifications of not taking each individual situation

into consideration, particularly with respect to the issuance of "no contact" orders. "If

you've got someone that's the primary bread-winner, okay? And there's no other

resource for the other half. And they're forced to be separated by a 'no contact' order.

That could cause a huge degree of difficulty. I mean, everybody's situation is different. I

think the idea is that if there's been a battering involved here, well, does she have other

resources." The implied concern here is that uniform issuance of "no contact" orders

might actually cause more harm than good for some victims and that the system should

consider the assets and resources of the individual victim when determining whether to issue a "no contact" order.

Ironically, their frustration over the absence of individually tailored punishment was paired with a slightly lesser frustration that probation officers are arbitrary and inconsistent in their treatment of perpetrators. So, on the one hand they strongly rejected the notion that a consistent response/punishment for perpetrators of domestic violence is appropriate and yet yearned for more consistency from probation officers. "I think they need to go back and make sure that the probation officers have a set rule of guidelines to follow too so that way, there's no fluctuation." Another participant concurred and asked, "Why isn't everything on an even par? Say, your PO is not on the same scale as my PO. My PO allowed me to go back home as soon as I started this class. I didn't even go to one class. Boom. I don't have to go and check in with her. I'm on probation for three years. I've got a felony assault from this, and I don't have to check in with her. So I've got the gravy train with my PO and I'm a felon. He's got a misdemeanor charge and he can't see his children. Why don't PO's have to be accountable and be on the same par and say, 'Okay, you're gonna do for one, do for all.'" One participant suggested that this type of inconsistency was evident in the courtroom as well. "I've seen variable different types of justice served to different people in the courtrooms."

It is interesting to note that perpetrators shared the concerns of police and probation officers about the challenges of a uniform response, both in terms of lack of individuation for perpetrators and what it can mean for victims when "no contact" orders are issued without consideration of the financial impact on the victim and they resonated

with the concerns articulated by victim advocates and victims about the inconsistency that can occur with probation officers and in the courts.

Victim Blaming. Perpetrators clearly felt as though their victims were partly if not equally responsible for the abuse and that they should also be mandated to receive treatment. "Only half the problem is getting solved with only one of the domestic violence partners getting treatment." "Absolutely!" chimed in another perpetrator. A third offered, "Maybe the girl didn't beat up the guy, but she still needs to go to some kind of class to understand what happened. Otherwise only half the problem is getting solved." For some, it was as simple as the fact that it takes two people to fight and while they might need some intervention/counseling for their role in the fight, the other person needs help too. "There was two people in the argument and domestic violence, okay. I'm gonna have to go through the 43, 48, you know, but it took two people to fight, and the other person obviously needs a little counseling too." Some perpetrators expressed confusion over the fact that they were being asked to focus on their bad behavior or bad choices, but there was no attention paid to what their intimate partner might have done. "I still feel a little bit uncomfortable or frustrated when I come to the classes because I feel like our teachers or instructors have the tendency to dismiss the behavior of the other person, the bad behavior. I understand that my bad behavior or somebody's bad behavior doesn't justify my actions. I understand that completely, but I also, I don't know. It seems to me that the bad behavior of the other person should be taken into consideration, you know?" For others, it is a matter of prevention. If their partners are made aware of acceptable versus unacceptable behavior, then they may be less likely to endure future

abuse. "I think the point is, I almost killed my wife. She was offered help, but never received it. I mean, she didn't take it. If I quit coming to these classes ever in my life, then I'm gonna use everything I learned here to abuse her again in the future. And if she's not educated also and made to educate, because oftentimes our wives tend to do is get back on our side. We're back with them. They're back on our side, trying to just pretend like it never happened. So I think the education and stuff needs to go both ways. It's not necessarily even in a disciplinary fashion, but in a forced hand. Because often time we don't know what's good for ourselves." This particular perpetrator's comments bear a close resemblance to the concerns expressed by police and probation officers, as well as batterer intervention providers, with respect to encouraging victims to receive educational counseling so that they can avoid or avert abuse in the future.

In summary, perpetrators of domestic violence were skeptical of the value of a punishment based system for intervening with their abusive behavior. Despite the fact that their overwhelming critique of domestic violence intervention is that the response is excessive, most also suggested that criminal justice sanctions are not sufficiently prohibitive. In other words, if someone wants to hurt his intimate partner, the threat of arrest or a probation violation (i.e., violating a "no contact" order) would not stop him. Almost universally they suggested that perpetrators have to want to change and that for most men, neither arrest nor intervention programs can make one want to change. Perpetrators were particularly frustrated with the fact that the system appears to have a "one size fits all" approach to sentencing and treatment, despite the fact that their individual histories and crimes vary tremendously. They argued that habitual and or

extremely violent offenders deserve a more intense response from the criminal justice system than someone who commits a one-time mistake or a minor crime. Ironically, while most perpetrators expressed a desire for a more differentiated response, a few expressed annoyances with the lack of consistency they witness in the courts and by probation officers. Finally, perpetrators suggested that responding only to them, as opposed to providing intervention services for their intimate partners as well, is misguided because "it takes two people to fight".

Summary Research Question Two

In general, key stakeholders in the domestic violence intervention system agreed with each other regarding the challenges to effectiveness faced by the system, primarily citing insufficient accountability and ineffective treatment, confusion and tension between the goals of punishment and rehabilitation, absence of an individually tailored response, and lack of a victim-centered response, signaled, in part, by rampant victim blaming.

Not surprisingly, perpetrators were the only ones who did not suggest that insufficient accountability was to blame for limited effectiveness; in fact they insisted that the system holds them too accountable. However for the majority of stakeholders queried, the current system is not adequately holding perpetrators accountable for their abuse. They are not arrested often enough, jailed for sufficiently long periods of time, prosecuted consistently and effectively, or forced to participate in effective batterer intervention for long enough periods of time. Interestingly, for some stakeholders these "accountability" limitations were described in tandem with their concerns that criminal

justice system sanctions or "punishments" are limited because they are not rehabilitative. In other words, not only is the system not adequately interrupting domestic violence, but it is not succeeding in preventing future abuse because perpetrators are not being rehabilitated. Officers, providers and perpetrators were particularly articulate about the limitations of coercing men to change. According to these stakeholders, coercion may lead to a short term interruption in abusive behavior; however, lasting attitudinal changes require compassion, hope, internal motivation and effective therapy.

Paralleling the conversation regarding the need to balance punishment and rehabilitation for perpetrators, stakeholders expressed equal anxiety about the domination of the "one size fits all" approach to criminal justice sanctions and batterer intervention programs. Officers and perpetrators were clear that the same administration of punishment and treatment may not be well suited for each individual abuser and asserted that better assessment of the individuals involved and the incident/relationship context might enable a more specific and effective response. Victims and advocates were also concerned about the prevalence of a "one size fits all" approach to perpetrators and, resonating in some ways with the concerns of perpetrators, expressed frustration with what they perceived to be both a lack of consistency within the criminal justice system and the fact that sanctions do not appear to correspond to the seriousness of the threat.

Finally, each stakeholder group discussed the fact that current strategies are not sufficiently victim-centered. For officers, advocates, victims, and providers this absence primarily manifests itself in rampant victim blaming and the inappropriate allocation of responsibility for the abuse and for intervening in the abuse on the shoulders of victims.

Victims and advocates were particularly incensed about the poor treatment that victims

receive at the hands of the criminal justice system and the DHS: Child Welfare, noting

that they are not sufficiently conferred with or communicated with throughout the

process. Almost every stakeholder group lamented the fact that current strategies do not

provide victims with the necessary resources (i.e., housing, childcare, employment) to

make safer choices for themselves and their children and noted that this dearth of

resources is particularly problematic given the fact that many of the accountability and

containment strategies for perpetrators exacerbate the financial burden on victims and

subsequently place them in an untenable position of deciding between their physical

safety and their financial security. Despite these concerns and observations, officers,

advocates and providers in some ways reinforced victim blaming within the field by

failing to identify or strategize about what else could be done with abusive men and went

as far as to tentatively agree with perpetrators who suggested that victims could benefit

from education and treatment.

Research Question Three:

How do key Portland Coordinated Community Response stakeholders make sense

of any discrepancies between theorized antecedents for men's domestic violence and

the current intervention strategies?

As posed, this question was extremely difficult for participants to answer. The

question asked stakeholders to hold in their minds two abstract concepts (theorized

antecedents for men's violence as well as current intervention strategies) and then not

only talk about the gaps or discrepancies they observed between them, but make sense or

explain those discrepancies. Only a few participants offered direct responses to this question. Police and probation officers, victim advocates and batterer intervention providers attempted to answer the question as it was posed, though even these groups were more apt to identify and describe rather than explain and discuss the gaps. Subsequently, in order to discern how stakeholders made sense of any discrepancies between theorized antecedents for men's domestic violence and current intervention strategies, I found myself taking material provided in response to one question and juxtaposing it with material provided in later sections. In other words, stakeholders would talk about the most widely endorsed explanations for men's domestic violence against women in response to discussion guide question #1 and then when responding to discussion guide question #3, they would often indicate that part of the problem with current strategies is that they are not responding to all aspects of the defined problem (i.e., a gap exists).

As explained in Chapter Four, focus group discussions are rarely linear and I was not interested in trying to force participants to speak about the material in a sequential order as dictated by my discussion guide. I preferred to allow the conversation to flow among the participants, often gravitating towards the subjects that most interested the participants. Obviously, I tried to cover all of the topics on my discussion guide with each focus group; however, they were often addressed "out of order" in an effort to maintain the conversational nature of the data collection method. This was particularly the case for research questions three and four, both of which required significant abstraction and therefore were often initially deflected. As mentioned previously, I chose

to not even pose discussion guide questions 4 and 5 in the second perpetrator group and in either of the victim/survivor groups after witnessing the frustration and confusion it created in the first perpetrator group. I felt it was imperative that the stakeholders remain empowered as informants and I quickly discerned that these particular questions proved disconcerting for the "non-professional" groups. So for these groups in particular, I drew upon material that they provided in response to other questions.

In general, there was some agreement among participants about the gaps between theorized antecedents for men's domestic violence and current intervention strategies, though diverse responses were offered by each group. All three professional groups identified discrepancies between individualized intervention efforts and the social "causes" of domestic violence, suggesting that a greater emphasis on prevention and social change is necessary. Police and probation officers, victim advocates and victims also noted that while the reasons any particular man might be abusive or violent are diverse, current intervention strategies are not necessarily responsive to this diversity. Victim advocates and victims went on to speak passionately about the fact that the system appears to hold victims accountable for the abuse they experience rather than holding their perpetrators accountable for the abuse they perpetrate and noted with great dismay that victims are not provided with sufficient resources in order to make safer choices for themselves and their children. Batterer intervention providers talked primarily about the challenges inherent in employing the criminal justice system to respond to perpetrators, suggesting that the consequences it can implement may not be perceived by their clients as sufficient deterrents. Perpetrators were adamant that ignoring the abusive or

problematic actions of their victim constitutes a major gap, relayed that for them

domestic violence was not a pre-meditated choice, but rather an impulsive, uncontrolled

behavior. Additionally, perpetrators suggested that the current strategies for intervening

with abusive men are counterproductive as they increase, as opposed to decrease feelings

of anger, potentially leading to more domestic violence.

Police and Probation Officers

Police and probation officers articulated a couple of distinct discrepancies

between theorized antecedents for men's domestic violence and current intervention

strategies. Specifically, they discussed the fact that given the multiple antecedents for

men's violence, current strategies are insufficient to address the diverse, individualized,

and often life-long issues that "cause" a man to be intimately violent. "I don't think we

are a one-stop shop for everybody. I think each situation is individual in itself and may

need something different." Additionally, they noted that, "It seems like we send people to

batterers' intervention every day. It's what we do. And they can go, but I mean, it's sort

of a learned behavior from childhood. A lot of times they've witnessed it, they've seen

it, they've experienced it, and we can send them once, and I just think sometimes that's

just not enough because they really have to approach, change their whole way of being."

In other words, officers suggested a gap exists between the diverse antecedents for men's

violence and the somewhat uniform criminal justice/batterer intervention response.

Specifically, they suggested that there is a gap between a pattern of behavior that may

take a lifetime to form and an intervention strategy that usually involves 2 hours a week

for 48 weeks.

Probation officers likened domestic violence to alcohol abuse and noted regretfully that the same level of service or treatment offered to alcoholics is not offered to perpetrators of domestic violence. "So people who have an issue with alcohol, if it's a severe issue, which I would certainly call domestic violence a pretty severe issue for our country, people with an alcohol issue, if they're wanting to get help, can seek an in-patient program for X number of days and really work through changing thinking… There isn't any program, I think, that is sufficient enough or, or time intensive enough to make a change in thinking that might then change behavior. And I don't know of anything like that, that might result in a different outcome, long-term, for the batterer."

Several police and probation officers talked about the currently insufficient focus on prevention and children as a disturbing gap or discrepancy. "I don't think there's any education at all for domestic violence in the schools, or even sexual violence. Kids grow up and they see their father, you know, abusing and controlling their mother, and they think it's normal. That's where it, I mean, like I said, it comes from that. And there's none of that in the schools at all. And, you know, that's a big gap." Officers talked about the benefits of starting programs as early as pre-school and continuing throughout elementary school. "I don't know how much kids actually get at this point, but at least they're hearing the same message over and over from the time they're really little. Maybe it will impact later." In addition to proposing primary preventative education programs for all children beginning in pre-school in order to address the gap they perceive between the root causes of domestic violence and current intervention efforts, officers expressed concern over the insufficient services provided to children who have

witnessed domestic violence. Officers talked about the need to intentionally intervene with these children if we want to break the cycle of violence. "It seems like really to intervene, it might have to be done, with those kids that are witnessing it and kind of, just control the adults and work with the kids."

Victim Advocates

Victim advocates identified some of the same gaps or discrepancies between theorized antecedents for men's violence towards women and dominant intervention strategies as the police and probation officers. For example, they noted that while familial, community and societal forces are recognized as contributing to domestic violence, current intervention efforts tend to primarily focus on individuals. "I just think there needs to be a continuum, like the public health model. Where it has the individual level, but there is also the relationship level, the community level, the societal level. We might be doing a 'fine' job, maybe, maybe on an individual level, but those other areas, I just don't see, I just don't see very much happening." Victim advocates also noted a lack of preventative efforts. "We're not focusing on the bigger issues. Like even as advocates we're responding to women's crisis, and it just feels overwhelming to try and address those bigger things. There isn't a lot of funding for domestic violence, so it just feels like we're doing what we can by responding to these immediate things, but it's not probably helping the overall issue. Like, it's not prevention." Finally, they noted that insufficient attention is currently being paid to intervening in the cycle of violence by working more directly with children who have witnessed abuse. "The children of those men that were battering them, they're the batterers now. So I think we need to look at everybody. We

need to look at the children, the women and the men because otherwise it's going to

continue. Because the kids are always left over here, so this child over here is the abuser

in 20 years, you know?"

By far, the most significant discrepancy discussed by victim advocates was the

fact that although most theorized antecedents for domestic violence involve the

perpetrator, much of the responsibility for stopping the abuse within the current system

appears to be placed on the shoulders of victims. "I think that the system is depending a

lot on survivors to hold abusive men accountable. I mean, again, that's just another way

that instead of focusing on the abusive men, we're focusing on the women." On the most

basic level, "we aren't able to make him leave and stay away, so our efforts always have

to be on supporting her leaving." Advocates lamented that it is not enough for a victim to

leave. If she wants justice and or safety, she has to actively participate in holding her

perpetrator accountable. They then spoke about how the criminal justice system depends

on their participation despite how terrifying it can be for victims to go to court and face

their abusers.

Advocates noted that not only are victims targeted inappropriately by the criminal

justice system, but also that they are inappropriately targeted by the Department of

Human Services: Child Welfare. "We have a case right now where there's abuse going

on and the mom was a victim, the child was a victim. The child was removed and then

she [sic: the victim] has to do a bunch of hoops, hoop jumping to get her child back. But

she wasn't the abuser. She's not the abuser, she wasn't the abuser, but she, you know,

she can see her child once a week. She has to pay because she let it happen and because

she didn't call the police and because she didn't do this. Not that *he* hurt the child. Not that *he* didn't call the police. So nothing about him. It's all, again, put on her."

Advocates were incensed over the fact that the system holds victims accountable for leaving, for prosecuting, for staying away, and for protecting their children, and yet the critical resources needed to do any of these things are not available to survivors. They reminded me that if we theorize that women often stay in abusive relationships out of financial necessity, then greater financial resources need to be made available if we expect them to leave, prosecute, and protect their children. The fact that they are not available is a gap that many victims simply cannot overcome. "I feel like the biggest thing that I'm seeing right now, with the victims I work with, is financial stuff. I mean they need housing. They need somebody to help pay their child care. They need somebody to help them raise their kids because their partner is gone. And I feel like for survivors, that's the biggest gap I see is the lack of resources and poverty. I've had a number of women say flat out, 'the reason I'll go back, I'll tell you right now, is because he's gonna help me pay my rent and he's gonna help me take care of the kids.'"

Advocates in both focus groups offered a suggestion for improving current intervention strategies that alludes to an interesting discrepancy. If patriarchy and societal pressures, norms, and values linked with patriarchy are implicated in men's domestic violence against women, they suggested that perhaps it is a mistake to put perpetrators with other similarly influenced men. "I don't see how he can be changed [in batterer intervention groups] because he don't feel like he is minority there. … When he sit[s] in a group of men like he is, the same, all of them have the same opinion[s]. Maybe

they don't show it to facilitator, but they do think the same way. And when he talks, he

feels like a hero. I don't think that groups like this can change him." As described earlier

in response to what limits the effectiveness of domestic violence intervention with

abusive men, advocates found it disturbing and problematic that perpetrators meet with

other like-minded individuals as part of the current intervention strategy. Instead, they

feet as though perpetrators might be more apt to change if they participated in groups of

men who were not abusive. Perhaps without the subversive agreement from fellow

batterers about his victim's role in the violence, perpetrators would be more motivated to

change.

Victims/Survivors

The question of making sense of discrepancies between theorized antecedents for

men's domestic violence and current intervention strategies was not directly asked of

victims. Even so, it was evident in their comments that they perceived several

discrepancies. In particular, they echoed comments made by their advocates and

expressed rage, frustration, and disbelief over the responsibility placed on them by other

stakeholders in the system for the abuse they have suffered and for intervening in the

abuse. "It's our responsibility to make it better. The victim is responsible for making it

better." Their frustration did not stem merely from the discrepancy that if men are

responsible for their abusive behavior then logically intervention strategies should target

men more directly, but also from their experiences of being re-victimized by the very

system that proclaims to be protecting them from victimization. "It's kind of like the

abuse starts over again because in an abusive relationship, you're held accountable for

every action that your abuser takes upon you. And it's almost like, with everything that they make us do, that accountability is still on us, because we have to go through all the hoops. What are the guys having to do? They're not made accountable for what they do, but we're made accountable for what we endure." Victims felt violated by current intervention strategies, particularly when it seems as though their abusers are off the hook. "They don't dwell up[sic] the abuser's past. They dwell up our past. They dwell up our childhood. They dwell up what we went through in our lives and what made us choose an abuser. But they don't dwell up the man's past, his whole life history."

Victims' sense of being inappropriately targeted by intervention strategies was particularly acute with respect to the Department of Human Services: Child Welfare. Echoing concerns described by advocates, victims repeatedly discussed being punished by DHS for crimes that their perpetrators committed. "What about a double jeopardy law for victims? We pay for this shit every day. Repeatedly. We are tried and convicted daily. Especially for our kids. We have to pay for it. They don't. You know? We're the ones that have to work our asses off just to get our kids back."

It was interesting to me that victims/survivors shared advocates' concerns about the wisdom of placing perpetrators together in a room with other perpetrators for treatment or intervention. As described earlier, victims questioned this feature of batterer intervention, suggesting that they learn from one another how to be better, more skilled and manipulative perpetrators. Some felt that it might be more effective to surround them with men who do not share their attitudes and values. "They need to be in a place where they're around guys that don't do it and learn something from them." The gap or

discrepancy implied by this critique is that domestic violence is a behavior that is learned or emulated. Subsequently, it may be misguided to place perpetrators of domestic violence together with other perpetrators in the hopes of intervening in their abuse.

Finally, victims and survivors briefly echoed comments made by police and probation officers that each abuser is unique and that perhaps current interventions should recognize and more appropriately respond to this diversity. "Each of my batterers were [sic] different. Completely 100 percent different."

Batterer Intervention Providers

Batterer intervention providers expanded on several of the discrepancies between theorized antecedents for men's domestic violence and current intervention strategies discussed by officers and advocates. Echoing concerns expressed by advocates, they noted that despite wide-spread recognition of the role that Patriarchy plays in domestic violence, current intervention strategies are doing little to directly influence societal attitudes about male and female gender roles or male privilege. One provider offered this thoughtful reflection, which, based on the vigorous head nodding that followed, appeared to resonate with other members of the focus group. "I think changing societal attitudes about male gender roles and female gender roles is a big part of the solution, and I don't know what we're actively doing about that. I mean, I think there's been a shift, and gender roles have become much less rigid and much less traditional, and there's been more support for equality between women and men over the last 40 years or so. And that's all good, but what are we actively doing to promote that? I really can't put my finger on anything, so that's where I would see the gap."

In trying to explain this lack of attention or focus on social change, providers suggested that it was an issue of assigning resources, particularly in a field where you often have to choose between responding to an immediate and dangerous crisis and taking micro-steps towards changing the larger society. "There could definitely be more done on the prevention side of things… how we raise our children and what society looks like. You know that social change piece often gets lost in the desire to address the immediate crises that are going on right now." Some suggested that it simply was not lucrative to focus on prevention and social change. "For providers, it's a financial expense to do prevention work. It does not generate any immediate income and so I think that it's easy for providers to simply do the work directly that they're getting paid for, which is the work with abusive men, and to do relatively little preventive work or other kind of community outreach work because it doesn't immediately generate income." Others suggested that it was not merely an issue of resources, but also an issue of priorities. "I think in general our culture isn't big into prevention because there aren't immediate rewards. So I think that's an issue on a broader level. There's no immediate benefit to educating teens about dating violence. There's delayed benefit, but when you've got to prioritize, that gets pushed off to the side."

Supporting the notion that social change efforts lag behind the current need, batterer intervention providers overwhelmingly agreed with police/probation officers and victim advocates that current prevention efforts are insufficient. They argued that if we theorize that abusive men are primarily responsible for domestic violence, then it makes sense to directly target boys and men with prevention information. Unfortunately,

providers reported encountering challenges when trying to do prevention work with boys and men. One provider talked about how she was actively discouraged from working with men by the Department of Human Services: Child Welfare. "I tried to suggest to DHS that we needed to do therapy with men, but that was a 'no-no'."

In trying to explain why prevention efforts lag behind the need, providers talked about how educating the community about domestic violence can often ruffle feathers and make men, in particular, uncomfortable. "If you attempt to water down the male privilege with teaching them to be sensitive or teaching them to be aware of the other forms of abuse, rather than the physical abuse, you are really gonna impact their ego. And once you attack someone's ego, it's not going to be acceptable." Providers lamented about how challenging it can be to get men and boys to embrace the idea that male privilege is partially responsible for domestic violence and that they may be unwittingly colluding in a system that is at least partially to blame for the victimization of countless women and girls.

Moving beyond the discussion of prevention and social change, several providers hinted that the currently heavy dependence on the criminal justice system to intervene in men's violence towards women inadvertently creates discrepancies. Some suggested it was simply an insufficient response in light of the population we are trying to reach. "We're looking at a crime where it's basically an inability to regulate or monitor feelings effectively. These people are gonna be the least likely ones to actually be able to think about, 'Gee, I might be punished for this.'" Other providers went on to suggest that the threat of criminal justice sanctions may not only fail due to undeveloped reasoning skills,

but also due to the positive allure the prison system may hold. "It's a very difficult population to try and get to turn a corner. The culture that some of them, that come in actually could see going to jail as a good mark on their record amongst their friends, and where do you go with that?" In other words, the threat of criminal justice sanctions may not be seen by some perpetrators as a negative consequence.

Additionally, providers noted that domestic violence constitutes an array of behaviors that come together in a pattern of power and control, most of which are not illegal. Subsequently, over reliance on the criminal justice system to intervene necessitates that much domestic violence goes unchecked. "There's been an excess of focus on physical abuse as a primary type of violence, when in fact, really the vast majority of domestic violence, in my opinion, is non-physical abuse. And, I think that we lose a tremendous number of the people who are being affected as we focus on the more striking and extreme examples. We're focusing way too much on the criminal justice system as the intervention. Because, again, when you move away from the physical abuse, you move away from the illegal abuse. Emotional abuse is much more widespread and it's probably not going to be very easy to pass laws against it."

Perpetrators

Across the board, perpetrators in the first focus group did not answer the question as phrased and I did not ask it directly in the second group. Both groups did however offer several distinct concerns about current intervention that speak effectively to discrepancies between theorized antecedents for men's domestic violence and current intervention strategies. Perpetrators identified at least three disconnects between how

they understand the causes of domestic violence and current intervention. First and

foremost, many of the perpetrators suggested that domestic violence is transactional (i.e.,

it takes two people to fight) and yet they feel as though the intervention focuses solely on

the role of the perpetrator of the physical violence. They expressed concern that if the

behavior of both parties is not addressed, the pattern is likely to continue in future

relationships. "Evaluate both people. Sit down here in different classes. You were the

one that hit, but you just didn't walk up to her all, 'oh honey, I love you' and hit her, you

know? It isn't like she did something that she deserved to be hit by, because you don't

deserve that, but it takes two people to fight and the next relationship that she's gonna go

into, she may repeat the same things."

Perpetrators also expressed frustration about the disconnect between the

assumption that domestic violence is a pre-meditated planned, controlled behavior and

their experience of NOT wanting to have hurt their partner, not wanting to have ruined

their lives. "I mean, last thing I want to do is, you know, choke the woman of my dreams

and, you know, cancel the wedding and everything. And I think that's probably the way

that everyone feels. Or most people feel. I mean, why do you want to hurt the one you

love, and all of a sudden it happens."

Finally, they suggested that it was ironic that the intervention for domestic

violence actually produces feelings of anger, powerlessness, and frustration – all feelings

that they linked with a greater, not lesser, likelihood of domestic violence. "It's, it's just

crazy that we're sitting here now and you know, people that didn't do it are accused of

doing it, and they're having to go through hell for it. That will cause hurt feelings. That

will cause anger. And yet, we're sitting here told to deal with what we did as 'be calm,

be peaceful, think of happy things'."

Summary Research Question Three

Despite the fact that as originally phrased this question was challenging for some

of the stakeholders, all of the groups identified gaps and discrepancies between current

intervention strategies and theorized antecedents of men's domestic violence. While

there were important overlaps in the responses provided by each group, specifically the

fact that officers, advocates and providers appeared to agree on the need for greater

prevention and social change efforts in order for our intervention efforts to align more

directly with our theories about what causes domestic violence, several noteworthy

distinctions emerged. Police and probation officers talked about the fact that the current

response does not adequately accommodate the diverse reasons that men are abusive.

Victims and victim advocates talked with anguish about their perception that victims are

held responsible or accountable for the violence they endure, and for stopping or

intervening in the violence. They also questioned the wisdom of placing abusive men

together during treatment as opposed to surrounding them with men who do not share

their abusive beliefs and attitudes. Batterer intervention providers talked about the

dangers inherent in relying so heavily on the criminal justice system to intervene with

abusive men given that this system holds appeal for some boys/men and the fact that

most acts of domestic violence are not crimes, thereby leaving much abuse ignored.

Perpetrators, standing in striking contrast to advocates and victims, suggested that their

partners are ignored by the system with respect to culpability and that this strategy is

discrepant with their interpretation of the antecedents of domestic violence. Finally,

perpetrators noted that their experiences of violence are dissonant with theories

suggesting that their abuse is premeditated and then mused that the current intervention

system seems to work at cross purposes in that it inspires them to feel angry, as opposed

to calm and in control of their emotions and actions.

Research Question Four:

How do key Portland Coordinate Community Response stakeholders make sense of any

discrepancies between the Duluth model of coordinated community response and

current intervention strategies for domestically abusive men?

Each stakeholder group was asked to make sense of or explain any differences

between their understanding of an ideal Duluth Coordinated Community Response

(CCR) to domestic violence and their perceptions of the CCR within the Portland Tri-

County area. I asked this question towards the end of each focus group discussion, after

participants had spent time identifying limitations of the current system. Therefore

participants in most groups were able to successfully move beyond pure description of

discrepancies and speculate about why differences existed. Of course, in many cases, the

description of the discrepancy and the explanation for why an ideal model has not yet

been achieved were one and the same. For example, if stakeholders identified a lack of

financial resources for victims as a shortcoming of the CCR in the Portland Tri-County

area, this lack is both a description of the discrepancy and a potential explanation for why

a more ideal model is not operating. It is important to note that while the professional

stakeholder groups were able to answer this question without further explanation of CCR,

the victim and perpetrator focus groups were unfamiliar with the term and frequently

asked me to define or explain what it meant. I answered in the most general terms,

usually saying something to the effect of, "A coordinated community response is the idea

that the entire community should work together to protect victims and hold perpetrators

accountable. It is the idea that police, probation, batterer intervention programs, victim

advocates, DHS, and the courts should be working together in order to best intervene in

domestic violence." Even with my description, victims and perpetrators were still

relatively unresponsive to the discrepancy portion of this question.   Fortunately, as with

Research Question Three, they were so forthcoming about concerns with the current

system that some of their responses speak directly to the issue of a gap or discrepancy

between what is traditionally idealized for the CCR and what they experience. It is these

comments that I have drawn upon for my analysis.

While each stakeholder group identified unique gaps or discrepancies, there were

some common observations and explanations offered across the groups. In trying to

make sense of why an idealized system for coordinating agencies and resources in the

intervention of domestic violence is not currently achieved, stakeholders identified a

shortage of financial resources, the fact that policies and procedures are implemented by

people, not systems, and therefore are subject to human variance in application, and

finally that the groups or organizations that are supposed to be working together approach

domestic violence from different perspectives and vantage points and that sometimes

these differences spawn mistrust and miscommunication.

Police and Probation Officers

When asked to explain or make sense of any gaps they experience between the

Duluth model CCR and the one they work within on a daily basis, police and probation

officers focused on three primary areas: the challenges that are inherent to successfully

intervening in domestic violence due to its complexity, the strain created by insufficient

financial resources (both for clients and for police and probation departments), and the

difficulties that exist when organizations who approach the problem of domestic violence

from different perspectives attempt to come together and collaborate.

Complex domestic violence dynamics. More than any other stakeholder group,

police and probation officers discussed the impact domestic violence dynamics have on

their ability to successfully carry out their responsibilities within the coordinated

community response, resulting in a gap between what they idealize for a CCR and what is

currently achievable. Specifically, they discussed the challenges that complex domestic

violence dynamics pose on making appropriate arrests, remaining compassionate and

understanding about the cycle of violence while working with victims, and navigating the

murky waters of "no contact" orders.

Officers talked about the unique difficulties police face attempting to determine

what infractions, if any, have occurred when they respond to domestic violence calls. A

probation officer offered the following description of the difficulties police encounter that

make it challenging for them to uphold their role in the coordinated community response.

"I know from speaking to some friends in law enforcement, it's very difficult to make a

decision on DV. Because you get a call, there's you know, a noise complaint at the

neighbor's house or whatever and they go there. Victim is crying, they're both drunk, there's no marks on her at all. He'd look her up and down. 'Do you have any marks?' 'No, no, but he, slammed me against the wall and did this and that,' and he says, 'I don't know what you're talking about. She's drunk and she's making things up.' What do you do? Do you make an arrest based on what she's saying? She's intoxicated, you know? He's on the other saying, 'I wasn't even here. I was down the street.' The guy down the street says, 'Yeah, he was at my house.' It's difficult for a police officer to make, unless there are marks on her body to where it is kind of a no brainer to where she's got a black eye, you know. It's sometimes not as clear cut as it may seem. I mean, the woman can be victimized all day long, every day, but you know, these batterers are not stupid. They're gonna do it in a way that there's no, there's no marks." As evidenced by this quote, not only do police officers sometimes struggle to untangle what actually transpired when they arrive at the scene of an alleged domestic violence incident, but they struggle knowing that sometimes when they are unable to make an arrest, it is because they are being manipulated by a perpetrator.

Police and probation officers also talked quite a bit about their struggle to remain understanding and supportive in the face of exigent interactions. "I honestly don't know how the police do it. Because I know a lot of them go to calls for me, to help with my people, night after night, and it's the same residence and they're getting the same story and the same run around. And I know that's just part of the whole domestic violence thing, but it's hard to remember that sometimes because you get frustrated. And I can only imagine how frustrating it must be to actually be doing the work out there when

people's emotions are really high. It must be frustrating to be out there night after night, alone with emotions being that high and not getting the cooperation that you want, or someone saying that you're lying." Officers acknowledged the cyclical course of domestic violence and appeared aware of the reasons why they might be "getting the run around" or why a victim might appear to be uncooperative, but this awareness seemed to only partially mitigate their frustration. "Everybody gets frustrated and even in advanced academy, we try to reiterate and deal with the frustrations and talk about barriers a lot just to try and refocus on 'okay, this is why this person is going back or not cooperating or changing their story'".

It seemed to especially upset officers when their integrity or honesty was questioned; for example when victims insinuate that a police officer lied on a report. "I can give a prime example just from a case recently that we were involved in. There was a police report that said, you know, X, Y and Z happened and then the police officer went back and the victim said, 'no, the police officer lied in that report. That didn't happen.' That basically the police officer made it up. The police officer got very upset because the victim was insinuating that the officer lied, when we obviously know that's not the case." Adding to their frustration is the fact that when victims change their minds or accuse police officers of lying, the district attorney is often unable to prosecute. "Often, we'll have a victim for, on our side, helping us with prosecution for about 24 hours and then after that the story is like the police lied or we can't find him or they've changed their mind or.. and then it's hard for the DA's office to, unless it's a super great case, it pretty much is out the window." For police officers, knowing that their efforts might be futile

appears to increase their frustration, and may in some cases impact their implementation

of arrest, thereby hindering achievement of an ideal coordinated community response.

       With respect to both knowledge and understanding of domestic violence

dynamics, as well as degree of frustration with the trying aspects of working with

domestic violence victims and perpetrators, officers identified a great deal of variance

among their co-workers. They suggested that while on the one hand things are improving,

"I think we've noticed in the last few years that the people coming through seem a lot

more educated about domestic violence", participants assured me that there will always

be some officers who struggle to be compassionate with victims/survivors and

appropriate in their interpretation of the laws. The officers I spoke with were clear that

this variance negatively impacts the community's ability to achieve successful

coordination of accountability. "With so many deputies in the country and police officers

in the country, there's that bell-shaped curve where you still have people who haven't,

officers who haven't, who don't get it." The real issue appears to be when officers who

"don't get it" are in positions of power and are able to taint their underlings. "The issue

comes when you have new people who have gone through the training and can speak the

language and then they hit the street and you've got coaches that, you know, 'god, I been

here every day for the last ten years and I'm just sick of it, you know?'" Apparently, this

type of informal training or indoctrination regarding the challenges of working domestic

violence cases can negate the impact of more formalized domestic violence education and

training, a key component of the Duluth model of coordinated community response.

Police and probation officers talked at length about how the complexity of domestic violence makes it particularly difficult to use a standardized practice with each situation, particularly when the strategy involves separating victims and perpetrators through the use of "no contact" orders. Because domestic violence involves an intimate personal relationship, as opposed to a bar fight, it is often much more difficult to separate the parties involved. In discussing how victims feel about "no contact" orders, officers reported that, "they want to be safe, and that's all good, but they also want this person that they love fixed. It's hard to keep people apart, so sometimes we just have to try to keep them safe while they're together." Others concurred with the futility of trying to keep two people apart that want (for whatever reason) to be together. "I think people are going to be, want to be together, it's gonna be hard to stop them unless you lock one of them up. And then they still contact each other, so I really don't know what you do. Sort of the reality of our world is if people want to be together, they're gonna be together and even if I have them on electronic monitoring with the GPS device, it seems they can get around it." Probation officers seemed quite clear that victims' desire to have contact with perpetrators makes it difficult for them to enforce and implement their responsibility within the coordinated community response. They may be charged with enforcing the "no contact" order, but if victims, not to mention perpetrators, are going to find ways to undermine the program, it makes successfully fulfilling their role challenging at best.

This is not to say that probation officers were "pro-contact". In fact, probation officers talked with great consternation about the tremendous strain and responsibility they feel when faced with making decisions about the appropriateness of contact. "There

is nothing that I encounter in doing this job that is fraught with more anxiety and stress

than the re-questioning, re-evaluating, re-questioning, getting feedback, staffing, then that

issue of allowing either a person to return home or just to allow them to meet in public. I

mean, it is a huge liability. I mean there is the institutional liability and all the civil, legal

liabilities. I think about that stuff so much less than I think about how I would feel

personally if, because I said, 'John, you can go home to live with Susie,' that something

horrific would happen. It's a huge responsibility. And often times in the midst of it I

think, 'Screw it, I'm never doing this again.'" For this particular probation officer, the

stress of navigating the terrain of whether or not it is safe to advocate for or support

releasing a "no contact" order is so great that it negates any potential value to his client.

In other words, this particular officer would prefer to allow the "no contact" order to

stand, despite any hardships it created, rather than assume the responsibility if something

were to go wrong.

Money. According to police and probation officers, the issue of contact or no-

contact is significantly impacted by the lack of sufficient resources for both victims and

perpetrators. "Funding is always a big issue. Funding for women so that they can be

independent, you know? Because that's a big issue with the whole scheme of domestic

violence is the woman a lot of times 'that's why they stay' it's, they stay and they call

you and they call me, and as the PO, trying to get me to drop the order because they want

the man back home. Don't matter how much violence is in the home because 'they pay

the bills'." Officers were clear that their role in the system, to achieve separation and

perpetrator accountability, is complicated by the fact that victims often need resources

that their perpetrators can provide. Separation may stop the violence, but it often creates other victimization experiences for the survivor such as not having enough money for food and rent. The fact that the coordinated community response is not currently able to provide victims with sufficient resources to live without their batterers translates into less than idealized implementation of the coordinated response.

Officers explained that insufficient resources are not only an impediment to achieving safety for victims, but are a barrier for many men who often do not have sufficient resources to pay for treatment or for housing. "They don't have the money to pay for treatments, so they don't go and then they get arrested and back to court and, you know? As probation officers, we try to provide as much assistance as we can, but the fact of the matter is that in an ideal world, we'd have a place for them to stay. We have some places for people to stay, but not everybody."

The identification of insufficient resources to explain the discrepancy between an idealized coordinated community response and the current response was greeted with great enthusiasm, particularly with respect to the impact it has on their ability to monitor or supervise domestic violence cases. "Well, we can't, definitely, follow up on all the cases that come through just because of person power. Budget cuts and all that." When I asked what specifically that meant in terms of what types of cases they did not follow-up with, an animated conversation erupted. A police officer explained, "All the incidents that come through and all the non-arrests that come through that there could be PC [probable cause] for that we just don't have the people to go out and make the arrests." A probation officer jumped in and agreed. "That would be the same on our side. We don't

even supervise a lot of cases." "We don't supervise menacing cases" another officer

offered. "We don't supervise VRO's [violation restraining orders], do we?" a third officer

questioned. One probation officer attempted to provide some history to explain why

there were so many types of cases that didn't receive supervision. "It's evolved over the

years because we were carrying caseloads of 85 to 100 individually and, which is pretty

intense for domestic violence. And in order for them to get our caseloads manageable in

the 50's and 60's, they had to say, 'We're not going to supervise certain things. You're

not going to provide the money for it, we're not going to do it.'"

In addition to not being able to supervise all the cases that they feel would be

appropriate to supervise in an ideal coordinated community response to domestic

violence, probation officers talked about not having enough resources to sufficiently

supervise the cases they do have. "If I wanted to call in the Calvary and have a police

officer go to my guy's house every single night, I could do that, if I really wanted to. But

you know, like I said, is that wasting law enforcement time and effort? Is that gonna be

beneficial or harmful? To have police officers going over every night or me going to

everybody's house every single day is just impossible." Another officer agreed, "I've got

65 people. Can I monitor them all? No, but I can pick the top 15 and really focus on

that. Or, like the other night, I can keep my eyes open when I'm driving home from work

and when I see him come by in the car with her, I can call the police and take care of it

that way. For me, it is just a recognition, there's no way that I can monitor everyone,

that's all I would do. Batterer's intervention would be out the window, compliance and

money would be out the window, work and employment tracking out the window? I

would just tail people around all day to see if they're seeing their partner."

Collaboration challenges. Finally, officers talked about the challenges posed by

the fact that the various entities within the collaboration approach domestic violence from

different lenses or perspectives and are sometimes even working towards different goals.

"I think from the probation perspective, sometimes we work at odds with law

enforcement or the DA's office because really it is their goal to keep people apart and

keep people safe. Whereas, we have these people for so long and sometimes it becomes

the goal to get the family back together safely." Officers then went on to express some

frustration over the fact that their perspectives or their opinions appears to be unimportant

to some members of the coordinated response. "The treatment community around

domestic violence kind of doesn't want to listen. At least that is what I've heard. They

don't want to listen to the probation officers."

It is noteworthy that in the midst of the discussion acknowledging how difficult it

is to blend or meld these different perspectives in order to offer a unified response to

domestic violence, officers involved with DVERT reported a more encouraging

experience. "I think it's really great here that everybody's housed in the same building.

There's a lot of access to various counterparts right here because you've got hotline folks

and you've got the DV unit and there are DA's that are readily accessible or available

anyway. The advocates are right next, sitting next to the officers up there and that's

great. I don't know how many places do that, but I think it sure is helpful in the

education piece for both ends, because I think it's lacking on both sides. That you can

really learn a lot from sitting next to somebody who does a different job. If you are going

to work together and hopefully towards a similar goal. Some of the tactics and strategies

might be different, but you'll come to understand why somebody is doing a certain thing

that you didn't really have an understanding for, so I think that's really important."

In summary, police and probation officers identified several explanations when

discussing discrepancies between an idealized CCR and current intervention strategies for

domestically abusive men. They described the multi-faceted challenges that police and

probation face when managing the complexity of domestic violence cases (e.g., the fact

that victims may change their minds immediately after arrest or during prosecution, the

fact that one policy may not work for all cases and the fact that individual officers vary in

the degree to which they understand these complex dynamics and are able to remain

compassionate and effective). In addition to these challenges, officers identified

insufficient financial resources as a challenge for victims (who may request that

prosecution or "no contact" orders be suspended because they are unable to afford to live

without the financial support of the perpetrator), perpetrators (who have trouble paying

for intervention and honoring "no contact" orders when they have no other place to live)

and for themselves (there is simply not enough time for probation to appropriately and

thoroughly monitor all of the cases they are assigned, much less all of the cases that are

currently sent to bench probation). Finally, probation officers admitted that they often

find themselves at odds with other members of the CCR when it comes to the long-term

goals for the family and that this difference, along with the fact that sometimes their

voices are not respected by others within the system, often inhibits genuine collaboration.

Victim Advocates

When asked about gaps between a Duluth Model of coordinated community response and their experiences working in the Portland Tri-County area, advocates often laughed or employed other non-verbal forms of communication before sharing their frustrations regarding the discrepancies they perceive. It was not unusual for advocates to respond with sly, almost "knowing" smiles and furtive glances to other participants in the room. At one point I tried to record this non-verbal behavior by saying the following, "Any gaps between what you wish the coordinated community response was and what it is in actuality? Candidness is important. Your sneaky little smile, I can't record that!" When pressed to articulate their experiences of the gaps or discrepancies, they talked extensively about how in an ideal CCR, victim/survivor safety and well-being would be priorities. Additionally, they talked extensively about the challenge of achieving genuine collaboration when stakeholders approach the problem of domestic violence from such different perspectives and when agencies are comprised of individuals who have vastly different degrees of compassion, training and experience when it comes to working with victims.

The current response is not sufficiently victim-centered. Advocates discussed the fact that while an ideal Duluth model of CCR prioritizes victim safety, achieved in part through perpetrator accountability, the reality in the Portland Tri-County Area is far from ideal. As discussed in response to Research Question Two, advocates suggested that the current CCR actually places victims/survivors in great danger. Not only are perpetrators not contained long enough for victims/survivors to achieve any degree of safety, but

sometimes the very fact that the CCR intervened can exacerbate the violence. "[In one example], they did arrest him and he ended up getting out and was on probation and then he assaulted her even worse because she got him on probation. Well, the system didn't keep her safe."

Victim advocates' ambivalence with respect to the role of the criminal justice system in the CCR emerged in several comments, particularly with respect to how the criminal justice system is perceived within communities of color. "I feel like we talk a lot about how in the African American community, young black men are imprisoned at a much higher rate, generally. And so, the woman in the community don't want to send their guys to jail, right? So I feel like you have all these different ways that people can have bad experiences with law enforcement." Others agreed. "Sometimes people in the community will say, 'I don't get why she just doesn't call 911,' you know? Driv[ing] down the street late at night and seeing the police officer drive next to them, is a real source of comfort for some people. And for some people it's 'I'm about to get pulled over'."

The criminal justice system is not the only partner in the CCR that according to these advocates is met with skepticism by some victims. "It's the same with child welfare. I've worked with a tiny number, a few women who have called child welfare for help with parenting, wanting to get some support and what a different lens that is, and what different life experiences she must have had to see that system as a potential source of support. Which ideally, it should be. Whereas we know for so many people, it's a really scary thing. 'Those are the people that take my kids away.'"

Advocates were particularly animated as they explained that not only are victims not safer as a result of the current system, but that more and more frequently they are the ones being held "accountable" or punished by the system, (i.e., they are the ones being arrested). "I'm sure a lot of people around the table could give examples, but I'm thinking of things like the police responding to a call, and the woman being the one who's arrested because she maybe struggled to get away from him or whatever. But, maybe she even smacked him or something because he was assaulting her and she was trying to get away. And so, he's got a mark and so she gets taken away." In other words, according to advocates, both insufficient containment for perpetrators and inappropriate "accountability" for victims within the CCR in the Portland Tri-County represent major gaps between an ideal CCR and the one currently in operation.

Advocates were also dismayed by how difficult the system is for their clients to navigate, and that these hurdles discourage women from pursuing assistance. "I think having a survivor have to deal with so many agencies just to make ends meet or to get all the hoops jumped through is really overwhelming and even people within their own agency don't communicate and so that's really frustrating for survivors. There isn't a lot of communication and it's hard to get people to call you back or call the survivor back. And she gets really frustrated and she doesn't want to participate. Just know, another reason why they go back is they just can't get to all the places that they need to go." Advocates acknowledged that they see it as their job to help women negotiate these hurdles, but lamented that they were needed in this capacity, given that some survivors might seek this information on their own. "As an advocate, I'm able to really, sort of,

help the woman I'm working with navigate the system, which is great. And it's part of

why I do what I do. I enjoy that part of it, but I think that's what sucks about it too, is

that knowing there's loads of survivors who are seeking those same information or same

resources that aren't able to access them because they don't have the language. It's like a

secret code and you have to have the language to get what you need. It needs to be

available regardless if someone has an advocate or not." In their minds, an ideal CCR

would be more accessible and user friendly to victims, the primary clients of domestic

violence intervention.

Finally, they discussed the notion of safety and empowerment and acknowledged

that determining how to provide safety is not always clear cut. "And that's controversial

too because what makes a woman safe? Like, holding him accountable regardless of

what she wants? I mean, it's a complicated issue." Another agreed and shared that the

women she works with are very ambivalent about having their perpetrators arrested,

taken out of the home and forced to pay for batterer intervention programs. "For

example, [client will say], 'If I complain to police, he will go to classes and they will take

our income away'. She sees it like it actually was punishment for her because money

was taken away from the family. Same like many women, man is in jail, they don't want

him really in jail because they want him to pay child support." The advocates discussed

with some outrage the small role that victims' voices sometimes occupy within CCR.

"Multnomah County pretty much looks at what victim wants. Clackamas County or

Washington County, especially Washington County, they never listen to women. They

always do what they feel is right." As described in response to Research Question Two,

if there were better communication between some of these agencies and victims, victims

might not feel as disempowered.

Money. Echoing concerns expressed by police and probation officers, advocates

identified insufficient resources available for victims as a factor contributing to the

discrepancy between the current CCR and an ideal model. According to advocates, an

ideal victim-centered empowerment model would more adequately address survivors'

long term viability and financial stability. A system that increases her physical safety at

the expense of her ability to feed, clothe and house herself and her children is taking

almost as much as it is giving. "I think the financial piece is so huge for women. So

even within the civil piece of law, like the restraining order, women can ask for this

emergency monetary assistance. But I tell every person I work with, you can ask for it

and the judge may order it, but it's impossible to enforce. It's pretty rare that men pay

that. Sometimes, depending on the judge, different judges won't even sign off on it for

different reasons. So I just feel like, again, that puts her in this bind. Enforcing the

emergency monetary assistance and restitution during criminal cases and enforcing child

support, all of those things I think would be helpful in terms of her being able to be

financially independent."

Collaboration challenges. Resonating with police and probation officers,

advocates frequently cited collaboration related challenges in attempting to explain or

make sense of discrepancies between an ideal Duluth Model of CCR and the current

implementation in the Portland Tri-County area. One advocate began the conversation

by alluding to these challenges and inviting her colleagues to provide specific examples.

"I can say what I feel like it [the CCR] means in theory [laughs] and then I can say what I

think it means in practice [there was a lot of shared laughter in the room]. I feel like in

theory it means that we are all sort of on the same page and we are all working together

to respond to domestic violence in a way that is going to increase the safety of survivors.

I feel like that would include advocates and law enforcement and the parole and

probation office and child welfare and DHS and any other community system that is

interacting with survivors or abusive men."

In responding to her challenge for others to chime in, two principle collaboration-

related challenges were described. Advocates talked about the difficulty that often occurs

when agencies that have different priorities or foci try to work together and they cited the

fact that collaboration between systems or agencies is dependent upon individuals,

individuals who vary in their knowledge and compassion about domestic violence

dynamics. One advocate was quite honest in discussing her reticence to share

information, a key component in the Duluth Model of CCR, with other partner agencies if

she doesn't trust they will prioritize victim safety and well-being. "To be quite frank, if

another system I'm working with has a completely different perspective on domestic

violence and a way of responding to survivors, I feel like as an advocate it's really

difficult for me to decide how to work with that system and how much information I'm

going to share with that system. To be honest. Because if I think that the information,

that there's a chance that it's going to be used against the survivor I'm working with or

that it's, I don't know, just not going to be received well (laugh). When you have two

very different perspectives about what domestic violence is and where it comes from, I

feel like that makes it really hard to have a community collaborative response."

Others agreed and offered specific examples of collaborating with agencies that

have different priorities and values with respect to victims can be problematic. "I feel

like a really good example is, I can think of a survivor who has been working with our

agency for a little while who also has a case at child welfare. Child welfare is very aware

that she's worked with us and rather than involve us when something came up, they just

immediately were pretty punitive to this woman. And I feel like they could have invited

us to the table and everybody could have come together to talk about what would be the

best way to respond to what happened and to talk to the survivor about what she wants to

have happen. And you know, to me, that's what good corroborative [sic] community

response looks like and it just doesn't feel like it happens. Unless, I guess, I feel like I

have a connection to somebody specific within a system, that I know I can contact who

kind of gets it, who's gonna work, you know, that we work well together. Then it, that

works well, but it's not the same as just being able to contact a system and knowing that

you're going to come together and that they'll contact you, because I think that's

important too. I feel like we don't often get recognized as experts in the field and people

that they can come to for information and to be included in processes." Several distinct

issues are raised in this quote. First, the fact that collaborating agencies often fail to

involve victim advocates while working with victims. Second, the fact that collaboration

is often dependent upon the individuals involved. If a relationship has been established

and trust has been earned, then collaboration and information sharing is possible, but

until that point, it is difficult for advocates to work openly with other collaborators for fear of negative ramifications for their clients. Finally, advocates often feel ignored as experts, despite their vital role in working with victims and spearheading the movement to end domestic violence.

I specifically questioned the advocates who participate in the DVERT (Domestic Violence Emergency Response Team) program to see if they felt differently. "I was gonna say, it's a little bit different with us because we bring the case, we'll bring a case to the table. And all those other agents, a lot of those other agents will be at the table. We'll pretty much have DHS and child welfare, legal aid and police, the DA's and the PO's." In questioning to see if those advocates participating in DVERT felt more respected by their system counterpoints, I was assured by some that they were. However, another member of the focus group offered this less positive comment about the equality of all members of DVERT. "I have to say, I've sat on DVERT. I haven't been on recently, and I've also sat on the SART [Sexual Assault Response Team] teams before, so wherever it might be, my experience has been that, as an advocate, with other advocates in the room, I've noticed that we don't speak up as much and that there is definitely, just from my experience, an underlying tension and, and a definite knowledge that we're coming from different places. And that sometimes I felt like people who had positions of more power, like police officers or PO's or whomever, had a lot more space at those meetings and did a lot more of the talking. And my experience with those corroborative meetings are that they can be really helpful, and I've definitely felt like there were times when we were all sharing things and able to communicate really openly.

But then I also feel like there were definitely times where that was not happening. And it's something that some of us would talk about a lot, but was always something that I felt like we would just, I really wished we would just put it out there, you know, with everyone present and be like, 'this just, for me, feels like we're not all communicating, like what can we do and how can we acknowledge that maybe it's not always functioning like it's supposed to be and how can we move towards that?'." Another focus group member, not currently serving on DVERT agreed and offered her own experience of the way in which advocates and victims were disempowered by the collaboration. "I'm not on DVERT anymore, but when I was, it was the people that had more power made a lot of decisions for the survivor and then dumped it on the advocate to make it happen and convince her that she needed to do these things. So we had to get her on board to prosecute or we had to get her to move when she didn't want to."

Despite their many reservations, advocates did not perceive the challenges presented by these differing goals and perspectives to be completely insurmountable. One advocate suggested that the more honest they can be with each other, the better off the CCR will be. "I feel like the times that it really works well are when we're also really honest about so, 'this is my role'. Like when I'm talking to a PO and I say, 'okay, so I get that your goals is this,' and like, 'but here is my role and my goal, like, so where can we come together?' I feel like those are really important things to talk about because it is true that we have some different roles and even if we're coming, even if we're on the same page, sort of theoretically, our roles are still a little different and the goals we are

hoping to achieve are a little bit different. And I think being able to talk about that

openly is important."

Human Variance. The importance of individual relationships was clear. When

advocates formed a positive working relationship with a stakeholder in another agency,

the collaboration between the two agencies worked more smoothly. Similarly, when

advocates encountered an individual within a collaborating agency that does not "get it"

and is consistently working at the detriment of victims/survivors, the collaboration falls

apart. "The problem with any of those systems is that there are people who make up

those systems, right? So it's not the police, it's individual officers, and those officers

carry the same beliefs about domestic violence or about violence against women that the

general population does. So when you're having systems that we look to as, like, system

response, but really it's individuals. And you hear from survivors that two women's

experiences are so different. Not because of the system, or because of the rules or the

policies or the procedures, but because of the individuals that are a member of that

system."

Advocates were enraged that individuals who consistently re-victimize their

clients are permitted by collaborating agencies to continue to work with them. "There

needs to be a point where people can't work with survivors anymore because they're not

okay to be working with survivors, you know? Like there's a certain point where

someone in a position of power, who has a lot of interactions with survivors or a lot of

interaction with batterers and is consistently being blameful and disrespectful and putting

her safety and her life and her kids' lives in jeopardy and is still in that position, is still a

member of our coordinated community response [gets sanctioned]." Another advocate agreed and offered this example. "Yeah, definitely, there was an example that we talked about at our last direct services meeting about a worker, a DHS worker who said something really, a couple of really heinous things to a survivor and I just thought, if that's not a fire-able offense? Like it seemed shocking to me that it could, I mean not totally shocking, but I mean the things that she said were sort of beyond what I would have ever expected someone to respond to anyone who was hurt by their partner. And so I think that is true, that individuals respond and individuals make up these different systems."

Advocates were not convinced that additional training was always the answer either. They suggested that some people carry such harmful beliefs that no amount of training is going to transform them into a person who is able to empower and support clients. "They sent this person to additional training and then she became the domestic violence person [for the office]. It's not that she doesn't know about domestic violence. Like you said, it's your personal attitude. I don't see what this additional training will do. Will it make her sensitive to the needs of survivors? Will she change after she receives training? Will she be totally different? So it depends a lot on individuals."

Advocates then provided examples of how victim blaming limits the collaboration's effectiveness. "I notice that sometimes a parole or probation officer has information that would be really helpful to a survivor, and they won't give it to her. I've had a probation officer say things to me like, 'well, I don't really know her yet, and I don't know what her intentions are, and I don't really trust her.' And it's like, she's not

the one that's on probation. She's the victim." This particular advocate went on to describe a situation where a victim was interested in learning the location of her perpetrator from his probation officer so that she can avoid those parts of town and the probation officer was unwilling to share that information because he was suspicious of her motives.

In reflection, victim advocates were extremely forthcoming about perceived discrepancies between the Duluth model of CCR and current intervention strategies for abusive men. There was clear consensus that while in theory the CCR prioritizes the survivor and her future safety, in actuality, this is not fully the case. Victims are often dismissed and marginalized by other stakeholders within the system, as well as mistakenly arrested as the primary aggressor. Additionally, the CCR often places the victim in greater danger since dismal prosecution rates and short jail sentences frequently mean that the victim faces greater physical consequences for engaging the CCR than if she did not contact the police. Most frustrating, perhaps, is the fact that the system is not equipped to truly help victims separate from their abusive partners. There are not the financial resources available to them for housing and child-care which would allow them to effectively and safely walk away. Victim advocates also spoke extensively about two major collaboration challenges that are partially responsible for the discrepancy between an ideal CCR and their current experience of the CCR. First, the fact that advocates and other stakeholders approach domestic violence and victims from such disparate reference frames makes information sharing difficult for advocates. They fear that information will be used to harm, rather than help victims. Second, collaborations do not exist between

systems, but rather between individuals. When an individual in a collaborating agency is either ignorant of domestic violence dynamics or fundamentally unsympathetic to victims, it is almost impossible for effective collaboration to occur.

Victims/Survivors

Although victims did not immediately identify with the term "coordinated community response", when I gave them a brief explanation and asked if they thought the model was working well, they described several discrepancies, many of which were consistent with gaps identified by police and probation officers as well as victim advocates.

The current response is not sufficiently victim-centered. Like their advocates, victims' noted the fact that often they are the ones being persecuted by the criminal justice system for defending themselves. "I see a lot more girls going to jail when [there is] a domestic violence call. You know? And if you don't have no bruises on you or anything and somebody says something about you, you're the one normally going to jail." Others agreed and described how victims can even get arrested for making a false accusation or a "false call". "Yep" "This is a false call. I'm taking you to jail." The conversation became extremely animated at this point with participants speaking almost on top of each other in order to express their opinions and experiences with this issue. "The woman calls, she's the one who gets hauled off to jail because they look at the scars on the man." "Yep" "I've had quite a few friends that have been taken off." "Yeah" "And they leave the kids with the man." "Right. They leave the kids with the abuser." Moving into a partial justification for why victims might sometimes look like

perpetrators, one woman explained that "Well, after you get your ass whupped and you go on back at him and hitting him, you're doing something. You're trying to say, 'Hey, you can't do this to me. I'm not going to allow it no more, and I'm done.'"

Complex domestic violence dynamics. Victims then alluded to the complexities of domestic violence and speculated that police officers often do not know who to believe when they arrive at a scene. "The cops don't know who to trust. They think you're both lying." In trying to explain about why it might be confusing for officers, victims acknowledged that some victims will lie or will cover up the evidence of an assault. "And they don't even know who was actually the one that's telling the lies. There's a lot of women out there that defend their beaters, and that's why some police officers, it's hard for them to believe some women." Other participants agreed and offered additional examples of how victims' behavior might be confusing to tease out. "I know a couple girls who would do that. Who will be like, 'Oh no' called me up, talking about 'Oh, he just cut my hand. I'm bleeding everywhere.' Cleaned up the spot and by the time I call the police, the police are over there, 'Oh no, everything's okay.'" Victims clearly acknowledge that when women are dishonest about abuse that has occurred, it interferes with police officer's successful implementation of the CCR.

Interestingly, victims suggested that police officers may not only be confused by domestic violence cases, but may be fearful of them. "Police are scared, you know?" "I think police, in general, are scared of walking into a domestic violence situation because you don't know what's going to happen. Who's gonna come out with a knife or a gun or what you're gonna get caught up in. But, I mean, you know, that's why they need special

units for that. Because that is a war zone you are walking into as a cop." It is interesting to speculate whether victims are projecting their sense of fear and helplessness onto police officers because their experience with the criminal justice system has not persuaded them that they can be kept safe from their abusers or whether they are simply accurately interpreting police officers' fears in the moment. Regardless, they seem to be suggesting that this fear impacts police officers' abilities to successfully intervene as members of the CCR.

Money. Victims acknowledged that one of the reasons the system may be failing to protect them adequately, and subsequently failing to live up to an ideal coordinated community response is a lack of resources. "I just think there's so many cases and there's not enough money. There's not enough judges. There are not enough courtrooms. They have to figure out to do something that isn't going to cost money."

Human Variance. Reinforcing what officers and advocates described, victims also recognize that the response they receive is often dependent on the individual they are interacting with. "It depends on the person, I guess. They're all different. Some people don't care, some people act like they care and you know, it doesn't really matter to them."

In summary, although victims were uniformly unaware of the Duluth model of CCR or even what the CCR was in practice, they were extremely consistent in describing a discrepancy between their experiences and what they think should be happening to intervene with domestically abusive men. Most saliently, victims agreed with police and probation officers that complex domestic violence dynamics interfere with an idealized

response from police and in the worst case scenario lead to victim arrests. Additionally, victims went on to note that a lack of sufficient resources, particularly for the courts, may explain why the system is not operating more successfully. Finally, they commented on the fact that collaborations depend on individuals and that this can sometimes be problematic if the individuals involved are not sincerely invested in helping victims achieve safety.

Batterer Intervention Providers

Of all the stakeholders I interviewed, batterer intervention providers were most apt to directly answer my question requesting reasons for any perceived discrepancies between a Duluth model of the CCR and what they participate in currently. Participants were very familiar with the Duluth model and also quite frustrated about their experiences with its sub-par implementation. Their explanations resonated with those described by police and probation officers, victim advocates, and victims, though they tended to highlight or emphasize gaps specific to communication and collaboration between the various entities within the CCR. So while they discussed the impact of complex domestic violence dynamics and insufficient financial resources on the CCR, they spent most of their time talking about how they are dismissed or ignored by other stakeholders, how the differing perspectives held by each agency make partnership challenging, how dependent the success of partnership is on individuals and subsequently how challenging it can be to maintain those partnerships in light of the high turnover rates.

Complex domestic violence dynamics. Like officers and victims, Batterer

intervention providers talked about how the complex nature and expression of domestic

violence can challenge the effectiveness of the CCR. Specifically, they discussed how

difficult it must be for police officers to determine who the primary aggressor is and

make appropriate arrests when there is confusing evidence. "They go to a home and it

looks like they've been mutually abusive and she's left marks on him but he didn't leave

marks on her, but she gets arrested because, you know? And if you have someone trained

to tease out who's the, truly the primary aggressor, that's a big difference." As suggested

in the above quote, providers hinted that sufficient training may be the key to untangling

the conflicting stories or evidence. "I can imagine, as a police officer, going into a

situation. It's really confusing because, you know, you have the survivor who probably

looks like she's totally rattled and upset and disheveled, and he's really calm and saying,

'Well, I have to kind of work on calming her down,' and the kids are saying, you know,

whatever they're saying to keep themselves safe. …Domestic violence is not an easy

thing to understand. It's so hard and I don't think there's an understanding exactly how

much training people need." Others concurred and suggested that "it can really show

within the same county, from city to city, the lack of training that they have around issues

of domestic violence." In order to clarify how insufficient training translates into a

discrepancy between an ideal CCR and the one currently in place, I asked, "So what are

the consequences of them not being as educated?" Providers responded, "Making poor

choices and carrying beliefs without realizing that those beliefs are putting a victim in

danger."

Despite these comments indicating the importance of training in order to overcome the difficulties created by the sophistication of this phenomenon, providers also suggested that training alone may not be sufficient. They acknowledged, just as other stakeholders had, the impact that co-workers can have on even newly trained officers. "[Name of trainer] came to Clackamas County and did a training on what they do in the academy, what training she gives them. And one of the things that she said that I thought was interesting is that, even though you get that domestic violence piece for the training of these new people, so to speak, then they go out, and they're out in the field with the person, the police office that's been doing it for years. He's been doing it forever. So this new person goes right along with the old stuff. So all the new training goes out the window."

Money. Interestingly, batterer intervention providers barely touched on the impact of limited or scarce resources, though they did indicate that the absence of sufficient funding is at least partially responsible for their inability to completely uphold their responsibility within the CCR. "We have to co-facilitate groups, but we're not getting any more money to do that. I mean that's one of my biggest issues managing the program. I understand that you [State of Oregon] wanted us to do this, but we're not getting anything extra to do it. And I can see the benefits in it, definitely, but, you know?" Additionally, they acknowledged that if probation departments had more resources and each officer had fewer cases to monitor, perpetrators would certainly be held more accountable. "I think the other issue is that we bring people into the criminal justice system and they are loosely monitored. Probation officers have huge caseloads

and some of the men I've worked with kind of have the belief that 'oh, this is kind of a joke. I've been processed. All I have to do is sit in this classroom. I'll get out and as long as my P.O. knows that I'm going to the class and the therapist or counselor or group leader doesn't write me a bad report, I'll get through.' I think if P.O. caseloads were lower and P.O.'s could have more contact with the guys and sort of impress up on him that we're taking this seriously, we're watching you, that might make a difference. I think P.O. caseloads are a big problem."

Collaboration challenges. Batterer intervention providers were most interested in laying responsibility for the perceived failures of the CCR on issues directly related to collaboration. In fact, their dismay over the current state of collaboration was sometimes so grim that I received responses such as, "I guess I would say, what coordinated community response?" When I asked them to elaborate, I was told, "I now have three guys who are on bench probation, which means that there is now a DV coordinator appointed by the court. She sees him once every three to six months…. And these guys are not doing minor crimes, you know? They're violent with their spouse or their girlfriend or whoever, threatening murder and with weapons and the whole nine yards, and we're kind of going, 'Why are you on bench probation? Why are you not being watched?' And then there's now the new L.L. R.R.T.. It's Low Level Recidivism Risk Team that the P.O.'s have. And what they're gonna tell you [is that] unless he commits a new crime, I don't want to hear about it. He's not coming to group, he's still using, I don't want to hear about it. Unless he's committed a new crime, I don't want to hear about it. And I'm quoting verbatim what I was told at a meeting with them."

Readily apparent was the fact that providers do not feel there is synergy between the work they are doing in group with perpetrators and the probation officers who are supervising these men. More specifically, they do not feel supported by or in partnership with probation officers. "I see a disconnect between the P.O.'s and at least my program. There are times that I say, 'This guy is really acting out in group. Would you meet with him?' Doesn't happen. 'We need another hammer here besides group. Would you talk to this guy?' It doesn't happen. All of a sudden a guy will be, he'll be in the program for six months and he's gone. Where'd he go? 'Oh, well, I decided he was doing well enough, so we just, you know, I talked to the judge and he's now off probation.' What's going on here? Where is this coordinated approach? Where's the feedback? Where is it you asking me my professional opinion about whether this guys is ready to get off? Whether this guy has made any progress, whether the attitudes have changed, whether the behavior has changed? And it's like we're functioning over here and doing our own thing. We're just something that you have to send guys to."

This experience of being ignored or disregarded by other stakeholders was echoed by several providers. "This is one of my biggest issues with the system. If I'm a domestic violence therapist and that's my specialty and I say to the police, 'this is a dangerous situation. This woman is in hiding. These kids are traumatized by the last situation where he threatened to kill them.' I give the police all that information with the mom's support and permission and the police still don't listen. That tells me that my opinion is not valued. So to me, these meetings are all great, but then when I look at really who runs it, it doesn't really matter how much we talk. I guess that is the

frustration I have. It doesn't matter how much we all talk. There's meeting after meeting after meeting and yet, the people on top will make the decisions." For providers, the fact that the men in their groups are not adequately supervised by probation, coupled with the fact that they are directly ignored or dismissed by police and probation officers when they try to share information or concerns represents a significant departure from an idealized version of CCR.

Providers went on to explain that genuine collaboration among stakeholders in the CCR is challenging, particularly when it involves the bringing together of different perspectives, different resources, in order to reach a common goal. "We can all be fine as long as we're all agreeing. But if somebody throws something out there that's different, then they're either shunned or ignored." "I think the frustration in coordinating community response is that while we all come to the table, sometimes the disagreements that people have create conflict. And so there's some who will be more outspoken and those who will keep silent because they don't [want to] get caught in conflict." In trying to explain why it may be difficult for stakeholders to successfully navigate these different perspectives or views within meetings, one provider explained that it may have something to do with the attempt to communicate across different professional cultures. "I think that there's language issues and cultural issues going on in coordinating community response. We have response advocates out-stationed at the police bureau and let me tell you, it feels like we're speaking two different languages even though it's the same goal. And I think that the same could be true with batterer's intervention programs and victims' advocates. So when we get together to do coordinated community response,

..we need to realize that we are speaking different languages and that we come from

different perspectives."

Human variance. Batterer intervention providers suggested that the success of

bridging these professional differences in order to collaborate is often dependent on the

specific individuals involved. It works if the partners trust each other, but it falls apart if

they do not. "There is a lack of trust, I think… I mean, we know the good people to call,

is how we sort of look at it, and we're nervous about what everyone else has to say. And

that's why you need more training at all levels." Others agreed that the degree of

collaboration, as well as the success of the CCR in general, varies based on the particular

players involved. "It's inconsistent depending on the P.O., depending on the judge,

depending on the provider or a person within the agency, depending on philosophy."

One provider suggested that this individual variance impacts more than just

traditional members of the CCR or criminal justice system, but rather extends to mental

health professionals, faith leaders, and community members who through their

knowledge of domestic violence or their ignorance can have an impact on the success of

the CCR. "A couple other gaps between the way the coordinated community response is

and the way we'd like it to be. One, just basic one, is ignorance. Do people understand

the relevance of domestic violence in their own professional lives? Most therapists are

ignorant to domestic violence. They don't see it. I mean, it can be looking them right in

the eye and they don't see it because they don't understand what it is. And we can see

that with the faith community, for example. Um, it's also a significant issue within other

cultural communities. It's a very common thing within many, um, cultural communities

is, is when you ask them about domestic violence, they say, 'Well, that's not a problem here. We don't have that problem like you all do,' and of course they do. They just don't understand it yet."

Providers suggested that some of the individual variance negatively affecting collaboration is related to the secondary trauma that some stakeholders experience working so closely with victims of domestic violence. "The most hostility and anger I've experienced in my professional career of 15 years with this has been from advocates and some providers. And my explanation for that, what I really think is going on, is I think it's enormously traumatizing to be working with victims. I think it is, because you're so helpless. I mean, you're helpless, your helplessness is even greater than her helplessness is, you know? And, I mean, it's so painful to be doing great work, and she's doing great things, you know? And then he comes in and he completely undercuts all of that. And so I understand very much because I have worked, I have and do work with victims. I understand how they can become, and I think it leads to a lot of burnout. So I think a significant thing that fuels a lot of this anger and hostility, um, is, is burnout." Obviously, according to this provider, burnout and hostility between partners in the CCR negatively impacts the success of those partnerships.

Finally, batterer intervention providers talked about the impact that rapid turnover has on not only their ability to establish and maintain successful relationships with other stakeholders, but also for the system to function optimally. "This is not easy material to learn. It is sophisticated. It makes sense, but it certainly takes longer than an hour. Turnover is a huge barrier. So, part of the justice system is probation and when you get

brand new, when you get these guys bouncing around from PO to PO or the POs are three

months in and they stay for six months and they leave and get somebody else. That

doesn't work as well as when you've got a PO that's had a DV caseload for years and

knows his stuff well. You don't have to keep training them. They're trained, they know

it well, they're getting a more sophisticated concept of what this stuff is. I think it's true

with police officers or anybody within the criminal justice system. Turnover really

compromises the quality of the response."

In general, batterer intervention providers expressed a lukewarm response to the

existing CCR. Most providers expressed frustration with the discrepancies they perceive

between an ideal model of coordination and their experiences of the current response.

Although certainly not the focus of their concerns, they, like officers, advocates, and

victims attributed some of the discrepancy to the complexity of domestic violence

dynamics and the lack of sufficient resources. Providers primarily attributed

discrepancies to dismissive responses by other members of the system, cultural divides

among the system stakeholders, human variance, and turnover. Providers were infuriated

about the degree to which their opinions regarding perpetrators are ignored by police and

probation. They also discussed with great detail the fact that each set of stakeholders

comes to the table with a unique perspective or culture and that blending or

compromising among those perspectives is often more difficult in actuality than in

theory. They were especially clear that the CCR is a practice implemented by individuals

and subsequently there is a great deal of variance based on the individual probation

officers, judges, advocates, and batterer intervention providers involved. Finally, they

spoke about the need for continued and expanded training for stakeholders, a process

which is often complicated by the rapid turnover within many of the collaborating

institutions (e.g., victim advocacy, DHS, police and probation).

Perpetrators

Like victims/survivors, perpetrators were unfamiliar with the term coordinated

community response, though several of the critiques they offered pertaining to the

domestic violence intervention system can be understood as discrepancies between an

ideal model of collaboration and the one they experience. Like other stakeholders,

perpetrators discussed the challenges posed by the complex nature of domestic violence,

particularly their perception that victims regularly lie about their victimization and that

the system is not set up to detect this type of manipulation. They also discussed the

significant financial challenge or burden they (and their victims) experience due to the

high costs associated with attending batterer intervention programs. Finally, they

discussed the fact that their experience of the intervention or response is strikingly

different depending on the specific individuals, primarily probation officers, who interact

with them.

Complex domestic violence dynamics. Several of the perpetrators I interviewed

expressed frustration over the fact that women lie about their abuse and they did not

understand how the police and the criminal justice system could so easily be manipulated.

"I won't name names, but when the police come and they talk, how can they discern

whether your [the victim's] word is better than your [the perpetrator's] word. 'I believe

you. You're a liar.' Some of us, you know, have vindictive partners who have made up

broken bones, all this kind of stuff down the road trying to get you in deeper and deeper

and deeper. How can a court just take their word as gospel?" These perpetrators

suggested that victims are regularly untruthful about their victimization and they felt a

weakness of the intervention (or the coordinated response) is the fact that not only are the

women believed without substantial evidence or proof (such as lie detectors), but that

often the DA will proceed with a case even when a victim has shown no interest in

pursuing. "And why can't, why can't, I know lie detectors aren't admissible in court, but

in a lot of these cases in here, the other partner says what they want to say, they take the

report, they don't show up to court, but the DA says, 'I'm gonna take it off of this

paperwork.' So now, this person there, they're out of it. They said what they wanted to

say out of a vindictive nature, out of an anger situation that happened that night, they

don't even have to be around anymore. The DA will pick it up and from what was said

that night on that paperwork. Go put on a lie detector. Make them prove that is what

happened. Because it's always two different stories. Make them prove that's what

happened. Yeah, some may have bruises, black eyes or bleeding. That's obvious proof

that something happened. But in the case of an argument or no physical violence at all

and they show up and believe their word as gospel and you're gone. No matter what you

say, you're, you're, you're done."

The men clearly presented themselves as victims of a system that takes their

freedom and their money because their spouse/partner happened to call the police first.

"When a cop shows up at the house, because the cops are called… they come in to make

sure that everybody's okay. So they don't need a search warrant to come in. So they

come in and make sure that everybody's okay and then, like you said, they take whoever called's word, you know? 'this happened' okay, good you're going." Others in the group agreed, "Whoever calls first, wins." "Yeah. And so, now, now they, they don't know what happened. They just take in the word of whoever called, you know?" One participant went on to suggest that one of the reasons they are unjustly "victimized" is because the criminal justice system benefits financially from their lengthy participation in batterer intervention treatment. "[The DA] knows we can get money on this sucker because we can throw him in the class where he'll have to spend 48 weeks and if he screws up, well, we'll just keep him in the system, keep rolling and rolling."

Money. The men were particularly emotional about the cost of batterer intervention programs and suggested that the high fees prevent them from fully engaging in the programs. "I think for me, the reason that I'm not able to really concentrate and all that [in group] is the stress of all the money. I have no money. Can something be done to help us cut the cost, my god, you know?" Others agreed and questioned why the programs are so expensive. "I don't understand why they charge so much. I mean, some of us, just kills us to have to pay for this class. And if we don't take the class and don't do the class, back to jail we go." Perpetrators were curious why there is not more government funding for these programs. "There should be more funding for this." "Yeah. More funding." "To help reduce the stress so I could learn more." "If we are one of the biggest problem areas in this society, which they say statistically we are, there should be funding for it. You know?" If the goal of the CCR is to reduce recidivism by holding men accountable and mandating attendance in batterer intervention programs,

perpetrators seem to be suggesting that an ideal implementation of the CCR would

involve reducing treatment costs so that they could more fully engage and absorb the

material.

    Human variance. Echoing comments made by every other stakeholder group,

perpetrators asserted that tremendous variance exists within the system response as a

function of the individuals involved. They were particularly clear about the impact of

this variability with respect to probation officers, though they alluded to it with respect to

police and treatment providers. "You either got a good P.O. or you don't it seems."

"Why is one PO say, 'nope, nope, nope' and the other PO says, 'Let's do this.'"

    One gentleman spoke in great detail of the differences he experienced between

probation officers and the impact that these different officers had on his relationship with

his children. "I asked my PO to please at least call [my son] and tell him what the 'no

contact' order is. My boy's 14, he doesn't understand what's going on and it's been

almost a year. And I've lost one of my boys, no doubt. He's so full of angry after this

long and not being able to talk to him. We never got a chance to heal. Or at least try to

heal together as a family, as a unit. You know, my heart aches. You know, to be a

perfect probationer and follow all the rules, I have literally given up my boys and it

breaks my heart that the system will not at least send my boy a birthday card for me.

Now I got a new [PO] and it's unfortunate that she's going [location removed to preserve

confidentiality], but right away I found out my son broke his collarbone. I left one

message on her phone and she got back to me the next day and told me she'd talked to

him and he's doing all right. And I tell you what. For me, it was incredible. I just think

that is what helps a family. Because that phone call to him, he knew I was trying."

Obviously, a "good" probation officer clearly made a difference for this man.

Similarly, perpetrators implied that a good treatment provider or counselor can make a

difference. "There's nobody as far as counselors and I've been involved with counselors

since probably I was like six that has the unique outlook and the characterism [sic] that X

(facilitator's name) has."

In sum, perpetrators had minimal to nonexistent knowledge of the CCR and

therefore were unable to directly respond to a request for perceived discrepancies with

current intervention strategies. However, a few of their comments in response to other

questions appear to speak to discrepancies. For example, they were distressed over the

fact that there seems to be no safeguard to protect them from vindictive partners who lie

about their abuse. Additionally, they were extremely frustrated about the exorbitant costs

associated with batterer intervention, suggesting that they would be better able to focus

on the material of the course if they were not so strained by the fees. Finally, they

discussed the fact that the system responds to men differently depending on the probation

officer or the treatment provider assigned.

Summary Research Question Four

In responding to the question of discrepancies between the Duluth model of CCR

and current intervention strategies for domestically abusive men, Portland stakeholders

shared some striking similar observations. Police and probation officers, victims and

perpetrators identified that the complexity of domestic violence, and the resulting

confusion about how to attribute blame and responsibility, contributes to a discrepancy between ideal and actual practice. All five stakeholder groups pointed to a lack of sufficient financial resources when trying to make sense of the gap between an idealized CCR and the one currently operating in the Tri-County area. For example, if the victim advocacy community was able to offer victims true financial independence, more women might be able to successfully leave their abusive partners. Additionally, if police and probation departments had sufficient resources, more domestic violence cases might be more closely supervised. Finally, if batterer intervention programs were less expensive, perpetrators might struggle less to complete their programs.

It is noteworthy that all five key stakeholder groups recognized and expressed frustration over the fact that while the CCR may be a system with idealized policies and procedures, it is a system implemented by individuals. Consequently, the actual performance is often dictated by the competence, attitudes, and policies of specific individuals within the system. The professional stakeholder groups also discussed the extreme challenge posed by working across cultural domains or perspectives (i.e., the perspective of victim advocates is different than the perspective of probation officers which differs from the perspective of batterer intervention programs). In addition to issues of trust, information sharing and goal setting, working across disciplines presents challenges with respect to honoring the specific expertise and authority of the "other" groups. It is noteworthy that each professional stakeholder group expressed disappointment and frustration over the fact that they feel as though their voices are not respected by other members of the CCR.

Research Question Five:

What do key Portland Coordinated Community Response stakeholders believe the role of community should be in domestic violence intervention with abusive men?

Although stakeholders interspersed opinions regarding the role of community in domestic violence intervention throughout each focus group, I concluded each discussion with a direct question designed to elicit additional insights. Most stakeholders provided rather straightforward responses, often focusing on the need for additional training for religious and medical personnel in order to improve screening for domestic violence, increased availability of resources addressing basic needs for victims and perpetrators, and enhanced prevention education efforts in the schools and the community at large. A handful of innovative ideas were also shared. It is interesting to observe that stakeholders rarely explained how any of their suggestions/ideas might be achieved. In other words, while most agreed that resources such as housing, employment and child care are needed, no one described exactly *how* these resources might be provided by the community. This truncation might indicate that stakeholders spend comparatively little time thinking about how community resources could be better utilized in order to ameliorate some of their critiques/concerns with the current strategies or it might simply be a function of the fact that it is challenging to fully describe opportunities that have not yet been realized.

Police and Probation Officers

When discussing the ideal role of community in domestic violence intervention with abusive men, police and probation officers primarily focused on the need for enhanced screening and services as well as increased prevention education within the

schools. Officers specifically singled out faith organizations and the medical community with respect to better screening. They pointed out that faith organizations are frequently approached by victims and perpetrators for relationship/marriage guidance and implied that if religious leaders were adequately informed, these leaders could have a positive impact on the safety of their congregations. "Instead of pastors counseling, 'oh, well, obey your man or your, your husband. He's the head of the household,' just be more aware of domestic violence issues and education there." Officers also suggested that better, more accurate domestic violence screening by agents of the health care community could make a difference. For example, the following was offered in response to my question about what they would like to see with respect to increased community involvement, "A greater level of understanding, education among health care providers. Emergency room, you know, those kind of first line." Their responses with respect to the faith and medical community were not very descriptive or detailed. The conversation at this point involved a lot of cross talk in that someone would say, "faith organizations" and another participant would say, "That's what I was going to say." A third participant would chime in, "That's what I was going to say too." Most often, participants did not explain in great detail what faith organizations or the health care industry should specifically do differently with respect to current intervention strategies, just that their role should be enhanced.

Police and probation officers pointed out that while raising community awareness about domestic violence is important, it is not always easy. In fact, one group spent quite a bit of time talking about the futility of a recent attempt to share information at a local

community event. "Well, we had a booth at the family fun festival. I don't know if you know about the fun festival, but it was created around domestic violence or family violence. The gal that created it asked our victim advocate to get up there and speak and she probably spoke for like five, seven minutes and it was really brief, but it was direct, to the point. She's a great speaker, but it was very unwelcomed. There were guys standing clear in the back, shaking their fists and making comments. There were a lot of women getting up and leaving and telling the coordinator that this was not an appropriate place."

Obviously resistance and denial within the community pose challenges to raising awareness about domestic violence; however, police and probation officers believe these challenges are worth addressing if communities, and specifically neighborhoods, are going to play a role in preventing and intervening in men's abuse. "Neighborhood groups could become a part of the solution. Since there has been sort of historically, a 'not my house, not my problem', or 'well, you know, they're married, that's his wife.' I'm not sure how I would see that exactly, just more of a complete support from everybody on your block." Officers went on to suggest that neighborhood support, particularly in the form of community-based drop-in programs, might really help children who are struggling with violence in the home. "If there were more community-based programs where kids were being drawn into, more community based programs for sports or science, just different things that kids could, on a free basis, because a lot of kids aren't going to be able to afford it. And so they're seeing positive things [too] and maybe developing some hope, I guess. That's not the word I'm searching for, but… a desire to

improve oneself. … That gives them a way to see how, maybe, people can treat each other differently in a relationship and a more positive role model."

One issue that was discussed with great passion was the absence of sufficient community resources for perpetrators of domestic violence, particularly in the form of housing, "Some of our guys are in a situation where they get arrested, and say it's their wife and they've been living together for ten years and they have three kids, right. Well, that man, may or may not have a job, may or may not support the family, and a lot of times they don't. They have substance abuse and they're in and out of work, and the main provider is the victim. So now they can't live at home anymore. Now they have to live somewhere. Where that is, you know, we don't know. Sometimes they have no resources. Sometimes the people that they have to go live with are not good influences. So a lot of it, to me, is housing. This is more than just the DV issues. It's all the criminogenic issues here. We're talking about housing, we're talking about substance abuse, all the stuff to where now they're forced to function as a normal adult and they have to find a clean and sober place that's not supported by the victim. And that causes all kinds of problems when they can't support themselves. They go back to the victim's house. They get caught there, they get arrested. As probation officers we try to provide as much assistance as we can, but the fact of the matter is in an ideal world we'd have a place for them to stay." Essentially, officers were suggesting that to sufficiently intervene in domestic violence, perpetrators might require an umbrella of resources, resources for their drug and alcohol dependency, resources for their unemployment, for their homelessness, etc. In other words, these men might require resources that are

beyond the scope of what has traditionally been addressed by dominant domestic

violence intervention strategies and which would require substantially more community

involvement.

As has been reported in response to earlier research questions, officers were

convinced that enhanced prevention education, specifically within the schools, is critical.

"I think another gap is the schools. Like I don't think there's any education at all for

domestic violence in the schools, or even sexual violence." For officers, primary

prevention education is important not only to teach boys how to appropriately behave in

intimate relationships, but also to teach girls what they should expect in relationship.

"And it's not just educating young men or boys that this is not appropriate behavior, but

the girls too, who live in the environment and see their mom being treated this way and

getting normalized to the chaos and the stress in the family so that when they get older

and get into relationships themselves, they don't feel comfortable unless they are in a

situation like that." Officers were confused and frustrated as they recounted their

perception that there is administrative resistance to offering this kind of valuable and

perhaps life-saving information to students. "There is one local batterer's intervention

provider who's very committed in this work, for years trying to get into schools and

encounters nothing but resistance from boards. Teachers want it, students were

interested, local principals, 'please come speak at our school.' Always the administration

will put some sort of roadblock in place that just wouldn't make it possible."

In summary, police and probation officers suggested a few ways in which the

community's role in the intervention of domestic violence might be enhanced or

expanded, principally involving greater screening and awareness building for religious leaders and medical personnel, neighborhood policing, free drop-in youth programs, additional resources for perpetrators, and increased preventative education in the schools.

Victim Advocates

Victim advocates offered similar suggestions to police and probation officers regarding how they would like to see the community involved in intervening in men's abuse, particularly enhanced screening efforts, augmenting basic need services for clients, and preventative education for youth, as well as proposing a few innovative ideas for how the community might be better engaged.

Advocates shared police and probation officers' desires for enhanced domestic violence screening. "I feel like educating almost any system about domestic violence is helpful in responding to men's violence." They discussed how damaging it can be when opportunities for intervention, particularly within the medical community, are lost as a result of absent or insufficient screening. "In [one] particular case, she wasn't able to go to the hospital without his escort. And when she went into the room, she was making up all kinds of reasons why she was there, trying, you know, saying she was, had a miscarriage. Well, she had three big old, melon sized bruises on her arm and leg that the doctors had to have seen, but never questioned and never asked the offender to leave the room."

Advocates also reasserted their earlier claims that housing and other financial resources are often what clients need most. "I feel like the biggest thing that I'm seeing right now with the victims I work with is financial stuff. I mean, they need housing.

They need somebody to help pay their child care. They need somebody to help them raise their kids because their partner is gone and I feel like for survivors, that's the biggest gap I see is the lack of resources and poverty." Unfortunately, neither the advocates nor the police/probation officers offered specific proposals for how the community might make these resources more available to their clients.

Victim advocates also agreed that the community has a tremendous responsibility to better educate and inform young people about healthy relationships. "I think before men become abusive it would be nice to have some more preventative stuff happening with kids that are school aged." Advocates pointed out that kids are entering relationships at young ages and that it is never too early to begin teaching them how to establish healthy interaction patterns. "Healthy relationship courses sooner in school. I think that even fifth grade going down to elementary level and then continuing it, because I think the kids are starting relationships really, really young."

Victim advocates went on to offer several additional suggestions beyond those offered by police and probation officers for the ideal role of the community in domestic violence intervention. Specifically, they discussed the potential benefits of a large scaled community awareness building campaign, engaging former perpetrators in the fight to end domestic violence, and creating some form of batterer registry. Advocates suggested that a large scale campaign, similar to the highly successful Mothers Against Drunk Driving (M.A.D.D.) campaign might be effective in engaging community bystanders in the prevention and intervention of domestic violence. "I just think about, like drunk driving. Like when M.A.D.D. was created where before M.A.D.D. existed, there was no

language around designated drivers. There was no bystander skills that could be taught

in terms of taking someone's keys, saying 'I'm driving you home.' You know? And, and

yes, there are still way too many drunk drivers, and lots of people are killed every year

from it, but it has decreased so much, and it's more part of the public discourse in a way

that violence against women is not. And I think that there needs to be something like that

[laughs]." In other words, advocates were suggesting that in order to truly engage

community members, a new set of tools (e.g., bystander skills) might need to be

developed and widely publicized.   Advocates also suggested that it might be helpful to

distribute awareness building material in non-traditional locations, particularly locations

that are frequented by men. "More DV in the traditionally male places. Whether it's a

sports arena or I don't know even a bar, just talking about DV. Reaching out to where

they will find the men. If that's who we're trying to educate, that's where we need to

reach out and there needs to be more role models in those fields."

The idea that men need to be better engaged in domestic violence awareness

building within the community gained quite a bit of momentum within one of the focus

groups. In brainstorming about how to best accomplish this task, advocates suggested

that first it might be necessary to de-gender the issue. "And I think it also needs to be

expanded from this idea of like a women's issue into, like, a human rights issue so that

it's not just about women. It's about society. It's about men. I just think it gets sort of

stuffed into this corner and called a woman's issue."

Advocates next agreed that men might be most impacted by listening to other

men, particularly former batterers. "When women talk about domestic violence, people

say, 'oh yeah, yeah, it's women issues,' but when man talks to men about this issues, I

think it's more impressive. I just remember that we had one guy that was an abuser. Our

client's husband and then he changed. He changed his attitude and [he would go] around

and speak about domestic violence. And I remember he was effective. And I think it's a

good idea to involve not only women, but more men." The idea of involving more men

in domestic violence intervention was highly appealing. Advocates discussed the power

that men have to influence each other either in positive or negative directions with respect

to treatment of their romantic partners. They went on to suggest that if the male

community could shift in its tolerance of degrading or abusive behavior, perpetrators

might be more inclined to shift as well. "What I'm thinking of when you say that is just

this idea, again, the sort of societal norms, and I think on a sort of individual and

community level like of other men and women, but I'm thinking of men in particular of

that not being acceptable. So that being shameful and that not, that not being something

they could boast about, that you can dominate your wife, you know? Or the idea of even

sort of warning signs of jealousy and stalking behavior and that sort of thing, of that

being disapproved by sort of the general population. So his buddies aren't going to

collude with him and you know maybe that's hoping for too much [laughs], but like, just,

you know other people in his community are not gonna accept his behavior."

Ultimately, advocates suggested that the community needs to be involved on

multiple levels. It needs to intervene with individual men and individual women, it needs

to offer support, guidance, and resources to victims and perpetrators and it needs to shift

on the societal level, perhaps through the use of an effective media campaign. "I think

media has a big role that it can play to create public opinion about this issue."

It was noteworthy however, that similar to the police and probation officers, when it

came to specifics, few were offered. More often, general statements were made with

little expansion on what it would look like for the community to be more involved. For

example, "I just think there needs to be a continuum, like the public health model. Like

the individual men, they need to be prevented from doing this to her and the kids, but also

to his next partner. While we know will probably happen. But then there's the next

level. There's the relationship level. She needs to be supported. Her friends and family,

his friends and family, his children, you know, every sort of those responses. The

community level, the societal level. It needs to happen at all of those."

One specific suggestion that was offered by advocates involved the development

of a community registry for perpetrators of domestic violence to better protect victims

and future victims. "Because we know these guys re-offend so much and have new

victims, some way of being able to spread the word about the guys, quite honestly, is

something ideally I would love to see." "Some way of saying, look, this is the third time

he's been charged, so we're gonna put him on this list or whatever."

In reflecting on how they would like the community to be involved in domestic

violence intervention with abusive men, victim advocates moved beyond discussing the

need for enhanced screening, resources and services for clients, and prevention education

to articulate the benefits that could be achieved by a large scale community awareness

building campaign equal to M.A.D.D. , the importance of shifting the public perception

of domestic violence from a women's issue to a human rights issue thereby better

engaging men and former perpetrators to the cause, and finally the possibility of creating

a community registry for perpetrators of domestic violence so that women might be able

to better avoid men who have been abusive in the past.

Victims/Survivors

Victims concurred with many of the suggestions offered by officers and advocates

for the role of community in the prevention and intervention of domestic violence as well

as describing several new ideas, including the development of in-patient programs for

perpetrators, summer camps for children who have witnessed abuse in their homes,

engaging the workplace community, and challenging the media to reduce the amount of

violence against women depicted on television.

Improving the community safety net for victims and perpetrators by enhancing

screening efforts, particularly within the medical field, was discussed with passion as

women shared their own "missed opportunity" stories. "I think there should be more

training. Definitely more understanding for not just police officers, but even in the

hospital, you know? I was giving birth to my son and the [nurse excused herself]. She

said, 'Well, I can see you guys are having difficulty. I'll leave.' Instead of staying [and

intervening in the abuse by perhaps saying], we're not married, he can't be here, you

know? She left." Victims wondered why medical personnel are required to respond or

intervene if they suspect violence against children, but not if they suspect violence

against a woman. "Well, they say that a hospital is automatically supposed to call CPS

[Child Protective Services] or whatever if they even suspect any type of abuse. So why

shouldn't it be the same for an adult? You know? A woman's gonna go in there, and she's not just gonna sit in there right away and say, 'oh yeah, you know, he beat me and I'm here. I need help." They suggested that ongoing training was necessary so that personnel would be primed to recognize the signs of abuse. "Not just sensitively training once a year. Something that's continuous, that refreshes their mind, you know? They get refreshers on what a drug user looks like or what an alcoholic looks like. Why not domestic violence person?"

Victims also agreed with police/probation officers and victim advocates in thinking the community could do more to prevent domestic violence by educating young people. "I think the schools could do better too. Teach how to treat women with respect. You hear on the news of some kid beat up somebody else or kids spanking other girls or whatever. It sounds really stupid, but it's just the beginnings of crap." "And that's where they could actually make a difference and say, 'That's not tolerated.' You know? 'Nobody tolerates that. You wouldn't like it if your dad went to work and did that to the secretary or something, would you?' And the kids' gonna say, 'No, that would be weird.' Okay, then why are you doing it, you know? I think that's a big opportunity there to prevent it before they get to be adults."

Finally, victims confirmed that often basic resources are what they need the most in order to keep moving forward and to keep safe. "I'm a disabled person and I needed resources because I had no money. I had no oil. I had no heat. I had no toilet paper, no food. It was horrible. So I needed resources."

Like the police and probation officers, victims also mused about how additional community resources might benefit perpetrators. An interesting dialogue emerged when one victim suggested that the community should offer treatment centers for perpetrators. "A treatment center for men that abuse women. They need something like that because that way they're teaching them, hey, this is not okay behavior." Victims liked the idea of an intensive in-patient domestic violence abatement program so much that they suggested it might be useful as a way of interrupting the cycle of violence with future perpetrators. "Do they have camps or somewhere where the kids can go in the summertime? Like church camps that are already there that the batterer can pay the fee for the kids to go there to learn to not be batterers?"

Moving beyond the suggestions offered by officers and advocates, victims talked at length about engaging the workplace community and enlisting the media in the prevention and intervention of domestic violence. Victims suggested that training for employers might be helpful. One victim talked about how she was essentially stalked at her place of work by family members of her abuser, but her employer felt powerless to intervene. With better training, he or she might have known what steps or actions could have been taken to more appropriately protect his or her employee. "The law says that as long as your abuser's family, friends or associates don't say anything to you, they can come and be by you. ..I work in a grocery store. I'm a cashier. His sister and his brother come and stand at the end of my check stand and just stand there and stare at me. But because they don't say anything to me and it's public property. But it states in the contact, 'no contact' order, it states in my restraining order, no third party intimidation.

No thoughts of intimidation and all of that crap. I'm sorry, it's intimidating for me, you

know, it's very hard to be efficient, friendly with your customers when you've got

somebody that you just want to strangle at the end of your check stand, and you want to

turn around and go, 'Fucking go to hell.' I tell my employer. I tell security. They can't

do anything. They cannot remove them because my restraining order is not on them."

Victims speculated that better training for employers might not only help with

screening for and subsequently protecting victims, but might also be highly effective as a

prevention and intervention tool for perpetrators. A lively discussion ensued in one

group as one woman suggested that perpetrators would be significantly impacted if

abusive behavior at home started to affect their professional life. "I think if they have an

employer, I think their employer should get involved because that's going to hold them

accountable." A second woman added, "Oh yeah, because if that mess spills over onto

their job, you better believe [it would make a difference]." The other women in the group

concurred and offered the following rapid-fire comments. "That's their livelihood." "Yes,

yes, I like that." "Their job, their friends." "Yes." "You better believe you'll see some

changing then."

Victims were very excited by the idea of publicly labeling and perhaps

humiliating their perpetrators, not only in their place of employment, but in social

settings. "Where they like to hang out at, hang up a picture that says, 'batterer'

underneath it." "Their churches, their spiritual worship, family, friends." Like victim

advocates, victims felt that a batterer registry would be an effective way for the

community to help prevent and intervene in domestic violence. "Why can't we start

listing batterers like we do sex offenders?" "Register them in a national register. This human male is a batterer. This is what he did to so-and-so woman. He is moving into your neighborhood. Put them on the web site."

Victims were greatly disturbed by the sheer abundance of violence against women depicted on television and once again engaged in a lively dialogue about not only the disturbing programming, but the lack of positive relationship role modeling, particularly for their children. "Oh, God. I think, if you watch any amount of TV, there's so much violence against women on television. I mean, Law and Order SVU? I can't watch that show because it's, it, and Criminal Minds? Oh! And it's always violence against women. Seldom is it against men. Sometimes it's against children." "Just the thought of it gives me goose bumps." "Right, I know. You know? I mean, for one thing, change the programming. Get more programs that celebrate women, men and relationships as working well." "Yeah. I have boys at home, and I keep it on channel ten most of the time because there's too much violence on TV…" "Towards women." "It's way too much. And it's like, why can't, now that needs to be regulated. Those people should be called on the carpet or accounted for." "Yeah." "Why do you have all this violence against women? 'Oh, it's the ratings.' Well, gee, thanks. You just gave another jerk an idea of how to hurt his, uh, supposed loved one."

In sum, victims concurred with several of the suggestions offered by officers and advocates, specifically the need for greater screening and training for medical community, enhanced resources and services for victims and perpetrators, and increased prevention education in the schools. Additionally, they highlighted the potential benefits

of actively engaging workplace communities to better protect victims and possibly hold

perpetrators more accountable as well as enlisting the media in prevention and

intervention efforts by reducing the amount of violence against women that is currently

portrayed on television.

Batterer Intervention Providers

Echoing the potential opportunities described by officers, advocates and victims,

batterer intervention providers identified the importance of the community's role in

screening for domestic violence and the subsequent need for more preventative education

and awareness building. Providers also spent a great deal of time talking about what

they, as providers, were doing to engage the community and how an engaged community

might better hold perpetrators accountable for their abuse. Providers then asserted that

not only should the medical, employment and religious communities be educated so that

they can better screen and intervene in domestic violence, but the community at large

needs to be educated and enlisted.

Providers were adamant that appealing to, and engaging, community leaders is

essential, as they are frequently in a position to persuade victims and perpetrators to get

the help they need. "Getting people who have positions of authority outside of the

domestic violence community, getting them to begin to come on board and call the men

on things. And they don't have to know it all and all the complexities, but at least have

the basic knowledge and to know where to send them." Reaching leaders within

religious communities was identified as particularly important. "We're specifically

trying to get into various church systems, religious communities and talk to people from

that perspective. Let's talk about what's going on in your congregation that you're not looking at. What are you saying to your women? What are you saying to your men? Trying to invite leadership to education workshops." Providers suggested that these leaders are important not only because of the sheer number of people they can influence on a regular basis, but because their influence can be uniquely powerful, particularly in terms of holding perpetrators accountable for changing their abusive behaviors. "They're also showing that pastors, when they mandate men to go into programs, that not only do the men go, but they complete, because they actually hold them in higher respect level than judges and probation." Providers talked about the success they've experienced when they train religious leaders. "It's a big deal to go in and do training for church leaders and have them afterwards come up and tell you, 'Wow, I've been doing a lot wrong, and I'm going to change how I respond to this.'" The idea that some religious leaders might have been misguided in their advice did not surprise providers who lamented that frequently when people seek support or advice from their religious leaders about domestic violence, they do not get the appropriate assistance. "Studies are showing that pastors are the number one place people go, and also number one least helpful."

Providers proposed that not just leaders, but really everyone, within the community can play a role in stopping domestic violence if s/he is made aware of abusive relationship dynamics and then chooses to hold perpetrators accountable and offer help to victims. "To me the coordinated community response is this idea that every member of the community, and the various roles that they play, being aware of what it means to be domestically violent and doing what they can to hold those individuals who are doing it

accountable, and providing support for those who are being victimized. So what am I

doing in my line of employment? What am I doing within my own family? What am I

doing within my neighborhood?" Reflecting on the success of the Mother's Against

Drunk Driving (M.A.D.D.) campaign, providers fantasized about how a similar effort

with respect to domestic violence could be truly effective in better engaging the

community. "And I think drinking and driving is perhaps a nice illustration of a

forerunner, where now I think you see a pretty decent coordinated community response

around drunken driving. It's friends talking to friends, it's talking within your parishes,

it's employers, it's bartenders, it's cabbies. And you see many different elements of the

community all doing what they can to help intervene with drinking and driving compared

to 30 years ago when almost nobody did. And I think that's to me the broader concept of

coordinated community response which would be necessary to really help stop domestic

violence."

Like the police/probation officers, advocates, and victims, providers

enthusiastically expressed that one critical role the community needs to fill with respect

to intervening in domestic violence is to provide increased prevention education to young

people through the school system. "There could definitely be more done on the

prevention side of things. How we raise our children and what society looks like. The

social change piece often gets lost in the desire to address the immediate crises that are

going on right now. I think there's a lack of response to the prevention aspects. Are we

in the schools? Are we talking about how people should treat each other? Are we talking

about gender-based violence? Are we talking about the wider social concerns? I think

there are some efforts to make that happen, but they're definitely overshadowed by the need for intervention and what we see are the results of the violence" Some of the providers tried to explain why the larger social concerns, as they relate to domestic violence, are left largely unaddressed within the schools. "I see that there is an awareness of prevention and education and need for social change, but there is this huge resistance towards that that stops you at the door, especially the school system. When I was wanting to do teen dating violence prevention in the school, it was so hard just to get into the school. I had teachers and secretaries that were like, 'oh, yes, this will be great,' and principals that were like, 'back off' and superintendents were like, 'no, no can't do it.'" Other providers concurred. The general sentiment was that there are only a handful of prevention programs currently operating. "There are a few, and I mean a very few prevention programs trying to get into junior high and high schools and talk to kids about how they treat one another. Not only date rape and stuff like that, but how do you treat one another with respect. But there are very, very few. Very, very rare."

Providers, like victims, were frustrated by the media and how domestic violence is depicted by the media. Providers talked primarily about the lack of appropriate labeling of abusive behavior and the fact that the media is underutilized for public service announcements. "Looking at the media, there have been some really horrible articles lately. There was a man who ran over his wife with a Lincoln Navigator and domestic violence was not mentioned one time in the article. The way the media responded, 'Well, I wonder what she could have done to make him so angry.' [We need to] really address those myths as they come up and make sure that our media are educated." Not only

would providers like to see more accurate reporting when domestic violence is involved, but they suggested ways in which the media could be utilized to inform the community about the plight of victims and the culpability of perpetrators. One provider suggested that we need "DV public service announcements on every channel, every day." Another talked about the potential of radio, "what a great venue to get the word about domestic violence out there in ways that haven't been heard." Another made a tongue-in-cheek suggestion that what we need is a reality show featuring domestic violence. "Considering how our society learns, what you probably need is a reality show put on by a producer who knows about domestic violence and where you're having that going on." Apparently, there was a violent relationship inadvertently captured on *The Amazing Race* (Doganieri & van Munster, 2001) which got a lot of people talking about appropriate versus abusive behaviors within intimate partnerships. Ultimately, providers mused about the need to find a way to talk to the community about domestic violence without alienating or discouraging them. "It's finding a way to present the information, because domestic violence is so depressing. [We need to] present it in a way that people won't just shut off."

In summary, providers echoed comments made by other stakeholders regarding the importance of awareness building, screening, and preventative education. They focused most intensely on the importance of engaging the religious community and utilizing the media to better educate community members so that they could be empowered to hold perpetrators accountable.

Perpetrators

Perpetrators, not surprisingly, did not spend time talking about how the community could be more involved in screening for and interrupting their own abusive behaviors. They did however, talk a little bit about what they needed from the community in terms of resources and they talked at length about missed opportunities for prevention through school and media based education.

Perpetrators began their responses by stating what they would have liked to have received from the community. "It would have been nice if I'd got a little bit of tenderness from the community. Because regardless of whether or not I create or do dastardly deeds, I'm still a human being myself. And the more that you stomp that human being out, the more that people want to trod it down and call you, call me a monster and make me feel bad, the more I'm gonna want to hide behind anger and frustration." Perpetrators were not just looking for compassion and understanding to soothe them, but also opportunities; opportunities that they perceived would result from a more compassionate response from the community. "How do we get the community to understand because I have a felony assault now on my record and trying to find a job, it's harder than hell to try and get a job now, you know? Because I'm a person-to-person crime. How do you get the community to understand that, give this guy a chance. Get him a job. He's still got skills that he can give to this, to his community, to the world."

Perpetrators, like other stakeholders, mentioned religious organizations when I asked about the role of the community. While their answers were abbreviated, (i.e., "Religion, Religion") a couple of men offered more informative responses. One

gentleman suggested that it would have been nice if a religious batterer intervention program had been available to him. "I'm a Christian and I would connect with a Christian setting to find peace in my heart versus sitting here and doing this and worrying about money. A Christian atmosphere teaches peace and for someone who is a Christian, it takes the hatred and puts peace in your heart. It really does." Another perpetrator suggested that religious marital counseling coinciding with batterer intervention program might be helpful. "I think that maybe if you could get a church organization or some other organization, you could get some kind of family marriage counseling going on the side, that maybe might not suck so much money out of your pocket that could go hand-in-hand with this."

The idea of having the community offer premarital or marital counseling was widely endorsed by perpetrators. They suggested that with the right information up-front or during their relationship, they might have been able to avoid their abusive behavior. One man proposed mandatory premarital counseling. "Okay, you want to get married? You gotta have one month [of] marriage counseling to see if you guys are gonna make it after the sex is over, what's gonna be left? We got to go to a marriage counselor and see if you two are going to be compatible down the road." Others agreed that providing marital or relationship counseling would help, but most felt that the education would have been most useful if it had been available to them as youth. "Education is great, but it would have been nice if I'd have had it in school right along with sex education."

Perpetrators quickly jumped on the idea of providing information about healthy relationships and abusive behavior in school and a lively interaction ensued. "You got

sex ed in school, why not have some kind of domestic violence seminars in school?" Perpetrators went on to suggest that abusive behavior and violence stem in part from confusion about how one should behave in relationships, confusion that could be ameliorated by preventative education courses in school. "Maybe somewhere on the elementary school level there needs to be some kind of coursework within the health classes that touches specifically on male/female expectations. There needs to be more structured education in terms of what's acceptable and what's not in terms of a relationship. What couples are expected to be like to each other, because on the one hand it's getting a lot more violent out there, but on the other hand, I also feel like it's a lot more touchy feeling [sic] than it used to be." Perpetrators suggested that while it might be possible to learn this type of information from their parents, it would have more impact if it came from a paid educator. "You know mom and dad can talk sex-ed, too, but it doesn't really hit home to a kid, I don't think, until he actually sits in a group classroom with somebody that's getting paid to tell him, 'this is the birds, the bees' or 'this is the rights and the wrongs,' or this is, you know? So I'm not talking 48 weeks, but how long is sex-ed class? A month? Three weeks, whatever? Two weeks?"

There seemed to be quite a bit of agreement among perpetrators that kids should receive ongoing information starting at a young age so that they would be prepared when they started to date in high school. "We can have our kids, our young kids, start to go through and learn a little bit as they're getting, getting up through their adolescence so that when they do go out to go and turn around and maybe date in their high school years or, you know, whatever, go out on the dating scene. They, they understand how to

consider other people's feelings." Without this kind of information or education in

school, perpetrators felt that youth would simply learn by trial and error. "They go out

and they learn on their own, and they learn by their mistakes." Several suggested that this

is somewhat akin to what happened to them. They engaged in abusive behavior because

they did not know it was abusive, they did not know what constituted domestic violence.

"Like you said, you didn't know that yelling was domestic violence. A kid's not gonna

know that yelling is domestic violence unless somebody sits there and tells him

beforehand that, you know, you can get a charge from the cops, I mean, this is the letter

of the law. We can send you to classes for 48 weeks, you know, and if you're telling

your kid in school, somebody's getting paid, has seen it on the other side saying, you

know, 'you yell at them, you move them two inches, it's kidnapping. You do this, you do

this. These are all charges that they will make stick.' You know? It's called don't have

sex, unprotected sex because you can get AIDS. That's fear, you know? They're putting

the fear of AIDS into a kid. Put the fear of going to jail into a kid. Do not yell at

somebody because it's domestic violence. You wouldn't want them yelling at you?

Don't yell at them. You can go to jail. If the cops are called, and you're yelling, you're

gonna go to jail. It's gonna stick."

Perpetrators were equally animated when they discussed the impact that the media

could have in preventing and intervening in domestic violence. "Fix it for the

generations coming, the 'just say no to drugs', and 'the more you know stuff' on TV.

That's the same type of thing that could help so that people are more socialized to have

fair fighting rules, and I, that's, that's the wrong term because when you are in a

relationship, it's not supposed to be fighting." It was particularly interesting to hear that

they felt the media would have been an effective tool because it comes directly into their

homes, into their living rooms. "Well, in my case, if I'd have known that what I was

doing was domestic violence, I might not have done it. So let's say I watched some

commercials. They throw commercials at you, buy everything in the frickin' world.

How about we have a commercial where the guy's yelling and then a public service

message comes underneath? We know we need help, but we're not going to seek it.

Therefore, it is coming to me. It's being brought into my house in front of my face and

now I can see it. Public service message and domestic violence and different styles.

Domestic violence isn't just physical." Others agreed and suggested that it would have

been particularly helpful for them if they had seen commercials that more accurately

depicted their abusive behavior, most of which was non-physical. "Yeah, because they

used to have those commercials where the woman was all beat up and black and blue.

We'll I'm not here for beating up my wife black, so when I see that commercial, I was

like man that guy needs some help. He needs some help and I never realized that I need

help. I need help for yelling." Perpetrators felt that these commercials or PSAs would be

effective if aired during shows traditionally viewed by men, "like in the middle of a

football game, some public service messages." Another perpetrator suggested the use of

pop-ups on the internet to capture people's attention. "Pop ups on the internet, I'm sure

everybody'll know about it then."

In summary, perpetrators, like other stakeholders, felt that raising community

awareness would be extremely helpful in the prevention and intervention of domestic

violence, primarily because it might have taught them how to act in their relationships and also helped them recognize that they had a problem sooner. Concurring with sentiments expressed by all of the other stakeholder groups, perpetrators felt this type of awareness building was particularly essential for young people in school. Finally, in some sense echoing the need for greater services/resources identified by police and probation officers, perpetrators were interested in receiving more compassion from the community at large, particularly with respect to extending job opportunities to men who have been convicted of person to person felonies.

Summary Research Question Five

In general, stakeholders' responses to the role of the community in domestic violence intervention with abusive men were more similar than different. Officers, advocates, victims and providers pointed to the need for enhanced training and screening efforts within religious organizations, the health care system and the community at large and every stakeholder group pointed to the enormous untapped opportunity within the school system to provide primary preventative education. Additionally, most stakeholders also felt that the media was a largely untapped market for PSAs targeted at raising awareness and identifying abusive behavior. Advocates and providers specifically referenced the success of the M.A.D.D. campaign against drunk driving as a useful model for what is needed on a community level to galvanize citizens in the prevention and intervention of domestic violence. Victims and providers were also interested in seeing more accurate media coverage of domestic violence cases and fewer glorified incidents of violence against women. A number of creative suggestions for

enhancing the community's role in domestic violence intervention were articulated --

neighborhood policing, free youth drop-in programs, enlisting men and former

perpetrators to help shift community attitudes regarding women, in-patient treatment for

perpetrators, on-line registry for perpetrators, requiring perpetrators to pay for their

children to attend special summer camps where they can heal and hopefully break the

cycle of violence, engaging workplaces to better protect victims and hold men more

accountable for their abusive behavior, and finally mandatory pre-marital counseling.

Negative Case Analysis

In order to enhance trustworthiness in the findings, I concluded my investigation

by conducting a negative case analysis. A negative case analysis involves searching for

and then discussing comments or ideas within the data that contradict or differ from

generalized patterns. It is an important step in building confidence in the integrity of the

findings (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990). I began by scouring each focus group

transcript for comments that stood in opposition to the summaries I had created. I

specifically looked for comments that disagreed or differed from the rest of the group and

which I had not already discussed or described within my findings. When I found such a

comment, I typed it up and then grouped it by stakeholder. What follows are the results

of this process. My intention is not to demonstrate how these comments diminish the

previous findings, but merely to accurately document the range of opinions that were

shared, thereby illuminating the boundaries or limits of the phenomenon. The fact that

only a handful of divergent comments emerged lends support to the appropriateness of

my analysis.

Police and Probation Officers

Within the police and probation officer focus groups, there were three outlying comments not otherwise incorporated within my report. One involved a positive comment about batterer intervention treatment programs working. "I think it does work, eventually. I mean, sometimes people have to hear stuff more than one time, but I think it does work". Another involved an officer who suggested that the CCR in Multnomah County was working better than if there was no collaboration, "at least we know who to call and, we know who we're talking to and pretty much what their response is going to be." Finally, in contrast to the many comments made about the fact that scarce financial resources impact men's ability to attend treatment, one officer shared a story about a client of hers who sleeps under a tarp by the train tracks and collects bottles every day in order to afford his treatment.

Victim Advocates

For the most part victim advocates were unenthusiastic about the success of the CCR; however there were a couple of comments that suggested that some advocates felt positive about the collaboration, particularly in Multnomah county. "In Multnomah County, there's a pretty strong relationship, at least with the DV probation officers and at least our agency… which I think is really important for survivors and batterers too." Another advocate agreed, "I think it's good, especially in Multnomah County. They have a good response." There were no other outlying comments found in the victim advocacy groups. This truncated range may be a result of the smaller sample size (9 total participants).

Victims/Survivors

The only significant outlying comments in the victim focus groups involved two women who reported that the criminal justice system had served them well. In response to a direct question from me about whether or not "anyone in the room had had a positive experience where police or arrest or batterer's intervention actually did make a difference and create greater safety for you and maybe made a change for your perpetrator?" two women spoke up. The first talked about how her father pulled his life together after losing his family, getting divorced, moving out of state and attending classes. "My, father, my parents were together for 21 years before they got divorced. My mom finally got fed up with it. Even though he went to anger management, went to batterer's intervention and my mom even paid for it, like, hopefully it will work. But, at first it didn't start working because he really didn't care until he lost his family. My mom got a divorce from him and then he started really working with it, working with it even though they were not getting back together. And it worked for him after that." Another woman chimed in and said, "Yeah. I had one too. Since the night that the call came in about a year and a half ago, I've been through a lot, but they have changed my life. The police, the state. I've been safe for a year and a half. He's gone and I have my kids and I'm clean and sober. So I believe it works."

Batterer Intervention Providers

A couple of providers took issue with the idea that the relatively high recidivism rates following batterer intervention suggest that the programs are not working. Instead, they reasoned that the programs are at least as effective as other similar programs for

drugs and alcohol, sex abuse, etc. and that perhaps it takes several therapeutic attempts before lasting attitudinal and behavioral changes can be achieved. These comments are not exactly outliers in that comments specifically contradicting this sentiment did not exist, but they were unique in that most stakeholders were content to buy into the context of my study (i.e., that domestic violence intervention strategies are limited in some ways). "I think the assumption that batterer's intervention, that the recidivism rate is terrible or something like that needs to be put in perspective with other forms of treatment, whether it's alcohol and drug. What I've heard is that people make several attempts to stop drinking or using drugs before they finally make a successful long lasting attempt to stop using, you know? And if you look at people's follow through, you know, people go to the doctor for diabetes treatment, the doctor tells them what to do. And a large percentage of people don't follow doctor's orders and you know die from diabetes or have heart problems. So, our success rate may not be any worse than other forms of public health intervention that we do in our culture."

Perpetrators

There were several outliers in the perpetrator focus groups, principally involving perpetrators not agreeing with their cohorts that the criminal justice system, batterer intervention programs and facilitators do not help them and there was one perpetrator who consistently called the other group members on their victim blaming. Contrasting the general sentiment about the police as angry, unhelpful and "out to get them", one gentleman commented that the police will treat you the way that you treat them. A handful of perpetrators discussed the ways in which the criminal justice system helped

them. "In my case in particular, I think it was a good thing that it happened. It sucks that it's lasted this long, but I'll get through it. You know? And now I'm a better person after the fact." Another offered, "I feel the same way because there was things [sic] that I didn't realize about myself… so it's helped me see the things that I need to change in my life, you know." Finally, a third gentleman disagreed that the district attorney makes up charges during arraignment. "That's a crock, man. 'Cause I never been charged with nothing I didn't do." One man consistently challenged his fellow group members when they tried to shift the focus to the "bad" behavior of their victims. "I would have to disagree with you… It just shows how far along in your program that you are [because] of the answers that you just gave because we're here to focus on us, not on anybody else's part in what happens to them." I have to note that in my opinion, the gentleman who made these corrective comments was enjoying the power his "knowledge" and "understanding of the material" gave him in the group. In other words, his comments did not seem completely other-serving. Interestingly, of the five stakeholder populations, the greatest range or diversity was expressed within the perpetrator groups. This may be a reflection of the fact that the men had been attending their respective batterer intervention programs for varying lengths of time and subsequently might have been at different stages of denial and acceptance with respect to their abusive behavior and the benefits of intervention. In other words, it may be that men who had been in the program longer were less resentful of the intervention and the groups and more capable of acknowledging the ways in which it was serving them.

Summary

The fact that these "outlier" comments were expressed provides some reassurance that the participants in the focus group discussions felt safe enough to disagree. It is noteworthy that most of the outlying comments refer to the ways in which the system *is* working. Given that the project focused specifically on identifying limitations to the systems' effectiveness and that participants were prompted by my questions to identify the shortfalls of current strategies, it is not surprising that there were few comments offered in support of the success of domestic violence intervention with abusive men. In fact, many of the comments reported in the negative case analysis were made in response to direct questions not on the discussion guide soliciting positive support for the efficacy of intervention. In the victim and perpetrator groups in particular, the sentiment of despair was so intense that as an applied researcher I felt compelled to shift the tone of the discussion before concluding. I was concerned about the negative impact of the evaluation if we only talked about the failings of the intervention. The fact that when requested supportive comments were offered is heartening and suggests that participants may have been able to provide examples of how domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men are working successfully if they had been systematically asked to do so.

Advisory Group Response to My Initial Findings

On May 8, 2009 I met with four members of my advisory group and my dissertation chair to discuss and review my initial observations and preliminary findings. In advance of the meeting I shared a copy of my summary statements for each research

question by stakeholder group. I also shared a copy of the direct quotes and paraphrases

that I initially culled and typed up when preparing each summary statement. The meeting

lasted for close to two hours and was tremendously reassuring. The assembled group

members were energized by my initial findings and expressed excitement and

anticipation about reading my final results. They informed me that my findings resonated

with their own observations, insights, and experiences within the field. It is particularly

noteworthy that during the course of the meeting the representatives present (one from

probation, two from the victim advocacy community and one from batterer intervention)

reenacted many of the agreements and tensions that I observed during the focus groups,

lending additional credibility and validity to the material upon which I have drawn.

Applying a System's Lens to Synthesize the Findings

In order to synthesize the vast amount of material collected, I enlisted a systems

approach to identify the key elements or subunits that according to stakeholders are

working together to manifest the quality, "limited domestic violence intervention

effectiveness" within the Portland Tri-County area (Lendaris, 1986). More specifically,

I invoked Linstone's (1999) technical, organizational and personal perspectives to assess

the material. Engaging multiple perspectives to create a final framework is

recommended from a system's approach, as one viewpoint is rarely considered sufficient

when assessing complex socio-technical systems. As described earlier, once the

stakeholders by research question summary statements were finished, I created a TOP by

research question matrix (see Appendix L). To do so, I focused on stakeholder responses

that pointed to concrete, tangible or quantifiable limitations of domestic violence

intervention with abusive men when invoking the technical perspective (T).   I attended

to processes, power dynamics, value struggles, and cultural differences when invoking

the organizational perspective (O), and I attended to responses that focused on the mental

processes of individuals, intuition, and feeling, when invoking the personal perspective

(P). In order to further synthesize the material I then condensed the presentation by

collapsing ideas from across the five research questions and created a new table (See

Table 1). In other words, I grouped together all of the technical factors impacting

successful intervention, all of the organizational factors, and all the personal feelings and

thoughts. This table includes twenty-seven ideas that according to key stakeholders in

the Portland Tri-County area contribute to limited effectiveness of domestic violence

intervention with abusive men.

Table 1

Limitations of current domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men viewed through a technical, organizational and personal lens (Linstone, 1999).

Technical Lens	Organizational Lens	Personal Lens
1) Insufficient or inappropriate arrests 2) Short prison sentences 3) Insufficient resources to respond appropriately and prosecute every case 4) Insufficient resources to monitor probationers 5) Ineffective and potentially harmful BIP 6) Insufficient resources to train CCR members about DV dynamics and victim blaming 7) Insufficient resources to provide for victim and perpetrator needs (housing, child care) 8) Insufficient attention directed at prevention 9) Insufficient time and resources to change social attitudes and values	1) Stakeholders are conflicted and at odds over whether current strategies should emphasize punishment or rehabilitation (treatment) 2) Stakeholders are frustrated and unsure about the costs and benefits of a "One size fits all" approach to perpetrators 3) The absence of victim-centered approach, coupled with rampant victim blaming exacerbates tension between stakeholders 4) The "invisibility" of perpetrators (e.g., no one knows what to do with them) contributes to victim blaming and isolates providers from other stakeholders 5) Teamwork within the CCR significantly impeded by different professional standpoints and cultures 6) Lack of respect and trust among stakeholders makes information sharing difficult.	1) Victims - The system doesn't prioritize their safety. They are abused by police and ignored by DAs, probation officers, etc. 2) Victims - Frustrated that current intervention strategies often make situation worse – arrest, probation and BIP can increase rather than decrease abusive behavior. 3) Victims - Extremely frustrated by the amount of responsibility placed on them by the CCR for the abuse they endure and for fixing it. 4) Perpetrators - System is too involved in their lives, disempowering them and their victims. 5) Perpetrators - DV is transactional and yet intervention focuses solely on them. 6) Perpetrators – Disconnected from the idea of DV as pre-mediated and controlled because they experience themselves

Technical Lens	Organizational Lens	Personal Lens
	7) Stakeholders hold different values and long term goals with respect to perpetrators, victims and families, straining collaboration 8) There is wide variability in the system response due to human variance 9) An over emphasis on physical DV and the CJS leads contributes to marginalization of other community resources (mental health, religious institutions, etc.)	as being "out-of-control." 7) Perpetrators - Intervention makes things worse as they are more angry and frustrated and feel more powerless which leads to greater levels of domestic violence. 8) Perpetrators – Frustrated by high costs of BIP. The financial strain interferes with their success. 9) Stakeholders feel dismissed, disrespected and sometimes betrayed by other stakeholders in the CCR.

Technical

Viewed through a technical lens, nine primary concerns or limitations surfaced. Insufficient or inappropriate arrests, short prison sentences, inadequate prosecution, insufficient monitoring of probationers, ineffective batterer intervention programs, insufficient training for CCR members about domestic violence dynamics, insufficient resources to provide for victim and perpetrator needs (e.g., housing and child care), insufficient attention directed at prevention, and insufficient time and resources devoted to changing social attitudes and values were all identified as barriers to optimal domestic violence intervention with abusive men.

Organizational

Viewed through an organizational lens, nine limitations impacting current

domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men surfaced. Stakeholders are

conflicted and at odds over how to balance punishment and rehabilitation. They are

frustrated and unsure about the costs and benefits of a "one size fits all" approach to

perpetrators. They are alarmed by the pervasiveness of victim blaming and the absence

of a victim-centered approach. They noted that the "invisibility" of perpetrators (e.g., no

one knows what to do with them) contributes to victim blaming and isolates batterer

intervention providers from other stakeholders. They acknowledged that teamwork

within the CCR is significantly impeded by different professional standpoints and

cultures, different long term goals with respect to clients, lack of respect and trust among

stakeholders making information sharing difficult, and inconsistencies in the system

response due to human variance. Finally, an over-emphasis on physical domestic

violence and the criminal justice system contributes to the marginalization of other

community resources (e.g., mental health, religious institutions).

Personal

Viewed through a personal lens, nine different limitations with current domestic

violence intervention strategies surfaced, most of which reflect the thoughts, feelings, and

experiences of victims or perpetrators. Given that they are the intended beneficiaries and

targets of the intervention, their perspectives are especially important to capture with this

lens. Victims/survivors articulated three primary concerns. They feel as though the

system does not prioritize their safety because they are abused or abandoned by police

and ignored by DAs and probation officers. They are frustrated that current intervention strategies often make their situation worse; arrest, probation and BIP can increase rather than decrease abusive behavior. Finally, victims/survivors were extremely disturbed by the amount of responsibility placed on them by the CCR for the abuse they have endured and for doing something to stop it. Perpetrators articulated five distinct concerns. They feel as though the system is too involved in their lives, disempowering them and their victims. They believe that domestic violence is transactional and are frustrated that the intervention appears to focus solely on them. They feel disconnected from the theory that domestic violence is pre-mediated and controlled because they experience themselves as being "out-of-control" when they are abusive. They also suggested that current intervention strategies can make things worse because they feel angrier and more powerless than before the intervention. Finally, perpetrators expressed a great deal of frustration over the high costs of batterer intervention programs, suggesting that the financial strain they experience interferes with their success in the programs. Officers, advocates, and providers all shared one additional personal perspective limitation. They reported feeling dismissed, disrespected and to some extent betrayed by other stakeholders in the CCR.

Seven interacting features of current domestic violence intervention strategies that interact to produce limited effectiveness of the system

Synthesizing and condensing the material into twenty-seven technical, organizational, and personal limitations allowed me better to scan the findings in search of overarching or summarizing themes. Seven primary or dominant themes emerged.

These seven interrelated challenges to the system's effectiveness encapsulate the

previously described twenty-seven limitations as well as the extensive findings reported

earlier.

According to key stakeholders in the Portland Tri-County area, it appears as

though seven interacting features may limit the effectiveness of domestic violence

intervention strategies with abusive men. Those seven subunits are: 1) attempting to

simultaneously punish and rehabilitate perpetrators, 2) dominance of a "one size fits all"

approach, 3) insufficient accountability within the system 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 (see

Figure 5).

Figure 5

Lendaris' (1986) definition of a system applied to the study findings.

Environment = Domestic Violence Movement
(Goal of eliminating violence against women)

System (A level) = Domestic Violence Intervention
Attribute: Limited effectiveness

**Subunits (B Level) = Units that operate together
to manifest the limited effectiveness of
domestic violence intervention**

Attempting to simultaneously
punish and rehabilitate

"One Size Fits All"

Insufficient accountability

Victim blaming

Barriers to Collaboration

Confusion created by
complex DV dynamics

Reactivity instead of proactivity

Attempting to simultaneously punish and rehabilitate perpetrators. Stakeholders expressed concern about how best to integrate the goals of punishment and rehabilitation with domestically abusive men. In particular, they mused about the efficacy of utilizing punishment to rehabilitate men, the negative impact men's resistance or resentment to punishment has on the efficacy of treatment, and finally the difficulties stakeholders encounter when they try to perform both functions simultaneously.

Police and probation officers articulated that punishment, particularly incarceration, does not equate to rehabilitation, especially since most men become more violent, as opposed to less violent, when they spend time in prison. Batterer intervention providers agreed and suggested that while punishment might lead to short term change, sustained or meaningful change (i.e., rehabilitation) requires therapy. Advocates and victims were similarly skeptical about the rehabilitative potential of criminal justice sanctions and postulated that when abusive men are placed in groups of other similarly minded men, whether in prison or in batterer intervention programs, they are not likely to change their destructive attitudes and beliefs about women. Most of the perpetrators I interviewed confirmed these suspicions and explained that for them, arrest, conviction, probation, incarceration and batterer intervention programs serve as a form of punishment, not rehabilitation.

Despite their ambivalence about the effectiveness of punishment in the service of rehabilitating abusive men, victims/survivors and victim advocates were almost unanimously in favor of intensifying punishment for perpetrators, whether through the use of the criminal justice system (i.e., more arrests, prosecutions and incarcerations) or

through the use of community sanctions (e.g., embarrassing them at their place of work or recreation). It is a bit unclear whether they were lobbying for intensifying criminal justice sanctions because they believe more punishment is a positive outcome in its own right, or because they believe that punishment, if applied more ardently, might rehabilitate perpetrators.

Each stakeholder group expressed concern about the impact of punishment on the efficacy of treatment. Batterer intervention providers and perpetrators were especially clear about the challenges presented when men are coerced by the criminal justice system to participate in treatment, though all stakeholder groups including victims/survivors and advocates acknowledged that in general perpetrators are extremely resentful about being forced to attend treatment and that this resentment interferes with the effectiveness of the programs. Victims/survivors and advocates specifically detailed how this resentment can translate into abuse when perpetrators return home from group angry about being forced to attend and take their frustrations out on their intimate partners. This dynamic was in some ways confirmed by perpetrators who noted with irony the fact that the groups often make them angrier.

The abusive men I interviewed repeatedly conveyed a sense of victimization at the hands of an unjust legal system. Even those few men who openly acknowledged that they had committed a crime, felt as though their sanctions or sentences were inappropriately excessive. When a couple of perpetrators disagreed and insisted that they would neither have stopped their abusive behavior nor had the skills and knowledge to change if they had not been "forced" to participate in treatment, these men were

challenged by their fellow participants in the focus group. In the midst of one of these

disagreement about the costs and benefits of being mandated to treatment, one man tried

to distinguish between being encouraged to attend and being forced to attend. "Pushed

on you is one thing, but being forced on you, jammed down your throat is another." The

image created by this statement, the image of having something "jammed down your

throat" represents the sense of victimization that most of the perpetrators expressed with

respect to the domestic violence intervention system.

Not only did stakeholders worry that blending these two orientations (i.e.,

punishment and rehabilitation) might be ineffective for perpetrators, but probation

officers and providers acknowledged that it was sometimes difficult for them to perform

both functions simultaneously. Officers noted that it is challenging to draw upon more

"social worky" skills to encourage their clients to embrace their treatment when most of

their job involves utilizing the threat of punishment to coerce men into adhering to their

probation requirements. Providers similarly discussed the negative impact blending these

two orientations can have on their ability to establish a productive therapeutic

relationship with their clients. The "punishment" discourse dominating current domestic

violence intervention strategies goes hand in hand with a vilification of perpetrators,

which according to batterer intervention providers negatively impacts treatment,

particularly when it comes to feeling good about the work they do and establishing a

positive therapeutic alliance with their clients. One provider talked about how her role in

the CCR would seem pointless if she did not believe that abusive men could change. The

group then discussed how difficult it can be to maintain this hope in the face of

stakeholders (including other providers) who are primarily interested in "punishing" abusive men. It is noteworthy that perpetrators' comments suggest that they are in fact sensitive to whether or not their program facilitator views them as redeemable and that when their facilitator holds out hope for their ability to change, they, too, believe it is possible and are more inclined to do the work.

Dominance of a "One size fits all" approach. Paralleling stakeholders' concerns, regarding how to balance punishment and rehabilitation when responding to abusive men, were their concerns about the "one size fits all" approach. Most stakeholders were quick to acknowledge that each perpetrator has a unique history as well as a unique familial, social, and societal context and that the same response might not be effective for each man who wields abuse. If sanctions and treatment were more specifically tailored to the individuals and crimes involved, victims might feel as though their unique plights were better taken into consideration and perpetrators might be more willing to embrace the consequences of their actions. As it stands now perpetrators are in some ways invisible within the system, disregarded as unique individuals within unique contexts, and are instead reduced to their crimes.

Police and probation officers, as well as perpetrators, were clear that each victim and each perpetrator possesses unique characteristics and is embedded in unique circumstances. They went on to suggest that if these differences are overlooked or ignored, not only is the response less effective, but it might actually be harmful. For example, victims suffer when they are inappropriately arrested for defending themselves against their primary aggressor (as a result of mandatory arrest policies) or when their

abuser is arrested, prosecuted, mandated to attend batterer intervention programs, or issued a "no contact" order regardless of their wishes or needs. According to the testimony provided by perpetrators, it appears as though victims and the community at large also suffer when abusive men are able to point to the lack of specificity in sanctions or treatment and use that as a reason to not acknowledge their offenses. For example, perpetrators were enraged to report that in their opinion they are all treated as though they are "real" abusers, when in fact they only yelled at their partner or "moved her two inches against her will", a crime yes, but not on par with someone who regularly beats his wife.

According to stakeholders, the inadequacies of a "one size fits all" approach are particularly evident when considering the needs of men who are traditionally marginalized within U.S. mainstream culture, such as men of color or men living in poverty. Current strategies almost exclusively rely on the criminal justice system, an institution that continues to treat minority men disparagingly. As one provider explained, "I think we probably would all agree that our criminal justice system is quite bigoted. It's classist, it's racist, it's sexist, you know? And so when you rely on it, you pull more strongly for targeting more people of color. You're targeting the working class folk. So I think one critique is that we are disproportionately targeting people who are already being oppressed in other ways."

According to advocates and victims/survivors, the dominant "one size fits all" approach to domestic violence intervention not only fails to adequately respond to the diverse needs of perpetrators, but to victims as well, who either because of their marginalized status or their desire to preserve their relationship find themselves choosing

to circumvent the criminal justice system. Advocates were clear that women of color are often less comfortable contacting the police, given their awareness of what it means to involve the CJS in their lives or the lives of minority men. Additionally, advocates were clear that the current system is not set up to extract or accommodate the preferences of victims. Knowing that once a victim contacts the police she is essentially turning control over her life to the criminal justice is enough to dissuade some victims from enlisting support.

Insufficient accountability within the system for abusive men. Almost unanimously, stakeholders expressed disappointment in the degree of accountability that perpetrators of domestic violence face with current strategies (Perpetrators were the only ones who did not attribute limited effectiveness of domestic violence intervention to insufficient accountability.). According to officers, advocates, victims and providers, abusive men are not being appropriately arrested when victims call the police for help, and when they are arrested they are being incarcerated for extremely short periods of time. These truncated prison stays greatly endanger victims when perpetrators return home and retaliate against them. Additionally, according to stakeholders, they send a disturbing message to victims, perpetrators, and the community at large about the "wrongness" of domestic violence.

Victims/survivors also noted that it takes an incredibly long time for their cases to be processed and they are frequently confused and alienated by the actions of the district attorney's office. They are rarely consulted regarding the charges brought against their abusers, and are frequently left bewildered when charges do not seem consistent with the

crimes committed. Even perpetrators reported being confused by the fact that they frequently found themselves facing charges that did not resemble their crimes. Advocates explained that in an effort to secure more convictions through plea bargaining, district attorney's offices often manipulate the charges, sometimes choosing to pursue offenses not related to domestic violence.

According to stakeholders in the Portland Tri-county area, the outcome, once a conviction is secured, is not especially encouraging. Due to insufficient funds, probation departments find themselves completely unable to adequately supervise their clients, resorting to "bench probation" for most perpetrators. Unless these men commit additional crimes and get arrested for them, they are not monitored.

Lastly, batterer intervention providers expressed frustration over the disconnect that exists between their programs and the rest of the accountability system. Providers shared that they struggle to enlist the support of probation officers to mandate attendance and lamented the fact that they do not receive vital information from victims that could confirm or dispel evidence of men's change or improvement.

Rampant victim blaming. Stakeholders within the Portland Tri-County CCR reported a disturbing level of victim blaming. Officers, advocates, victims/survivors and providers talked freely about the fact that many stakeholders blame women for the abuse they experience and hold them primarily responsible for stopping it, either by leaving, pressing charges, or participating in prosecutions. According to stakeholders, not only do victim blaming statements and attitudes limit the effectiveness of current intervention strategies by contributing to poor decision-making with regard to perpetrator and victim

accountability, but sadly when victims reach out for help and are met with insensitive and blaming comments, they are far less likely to reach out again.

It was evident that victims/survivors in this study felt completely abandoned by the criminal justice system – ignored and blamed by police, district attorneys, and probation officers. Advocates and victims/survivors recounted multiple examples of victim blaming statements made by police officers, DHS workers, and probation officers, including some that went so far as to suggest that victims enjoy and directly instigate the abuse. Officers agreed, and reported being discouraged by the fact that despite training, their colleagues often operate within a victim blaming paradigm, particularly when children are involved.

Disturbingly, this rampant victim blaming persists side by side with insufficient resources. Advocates repeatedly noted that the critical services, such as housing, child care, employment, health care, that might enable victims to make safer choices for themselves and their children are not readily available. So at the same time that victims are denied access to these vital services, services which are often being provided by their abusive partner, they are blamed for the fact that they have not done more to leave the relationship.

It was interesting that police and probation officers, victim advocates, and providers all expressed a sense of hopelessness about changing perpetrators, and instead indicated that they would prefer to expend energy helping victims. I believe that this "invisibility of perpetrators" within the system translates into victim blaming because it ultimately places responsibility for ending the abuse on victims.

Barriers to effective collaboration. Police and probation officers, victim advocates and providers were quick to acknowledge that one of the ways that current intervention strategies are limited is their failure to achieve the intended coordination of services for victims or perpetrators designated by the Duluth Model. Stakeholders identified several distinct barriers to optimal functioning including: the impact of value differences on trust and information sharing, a lack of professional courtesy and respect, and the variability among the actual individuals who represent collaborating partners.

Stakeholders pointed out that it is challenging to fully partner when collaborating agencies approach domestic violence from such different perspectives and hold vastly different goals and attitudes (i.e., reunification versus separation, victim blaming) with respect to clients. These standpoint differences make trust and information sharing difficult. For example, victim advocates pointed out that they are uncomfortable sharing information with DHS workers or probation officers knowing that they often harbor victim blaming attitudes and beliefs and may use any information advocates share to the detriment of their clients.

Additionally, several stakeholder groups admitted that they regularly feel dismissed or ignored by other, usually more powerful, stakeholders within the CCR and that when these stakeholders refuse to integrate their expertise, successful intervention is significantly hampered.   Police and probation officers reported that batterer intervention providers do not seem interested in listening to their input, just as providers lamented the fact that their advice is often blatantly ignored by police and probation officers. For example, providers reported having attempted to reach out to probation officers with

concerns about a particular perpetrator and being told that the officer was not interested

in hearing from them unless they violated their probation (i.e., unless they broke the law

and needed to be "punished"). Providers also reported that perpetrators have sometimes

been pulled by probation officers from their programs for "good behavior" without any

input from them about how they are doing in group. Obviously, this type of

communication breakdown leads to a serious lapse in accountability for perpetrators.

Advocates expressed similar frustrations, suggesting that DHS workers and

probation officers frequently fail to solicit their input or assistance when working with

their clients. However, it is encouraging to note that advocates who work as members of

DVERT teams reported better communication and relationships, though power

imbalances between members of the criminal justice system or DHS and advocates were

noted.

A final challenge to the CCR mentioned by every stakeholder group is the fact

that policies and procedures are not implemented by agencies or organizations, but rather

they are carried out by individuals. Officers, advocates, victims/survivors, providers and

perpetrators all identified human variance as a factor that limits the success of current

intervention strategies. Given the complexity of domestic violence dynamics,

stakeholders reported that insufficient training and rapid turnover mean that clients can

receive vastly different responses from within the same system (i.e., police and probation

officers vary, DHS workers vary, advocates vary, BIP facilitators vary). This variance

can be confusing to clients and frustrating to fellow collaborators.

Confusion created by complex domestic violence dynamics. Most stakeholders

were clear that the dynamics involved with domestic abuse are uniquely complicated and

that the criminal justice system is ill-equipped to manage the ambiguous context of

domestic abuse. Assigning responsibility and blame is particularly challenging for law

enforcement officers when they arrive at the scene and hear two very different accounts

of what has transpired. While adequate training can mitigate confusion, the fact remains

that the answer may not be as simple as "he is the perpetrator and needs to be punished"

and "she is the victim and needs support services". Domestic violence is unique from

stranger assaults in that the participants are likely to remain in contact with one another,

either because they want to repair their romantic relationship, are financially

interdependent, or because they share children. This difference complicates the question

of whether to focus on punishing or rehabilitating offenders. Perpetrators were

particularly angered by the fact that the criminal justice system and batterer intervention

treatment programs do not appear to acknowledge that "it takes two people to fight" and

subsequently their victims are culpable as well.

According to the stakeholders I interviewed, the confusion caused by complex

domestic violence dynamics does not stop with police officers. Participants reported that

probation officers are often vexed by the actions and decisions of victims, particularly

their unwillingness to immediately exit abusive relationships, their hesitancy or

unwillingness to press charges and participate in prosecution and their interest in having

"no contact" orders lifted. Officers were honest in reporting the fact that even though

they understand the cycle of violence and the fact that it takes a woman "on average

seven times to leave her abusive partner", they find themselves frustrated when victims do not leave.

Reactivity instead of activism and prevention. When asked to reflect on what limits the effectiveness of domestic violence intervention with abusive men, every stakeholder group I interviewed pointed to the fact that current strategies are reactive as opposed to preventative. Instead of focusing on how to stop abuse from occurring in the first place, the system is focused on how to interrupt and punish violence that has already occurred. There were four primary layers to this critique.

First and foremost, stakeholders discussed the fact that very little is being done to shift attitudes and beliefs at the societal level. Participants explained that despite the fact that antecedents of domestic violence are identified primarily at the societal level, few efforts directly target this level of analysis. This absence was primarily attributed to a scarcity of resources, though some stakeholders acknowledged that it reflects an orientation and prioritization within the field. Domestic violence advocates, in particular, discussed the fact that they barely have the resources to meet the immediate crisis needs of their clients and subsequently are unable to focus attention on advocating for social change. Providers noted that there is no tangible reward (i.e., they do not get paid) for doing community outreach or activism. Sadly, stakeholders noted that until substantial shifts in gender roles, masculinity and femininity, conflict resolution, and power tactics occur on an institutional or societal level, the movement to end domestic violence will be limited in its success.

Second, stakeholders expressed that there are important prevention opportunities that are currently unexercised, particularly providing prevention education within the schools, increasing training for the workplace, medical field, and religious institutions, and raising awareness through the media. The fact that prevention education is not common within the schools was a great source of consternation for stakeholders. Perpetrators in particular could not understand why courses on relationships and domestic violence are not regularly offered. They suggested that if they had received information in school about acceptable versus unacceptable behavior and the consequences for those behaviors, they would have made different choices (i.e., abuse would have been prevented). Officers and providers lamented the fact that efforts to provide this type of programming are often met with resistance, particularly by local school boards.

Providers, advocates and victims/survivors were particularly interested in enhancing the training provided in workplaces, the medical field and within religious organizations suggesting that training could translate into more effective screening and directly prevent future violence. Stakeholders also talked about the untapped potential of the media. Advocates, providers and perpetrators suggested that by using the media in the form of PSAs, commercials, and reality shows many people who might ordinarily not have contact with the domestic violence movement could learn to identify, seek help, and prevent abuse. Victims/survivors in particular were interested in lobbying television executives to reduce the amount of violence against women regularly depicted on popular shows, suggesting that these shows might actually provide perpetrators with new ideas about how to hurt women.

Third, stakeholders, particularly victim advocates and probation officers, discussed the fact the system was neglecting a critical prevention opportunity by not focusing more explicitly on remedying the shortage of vital resources for women, particularly housing, child care, and employment. According to these stakeholders, far too many women are forced to stay in abusive relationships because their other options are simply unacceptable (i.e., homelessness or not being able to feed their children). If more time and attention was devoted to lobbying and securing vital basic needs and services for all women, the system might be able to spend less time intervening in the crises that ensue in their absence.

The final critique with respect to reactivity involves stakeholders' concern that heavily reliance on the criminal justice system, with its' focus on "punishing" individuals after they have committed a crime, cements this emphasis within the field. The issue of probation violations is a perfect example. Probation officers, providers, and perpetrators were clear that the system is not designed to assist in the avoidance of violations, merely to hand out sanctions in response to them. According to providers, probation officers do not want to hear from them if their probationer is struggling in group. They are only concerned if probationers have done something that violates the conditions of their probation and subsequently warrants a CJS response. Probation officers agreed and were equally frustrated to report that in their opinion the system is not set up to help their probationers avoid violations. In fact, the system seems to set men up to fail by requiring them to pay for expensive treatment and issuing "no contact" orders even when they create substantial hardships for the family. Perpetrators appeared keenly aware that the

system (e.g., probation officers) is watching for their slip-ups, not helping them to avoid infractions.

Summary. In reflecting on the findings produced during this inquiry, it is clear that soliciting input about what is limiting the effectiveness of domestic violence intervention with abusive men from key stakeholders within the Portland Tri-County CCR was worthwhile. Not only were stakeholders eager to provide insight and information about specific ways in which current strategies fail to meet their expectations, but they were able to discuss gaps between theorized antecedents for domestic violence and current strategies, discrepancies between an ideal model of CCR and what they experience, and provide suggestions for how they would like to see the larger community engaged in domestic violence intervention. In the next chapter, I bridge connections between the seven themes that emerged from stakeholders' responses and the existing literature on domestic violence intervention. I point out the ways in which these themes or subunits interact to produce the "limited" effectiveness of the system and then outline a few of the theoretical, practical and methodological implications of this study.

Chapter Six: Discussion

Domestic violence is one of the most complex, costly, and critical social problems facing our society today (Bancroft, 2002; Healey et. al., 1998; Mears, 2003). Each year, millions of women and children suffer significant emotional, psychological and physical trauma as a result of men's abusive behavior (Astin et al., 1995; Bufkin & Bray, 1998; Campbell et al., 1997; Fantuzzo & Mohr, 1999; McKay, 1994; Moscicki, 1989; Rand & Strom, 1997; Straus et al., 1990; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000; Walker, 1991). Over the course of the last three decades, the domestic violence movement has successfully pushed the conversation about how best to intervene into mainstream discourse (Lehrner & Allen, 2009). Once considered a closeted, personal tragedy, the plight of domestic violence victims has been widely exposed (Carlson & Worden, 2005; Klein, Campbell et al., 1997; Schechter, 1982). Numerous theories have been developed to explain men's violence against women (Harway & O'Neil, 1999), support services and shelters for victims have multiplied (Farmer & Tiefenthaler, 2003; Schechter, 1982), criminal justice sanctions and intervention programs for abusive men have proliferated (Healey et al., 1998), and research aimed at understanding perpetrators and assessing the efficacy of interventions has flourished (Gondolf, 2002).

Despite this attention, efforts to successfully reduce the incidence of domestic violence have not met with tremendous success. Not only have rates of perpetration remained disturbingly high (Bachman, 2000), but rates of recidivism following men's arrest (Babcock & Steiner, 1999; Schmidt & Sherman, 2996), prosecution (Murphy et al., 1998), supervision (Rempel, Labriola & Davis, 2008), and attendance in treatment

programs (Dobash & Dobash, 1997; Feder & Wilson, 2005) are far from ideal.

Unfortunately, evaluation studies to date have provided practitioners with little guidance

about how to improve the success of current strategies as a whole. Most studies have

focused narrowly on indentifying individual characteristics associated with increased

rates of recidivism following contact with one or more intervention component (i.e.,

arrest, prosecution, probation or treatment) (Date & Ronan, 2000; Feder & Dugan, 2002;

Hamberger & Hastings, 1990; Jones & Gondolf, 2001). Though a growing number of

process-oriented evaluations designed to explicate how certain aspects of domestic

violence intervention are effective now exist (Pandya & Gingerich, 2002; Scott & Wolfe,

2000; Silvergleid & Mankowski, 2006; Wangsgaard, 2001), few provide guidance on

how to enhance current strategies collectively. This project attempted to address this gap

by engaging a systems approach to study limitations of current domestic violence

intervention strategies with abusive men. By attending to context, processes and multiple

perspectives (Lendaris, 1986) in order to best understand and critique the targeted system,

a new question was posed, "What theoretical restrictions and intervention

decisions/characteristics interact to limit the effectiveness of domestic violence

intervention with abusive men?"

Six key stakeholder populations within the Portland Tri-County area were

convened in 10 focus groups and asked a series of questions designed to elicit their

feedback regarding what is limiting the success of domestic violence intervention with

abusive men in their communities. Police and probation officers, victim advocates,

victims/survivors, batterer intervention providers, and perpetrators met in homogenous

groups, comprised of between 4 and 12 members for an average of 77 minutes to discuss

their perceptions of what constitutes current domestic violence intervention with abusive

men, what is limiting its success, and how else they would like to see the community

engaged. Transcripts were analyzed using a constructivist grounded theory approach

(Charmaz, 1995) and emergent themes and ideas in response to five key research

questions were reported.

Major Findings

Project Goal One

The first goal of this project was to describe and critically analyze limitations of

current domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men. Fortunately,

stakeholders were quite eager to offer their perceptions of the limitations of the current

response and provided compelling descriptions of the multiple ways in which they find

the present system problematic.   Their descriptions are captured or represented by seven

emergent themes that operate together to manifest the attribute "limited effectiveness"- 1)

attempting to simultaneously punish and rehabilitate perpetrators of domestic violence, 2)

dominance of a "one size fits all" approach, 3) insufficient accountability within the

system 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. Stakeholder comments supporting these seven themes were

carefully reviewed in the previous chapter. At this point, it is important to contextualize

their comments within the existing literature of the field. As Kidder and Fine (1997)

contend, researchers have a responsibility to assert interpretive authority over the data,

and "advance a theoretical framework around the 'voices' of informants, to help analyze these voices in their historic and current circumstances." (p. 49).

Much has been written in the last decade about the problems associated with heavy reliance on the criminal justice system to intervene in domestic violence (DeKeserdy & Dragiewicz, 2007; De-Leon-Granados, Wells, & Binsbacher, 2006; Erwin, 2006; Ford, 2003; Grauwiler & Mills, 2004; Guzik, 2009; INCITE, 2003!; Mankowski et al., 2002; Pence, 1999; Romkens, 2006; van Wormer, 2009). The testimony gathered for this project provides clear support for these concerns. The seven emergent themes or subunits that stakeholders in the Portland Tri-County area identified as operating together to manifest "limited effectiveness" of the intervention system point to four fundamental tensions or challenges linked with utilizing the criminal justice system as the primary vehicle to hold perpetrators accountable for their abuse. These tensions or challenges include the difficulty of 1) blending 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.

Blending the goals of punishment and rehabilitation. Stakeholders in the present study were concerned about the effectiveness of current domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men and spoke at length about their perceptions of the challenges associated with blending punishment and rehabilitation. Specifically, they suggested that punishment does not equate to rehabilitation; that criminal justice sanctions often produce tremendous resentment and resistant in perpetrators worsening the abuse that victims

receive at the hands of their perpetrators and interfering with treatment success; and, finally, that stakeholders often find it challenging to perform both functions simultaneously.

In trying to disentangle and contextualize their concerns, it may be helpful to revisit how the goals of punishing and rehabilitating perpetrators of domestic violence became enmeshed in the first place. In the late 1970's, domestic violence advocates recognized that providing emergency shelter and counseling services for victims was somewhat futile if nothing were going to be done with abusive men (Dobash et al., 2000; Pence and Shepard, 1999). Subsequently, advocates began lobbying for a two-pronged approach to perpetrators. They wanted victims to be recognized as citizens of the state deserving of protection by the criminal justice system (Miller, 2001) and they wanted perpetrators to receive some form of treatment (Jennings, 1987) so that they might no longer pose a danger to current or future victims (Adams & McCormick, 1982; Gondolf, 1987; LaViolette, 2001). This push for punishment or criminal justice system-imposed accountability on the one hand and rehabilitation or batterer intervention treatment on the other became blurred into a singular approach when judges started mandating attendance in intervention programs as a condition of probation or as a way to defer conviction (Ganley, 1987; Hamberger & Hastings, 1993; Harrell, 1991; Pence, 1999; Soler, 1987). In other words, while initially there may have been recognition and appreciation of the fact that punishment and treatment are distinct intentions that serve distinct functions, this recognition seems to have muddied over time.

Once attendance in batterer intervention programs became mandated by the

criminal justice system, these programs started to fall more under the guise of punishment

and accountability and less under the guise of treatment or therapy. This shift was not

accidental or unintentional; it was initiated by domestic violence advocates who were

concerned that providing therapy to abusive men conveyed a problematic and disturbing

message about the root causes of domestic violence (Dutton & Nicholls, 2005; Schechter,

1982; Straus, 1974; Yllo, 1988). Mainstream advocates were working tirelessly to

promote the idea that domestic violence was sanctioned, endorsed and essentially caused

by Patriarchy, or the political, social, and interpersonal subordination of women by men

(Pence & Paymar, 1993) and to offer therapy to counter intentional choices that

individual men exercised was contraindicated (Schechter, 1982). The appropriate

treatment for men's violence against women was one that involved re-education about

power and control and gender equity (Babcock et al., 2004; Pence & Paymar, 1993)

coupled with confrontation in order to hold them accountable for their abuse. The irony,

as indicated by the responses of stakeholders in the Portland CCR and supported by

existing literature, is that neither intention has yet to be fully realized. Despite significant

gains in the criminalization of domestic violence over the past three decades (Fagan,

1996; Gondolf, 2002; Harrell, 1991; Jolin, 2008; Miller, 2004), abusive men are still not

being sufficiently punished or held accountable as indicated by low prosecution rates

(Fagan, 1989; Ford, 1993; Ford, 2003; Henning & Feder, 2005) and infrequent

incarcerations (Hester, 2006). Additionally, efforts to rehabilitate or reduce men's

propensity to recidivate either through criminal justice sanctions or batterer intervention

programs have not met with overwhelming success (Babcock et al., 2004; Buttell &

Carney, 2005; Feder & Dugan, 2002; Feder & Wilson, 2005; Harrell, 1991; Henning &

Holdford, 2006).

Stakeholders in the current study appeared rather conflicted about criminal justice

sanctions. On the one hand, almost every group noted that insufficient accountability for

perpetrators of domestic violence manifesting in the form of missed arrests, dismissed

charges, unsatisfactory prosecutions and short incarcerations was problematic in that

victims are not given the protection they deserve and perpetrators are not being

sufficiently punished. However, at the same time, stakeholders questioned the

effectiveness of enhancing these strategies given the fact that they are not rehabilitative

and can often aggravate the situation and further endanger victims.

The fact that stakeholders in the present study questioned the rehabilitative

potential of punishment for perpetrators of domestic violence, particularly in the form of

prison, should come as no great surprise. Currently in the United States there is growing

skepticism regarding the positive impact of incarceration. When introducing "The

National Criminal Justice Commission Act of 2009", Senator Webb (2009) reminded

Congress that "despite burgeoning prisoner populations, our communities and

neighborhoods are not safer" (p. 70). After noting that the United States imprisons a

stunningly high percentage of our citizens compared to the rest of the world (the U.S.

contains 5% of the world's population and 25% of the world's reported prisoners), Webb

acknowledges that rehabilitation efforts within prison fall pitifully short. In other words,

it is not surprising that stakeholders in the current study were skeptical of the efficacy of

punishing perpetrators in the hopes that they will be rehabilitated as there is little evidence to support such expectations (Andrews & Bonta, 2006). "We have been unable to find any review of experimental studies that reveals systematically positive effects of official punishment on recidivism (that is, there is no evidence that official punishment reduces recidivism)" (p. 70).

More disturbing, perhaps, than the fact that punishment does not seem to rehabilitate perpetrators is that fact that, according to stakeholders in the current study, criminal justice system involvement might actually make perpetrators more abusive. According to officers, advocates and victims/survivors, overnight holds (which are common for domestic violence offenses) place victims in a tremendously frightening position. Angry and indignant over being arrested and spending the evening behind bars, perpetrators frequently retaliate and the physical consequences for victims can be severe. Victim advocates and victims discussed the fact that it seems pointless to engage the police, knowing that perpetrators are released so quickly and that "she would get it worse".

This finding is consistent with other literature suggesting that police intervention can sometimes exacerbate the violence (Hovell, Seid, & Liles, 2006). Schmidt & Sherman (1996) reported that arrest for certain populations, particularly the unemployed and unmarried, might actually increase the rates of future domestic violence and Fagan (1989) reported that men with prior arrests or who had long histories of severe violence against their partners were more likely to recidivate if prosecuted. It is important to keep in mind that stakeholders, particularly advocates and victims, did not appear to be

lobbying for a reduction in criminal justice sanctions when they talked about the dangers

of arrest. In fact, they seemed to be suggesting that the punitive consequences need to be

greater in order to provide appropriate levels of punishment for perpetrators and

protection for victims, though it is unclear whether they believe intensifying sanctions

would translate into a reduction in retaliation.

Victim advocates and victims also spoke about the retaliation and abuse that can

occur as a consequence of perpetrators' mandated attendance in batterer intervention

programs. Victims reported that their partners often return home from group angry about

being forced to attend and pay for treatment. These perpetrators often take that anger out

on their victims, blaming them for engaging the criminal justice system in the first place.

Additionally, victims and advocates lamented that perpetrators often become craftier as a

result of their participation in treatment. It has been their experience that perpetrators

often learn how to better manipulate their partners and the criminal justice system from

the other men in the group. They learn to hit their partners where the bruises will not be

seen; they learn to accompany their partners to the hospital so that they can control the

story that gets told to medical personnel and they learn new ways to emotionally and

psychologically abuse their victims. In other words, according to stakeholders in the

Portland Tri-County area, mandated batterer intervention treatment, like other criminal

justice sanctions (i.e., arrest and prosecution), can sometimes increase the abuse that

victims receive at the hands of their perpetrators. These reports are consistent with

concerns expressed by Scott (2004) and others (Gondolf, 2002; Gregory & Erez, 2002;

Pollack & MacKay, 2001) about the possibility that while physical assaults or abuse may

decrease during batterer intervention programs, other forms of abuse (i.e., psychological and emotional) may remain the same or escalate.

Stakeholders in the current study noted that mandating batterer intervention can not only produce feelings of resentment and resistance in perpetrators, which can translate into anger and abuse directed at their victims, but they pointed out that this resistance can interfere with men's ability to engage in treatment. Officers, advocates and victims all noted that men will frequently just "go through the motions" of treatment; an impression that was at least partially validated by the testimony of perpetrators. According to these stakeholders, perpetrators see it as a punishment they have to endure or a hoop they have to leap through, not as a pathway for change or a vehicle for self-improvement. It was abundantly clear that the abusive men I interviewed resented the fact that the criminal justice system was imposing requirements on them, particularly requirements related to treatment. For most of them, mandated batterer intervention constituted punishment, not rehabilitation. They were being punished; they were being forced to attend and pay for treatment and as such they were victims of an unjust system.

This "victim stance" is not unique to the participants in my study. A handful of recently conducted qualitative explorations reveal that punitive measures can often be counterproductive when perpetrators begin to see themselves as victims of the criminal justice system as opposed to offenders rightfully charged who need to change (Anderson & Umberson, 2001; Eisikovits & Buchbinder, 2000; Guzik, 2009). After interviewing 30 perpetrators about their experiences with mandatory arrest and no-drop prosecution polices, Keith Guzik (2009) writes that "nearly all the respondents in this study

understand their punishments as unfair sanctions meted out by an unjust local legal

system rather than as a consequence of their own actions" (p. 94). Guzik goes on to

stipulate that this victim stance permits and prevents perpetrators from engaging in their

treatment programs; for if they are victims of an unjust system then they must not be truly

guilty of their crimes. "While advocates hope that punishment teaches abusers a lesson,

often the lesson they learn is that they are victims of an unjust legal system" (Guzik,

2009, p. 5).

Guzik notes that the perpetrators in his study attempted to separate themselves

from "true" batterers, as a way of suggesting that the criminal justice sanctions and

treatment were not necessary for them. This framing was rampant in the current sample

as well. The men I interviewed did not try to minimize the crime of domestic violence

per se, but rather attempted to convince me that they had not really committed domestic

violence. According to their testimony, mandated treatment makes sense for real

batterers who beat their partners, but not for men who yell or "move their victims two

inches against their will". When men distance themselves from "true" batterers in

response to "excessive" criminal justice sanctions, they not only lesson their culpability,

but they significantly hamper their ability to be engaged and rehabilitated by the

treatment program. If they do not see themselves as offenders of violence, but rather

victims of an unfair system, they may resist absorbing the material presented to them in

group. "Definitions of the self as non-violent were central to batterers' responses to

criminal justice interventions. To the extent that counseling challenges this definition of

the self, participants may resist participating in the programs" (Guzik, 2009, p. 176).

This type of resistance was evident among the perpetrators I interviewed, with most of them claiming to not need the techniques or skills provided during group.

It has also been suggested that the confrontation or "punishment" stance adopted by most batterer intervention programs (Milner, 2004) might actually contribute to men's resistance to the material (Chovanec, 2009; Murphy & Baxter, 1997; Wexler, 2000). "The coercive nature of many interventions (e.g., court orders) can complicate the change process, particularly the initial decision to change" (Day, Chung, & O'Leary, 2009, p. 210). This hypothesis is supported, in part, by a growing body of work suggesting that different processes of change (Pandya & Gingerich, 2002; Scott & Wolfe, 2000; Silvergleid & Mankowski, 2006; Wangsgaard, 2001) may be more or less effective with perpetrators depending on which stage of change they are in (Chovanec, 2009; Daniels & Murphy, 1997; Murphy & Baxter, 1997; Scott, 2004). Murphy & Baxter (1997) were among the first to suggest the application of the transtheoretical model of change (Prochaska & DiClemente, 1984) to batterers' intervention. There are three organizing principles or dimensions within the transtheoretical model: stages of change, processes of change and levels of change. The stages of change represent sequential, temporal markings describing when an individual must complete certain tasks if sustained behavior change is to be achieved. Certain processes of change may be more effective in facilitating change during certain stages, and this "matching" has significant implications for work with batterers (Daniels & Murphy, 1997; Lehmann & Simmons, 2009).

Based on research with other behaviors, Daniels & Murphy (1997) assert that experiential processes, such as consciousness-raising, dramatic relief, environmental

reevaluation, social liberation and self-reevaluation are more effective when clients are in the early stages of precontemplation, contemplation and preparation for action, while behavioral processes, such as helping relationships, stimulus control, counter-conditioning, reinforcement management, and self-liberation are more appropriate in the later stages of action and maintenance and can in fact be counter-productive if used in the early stages. It may be that coercing (through punitive criminal justice sanctions) and confronting men when they are in the early stages of pre-contemplation is counterproductive to rehabilitation (Beesley & McGuire, 2008) in that it increases resistance to change.

Finally, stakeholders discussed the challenges they personally face when trying to navigate the goals of punishment and rehabilitation with men in order to fulfill their responsibilities within the CCR. Probation officers discussed how difficult it can be for them to simultaneously be responsible for forcing men to attend treatment and punishing them if they do not attend while also serving as "counselors" to them, advocating for them to really embrace the program material. Likewise, batterer intervention providers discussed how it can sometimes be difficult for them to be effective as therapists while operating within the dominant "punishment" orientation of the CCR. The focus on punishment within the CCR promotes the notion that perpetrators are "bad" men in need of sanctions, as opposed to "mad" men in need of treatment (Mankowski, et al., 2002) and presents a challenge for batterer intervention providers. If abusive men are "bad" men, the possibility of rehabilitation is precluded. If they are "bad" men, then there is no hope that they can change. Providers insisted that for therapy to be effective, establishing

and maintaining hope is critical. It enables them to feel positive about their role in the

CCR and it is necessary in order to establish a productive therapeutic relationship with

their clients. Perpetrators' comments suggest that they are in fact sensitive to whether or

not their program facilitator views them as "bad" or "mad" and that when their facilitator

holds out hope for their ability to change, they too believe it is possible and are more

inclined to do the work. As a side note, I observed that men who explicitly identified

their facilitator as having "hope" for their redeemability were more engaged, less

resentful, and far more appreciative of the value of treatment than the perpetrators who

did not share this impression of their facilitator.

The importance of both a positive therapeutic relationship and "hope" within

therapy has been well documented. Miller, Duncan, and Hubble (1997, 2004) and others

(Lambert & Barley, 2001; Lambert & Ogles, 2004) have summarized the pantheoretical

factors of change and have noted their importance. Lehmann & Simmons report that

"40% of the change variance [is due] to the client's extra-therapeutic factors (such as

strengths, resources, coping skills, motivations, where they live, social support, and so

forth); 30% to the client/therapist therapeutic relationship (this includes the quality of the

client's participation in the therapeutic relationship); and 15% to the therapist's attitude in

conveying a sense of hope to the client" (p. 20). Their conclusions support the concerns

of local providers and perpetrators and suggest that labeling men as hopeless and "bad"

likely interferes with treatment effectiveness.

In conclusion, it seems clear that domestic violence intervention strategies with

abusive men initially intended to address both punishment and rehabilitation. Over time

the balance between these two objectives blurred and shifted to the point that punishment

(and the criminal justice system) is clearly privileged. It may be helpful for the domestic

violence movement to reconsider the primacy of "punishment" in dealing with men who

perpetrate abuse and critically reflect on how to better integrate or utilize best practices

from both the criminal justice and the mental health fields. Given stakeholders'

frustrations with overnight holds and short incarcerations, it may be necessary to augment

some criminal justice sanctions in order to meaningfully hold men accountable and

provide safety for victims. At the same time, it may be helpful to divest or better separate

rehabilitation or treatment from the criminal justice system in order to maximize its

potential benefits.

Balancing consistency with an individually tailored response. Stakeholders in the

Portland Tri-County CCR seemed to vacillate between desiring a more consistent

response to perpetrators of domestic violence and a more variable or individually-tailored

one. More accurately perhaps, they expressed a desire for and concerns about both.

While consistency was touted for its reliability and uniformity such that all perpetrators

might be subject to the same sanctions and consequently all victims might receive the

same protection, variability was lauded for its specificity and appropriateness. Most

stakeholders noted that currently, consistency or a "one size fits all" approach, dominates

intervention strategies with abusive men, and they expressed grave concerns with this

focus. In particular, they questioned the effectiveness of relying so heavily on the

criminal justice system for all perpetrators, given their understanding of the ways in

which that system operates and is received differently by men of color and men living in

poverty. They also spoke at length regarding the fact that within the criminal justice system violence is de-contextualized, resulting in grave consequences particularly for women who are arrested for using defensive violence. Finally, they questioned the benefits of a "one size fits all" approach to treatment given the diverse needs of individual perpetrators. Comments in support of the need to enhance consistency were also made, particularly with respect to arrests, prosecution and probation requirements. As with the tension between punishment and rehabilitation, it seems as though stakeholders were ultimately lobbying for better achievement of both intentions; enhanced consistency in terms of sanctions or accountability for perpetrators on the one hand and increased variability or specificity on the other.

There has been much written about the fact that current domestic violence intervention strategies in the United States are dominated by a "one size fits all" approach, as indicated by their fundamental dependence and utilization of the criminal justice system to hold men accountable for their intimate abuse (Erwin, 2006; Guzik, 2009; van Wormer, 2009). This singularity has been strongly criticized, particularly by advocates representing marginalized populations (INCITE!, 2003; Mederos, 1999, Ritchie, 2000). Stakeholders in the Portland Tri-County area echoed these concerns, observing that minority men are treated disparagingly by the criminal justice system. They are more likely to be arrested, prosecuted and incarcerated for domestic violence than white or wealthy men (Ruttenberg, 1994; Cahn, 2000; Coker, 2001). As such, stakeholders suggested that they are likely to have a different response to the threat of criminal justice sanctions than less targeted populations. For example, the "victim

stance" that many perpetrators in the current study adopted with respect to sanctions is likely to be exaggerated for men who are able to point to statistical and anecdotal evidence in support of their claims that they are unfairly treated by the criminal justice system. A slightly different, but related, concern was raised by providers, who suggested that instead of serving as a deterrent, the threat of sanctions may actually serve as a "badge of honor" for some young men, with incarceration functioning as a desirable outcome.

Stakeholders suggested that heavy reliance on the criminal justice system to intervene with abusive men is equally complicated for women of color and women living in poverty. They resonated with much of what has been written in the field regarding the internal conflicts that arise for these women when considering whether or not to call the police or press charges (Erwin, 2006, INCITE!, 2003; Miller, 1989; Ms. Foundation for Women, 2003; Richie, 1996; Williams, 1998). While there is some evidence to suggest that women from minority groups may be more likely to contact the police (Hutchinson et al., 1992), many have suggested that marginalized women may be reticent to engage the criminal justice system for fear they will be harshly judged by their communities (Danis, 2003), be deported (Rasche, 1995), or be unable to provide for their children if their perpetrator is incarcerated (Iovanni & Miller, 2001; Jordan, 2004). "Law and order approaches to violence are ill suited to the needs of a diverse range of marginalized women (e.g., women of color, poor women, lesbians) who have historically been inadequately served by police intervention" (DeKeseredy & Dragiewicz, 2007, p. 880). Stakeholders in the current study unanimously pointed to the fact that criminal justice

sanctions carry vastly difficult consequences for poor women and many suggested that awareness of these consequences frequently dissuade victims from utilizing these strategies. Victims may refuse to call the police, refuse to testify or request that "no contact" orders be lifted in order to insure that their perpetrators remain under the same roof, providing essential financial support, despite the fact that they are then subject to continuing violence.

Heavy reliance on the criminal justice system is both a representation of and a codifier of a "one size fits all" approach. Depending on the criminal justice system, to the exclusion of other approaches for intervening in men's domestic violence, represents a singular approach. Additionally, utilization of the criminal justice system has itself reinforced the primacy of a "one size fits all" approach through adoption of mandatory arrest and prosecution policies coupled with its 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 & Austin, 1993). Unfortunately, one unintended outcome of this "equalizing" practice is that women are now being arrested at an alarming rate (Erwin, 2006; Miller, 2001), a phenomenon that greatly concerned some stakeholders in the current study. The CJS is "incident driven" such that officers focus on the incident or dispute at hand, rather than on the context or history precipitating the conflict (Heany, 2006). As a result, primary victims acting in self defense are more and more frequently being arrested as the primary aggressor or in tandem with the primary aggressor in the case of "dual arrests" (Miller, 2001; Muftic, Bouffard, & Bouffard, 2007). Research

reveals that women now constitute 20% of those arrested for domestic violence (Henning & Renauer, 2005; McMahon & Pence, 2003) and there is evidence indicating that over half of these women may be primary victims (Henning, Renauer, & Holdford, 2006). Stakeholders in the current study lamented this trend and the devastating impact it has on individual victims. Not only are victims who are arrested as a consequence of mandatory arrest laws subject to the humiliation of criminal justice sanctions, but, according to Portland CCR stakeholders, the repercussions can be devastating in terms of decreased future employment and housing opportunities. Furthermore, advocates and victims pointed out that knowing that they might be arrested can dissuade victims from seeking police protection.

The criminal justice system's "one size fits all" approach to domestic violence mistakenly assumes that domestic violence is a singular phenomenon; that it manifests in a similar pattern for all perpetrators and victims. Research suggests that intimate violence may actually manifest in at least two different patterns (Erez & King, 2000; Melton & Belknap, 2003). Specifically, studies have shown that domestic violence can be exhibited in the traditionally conceived pattern of abuse (e.g., intimate terrorism) or in a more mutually engaged form of violence (e.g., situational violence or common couple violence) (Johnson, 1995). It is reasonable to conclude that mandatory arrest laws and the decontextualization of individual incidents have led to arrests of women and men engaging in common couple violence under the application of laws originally designed to protect women from men's patriarchal terrorism (Guzik, 2009).

Perpetrators in the current study would certainly concur that treating all incidents of domestic violence in the same manner is problematic. Many of them insisted that they were arrested for a one-time mistake and subsequently their violence was fundamentally different from men who regularly beat their wives. Their primary complaint was that the system treats all perpetrators the same regardless of their crime (whether in the context of common couple violence or intimate terrorism). They were particularly outraged to report that despite variations in their crimes or histories, they all received the same sanctions and are forced to participate in the same length of treatment. Guzik's (2009) data lend some credibility to their assertions. He notes that in his sample of 20 perpetrators, "intimate terrorists and situationally violent offenders experience[d] similar outcomes from the criminal legal system" (p. 95).

Of course, it remains to be seen whether different responses from the criminal justice system are warranted for different patterns of abuse. As Zorza (2010) points out, it may be difficult to definitively determine whether a "situationally violent" man is on his way to becoming an "intimate terrorist" or if his act of violence really represents a "one-time" incident. Furthermore, should the crime of strangulation be treated less seriously just because the perpetrator has never been violent or abusive before? Equally vexing is the challenge created by the fact that the criminal justice system can currently only punish physical violence, making it difficult to sanction many of the actions and behaviors that traditionally characterize intimate terrorism (Stark, 2007).

This challenge was hinted at by several stakeholder groups and expressed directly by batterer intervention providers. Providers noted that when we focus heavily on those

acts or crimes that are "punishable", most acts of domestic violence are ignored. Given

that domestic violence is traditionally defined as a pattern of coercive behaviors, most of

which do not involve physical violence, many perpetrators of domestic violence and their

victims fall through the cracks. "The equation of abuse with physical force in

relationships has helped the domestic violence revolution access a range of professional

and political agendas. But it has failed victimized women in critical ways" (Stark, 2007,

p.85). Most forms of domestic violence are not illegal. By ignoring or casting aside the

complexities of domestic violence and attending to only one manifestation, many women

have been left without intervention options.

Clearly, the criminal justice system as a "one size fits all" approach to domestic

violence struggles to meet the diverse needs of perpetrators and victims. As will be

discussed more fully in the implications section, perhaps alternative restorative justice

approaches such as victim-offender conferences, family group conferencing, healing

circles and community reparations might better accommodate their unique and varied

needs (Braithwaiute & Daly, 1998; Grauwiler & Mills, 2004; van Wormer, 2009; Ptacek,

2010).

When discussing the drawbacks of a "one size fits all" approach to perpetrators of

domestic violence, stakeholders in the Portland Tri-County CCR were particularly

concerned about the lack of specificity with respect to treatment. Their concerns parallel

a growing recognition within the field that enhanced intervention success might be

achieved through the adoption of a more tailored treatment. "There would appear to be a

need to develop more differentiated service responses determined by a detailed

assessment of the nature and causes of the offense, as well as the severity and risk of re-offending occurring" (Day, Chung, & O'Leary, 2009, p. 210). Stakeholders, particularly police and probation officers, observed that the reasons why any particular man is abusive vary and that to ignore this diversity seems unwise. They hypothesized that interventions might be more successful if detailed intake assessments were conducted and corresponding treatment assignments made.

Unfortunately, as a result of the wide-spread adoption of state standards (Austin & Dankwort, 1999), batterer intervention programs may not be equipped to respond to the diverse needs of perpetrators. Similar to mandatory arrest policies, state standards were initiated in order to promote consistency and prevent men who committed similar crimes from being sent to radically different and potentially dangerous treatment programs (Bennett & Piet, 1999; Gelles, 2001). The result is that despite the range of theories that have been advanced to explain men's violence towards women, theories that observe the impact of physiological and biological forces (Green, 1999; Janssen, Nicholls, Stefanakis, Spidel, & Simpson, 2005; Rosenbaum et al., 1994), mental illness and psychopathology (Dutton, 1995; Ehrensaft, Moffitt & Caspi, 2004; Jasinski, 2000), substance abuse (Johnson, 2000; Langhirichsen-Rohlin, 2005; Quigley & Leonard, 2000; Schafer, Caetano & Cunradi, 2004; Stuart, Moore, Kahler & Ramsy, 2003; Tolman & Bennett, 1990), skill deficits, destructive relationship patterns (Anderson & Scholossberg, 1999; Cook & Frantz-Cook, 1984; Neidig, Friedman, & Collins, 1995) and culture, race and class (Sanchez-Hucles & Dutton, 1999), most batterer intervention programs do not attend substantially to these issues.

This trend towards uniformity in batterer intervention programs has not been without critics. Many have suggested that too little is known about what works in batterer intervention to force adherence to guidelines (Buttell & Carney, 2005; Corvo & Johnson, 2003; Fagan, 1996; Feder & Wilson, 2005; Holtzworth-Munroe, 2001; Lehmann & Simmons, 2009), while others have suggested that the dominant model being endorsed is problematic (Dutton & Corvo, 2006). Gelles (2001) nicely summarizes these two concerns.

> There are two compelling arguments against the evolving trend of standards for intervention programs for men who batter. The first argument is the simplest and least controversial: We simply do not know enough about which treatment programs are effective, for which men, and under what conditions to mandate standards for such programs. The second argument is more complex and infinitely more controversial: The standards that are being called for, developed, and applied, represent a particular ideological commitment of those who work on behalf of battered women and are less tied to a therapeutic theory of philosophy (Gelles, 2001, p. 14).

The ideological position that Gelles is referring to is the "patriarchy as cause" theory that mainstream domestic violence advocates have advanced to explain men's violence (Pence & Paymar, 1993; Schechter, 1982). The argument that Gelles and others (Dutton & Corvo, 2006) have put forth is that while a socio-political analysis of domestic violence may be appropriate, it has limited therapeutic value. As discussed in the

"punishment and rehabilitation" section, batterer intervention programs might need to focus more attention on first determining and then responding to *how* men change.

Stakeholders' impulse to try and match perpetrators with appropriate intervention programs appears to be supported by preliminary research suggesting that pairing perpetrators profiles with specific treatment strategies may enhance effectiveness. For example, Saunders (1996) randomly assigned 218 men to either a Feminist-Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment (FCBT) model or a Process-Psychodynamic Treatment (PPT) model. His results indicated that anti-social, substance-abusing men were far less likely to recidivate when assigned to FCBT (36%) as opposed to when they were assigned to PPT (53%). Men with dependent personalities demonstrated the reverse pattern, such that they were more likely to recidivate when assigned to FCBT (52%) than when assigned to PPT (33%). Similarly, Williams (1995) evaluated the impact of culturally focused batterer counseling on 41 African-American men in Minneapolis-St. Paul and reported that men in the culturally focused programs felt less isolated, were more comfortable engaging with the other participants, and had more positive feelings towards their counselors than men in conventional programs. These findings suggest important advantages that culturally specific programs might have over mainstream batterer intervention programs for marginalized men. Attending to perpetrators' drug and alcohol issues also appears promising (Stuart et al., 2003). O'Farrell & Murphy (1995) demonstrated a significant decrease in marital violence among perpetrators who ceased drinking following behavioral martial therapy alcoholism treatment in comparison to perpetrators who did not stop drinking following the treatment. The real question

becomes how to provide consistency within and across programs while simultaneously attending appropriately to the diverse needs of batterers.

In conclusion, stakeholders in the Portland CCR struggled to disentangle the benefits and drawbacks of consistency and variability with respect to perpetrators of domestic violence. While most expressed reservations about the primacy of the "one size fits all" response and heavy reliance on the criminal justice system, they were not uniformly in favor of less consistency, particularly if the resulting variability equates to less accountability for perpetrators. It may be that similar to the punishment and rehabilitation quandary, an optimal solution involves simultaneously enhancing both consistency and variability, a strategy that might require enhancing current strategies while engaging alternative approaches for intervening in men's domestic violence.

Effectively protecting and empowering victims. Stakeholders in the Portland Tri-County area expressed skepticism about the criminal justice system's ability to simultaneously protect and empower victims of domestic violence. More accurately, they expressed dismay over the degree of disempowerment that victims experience in the name of "protection". They described how victims are essentially thrust into a relationship with the criminal justice system that bears a striking resemblance to the one they experienced with their abusive partners; one in which they are deprived of the authority to make decisions about their lives, bullied into participating in the prosecution of their abusers, and blamed for the abuse they endure.

The grassroots domestic violence movement of the 1970's was focused on protecting <u>and</u> empowering battered women (Schechter, 1982). Early mainstream

advocates sought to achieve women's protection through underground shelters (Schechter, 1982) and by challenging the criminal justice system to assist battered women (Pence & Shepard, 1999). However, victim empowerment was equally paramount (Schechter, 1982). "Battered women's rights to self-determination, including the decision to leave or stay with their husbands, were to be respected; if sexism robbed women of control over their lives, Women's Advocates would work on methods for returning it (Schechter, 1982, p. 63).

Unfortunately, achieving a constructive balance between protection and empowerment for victims has been challenging under the rubric of current domestic violence intervention strategies. Heavy reliance on and engagement of the criminal justice system to provide protection for victims has significantly hampered empowerment for individual women (DeKeserdy & Dragiewicz, 2007; DeLeon-Granados, et al., 2006; Erwin, 2006; Grauwiler & mills, 2004; Gulik, 2009; Mills, 1998, 1999; Romkens, 2006; van Wormer, 2009). When advocates enlisted the criminal justice system on behalf of victims, they consciously engaged an institution that had been instrumental in maintaining social inequalities with the hope that by advocating for domestic violence victims' rights and subsequently changing the criminal justice response towards them, much needed institutional change would be achieved (Pence & Shepard, 1999). Over time, it has become clear that engaging the criminal justice system on behalf of battered women has created a tension between "institutional advocacy" on the one hand and the desires of individual women on the other hand (Pence & Shepard, 1999). While some could convincingly argue that the "rights" of battered women as a whole are served by

advancing zero tolerance policies such as mandatory arrests and no-drop prosecution, according to local stakeholders the authority and power of individual women are regularly compromised by these very policies.

Victims/survivors, advocates and perpetrators in the current study confirmed that victims have little say in whether arrests are made, charges are pressed, prosecutions are pursued, or "no contact" orders are released. In other words, many of the criminal justice practices, (i.e., mandatory arrests, no-drop prosecutions and "no contact" orders issued by the courts), originally advanced in the service of protecting victims (Jordan, 2004; Mears et al., 2001; Orchowsky, 1999; Weisz et al., 1998) have not only failed to provide security, but they have fundamentally alienated and disregarded victims (Belknap, 2007; Burford & Adams, 2204; Buzawa & Austin, 1993; Ford, 2003; Grauwiler & Mills, 2004; Guzik, 2009; McDermott & Garofalo, 2004; Mills,1998; Ms. Foundation for Women, 2003; Orchowsky, 1999). Most disturbing, perhaps, is the realization that these policies have confined victims in ways that are all too familiar to them.

> The strong alliances between the domestic violence movement and the police replicates, on a societal level, the relationship between the battered woman and her abuser…. [sic] The woman turns to a powerful man for protection from a hostile and frightening world, yet this domestic sanctuary increasingly closes in on her, restricting her range of movement (Mankowski et al., 2002, p. 191)

This assertion, that current practices have replicated an abusive relationship for victims, was thoughtfully articulated by Linda Mills' in her 1999 article, entitled *Killing her softly: Intimate abuse and the violence of state intervention.* In it, Mills details the

disturbing nature of the relationship between victims and the state, suggesting that

mandatory domestic violence policies and practices actually inflict emotional violence on

victims by depriving them of respect and empowerment. It is interesting to note that in

1993, Buzawa & Austin interviewed 80 domestic violence victims about their

experiences with the police and reported that one of the factors that best determined

whether or not victims were satisfied with the criminal justice system's response was the

degree to which their preferences regarding arrests were honored (regardless of whether

their preference was to arrest or not to arrest). In other words, what mattered most was

whether a victim was treated as an agent of her own life, an equal partner, capable of

making safe and rational choices about her safety. Buzawa & Austin cautioned that

wide-spread adoption of mandatory arrest policies would ultimately eliminate victim

discretion.

Victims/survivors in the present study were particularly frustrated by the fact that

they had little or no say in the prosecution of their batterers. They explained that they

were not consulted or even communicated with by the district attorney's office and were

frequently confused about how best to secure their desired outcome. Participants testified

more than once that they thought they had taken the necessary steps to prosecute their

abusers, only to find out later that they had not. Clear and accurate communication was

difficult for victims to secure; they reported getting the "run-around" or not being able to

get a straight answer from representatives at the courthouse. Victim advocates in the

Portland Tri-County area confirmed these experiences and expressed distress over the

fact that the system is so difficult for clients to navigate. Similar frustrations have been

reported by victims in other communities (Grauwiler, 2007). Peggy Grauwiler conducted

multiple, in-depth semi-structured interviews with ten women who had had various

contact with the domestic violence system in New York City. Among many other

frustrations, these women reported "the *run around* effect" (p. 315). These women noted

that they would receive conflicting answers to the same questions and were subject to

"apathy, indifference and inadequate response amongst criminal justice personnel (i.e.,

judges, police and court staff)" (p.315).

Ironically, mandatory arrest and no-drop prosecution policies may actually serve

to increase rates of domestic violence when victims avoid contacting the criminal justice

system out of fear that they will no longer be in control. Several advocates in the present

study pointed out that knowing that once a victim contacts the police she is essentially

turning over control over her life to the criminal justice system is enough to dissuade

some victims from enlisting support from dominant domestic violence intervention

vehicles altogether. This unintended consequence has also been articulated by others in

the field.

> It has been argued that mandatory arrest undermines women's autonomy and even
>
> violently disempowers them because they are forced onto a trajectory that might
>
> be against their own wishes and interests. The prospect of invoking a full-fledged
>
> criminal justice intervention where the victim has to testify against her abuser can
>
> make women reluctant to call the police, thereby depriving them of protection
>
> (Mills, 1998, 1999) (Romkens, 2006, p. 160).

Of course, victims are not always "ignored" by the criminal justice system. In fact, according to stakeholders in the Portland Tri-County area, they are often bullied into participating in prosecution of their perpetrators even if they want nothing to do with the case. Whether they want distance from the case for emotional, psychological or physical safety reasons, their wishes are regularly disregarded and they are frequently coerced into participation. One advocate described how one of her clients was essentially stalked with multiple threatening phone calls by the district attorney. According to Ford (2003), this type of behavior is becoming commonplace among prosecutors.

> It has become increasingly common for prosecutors to use [sic] coercion on victims: Victims are forced to participate in criminal justice proceedings under threat of criminal sanctions. In some jurisdictions, victims are told that they must participate and that if they fail to appear, they will be subject to arrest" (p.669).

Clearly coercion by the criminal justice system deprives the victim of control, just as she was deprived of control in her violent intimate relationship (Ford, 2003; Mills, 1997).

The most common manifestation of victim disempowerment reported by stakeholders in the Portland Tri-County area was the rampant proliferation of victim blaming. Every stakeholder group, except perpetrators, identified wide-spread victim blaming within the system. According to stakeholder testimony, victims are blamed for choosing abusive partners, for staying in the relationship with abusive partners, for not calling the police, for calling the police too often, for not pressing charges, for not participating in prosecution, for allowing their abusers to violate "no contact" orders and for reconciling with their abusive partners. Police and probation officers were candid in

acknowledging that regardless of their training and experience and despite the fact that most of them are aware of the fact that contextual factors such as lack of sufficient housing, childcare, and employment often force women to choose between their physical and financial safety, they are often guilty of blaming the victim for her situation, especially if there are children involved. Unfortunately, this type of victim blaming is not confined to Portland police and probation officers. Grauwiler (2008) reports that "participants stated that they were frequently treated as though they were the 'criminal', or that the violence was their fault by responding police officers, judges and other court personnel" (p.315).

Why, after 30 years of activism and education around domestic violence, is victim blaming still so prevalent? Social psychologists explain the phenomenon of victim blaming as stemming from defensive attributions and a belief in a just world (Aronson, Wilson, & Akert, 1994). People want to believe that the world is a safe place where people get what they deserve. The logical extension of this belief is a tendency to attribute crimes or tragedies to deficits in victims' abilities or characters. In other words, bystanders tend to "blame the victim" for their situation (Burger, 1981; Lerner & Simmons, 1966; Shaver, 1970; Walster, 1966).

> By using this attributional bias, the perceiver does not have to acknowledge that there is a certain randomness in life, that an accident or criminal may be waiting just around the corner for an innocent person – like oneself. The belief in a just world keeps anxious thoughts about one's own safety at bay (Aronson et al., 1994, p. 191).

It is reasonable to assume that stakeholders in the Portland Tri-County area may be attributing blame to victims in order to protect their belief in a just and safe world. However, for many of the stakeholders I interviewed, their inclination to blame the victim also seemed linked with their own feelings of impotence with respect to successfully intervening in domestic violence. They reported feeling helpless to protect women and frustrated when women did not appear to help themselves, as well as hopelessness about the potential to rehabilitate perpetrators. It may be psychologically easier for members of the CCR to make internal attributions (Heider, 1958) about the character failings of victims and perpetrators rather than accept ownership for the ways in which the system (of which they are a part) is failing.

Balancing the goals of creating institutional change for battered women, while simultaneously providing protection and empowerment for individual women, has become increasingly difficult within a domestic violence intervention system that relies so heavily on the criminal justice system. Testimony collected from stakeholders in the Portland Tri-County area suggests that the costs for individual women for depending almost exclusively on the criminal justice system to respond to abusive men are great. The fact that increasing engagement of the state on behalf of domestic violence victims has not been more successful in equalizing power and agency for female victims will likely not surprise radical feminists (Brown, 1995). As Catharine MacKinnon (1989) illuminated in *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State*, the liberal state is fundamentally sexist and "the rule of law – neutral, abstract, elevated, pervasive – both institutionalizes the power of men over women and institutionalizes power in its male form" (p. 238). In

other words, it may have been misguided for advocates to depend so heavily on a state institution to intervene in domestic violence given that they theorize intimate violence against women to be both a symptom and illustration of patriarchy. In the immortalized words of Audre Lorde (1984), "the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house" (p. 110).

 Moving beyond reactivity towards prevention. Stakeholders in the Portland Tri-County CCR suggested a fourth tension that heavy reliance on the criminal justice system to intervene in men's domestic violence exacerbates: the tension between reacting to an individual man's violence against an individual woman and developing strategies to prevent men's violence against women. Community psychologists differentiate between these two strategies, labeling the first, "tertiary prevention," (Fried, Reppucci & Woolard, 2000) in that it is geared at preventing destructive behavior in people who have already exhibited it, and the second, "primary prevention," in that it is oriented towards groups, occurs prior to the actual problems and is aimed at securing or strengthening the mental health of those who are not yet affected (Cowen, 1996). Stakeholders were disturbed by the fact that current efforts almost exclusively target individuals who have been abusive, a clear illustration of tertiary prevention, despite the wide-spread acceptance of a socio-political analysis of the root causes of domestic violence which suggest that prevention should target institutional levels of analysis. They were vexed by the fact that a disproportionate amount of resources are currently devoted to "crisis" management rather than prevention education or provision of vital basic resources.

Stakeholders noted that despite the dominance of societal level theories linking

patriarchy to men's violence towards their intimate partners (Dobash & Dobash, 1992;

Pence & Paymar, 1993), current strategies for intervening with men's violence rarely

focus on societal or institutional levels of change. They attributed this lack of focus to a

shortage of resources, though a few suggested that while scarce resources certainly

contribute to or enable this focus, the reality is that the current attention to tertiary

prevention reflects a choice or prioritization within the field. As reviewed in Chapter

Two, Lehrner & Allen (2009) and others (Erwin, 2006) have suggested that this shift in

focus from a more explicitly political analysis of domestic violence to a fundamentally

individual level analysis may be attributable to the dominance of the criminal justice

system. "Although the early days of the battered women's movement explicitly linked

violence and gender subordination, this understanding has been transformed by

increasing criminal justice intervention that introduces gender-neutral legal standards"

(Erwin, 2006, p. 199). The tenet of this argument is that alignment with the criminal

justice system, with its propensity to evaluate individuals divested of context or

circumstance, has prompted a shift away from examining and addressing influencing

factors at the socio-political level (factors such as patriarchy, racial and class oppression).

Historically, domestic violence advocates sat outside of the CJS and offered a

critique of its policies and practices. They were among the first to identify the culpability

of the criminal justice system in the victimization of women at the hands of their intimate

male partners (Hovell et al., 2006; Schechter, 1982), and to subsequently demand, insist

and lobby for policy shifts (Shepard & Pence, 1999). Today, the situation has changed

and victim advocates are far more likely to work in collaboration with the CJS

(McDermott & Garofalo, 2004).

> As a result of movement agencies' dependence on public dollars and of the
>
> opportunity to collaborate with powerful system stakeholders, movement veterans
>
> argued that leaders and agencies have begun to "pull their punches" to remain
>
> viable. Although movement agencies need government funding to survive, some
>
> argued that survival has come at a cost to the movement's social change agenda
>
> (Lehrner & Allen, 2009, p. 666).

It has been argued that victim advocacy has in some ways become co-opted by

powerful system stakeholders like the criminal justice system (Erwin, 2006; Lehrner &

Allen, 2009; McDermott & Garofalo, 2004; Pence 2001). It has even been suggested that

advocates have lost their passion for social change as a result of the many improvements

over the past twenty years in the CJS's response to domestic violence (Lehrner & Allen,

2009). Of course, others continue to successfully contend that engaging the criminal

justice system on behalf of battered women represents a societal level strategy

(McDermott & Garofalo, 2004; Pence & Shepard, 1999); however, participants in the

current study seemed more inclined to view the CJS as a strategy directed primarily at

individuals.

Despite the suggestion that victim advocacy has become institutionalized

(Shepard, 1999) with many advocates now viewing domestic violence as a "depoliticized,

degendered phenomenon" (Lehrner & Allen, 2009, p. 662), this does not appear to be the

case among Portland advocates. The women I interviewed were clear that a socio-

political analysis was appropriate in order to understand domestic violence, but lamented that due to the "crisis-oriented" nature of their work, their day-to-day activities are primarily reactive and focused on helping individual women survive. Advocates and providers acknowledged that if they weren't so focused on tertiary prevention, they might be able to more fully participate or engage in primary prevention efforts, particularly in the form of training for medical and religious and prevention education in the schools.

The most ardently discussed missed prevention opportunity raised by stakeholders involved providing vital basic needs such as housing, child care, and employment for both perpetrators and victims. Stakeholders were quite clear that until these basic needs are fulfilled, domestic violence will continue to plague their communities. Officers and advocates pointed out that focusing on enhancing or improving criminal justice sanctions without attending to these vital human rights is woefully short-sided. Victims will not choose to engage sanctions if the end result means that she cannot feed or house her children. "U.S. best practices such as increasing law enforcement responses or aggressive prosecution polices often fail to take into account or respond to the numerous needs of women who are battered, including long-term housing, economic support, or child care" (Erwin, 2006, p. 199). Additionally, stakeholders suggested that perpetrators will be unable to respect and abide by the sanctions (e.g., attendance in mandated BIPs and honoring "no contact" orders) if they do not have critical resources such as housing and employment.

In conclusion, it appears as though stakeholders feel stuck reacting to domestic violence, rather than preventing it. Their personal dilemmas illuminate a larger challenge

or tension facing the field. Relying on the criminal justice system to intervene in men's

abuse has supported and endorsed strategies focused on the individual level of analysis,

rather than preventative and activist strategies which would more directly target the

societal or institutional level of analysis. Elizabeth Pleck (1987) comments on this

phenomenon in her review of the development family violence social policy.

Specifically, she acknowledges the de-politicizing impact that coalitions with federal

state institutions have had the domestic violence movement. "No social movement

survives the process of community acceptance with all of its radical ideas intact. The

battered women's cause had been considerably tamed by the coalitions and compromises

it made in order to receive state and federal funding" (Pleck, 1987, p. 199). It may be

that as activists critically reflect on the costs associated with some of the coalitions that

have been forged, revitalized activism and prevention efforts will return to center stage.

Summary. Thanks to the enthusiasm and willingness of key stakeholders in the

Portland Tri-County CCR to share their opinions, the first goal of this project was readily

achieved. A number of limitations affecting the effectiveness of domestic violence

intervention with abusive men were described during the focus group discussions.

Drawing on a systems approach to synthesize and organize their comments, seven

thematic challenges that operate together to manifest the attribute "limited effectiveness"

of the system were identified. These seven challenges illuminated four fundamental

tensions or dilemmas that are created by heavy reliance on the criminal justice system to

intervene in domestic violence: the difficulty of 1) blending 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. Continuing to critically reflect on these tensions or dilemmas will likely

create opportunities for enhancing intervention efforts with abusive men.

Project Goal Two

The second goal of this project was to identify and describe additional

opportunities for engaging community resources in domestic violence intervention with

abusive men. It is noteworthy that, when asked, key stakeholders within the Portland Tri-

County CCR described an intervention response limited primarily to the criminal justice

system. Every group referenced police responding to crisis calls and making arrests,

district attorneys prosecuting perpetrators, and courts assigning probation and mandating

attendance in batterer intervention programs. Advocates, victims, and providers also

acknowledged the role of the Department of Human Services: Child Welfare, while

officers, advocates and providers briefly mentioned the existence of victim services and

community outreach to the religious and medical communities.

When asked directly about resources in the community that they would like to see

involved in intervening in men's violence against women, stakeholders suggested missed

opportunities at the institutional/organization level, the social/group level and the

individual level of analysis (see Figure 6).

Figure 6

Stakeholder suggestions for how to better engage the community in holding abusive men accountable.

INSTITUTIONAL/ORGANIZATION LEVEL SUGGESTIONS

- Enhance domestic violence training and screening for religious organizations, health care system and community at large
- Launch a campaign similar to M.A.D.D. to galvanize citizens and promote better bystander behaviors
- Provide prevention education, particularly within the schools
- Utilize the media in the form of PSAs and Internet Pop-ups to raise awareness about domestic violence and what constitutes abusive behavior
- Reduce the amount of violence on TV, particularly violence against women
- Engage the workplace to better protect victims and hold men more accountable for their abusive behavior
- Increase availability of resources addressing the basic needs of victims and perpetrators
- Augment community compassion for perpetrators; particularly with respect to providing employment opportunities

SOCIAL/GROUP LEVEL SUGGESTIONS

- Neighborhood policing
- Free drop-in youth programs
- In-patient treatment programs for perpetrators
- On-line registry of perpetrators
- Enlist men and former perpetrators to help shift community attitudes towards women

INDIVIDUAL LEVEL SUGGESTIONS

- Require perpetrators to pay for their children to attend special summer camps in order to help break the cycle of violence
- Mandatory pre-marital counseling

At the institutional/organization level, stakeholders discussed the benefits of enhanced

training for religious and medical personnel, the exciting possibilities linked with

launching a campaign similar to M.A.D.D. in order to galvanize citizens and promote

better bystander behaviors, and the critical need to provide prevention education,

particularly within the schools. Most stakeholders also suggested that the media could be

better utilized to dispel myths about domestic violence, provide facts and basic

information in order to raise awareness about what constitutes abusive behavior, and help

decrease the community's tolerance of violence towards women. Victims also discussed

the advantages of engaging the workplace in order to better protect them and help hold

abusive men accountable for their behavior. Finally, every stakeholder group noted the

importance of increasing the availability of vital resources in order to better meet the

basic needs of victims and perpetrators, with perpetrators specifically suggesting that they

would benefit from community compassion in the form of employment opportunities.

  At the social/group level of analysis, stakeholders suggested the creation and

utilization of neighborhood policing, free drop-in youth programs, in-patient violence

abatement programs for perpetrators, and an on-line registry of abusive men that would

be accessible to the public. Providers and advocates also suggested enlisting men and

former perpetrators to help shift community attitudes regarding women. At the

individual level of analysis, victims suggested having perpetrators pay for their children

to attend special summer camps in order to help break the cycle of violence and

perpetrators discussed the potential advantages of mandating pre-marital counseling.

Stakeholders' suggestions for how to better engage the community were creative, diverse and spanned multiple levels of analysis. The fact that their suggestions were relatively undeveloped in terms of specific details, in comparison to the rest of their comments, may be a function of their allegiance and involvement with current strategies, or it may simply reflect the fact that it is far easier to critique existing modes of intervention than to provide specifics regarding ideas that in their minds have yet to come to fruition. It is exciting to observe that their suggestions seem to coincide with emerging practices in the field, examples of which may provide some of the missing detail. In particular, there is growing awareness of the prevention and intervention opportunities that exist within health care settings, the educational system, and the workplace.

The health care system has been a popular recent target of domestic intervention efforts due, in part, to the fact that so many victims of domestic violence seek medical help either in emergency rooms or primary care settings (Murphy & Ouimet, 2008). The National Institute of Justice and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2000) estimates that each year approximately 480,000 visits are made to emergency rooms as a result of domestic violence. Unfortunately, despite wide-spread support for universal health care screening in order to identify and provide vital support to victims (Murphy & Ouimet, 2008; Thackeray, Stelzner, Downs, & Miller, 2007), this practice has not yet been fully actualized. Thackeray et al. (2007) reported that in their sample of 140 self-identified victims, less than 40% were screened by a health care professional for interpersonal violence and only 1% of those screened received information about relevant resources. This finding resonates with statements made by victims/survivors in the

current study who reported that they were not asked by medical personnel about violence despite strong evidence suggesting that they might have been abused.

Several barriers to universal screening have been identified, many of them linked to concerns that health care providers have about exacerbating the violence or alienating their patients because they believe they lack the skills to appropriately deal with victims of violence (Allen, Lehrner, Mattison, Miles, & Russell, 2007; Sugg, 2006). It may be that innovative strategies are needed if universal screenings are to be more successfully implemented. For example, Murphy and Oimet (2008) have proposed that social workers collaborate with health care settings and provide on-site assessments, interventions and referrals in order to mitigate some of the concerns described above. Others have suggested the use of technology in order to address barriers. Hawkins, Pearce, Skeith, Dimitruck & Roche (2009) reviewed a large scale project to "wed" technology with health care professionals' knowledge and skills in order to expedite screening and intervention for domestic violence. They concluded that:

> Increased electronic sharing of information reduced redundancy in screening for domestic abuse and neglect and in collection of health information. Not only did technology reduce time in responding to patients at risk, but it also reduced the stress on patients created by having to repeat their stories to several health care providers (p. 65).

It is likely that as these and other innovations are explored and adopted, the resources of the health care system can be better optimized to intervene in domestic violence.

The educational system has also been a popular target for primary prevention and to some extent intervention efforts (Wekerele & Wolfe, 1999). Paralleling comments made by local stakeholders, Wolfe & Jaffe (1999) report that school-based awareness and skill development programs provide an important venue through which to reach children and can be effective in reducing future incidents of domestic violence. They document the following key elements for a successful school-based program:

> Identifying relationship violence as a form of societal violence; acknowledging that domestic violence is an abuse of power and control; creating a high enough level of trust so that children can disclose exposure to domestic violence and teachers can make appropriate referrals; teaching safety skills about what to do when domestic violence occurs; and encouraging the development of social skills such as anger management and conflict resolution as alternatives to violence (p. 139).

Initial evaluations of the effectiveness of school-based dating prevention programs reveal that students not only increase their knowledge about dating violence, but experience positive attitudinal changes with respect to abuse and relationship conflict. Furthermore, there is some evidence to indicate that participants self-report less "offending" behaviors after completing programs than do control subjects (Wekerle & Wolfe, 1999).

In addition to traditional school-based prevention programs that involve essentially "mini-trainings" to students and teachers, there is a growing trend towards providing support groups within schools for targeted individuals. In programs of this nature, students who are identified by school officials as being "at risk" for violence

either because of their family histories or their own personal dating histories are invited

to attend a weekly support group facilitated by counselors from local domestic or sexual

violence agencies. *Expect Respect*, a teen dating violence prevention program, is an

example of this type of effort (Ball, Kerig, & Rosenbluth, 2009). Initial results from a

qualitative exploration of this particular program suggest that students learned new

communication and anger management skills, while also increasing their knowledge

about healthy relationships and the warning signs of abuse within dating relationships.

Additionally, students reported becoming more aware of their own abusive behaviors

(Balll, Kerig, & Rosenbluth, 2009). Clearly, these preliminary evaluation findings

suggest that stakeholder's impassioned requests to augment domestic violence prevention

education within the schools warrant continued consideration.

Discussions regarding the spillover or impact of domestic violence on the

workplace, as well as the opportunities for prevention and intervention that lie therein,

have surged in recent years (Mankowski, Galvez, Rollins, Hanson, Perrin, & Glass, 2009;

Swanberg, Logan, & Macke, 2005; Swanberg, Macke, & Logan, 2007). Research reveals

that between 36% and 75% of victims are harassed by their abusers while at work

(Shepard & Pence, 1988; Swanberg, Macke & Logan, 2005) and murder by a current or

former intimate partner accounts for 20% of women's workplace deaths (US Department

of Labor, 1997). Additionally, victims are often absent (46%) or experience reduced

productivity (71%) as a result of the violence in their lives (Swanberg, Macke & Logan,

2005). In the face of these sobering statistics, workplace policies are becoming

increasingly common. Swanberg et al. (2005) suggest that workplace domestic violence

policies focus on prevention, protection and assistance by including the following

strategies: Prevention can be enhanced through the adoption of zero tolerance policies

with regard to violent behavior. Protection can be augmented by establishing

confidential avenues through which employees can reach out for assistance and by

offering regular training about the signs and indicators of violence. Finally, victims can

be greatly assisted by the development of personnel policies that accommodate the

specific needs that victims frequently have – such as paid time off, flex-time or

workplace relocation.

There has been less written about the ways in which the workplace can be

mobilized to hold perpetrators of domestic violence accountable, a strategy that was

advocated for by local stakeholders. However, a recent survey of perpetrators

participating in batterer intervention programs throughout Oregon revealed that the

majority of their employer's (79%) were aware of their violence (Mankowski et al.,

2009). Mankowski et al. (2009) suggest that with adequate training and information

about local resources, employers could be empowered to assist and intervene with both

victims and perpetrators.

It is rewarding to realize that not only were stakeholders able to identify and

describe multiple innovative opportunities for engaging community resources, but they

specifically advocated for opportunities that are authenticated by burgeoning practices in

the field.

Project Goal Three

The project's third goal involved creating opportunities for key stakeholders within the domestic violence system to dialogue about its limitations and in doing so, facilitate possibilities for action and change. Drawing on the field of action research (Burman, 2004; Dobash & Dobash, 1988; Sullivan, Bhuyan, Senturia, Shiu-Thornton, & Ciske, 2005; Stringer, 1996), I speculated that using focus groups might ignite shifts or changes. My hope was that by bringing stakeholders together in a safe environment to discuss their concerns about domestic violence intervention, ideas about how to improve the system would emerge and that these same stakeholders might then take it upon themselves to initiate change consistent with these ideas. Unfortunately, participants were so eager to name and describe limitations of the current system that conversations about how these limitations could be redressed did not occur during the groups. As will be discussed in the limitations section, it might have been helpful to structurally create space for this purpose, perhaps in the form of a question about what focus group participants might do to improve current strategies.

This project did, however, meet the objective of facilitating opportunities for key members of the domestic violence intervention system to critically reflect on their practices. Reflecting in this way on the challenges and limitations associated with current domestic violence intervention strategies very likely invoked internal changes. Johnson (1998) refers to this time of utilization as process use, where behavioral and cognitive changes occur in persons involved in the evaluation as a result of their participation. It was clear, based on their exuberance, that participants enjoyed having the opportunity to

share their thoughts and reflections with one another and with me. Victims and

perpetrators seemed particularly impacted. In one of the survivor focus groups, the co-

moderator and I unsuccessfully tried to "end" the group when the allotted time was

reached, only to find the participants unwilling to release the space. They wanted to keep

sharing their stories with us and with each other. Similarly, in one of the perpetrator

groups, a gentleman shared that the focus group experience was the best session of his

treatment program because I was really listening to him and soliciting his input.

I am confident that once a final executive summary is shared, a new level of

dialogue or enlightenment (Johnson, 1988; Weiss, 1998) about the collectively perceived

barriers to more effective domestic violence intervention with abusive men will occur.

Participants repeatedly commented about their eagerness to hear what other stakeholders

had to say with respect to the questions I posed. Their interest in the study findings is

further indicated by the fact that 64% of the professional stakeholders requested that I

mail them a copy of the executive summary, despite the fact that to do so meant they had

to provide me with contact information that I had not previously solicited due to

confidentiality concerns. Finally, my advisory committee members remain quite anxious

to receive a project summary that they can circulate, believing that it will prompt useful

dialogue within the Portland Tri-County domestic violence intervention communities.

Limitations of the Project

Before discussing the implications of this research, I want to acknowledge several

design limitations that likely restrict the impact of my study. First and foremost, it

became abundantly clear after conducting just a handful of focus groups that key

stakeholder populations were missing. Restricted resources prevented me from

broadening my initial sample; however, I suspect that much would have been learned if I

had also been able to solicit input from district attorneys, judges and social workers from

the Department of Human Services: Child Welfare. These three stakeholder groups were

repeatedly identified by participants as key members of the CCR and were frequently

targeted as problematic with respect to successful intervention. Future explorations may

want to include their reflections. Additionally, it may have been useful to gather data

from stakeholders outside of the traditional CCR (i.e., religious leaders, employers,

medical personnel). It is possible that organizational representatives not involved with

the CCR may have been able to provide provocative feedback, particularly with respect

to how the larger community can better be utilized to intervene with abusive men.

Additionally, a few characteristics of the actual study informants need to be

acknowledged and recognized for the impact they may have on the material that I

gathered and analyzed. For example, many of the victims who participated in the focus

groups were actually mandated by the Department of Human Services to attend victim

support groups. The trend to mandate support services to victims is a rather new and still

controversial one, and I was quite surprised to learn how many of the women I

interviewed were participating in their support group because of a mandate from DHS. It

is likely that these women felt somewhat coerced by the "system" and their bitterness and

negatively towards current domestic violence intervention strategies may have been

exacerbated as a result.   Additionally, most of the women I interviewed were likely still

dealing with the emotional scars of their victimization.   It is possible that had I

interviewed women who were five or more years into their survivor-hood, less frustration and disappointment may have accompanied their accounts.

As I mentioned earlier, the victim advocacy groups were far smaller than I think would have been ideal. It was extremely challenging to get adequate representation. I speculate that this was either due to the intense workload of these professionals or because advocates chose not to prioritize research on intervening with abusive men. Regardless of the reason for the smaller sample size, it is conceivable that those women who did carve out the time to participate in the focus groups were more likely to have significant concerns about the present system than those advocates who chose not to participate. In other words, it is possible that there are advocates in the Portland Tri-County community who feel quite favorable about current intervention strategies with abusive men and consequently did not feel compelled to participate in the research.

It is also important to contextualize the comments of the perpetrators. The men who participated in the study were currently in the throes of completing their mandated programs. It is reasonable to suspect that if I had interviewed men who had successfully completed their programs or men who were arrested, but perhaps not convicted and sent to intervention programs, different opinions and perspectives with respect to current strategies may have emerged. The men I interviewed were certainly more likely to find the topic of limitations of current strategies highly emotionally charged. I don't believe that any of these sample characteristics diminish the relevance or importance of the findings; however, it is important to remain cognizant of their potential impact.

While focus groups were highly appropriate given the purpose of the project and are uniquely capable of capturing emergent discourse among participants, I found them more limited in their ability to secure in-depth information than one-on-one interviews. For instance, it was sometimes difficult to follow-up on individual comments made during the discussions because of the animated and lively exchanges occurring. Participants were often so excited to provide additional support for an idea offered by a colleague that I struggled to probe more deeply. For example, when brainstorming about how else to involve the community in intervening with abusive men, participants rapidly listed institutions such as religion or the medical field, and before I could ask how they envision these institutions being more fully engaged, another participant would concur and offer a similar list. Future research might include opportunities to conduct follow-up interviews with focus group participants in order to more deeply explore topics that were either marginalized or only cursorily addressed.   Another set of challenges for this project stem from the research questions themselves. To begin with, I asked participants to think in atypical ways about domestic violence intervention. Traditionally in this field, evaluation questions have been orientated towards assessing the efficacy of a specific component or program. Rarely have stakeholders been asked to describe and evaluate what is not working on a systemic level. It proved a slightly more difficult task for informants to constructively critique domestic violence intervention as a whole, rather than to point out ways in which specific components of the intervention are failing to be properly implemented. In addition, I twice asked participants to hold two ideas (one of them abstract) in their minds and discuss the gaps or discrepancies between them. This

proved to be a challenge for many of the participants. Future research interested in garnering similar information might spend more time prepping and guiding the participants. For example, if I had used a flipchart to record their responses regarding the causes of men's abuse and another flipchart to record their reporting of the limitations impacting the efficacy of domestic violence intervention with abusive men, it might have been easier to guide participants through a discussion of the gaps or discrepancies between their responses.

Finally, my inability to more fully document achievement of my third project goal, facilitating possibilities for action and change by creating opportunities for key stakeholders to dialogue about the limitations of domestic violence intervention with abusive men, reflects a flaw in the project's design. While I was able to speculate about the ways in which the focus group discussions empowered stakeholders based on the comments they made during and after our meetings, a more formalized assessment tool would have enhanced my ability to identify specific intentions. Future research hoping to instigate a similar outcome would benefit from the addition of either follow-up interviews or a follow-up survey with participants to solicit tangible examples of how they were compelled to action as a result of the focus group discussions. Additionally, it might have been helpful to add a question specifically targeting possibilities for action. So much of the conversation focused on what was not working that participants really did not have an opportunity during the focus group to reflect or brainstorm about what they could do to improve current strategies.

Project Implications

Implications for theory

Despite the limitations described above, this project presents exciting implications for theory, practice and research. With respect to theory, the project endeavored to ask one primary question: Has the domestic violence movement fallen victim to the ecological fallacy? Testimony provided by stakeholders in the Portland Tri-County CCR suggests that the answer may be "yes", for in order to avoid the ecological fallacy (Watzlawick, Weakland, & Fisch, 1974), the levels of analysis between our problem definition and our interventions must align.

Stakeholders in the current project identified antecedents for men's domestic violence on multiple levels of analysis. They discussed institutional forces such as patriarchy, restricted gender roles, culture, race and class. They described social or group level forces such as peer modeling, the intergenerational transmission of violence, and destructive couple dynamics and they noted the influence of individual level forces like drugs and alcohol, skill deficits, impulse control, and mental illness. With respect to intervention strategies however, stakeholders identified a primarily individual level response, one that depends heavily on the criminal justice system to hold individual men accountable for their abuse by arresting, prosecuting, and mandating that they attend batterer intervention programs. So while stakeholders defined the problem of domestic violence (i.e., they identified antecedents for men's violence) on multiple levels of analysis, they reported that current strategies are focused primarily on the individual level. This mismatch results in a clear demonstration of the ecological fallacy and may

partially account for the limited effectiveness of current domestic violence intervention strategies.

Stakeholders seemed well aware of missed opportunities to better align intervention strategies with antecedents of men's violence. As reviewed in response to Project Goal Two (see Figure 6), they noted that intervention opportunities abound at the institutional level (i.e., within religious organizations, the health care system, the schools, and workplaces), at the social or group level (i.e., enlisting men and former perpetrators to help shift community attitudes, neighborhood policing, on-line perpetrator registries) and at the individual level (i.e., by attending more specifically to victims' and perpetrators' specific histories and basic needs). It seems reasonable to conclude that if the coordinated "community" response were to better expand beyond the criminal justice system to incorporate some of these opportunities, the ecological fallacy would be avoided and the system might experience enhanced effectiveness.

It may be helpful to revisit why multi-level intervention responses have not been more fully explored and implemented. It seems clear that the theoretical constriction within the field, namely the strong endorsement of a simplified version of "patriarchy as cause" to explain men's violence, has focused activists and practitioners on interventions that target individual men's choices rather than targeting schools, religious organizations, the state and federal government, or the media as institutions responsible for upholding patriarchal values. Once the "patriarchy as cause" explanation for men's violence became reduced to the issue of "choice", the intervention focus turned to holding men "accountable" for that choice (Haaken, 2010). If domestic violence is a choice, then the

best way to stop men from making that choice is to hold them "accountable" for their

choices by imposing sanctions that remind them and everyone else that choosing abuse of

an intimate partner will not be tolerated. Until mainstream discourse about the

antecedents of domestic violence shifts from this narrow translation of "patriarchy as

cause" to a more encompassing one, one that is better equipped to incorporate the

intersectionality of race and class (Collins, 2000; Crenshaw, 1994; Haaken, 2010;

Ritchie, 2000) as well as the influence of group and individual level forces, intervention

options will be stunted. Feminist activists initially hoped that a political analysis of

men's violence would position them to lobby on a variety of fronts for women's civil

rights and it is disheartening to realize that the dominant translation of their analysis

seems to have obscured this potential.

Of course, theoretical constriction is only partially responsible for the limited

intervention strategies evident in the Portland Tri-County area. Over the years, anti-

violence activists have marginalized certain approaches because they were deemed

dangerous or problematic (Adams, 1988; Bogard, 1974; Edleson, 1985; Schechter, 1982;

Yllo, 1988). For example, providing mental health services to abusive men was

considered inappropriate given the lethal consequences for victims when therapists

blamed them for their abuse or engaged couples counseling without taking appropriate

measure to enhance their safety. However, despite the historically appropriate motives

guiding the decisions to exclude certain intervention strategies, the resulting restriction

has contributed to misalignment and fulfillment of the ecological fallacy. It may be that

as the movement embraces a more paradoxical definition (Rappaport, 1981) of men's

violence against women (e.g., one that allows for both a socio-political and mental health explanation), responses that appear to defeat or contradict each other (i.e., substance abuse treatment and criminal justice sanctions) will become less aversive (Phillips, 2000).

Multi-level theories explaining men's violence towards women (Harway & O'Neil, 1999) appear to be gaining momentum, at least within the Portland Tri-County CCR community and it is reasonable to assume that domestic violence intervention strategies will become more effective when multi-level policies in response to these theories (Phillips, 2000) are similarly embraced and adopted.

Implications for practice

Several exciting implications for practice are indicated by the study results. As reviewed earlier, the findings appear to support previously named limitations associated with heavily relying on the criminal justice system to intervene in domestic violence (Grauwiler & Mills, 2004; Guzik, 2009; Mederos, 1999; Mills, 2003; Ms. Foundation for Women, 2003; Pence, 1999; van Wormer, 2009). More specifically, they illuminate four fundamental tensions or challenges accentuated by this dependence. It might behoove practitioners to critically reflect on how interventions can respond to the following questions that are suggested by these tensions. For example, 1) How can domestic violence intervention strategies better balance the intentions of punishment and rehabilitation for perpetrators? 2) How can strategies be both consistent and "fair", and yet attend to the individual variation? 3) How can strategies be enhanced to better protect and empower victims? And finally, 4) How can current strategies move beyond reactivity

towards prevention? While I certainly do not presume to have the answers to these

questions, a few possibilities are worth exploring.

Despite the limitations associated with the criminal justice system, I share Guzik's

(2009) contention that the domestic violence movement should not turn its back on this

response or the multiple gains that can be attributed to the criminalization of domestic

violence. "It seems irresponsible to abandon the state as an ally in the fight against

domestic violence. Without an adequate security alternative to replace the police,

abandoning the state is tantamount to abandoning women to endure intimate violence

alone" (p.187). By enlisting the criminal justice system, advocates within the movement

successfully pulled the horror and trauma of domestic abuse out of the closet and into the

public domain and a truly impressive chink in the armor of Patriarchy was achieved.

This said, it is clear that during the past decade, voices expressed in opposition to its

primacy have grown louder and once marginalized critiques (INCITE!, 2003) have

flooded into mainstream discourse. It is vital that the movement respond to these

critiques.

The results of my project suggest five primary opportunities for intervention

enhancement. 1) Continue to refine the criminal justice response, 2) improve the efficacy

of batterer intervention treatment, 3) attend more explicitly to collaboration barriers, 4)

fervently build the capacity of alternative approaches, and 5) focus on advocacy and

prevention.

Refine the criminal justice response. If we listen to the stakeholders queried, there

are key issues that need to be addressed if the criminal justice response to domestic

violence is going to be more effective. Unfortunately, these key issues and consequently

their recommendations appear somewhat contradictory. Stakeholders almost uniformly

requested greater accountability for perpetrators of domestic violence in the form of

arrests, prosecutions and incarceration, and yet they simultaneously expressed grave

reservations regarding the dangers of and lack of rehabilitative potential of these

sanctions. Additionally, their requests for increased accountability were offered in

tandem with testimony lamenting the disempowerment that victims often experience in

the face of policies specifically designed to enhance accountability (i.e., mandatory arrest

and no-drop prosecution).

Obviously, there is not a singular solution to these contradictory

recommendations. However, after listening closely to stakeholders in the Portland Tri-

County CCR and revisiting the initial goals of the domestic violence movement, one

thing seems very clear to me. The criminal justice system must do a better job listening

to, empowering, and protecting current victims. While institutional advocacy advanced

in the name of "future" victims is to be applauded, it cannot come at the expense of

victims who are already suffering. These women must be better supported and their

voices solicited and incorporated. Mills (1999) proposes a "Survivor-Centered Model" in

order to shift from the currently abusive relationship that many victims have with the

state towards one that promotes acceptance, respect, reassurance, resocialization,

empowerment and liberation. She suggests that officers of the state view every

interaction they have with a victim as an opportunity to model and reinforce healthy

patterns of relating. This might mean that officers spend more time at the scene

determining the history and context of any particular assault and the ramifications or

implications of their actions, or that district attorneys spend more time establishing a

trusting relationship with clients so that they can take action in partnership, or that

probation officers and judges engage victims in honest conversations about the costs and

benefits of releasing "no contact" orders.   Current and marginalized members of the

coordinated community response must strategize together to determine about how best to

engage and empower victims. It is quite possible that perpetrators will be held more

accountable if victims are heard and honored with respect to the sanctions that get

imposed.

Additionally, if the criminal justice system is going to continue to play a

productive role in the interruption of domestic abuse, then it will be important to

challenge the system to embrace the unique dynamics inherent in interpersonal violence.

Whether that means broadening the crime to include coercive control as Stark (2007)

suggests or limiting the crime to patriarchal terrorism as Guzik (2009) suggests is

unclear. What is clear is that the current incident-focused approach is not adequately

serving victims. Victims of patriarchal terrorism are not served when the absence of

physical abuse translates into a refusal of the system to intervene on their behalf and

victims of common couple violence or situational violence may not be best served when

arrest, probation, "no contact" orders and treatment strain their family's ability to survive

financially. Additionally, as long as the criminal justice system insists on dichotomizing

those involved as either perpetrators or victims, much will be lost. Victims will lose the

chance to fight back or defend themselves for fear of getting arrested and perpetrators

will lose the opportunity to be seen as whole human beings struggling with their own experiences of victimization, worthy of compassion, and capable of change.

Improve the efficacy of batterer intervention treatment. Strong endorsement of an oversimplified "patriarchy as cause" explanation for men's violence and the criminal justice system as the best vehicle for interrupting men's violence has led to a problematic "blurring" for providers of batterer intervention. Standards for best practice were adopted primarily on theoretical grounds, rather than on the basis of evidence (Maiuro, Hagar, Lin & Olson, 2001; Renzetti, Edleson, & Bergen, 2001). Subsequently, it might be worthwhile for batterer intervention providers return to the drawing board and be given the freedom and flexibility to try alternative models for changing abusive men (Lehmann & Simmons, 2009). Lehmann & Simmons (2009) recently compiled a collection of essays in their book entitled, *Strengths-Based Batterer Intervention*. In it, they call for a paradigm shift to occur, one which recognizes the heterogeneity of batterers, moves away from the manualization of BIP programs (which assume a "one size fits all" population), focuses on the processes of change, and finally turns away from a confrontational model in favor of a "strengths" or assets based model. Given the relatively high rates of recidivism following batterer intervention programs, rates which are not consistent with crime rehabilitation rates more generally (Andrews & Bonta, 2006), it seems premature and inappropriate to advance one program model over others. Batterer intervention providers should be encouraged to develop and advocate for models based on theory, practice, and evaluation.

Attend more explicitly to collaboration barriers. Stakeholders in the Portland Tri-County CCR were clear that while important strides have been made in the name of coordination, ideal collaboration has yet to be achieved. If domestic violence strategies are to be more effective with abusive men than issues of trust, information sharing, professional respect, and communication need to be better resolved. Stakeholders were clear that each agency or organization approaches the issue or client from a unique position and that it is not possible, nor desirable, to operate from a singular viewpoint. Rather, it was suggested that a more honest level of dialogue about these differences needs to be embraced. Instead of holding collaborative meetings where various stakeholders come to the table and merely discuss a situation or a specific case, conversations about the barriers to trust, information sharing, and respect among partners need to be more directly engaged. Naming these challenges to collaboration and holding frank discussions about how they can best be managed will likely be an important step towards greater optimization. It seems clear that until all stakeholders are valued for their unique perspectives and their advice solicited and, when possible heeded, collaboration will be in name only and lapses in accountability for abusers and support for victims will continue.

It is noteworthy that stakeholders participating in DVERT programs were more inclined to report positive collaborative experiences, particularly when stakeholders were co-located. In other words, when advocates were physically stationed within police or probation units, both entities reported benefits. It is likely that proximity breeds greater "institutional empathy." Banks, Dutch, & Wang (2008) reviewed collaboration issues

that surfaced during and after implementation of the "Greenbook" project which targeted the relationships between the child welfare system, batterer intervention providers, and domestic violence advocates. They reported the importance of developing "institutional empathy" or an understanding of the context and environment influencing how a partnering agency approaches issues. While it is likely infeasible for every collaborative partner to place representatives within every other collaborative partner's office, a system or process of shadowing may be possible and given the intensity of the stakeholders when explaining their concerns, likely warrants consideration.

Build the capacity of alternative approaches. Stakeholders' multifaceted and substantial critiques of current intervention strategies with abusive men make it abundantly clear that alternative approaches to the criminal justice system must be more vigorously developed and utilized. There are exciting trends within the field to embrace responses that better incorporate victim and perpetrator voices, have the flexibility to acknowledge and accommodate the complexity of domestic violence dynamics, and are less likely to discriminate and alienate based on race, culture, and class. For example, the use of restorative justice models (Braithwaite, 2003) has been widely suggested. Though not without complications for victims (Coward, 2000; INCITE!, 2003), some argue that restorative justice practices create the possibility for greater satisfaction for the parties involved (Grauwiler & Mills, 2004; Ptacek, 2010; von Wormer, 2009).

James Ptacek (2010) recently published a collection of essays on this topic in his book entitled, *Restorative Justice and Violence Against Women* (2010). In it, authors

describe several exciting community-based models being tested across Canada, Australia

and the United States, models such as the Community-Based Interventions Project.

> This demonstration project seeks to develop, pilot test, evaluate, document and
>
> distribute a replicable comprehensive alternative community-based approach to
>
> violence intervention. This approach is aimed toward expanding the capacity of
>
> oppressed communities to end and prevent violence by equipping its most
>
> accessible resources – family, friends, neighbors, co-workers, and others toward
>
> whom persons in need first turn – with the models and tools to effectively
>
> intervene (Kim, 2010, p. 207).

Given how frequently scarce resources were identified as a hindrance for victims and a

strain for perpetrators, it is likely that drawing more substantially on local or community

level resources may better meet their needs than relying primarily on state or federal

assistance.

> For years, advocates traditionally marginalized by the mainstream domestic

violence movement have been calling for and responding to the need for intervention

models that more adequately and appropriately address their specific issues of

marginalization. Recognizing that many victims choose to remain with their partners for

religious, cultural or financial reasons, Grauwiler & Mills (2004) offer a compelling

argument to advance the use of restorative justice in the form of Intimate Abuse Circles

(IAC).

> IACs are a culturally sensitive alternative to the criminal justice system response
>
> to domestic violence as the content of the conferences is tailored to the parties

involved. The Intimate Abuse Circle model seeks to honor the partners' choices

to remain together despite the violence. The IAC model achieves this goal by

establishing circles of support within the couple's community that foster healing

within their cultural context (p. 65).

The Cultural Context Model (Almeida & Dolan-Delvecchio, 1999), described in

Chapter Two is another example of an alternative model of batterer intervention that

better acknowledges and responds to a man's unique cultural community. Unlike

traditional models, the CCM targets multiple levels of analysis. Men involved in CCM

do individual work, couple work, family work and community outreach. It is

particularly noteworthy that the CCM engages men from the community who have not

been abusive in their relationships to function as sponsors, permits couple therapy once a

batterer has proven the ability to accept responsibility for his actions, requires family

therapy and culture circles with children and adolescents in order to break the cycle of

violence and engages graduates to provide community outreach. As suggested in Chapter

Two, I believe that the mainstream movement can learn a great deal about how to

effectively engage the community and address antecedents at multiple levels of analysis

by observing these models.

Focus on advocacy and prevention. Finally, the domestic violence movement

must revitalize its focus on prevention and activism. Heavy reliance on the criminal

justice system has gone hand and hand with a professionalism of the movement, a trend

that has been blamed for diminishing the passion and capacity for social activism among

advocates (Lehrner & Allen, 2009; McDermott & Garofalo, 2004; Shepard, 1999).

Attention must be refocused on the societal and social contributors to domestic violence.

Advocates and others within the movement must continue to provide prevention

education targeting gender roles, masculinity/femininity, conflict resolution, equity and

coercive uses of power and this prevention education should not be limited to school-

aged children.

A massive media campaign, similar to M.A.D.D., is an intriguing possibility

because of its focus on bystander behavior. The brilliance behind the M.A.D.D.

campaign is that it sought to mobilize average citizens within the community in order to

stop a destructive behavior. Slogans such as "Friends Don't Let Friends Drive Drunk"

gave community members specific tools so that they could intervene successfully. It has

been shown that bystanders are more likely to get involved in sexual violence prevention

if they have been given specific skills related to particular situations (Banyard, Plante, &

Maynihan, 2004). It is reasonable to suspect that friends and neighbors may be more

likely to intervene in domestically abusive situations if they are informed of ways in

which interpersonal violence manifests and if they have been equipped with user-friendly

tools, tools akin to assigning a designated driver, collecting keys at the start of a party, or

stopping a friend from getting in the car through the use of a caring slogan.

Focusing prevention efforts on the development of these types of bystander skills

may be beneficial particularly in light of research suggesting that victims of domestic

violence are more likely to seek support from informal helpers (i.e., friends, neighbors,

family members) than from professional helpers (Fugate, Landis, Riordan, Naureckas, &

Engel, 2005; Gondolf, 2002). After interviewing 491 abused women about their help-

seeking behavior, Fugate el al. (2002) report that "informal helpers were the largest source of support to women in this study" (p. 307) and conclude that, "an informed caring community of support would greatly enhance a woman's ability to evaluate her situation and decide what assistance she needs" (p. 307).

Providers in the Portland Tri-County CCR noted that educating the community about domestic violence, particularly the social and societal antecedents of domestic violence, can often produce defensiveness. One participant observed that, "if you attempt to water down the male privilege with teaching them to be sensitive or teaching them to be aware of the other forms of abuse, rather than the physical abuse, you are really gonna impact their ego. And once you attack someone's ego, it's not going to be acceptable." Consequently, it may be necessary to better engage male participation in community outreach efforts. Advocates in the study agreed that it can sometimes be difficult for them as woman to get through to male audiences and suggested instead that male batterer intervention providers and former perpetrators may be successful reaching audiences that might otherwise turn a deaf ear to the "angry feminists".

It may also be helpful for stakeholders in the domestic violence intervention community to challenge popular ideas of masculinity and femininity within the context of romantic love, particularly as it is portrayed in the media. I was recently curious about the cult-like popularity of the series called *The Twilight Saga* by Stephenie Meyer. I picked up the first book entitled *Twilight* and was immediately distraught to discover that the relationship being idolized by millions of teenage girls (and their mothers) across the United States is a fundamentally violent one. Edward Cullen is a strong and powerful

vampire in love with a girl who he wants desperately to "eat"/ kill. Bella Swan is an accident prone girl in love with a dangerous vampire, who would rather risk dying at his hands than live without him.

Even as he called to me with sharp-edged fangs, I feared for *him*. And in that I had my answer. I didn't know if there ever was a choice, really. I was already in too deep. Now that I knew [that he was a vampire] *–if* I knew – I could do nothing about my frightening secret. Because when I thought of him, of his voice, his hypnotic eyes, the magnetic force of his personality, I wanted nothing more than to be with him right now. Even if…[he might kill me] (Meyer, 2005, p. 139).

I've had heated exchanges with adult friends over the risks of exposing young girls and boys to this message. Being repeatedly told that Bella and Edward love each other and Edward does not want to hurt her is no reassurance. Domestic violence is a complex phenomenon. Victims are often deeply in love with their perpetrators and perpetrators are often extremely conflicted about their violence. Advocates must continue to illuminate these complexities and the problematic portrayals of romantic love that pervade mainstream culture.

In conclusion, it may be that balancing the intentions of punishment and rehabilitation for perpetrators involves improving accountability for abusive men by better empowering victims, enhancing collaboration, and enlisting alternative models of justice. Similarly, it may be that enhancing rehabilitation for perpetrators involves better attending to their diverse individual needs and enlisting alternative models of treatment. Finally, better protecting victims might involve increasing some aspects of "punishment"

for perpetrators, as well as a resurgence in prevention efforts. Just as the seven sub-units identified by stakeholders operate together to manifest the attribute "limited effectiveness" of current domestic violence intervention systems (see Figure 5), the four fundamental tensions or challenges they illuminate with respect to heavy reliance on the criminal justice system are interwoven. It seems only logical then to assume that resolving or responding to these tensions will involve interlocking or overlapping strategies.

Implications for research

With respect to methodology, it is clear that invoking a systems approach to the study of domestic violence intervention with abusive men enhanced and deepened what I was able to discern, and subsequently may warrant consideration by other researchers. By embracing the context in which individual components of the intervention operate and attempting to critique the system as a whole, much was learned. Rather than merely developing a critique of the challenges created for victims by mandatory arrests or the way a "one size fits all" approach to treatment impacts efficacy, an integrated discussion of the systemic challenges was possible. In other words, asking stakeholders to express their concerns across the multiple components produced a more holistic analysis and allowed for the identification of unifying candidates, such as the tension that exists between consistency and variability with respect to the current "one size fits all" approach within the criminal justice system and batterer intervention programs. As others have observed, elements of the domestic violence system (i.e., arrest, prosecution,

probation, batterer intervention programs, victim services) do not operate in isolation and it vital that we not evaluate them as if they do (Gondolf, 2002; Tolman, 2001).

Another key advantage of engaging a systems approach to evaluate domestic violence intervention is that I was directed to attend to the processes or the interactions within the larger unit. Rather than simply presenting salient themes sequentially, I was able to explore and present the interrelations among the challenges described by stakeholders. While it may be illuminating to point out that stakeholders identified a lack of prevention education as a candidate for why intervention is not more successful, it is perhaps more helpful to explore this critique in conjunction with their concerns about the criminal justice system. Future research examining the multiple ways in which these subunits operate together and impact one another will likely produce additional candidates for improving effectiveness.

The decision to use focus groups for gathering material was rewarded in that interactions, agreements, and disagreements among the participants enabled me to develop a richer understanding of how stakeholders felt. If I had chosen instead to conduct interviews, I would not have been privy to the disagreements that perpetrators and providers had with one another. It was often in response to comments made by fellow participants that the most thorough and provocative material was shared. Participants pushed each other to provide better explanations of their frustrations and to justify any comments made that differed from the general consensus of the group. Additionally, conducting focus groups enabled me to detect a group narrative. For example, I was able to observe the "victim" stance that ironically both victims/survivors

and perpetrators have adopted with respect to the criminal justice system, a narrative that might not have emerged during one-to-one conversations. Evaluators who are similarly interested in capturing group narratives with respect to domestic violence intervention strategies might want to consider utilizing focus groups for data collection.

Finally, by soliciting multiple perspectives on the unit of study (Lendaris, 1986; Linstone, 1999), a more thorough and accurate understanding of the system was possible. While it would have been informative to interview perpetrators about their experiences with domestic violence intervention, their responses in isolation would have painted a skewed picture of the criminal justice system. For example, I might have been led to believe that current strategies are overly severe and that victims are more than adequately protected by CJS sanctions. It is only when I held their accounts in concert with the accounts of victims/survivors, advocates, officers and providers that a more nuanced and valid description was possible. Each stakeholder group offered a slightly different analysis of the challenges or limitations of the system. Comparing, contrasting, and merging what each group had to say illuminated a more complete picture. Given the striking contrasts that emerged between and among stakeholders in the current study, particularly between the accounts of perpetrators and victims, it may be important for future endeavors to similarly incorporate multiple perspectives in order to accurately represent the range of experiences that people have with the domestic violence intervention system.

This exploration demonstrates that it is possible and profitable to view and assess the domestic violence intervention system as a whole. Doing so enabled me to embrace

the context in which the subunits operate, highlight and extract the processes and interactions among the subunits, and finally enlist multiple perspectives to illuminate and analyze the findings. It is important that future explorations avoid codifying a narrow focus within the field, whether it is by studying components of the system in isolation, ignoring the ways in which various subunits influence and impact each other or viewing the system through one lens at a time. Researchers must strive to mirror the complexity of domestic violence dynamics and the strategies that are possible to intervene in those dynamics with our methodology; failing to do so may only exacerbate the constrictions that presently inhibit effectiveness.

Summary

The domestic violence movement has made extremely impressive strides towards reducing the incidence and trauma of domestic violence (Gordon, 1988; Haaken, 2010; Jolin, 2008; Pleck, 1987. Once considered normative and acceptable behavior, men's abuse of their intimate partners is no longer morally or legally sanctioned in the United States (Gordon, 1988; Pleck, 1987). It was a momentous occasion when the first laws criminalizing domestic violence were enacted for it signaled a judgment by society that the privacy granted to the family by the state did not include turning a blind eye towards men who beat their wives. Similarly, when police officers refused to enforce the new laws and legal action was taken in the form of class action law suits (Fagan, 1996; Jolin, 2008; Pleck, 1987) an impressive victory against institutionalized gender oppression was achieved. Likewise, when inconsistent application of the laws and inconsistent sanctioning of perpetrators in the courts was observed, a progressive model of

coordination and collaboration was developed, funded and widely adopted (Pence & Paymar, 1993). It could easily be argued that the success of the domestic violence movement to this point can be attributed to activists' willingness to modify existing practices and policies in response to realizations and recognition that they weren't yet optimal. The strength of the domestic violence movement will continue to lie in its ability to advance new policies in response to information describing opportunities for growth and improvement.

I embarked upon this journey with the hope that by turning a critical and evaluative eye towards current strategies, places of conflict would emerge, and consequently suggestions for how to improve them might surface. While there is certainly no guarantee that the theoretical, practical and methodological implications that I've proposed will enhance the efficacy of domestic violence intervention strategies, I believe that they are worth considering given the testimony of stakeholders in the Portland Tri-County CCR which echoed growing concerns in the field.

Drawing once again on a systems approach, it may be helpful to conceptualize the study implications as suggested subunits that when operating together might manifest the quality "improved effectiveness" of the domestic violence intervention system (see Figure 7). In other words, if the field were to advance and embrace more multi-leveled theories and police responses, refine the CJS response by better engaging victims and embracing the complexities of domestic violence, improve the efficacy of batterer intervention by experimenting with alternative approaches and moving away from a "one size fits all" model, attend more directly to collaboration barriers through honest dialogue

and increased institutional empathy, build the capacity of alternative approaches such as restorative justice and intimate abuse circles, focus on advocacy and prevention, and employ systems approach methodology to evaluate current strategies, improved efficacy may be possible.

Figure 7

Lendaris' (1986) definition of a system applied to study implications.

Environment = Domestic Violence Movement
(Goal of eliminating violence against women)

System (A level) = Domestic Violence Intervention
Attribute: Improved effectiveness

Subunits (B Level) = Subunits that when operating together might manifest improved effectiveness of domestic violence intervention

Theory:
1) Advance multi-level theories coupled with multi-level policy responses in order to avoid the ecological fallacy.

↕

Practice:
1) Refine the CJS response (better integrate victims and embrace complex domestic violence dynamics)
2) Improve efficacy of BIP (experiment with alternative approaches and move away from "one size fits all" model)
3) Attend to collaboration barriers (hold honest dialogue among partners and increase institutional empathy through proximity and shadowing)
4) Build capacity of alternative approaches such as restorative justice, IACs, and CCM
5) Focus on advocacy and prevention (prevention education, challenge popular notions of romantic love)

↕

Research:
1) Drawn on systems approach for evaluating domestic violence intervention (attend to context, processes, and multiple perspectives)

Concluding Thoughts

The epidemic perpetration of domestic violence remains one of the most vexing social crises of modern times (Bancroft, 2002; Healey et al., 1998; Mears, 2003). The fact that millions of women are injured each year by their intimate partners is for some a signal of the pervasive and insidious nature of patriarchy, while for others it signals a tremendous lapse in our ability to galvanize communities beyond the criminal justice system to intervene.

What is clear to me after embarking on this journey is that single level theories, despite their benefits, are fundamentally inadequate to address the complex nature and manifestation of interpersonal violence. Instead, multi-level models for understanding domestic violence (Harway & O'Neil, 1999) are necessary if we are to avoid some of the limitations identified in this project. When we choose to acknowledge antecedents of men's violence against women on multiple levels of analysis, we open ourselves to the possibility of responding more effectively. By acknowledging macrosocial influences such as racism and classism, socialization influences such as rigidly defined gender roles, relational influences such as interaction patterns within couples, and individual influences such as biology and psychology, we can expand our intervention efforts to better meet the specific and collective needs of victims and perpetrators. For example, victim advocates can better embrace the history of activism that guided and shaped the domestic violence movement and once again more directly target antecedents at the macrosocial and social level of analysis in addition to helping individual women. Batterer intervention providers might be inspired to more fully draw upon the knowledge and successes of mental health

professionals to develop programs that better engage perpetrators as well as participate in more community outreach targeted at challenging rigidly defined gender roles, notions of masculinity and femininity, and acceptable relationship behavior. Additionally, alternative community based models of intervention might gain momentum and move more substantially into mainstream practice.

Given the constellation of individual, relational, and macrosocial factors that interact and contribute to men's violence against women, it is unlikely that one best solution for how to intervene exists. Rather, we must strive to draw on the diverse strengths and collective wisdom within our communities to advance responses that avoid the ecological fallacy and address antecedents of domestic violence at the individual, social, organizational and institutional levels of analysis.

References

Adams, D. (1988). Treatment models of men who batter: A profeminist analysis. In K.

Yllo, & M. Bograd (Eds.), *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse* (pp. 176-199).

Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Adams, D., & McCormick, A. (1982). Men unlearning violence: A group approach based

on the collective model. In M. Roy (Ed.), *The Abusive Partner.* New York, NY:

Nostrand.

Adler, M.A. (2002). The utility of modeling in evaluation planning: The case of

coordination of domestic violence services in Maryland. *Evaluation and Program

Planning, 25*, 203-213.

Alexander, P. C., Moore, S., & Alexander III, E. R. (1991). What is transmitted

in the intergenerational transmission of violence? *Journal of Marriage and the

Family, 53,* 657-668.

Allen, N.E. (2006). An examination of the Effectiveness of Domestic Violence

Coordinating Councils. *Violence Against Women, 12 (1),* 46-67.

Allen, N.E., Lehrner, A., Mattison, E., Miles, T., & Russell, A. (2007). Promoting

systems change in the health care response to domestic violence. *Journal of

Community Psychology, 35 (1),* 103-120.

Almeida, R. V., & Dolan-Delvecchio, K. (1999). Addressing culture in batterers

intervention. *Violence Against Women, 5*(6), 654-683.

Altman, I., & Rogoff, B. (1987). World views in psychology: Trait, interactional,

organismic, and transactional perspectives. In D. Stokols, & I. Altman (Eds.),

Handbook of environmental psychology, Vol 1 (pp. 7-40). New York, NY: Wiley Publishers.

American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders DSM-IV-TR Fourth Edition*. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing.

American Psychological Association. (1996). *Violence and the Family: Report of the American Psychological Association Presidential Task Force on Violence and the Family: Issues and Dilemmas in Family Violence*. Washington DC: Author

Anderson, K., & Umberson, D. (2001). Gendering violence: Masculinity and power in men's accounts of domestic violence. *Gender and Society, 15,* 358-380.

Anderson, S.A., & Schlossberg, M.C. (1999). Systems perspective on battering: The importance of context and pattern. In M. Harway, & J.M. O'Neil (Eds.). *What causes men's violence against women?* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc

Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (2003). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct (3rd edition).* Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co.

Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (2006). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct (4th edition).* New York: Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 126 (5),* 651-680.

Aronson, E., Wilson, T.D., & Akert, R.M. (1994). *Social Psychology: The heart and the mind*. New York: HarperCollins College Publishers.

Astin, M.C., Ogland-Hand, S. M., Coleman, E.M., & Foy, D.W. (1995). Posttraumatic stress disorder and childhood abuse in battered women: Comparisons with maritally distressed women. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 63(2),* 308-312.

Austin, J.B., & Dankwort, J. (1999). Standards for batterer programs: A review and analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14 (2),* 152-168.

Babcock, J.C., Green, C.E. & Robie, C. (2004). Does batterers' treatment work? A meta-analytic review of domestic violence treatment. *Clinical Psychology Review, 23 (8),* 1023-1053.

Babcock, J. C., & Steiner, R. (1999). The relationship between treatment, incarceration, and recidivism of battering: A program evaluation of Seattle's coordinated community response to domestic violence. *Journal of Family Psychology, 13(1),* 46-59.

Bachman, R. (2000). A comparison of annual incidence rates and contextual characteristics of intimate-partner violence against women from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) and the National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS). *Violence Against Women, 6(8),* 839-867.

Bachman R , & Saltzman L. (1995). *Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report: violence against women: Estimates from the redesigned survey (NCJ-154348).* Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Baker, R., & Hinton, R. (1999). Do focus groups facilitate meaningful participation in social research? In R. S. Barbour, & J. Kitzinger, (Eds.), *Developing focus group*

research: Politics, theory and practice (pp. 79-98). London: Sage Publications, Inc.

Ball, B. Kerig, P.K., & Rosenbluth, B. (2009). "Like a family but better because you can actually trust each other": The Expect Respect dating violence prevention program for at-risk youth. *Health Promotion Practice, 10(1).* 45S-58S.

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.

Banks, D., Dutch, N., & Wang, K. (2008). Collaborative efforts to improve system response to families who are experiencing child maltreatment and domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 23 (7),* 876-902.

Barbour, R.S., & Kitzinger, J. (1999). *Developing focus group research: Politics, theory and practice.* London: Sage Publications, Inc.

Banyard, V.L., Plante, E.G., & Maynihan, M.M. (2004). Bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *Journal of Community Psychology, 32(1),* 61-79.

Belknap, J. (2007). *The invisible woman: Gender, crime and justice (3rd edition).* Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth.

Bennett, L., & Piet, M. (1999). Standards for batterer intervention programs: In whose interest? *Violence Against Women, 5(1),* 6-24.

Berger, P., & Neuhaus, R. (1977). *To empower people.* Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.

Beesley, F., & McGuire, J. (2009). Gender-role identity and hypermasculinity in violent offending. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 15(2 & 3).* 251-268.

Bograd, M. (1984). Family systems approaches to wife battering: A feminist critique. *American Journal of Orthospsychiatry, 54,* 558-568.

Bograd, M. (1988). Feminist perspectives on wife abuse: An introduction. In K. Yllo, & M. Bograd (Eds.), *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse* (pp. 11-26). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Bowen, L.K., Gwiasda, V., & Brown, M.M. (2004). Engaging community residents to prevent violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19(3),* 356-367.

Bowker, L. (1983). *Beating wife beating.* Toronto: Lexington Books.

Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame, and reintegration.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Braithwaite, J., & Daly, K. (1998). Masculinity, violence and communitarian control. In S. Miller (Ed.), *Crime control and women* (pp. 151-180). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Brannon, Robert. 1985. Dimensions of the male sex role in America. In A.G. Sargent (Ed), *Beyond Sex Roles*, (pp. 296-316). St. Paul: West Publishing Company.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brookoff, D., O'Brien, K., Cook, C., Thompson, T., & Williams, C. (1997).

    Characteristics of participants in domestic violence: Assessment at the scene of

    domestic assault. *Journal of American Medical Association, 277,* 1369-1373.

Brooks, G. R., & Silverstein, L. B. (1995). Understanding the dark side of masculinity:

    An interactive systems model. In R. F. Levant, & W. Pollack (Eds.), *A new*

    psychology of men (pp. 280-327). New York: Basic Books.

Brown, W. (1995). *States of Injury.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Browne, K.O., Saunders, D. G., & Staecker, K. M. (1997). Process-psychodynamic

    groups for men who batter: A brief treatment model. *Families in Society, 78(3),*

    265-271.

Brygger, M.P., & Edleson, J.L. (1987). The domestic abuse project: A multisystems

    intervention in woman battering. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 2(3),* 324-

    336.

Budde, S., & Schene, P. (2004). Informal social support interventions and their role in

    violence prevention: An agenda for future evaluation. *Journal of Interpersonal*

    Violence, 19(3), 341-355.

Bufkin, J. L, & Bray, J. (1998). Domestic violence, criminal justice responses and

    homelessness: Finding the connection and addressing the problem. *Journal of*

    Social Distress & the Homeless, 7(4), 227-240.

Burford, G., & Adams, P. (2004). Restorative justice, responsive regulation and social

    work. *Journal of Sociology and Social Work, 31,* 20-27.

Burger, J.M. (1981). Motivational biases in the attribution of responsibility for an

accident: A meta-analysis of the defensive-attribution hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 90*, 496-512.

Burman, E. (2004). Organising for change? Group-analytic perspectives on a feminist action research project. *Group Analysis, 37(1),* 91-108.

Buttell, F.P., & Carney, M.M. (2005). Do batterer intervention programs serve African American and Caucasian batterers equally well? An investigation of a 26-week program. *Research on Social Work Practice, 15(1),* 19-28.

Buzawa, E.S., & Austin, T. (1993). Determining police response to domestic violence: The role of victim preference. *American Behavioral Scientist, 36(5),* 610-623.

Buzawa, E.S., & Buzawa, C.G. (2003). *Domestic Violence: The Criminal Justice Response.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Cadsky, O., Hanson, R.K., Crawford, M., & Lalonde, C. (1996). Attrition from a male batterer treatment program: Client treatment congruence and lifestyle instability. *Violence and Victims, 11,* 51-61.

Cahn, N. (2000). Policing women: Moral arguments and the dilemmas of criminalization. *DePaul Law Review, 49,* 817-820.

Campbell, J. C., Kub, J., Belknap, R. A., Templin, T. N. (1997). Predictors of depression in battered women. *Violence Against Women, 3(3), 271-293.*

Carden, A.D. (1994). Wife abuse and the wife abuser: Review and recommendations. *The Counseling Psychologist, 22,* 539-582.

Carlson, B.E. & Worden, A.P. (2005). Attitudes and beliefs about domestic violence:

 Results of a public opinion survey. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20 (10),*

 1197-1218.

Center for Disease Control (2003). *Costs of intimate partner violence against women in*

 the United States. Atlanta, GA: Author.

Cervantes, N.N., & Cervantes, J.M. (1993). A multicultural perspective in the treatment

 of domestic violence. In M.Hansen, & M.Harway (Eds.), *Battering and Family*

 Therapy: A Feminist Perspective (pp. 156-174). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

 Publications, Inc.

Charmaz, K. (1995). Grounded theory. In J.A. Smith, R.Harre, & L.V. Langehove (Eds.),

 Rethinking methods in psychology (pp. 27-49). London: Sage Publications, Inc.

Chen, H., & Rossi, P.H. (1983). Evaluating with sense: The theory-driven approach.

 Evaluation Review, 7(3), 283-302.

Chesney-Lind, M. (2002). Criminalizing victimization: The unintended consequences of

 pro-arrest policies for girls and women. *Criminology and Public Policy, 2(1),*

 81-90.

Chovanec, M.G. (2009). Facilitating change in group work with abusive men: Examining

 stages of change. *Social Work with Groups, 32,* 125-142.

Coker, D. (2001). Crime control and feminist law reform in domestic violence law.

 Buffalo Criminal Law Review, 4, 801-860.

Collins, J. (1982). *Drinking and crime: Perspectives on the relationship between alcohol*

 consumption and criminal behavior. London: Tavistock.

Collins, K.S., Schoen, C., Joseph, S., Duchon, L., Simantov, E. & Yellowitz, M. (1999). *Health Concerns Across a Woman's Lifespan: The Commonwealth Fund 1998 Survey of Women's Health.* New York: New York: The Commonwealth Fund.

Collins, P.C. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment.* New York: Routledge.

Conner, K.R., & Ackerley, G.D. (1994). Alcohol-related battering: Developing treatment strategies. *Journal of Family Violence, 9(2)*, 143-155.

Conroy, M.A. (2006). Risk management of sex offenders: A model for community intervention. *The Journal of Psychiatry & Law, 34,* 5-23.

Cook (1985). Postpositivist critical multiplism. In R.L. Shotland, & M. Mark (Eds.), *Social Science and Social Policy* (pp. 21-62). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

Cook, D.R., & Frantz-Cook, A. (1984). A systematic treatment approach to wife battering. *Journal of Marriage and Family Therapy, 10,* 83-93.

Corvo, K., & Johnson, P.J. (2003). Vilification of the "batterer": How blame shapes domestic violence policy and interventions. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 8,* 259-281.

Coward, S. (2000). Restorative justice in cases of domestic and sexual violence: Healing justice? *AiR: Abuse information and resources for survivors.* Retrieved April 7, 2010. http://www.hotpeachpages.net/canda/air/rj_domestic_violence.html).

Cowen, E.L. (1996). The ontogenesis of primary prevention: Lengthy strides and stubbed toes. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 24,* 235-249.

Crossman, R. K., Stith, S. M., & Bender, M.M. (1990). Sex role egalitarianism and marital violence. *Sex Roles, 22(5/6),* 293-303.

Daly, J.E., Power, T.G., & Gondolf, E.W. (2001). Predictors of batterer program attendance. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16 (10),* 971-991.

Daly, J. E., & Pelowski, S. (2000). Predictors of dropout among men who batter: A review of studies with implications for research and practice. *Violence and Victims, 15 (2),* 137-160.

Daniels, J.W., & Murphy, C.M. (1997). Stages and processes of change in batterers' treatment. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice, 4,* 123-145.

Danis, F.S. (2003). The criminalization of domestic violence: What social workers need to know. *Social Work, 48 (2)*, 237-245.

Date, A. L., & Ronan, G. F. (2000). An examination of attitudes and behaviors presumed to mediate partner abuse: A rural incarcerated sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15(11),* 1140-1155.

Davidovich, J. (1990). Men who abuse their spouse: Social and psychological supports. *Journal of Offender Counseling and Service Rehabilitation, 15,* 27-44.

Davis, A. Y. (1990). *Women, culture and politics.* New York: Vintage Books, A division of Random House, Inc.

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

Day, A., Chung, D., & O'Leary, P. (2009). Programs for men who perpetrate domestic violence: An examination of the issues underlying the effectiveness of intervention programs. *Journal of Family Violence, 24,* 203-212.

DeKeseredy, W.D., & Dragiewicz, M. (2007). Understanding the complexities of feminist perspectives on woman abuse: A commentary on Donald G. Dutton's *Rethinking Domestic Violence*. *Violence Against Women, 13(8).*874-884.

DeLeon-Granados, W., Wells, W., & Binsbacher, R. (2006). Arresting developments: Trends in female arrests for domestic violence and proposed explanations. *Violence Against Women, 12 (4),* 355-371.

DeLeon-Granados, W., & Wells, W., & Long, J. (2005). Beyond Minneapolis: A preliminary theoretical model for alleviating conceptual ruts in domestic violence intervention research. *Western Criminology Review, 6 (1),* 43-58.

Dehart, D.D., Kennerly, R.J., Burke, L.K., & Follingstad, D.R. (1999). Predictors of attrition in a treatment program for battering men. *Journal of Family Violence, 14(1).* 19-34.

DeMaris,A., & Jackson, J.K. (1987). Batterer's reports of recidivism after counseling. *Social Casework: The Journal of Contemporary Social Work, 68,* 455-465.

Dobash, R.E., & Doash, R. (1979). *Violence Against Wives: A Case Against the Patriarchy.* New York: The Free Press.

Dobash, R.E., & Dobash, R.P. (1988). Research as social action: The struggle for battered women. In K. Yllo, & M. Bograd (Eds.), *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse* (pp. 51-74). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Dobash, R.E., & Dobash, R.P. (1992). *Women, violence and social change.* London: Routledge.

Dobash, R.E., & Dobash, R. P. (1997). Men's violence and programs focused on change. *Current Issues In Criminal Justice, 8(3)*, 243-262.

Dobash, R.E., & Dobash, R.P. (1998). *Rethinking Violence Against Women.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Dobash, R.E., Dobash, R.P., Cavanagh, K., & Lewis, R. (1999). *Changing Violent Men.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Doganieri, E., & van Munster, B. (2001). *The Amazing Race* [Television series]. New York: CBS.

Dunford, F. (2000). The San Diego Navy Experiment: An assessment of interventions for men who assault their wives. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68,* 468-476.

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

Dutton, D. G. (1995). *The batterer: A psychological profile*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

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

Dutton, D.G. (2000). Witnessing parental violence as a traumatic experience shaping the abusive personality. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 3,* 59-67.

Dutton, D.G., & Corvo, K. (2006). Transforming a flawed policy: A call to revive psychology and science in domestic violence research and practice. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 11,*457-483.

Dutton, D.G., & Nicholls, T.L. (2005). The gender paradigm in domestic violence research and theory: Part 1 – The conflict of theory and data. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 10,* 680-714.

Dutton, D.G., & Starzomski, A. (1994). Psychological differences between court-referred and self-referred wife assaulters. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 21(2)*, 203-222.

Dutton, M. A. (1992). Assessment and treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder among battered women. In D.W. Foy (Ed.), *Treating PTSD: Cognitive-behavioral strategies. Treatment manuals for practitioners* (pp. 69-98). New York, NY: Guildford Press.

Easton, C., & Sinha, R. (2002). Treating the addicted male batterer: Promising directions for dual-focused programming. In C. Wekerle, & A. Wall (Eds.), *The Violence and Addiction Equation: Theoretical and Clinical Issues in Substance Abuse and Relationship Violence.* Brunner: Routledge.

Edelson, J. (1985). Violence is the issue: A critique to Neidig's assumption. *Victimology, 9, 5.*

Edleson, J. L. & Tolman, R. M. (1992). *Intervention for men who batter: An ecological approach.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Ehrensaft, M. K., Moffitt, T.E., & Caspi, A. (2004). Clinically abusive relationships in an unselected birth cohort: Men's and women's participation and developmental antecedents. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 113(2),* 258-271.

Eisikovits, Z., & Buchbinder, E. (2000). *Locked in a violent embrace: Understanding and intervening in domestic violence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Eisikovits, Z. C., & Edleson, J. (1989). Intervening with men who batter: A critical review of the literature. *Social Service Review*, 384-414.

Eisenstadt, S. A. & Bancroft, L. (1999). Domestic Violence. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *341(12),* 886-892.

Erez, E., & King, T.A. (2000). Patriarchal terrorism or common couple violence: Attorney's view on prosecuting and defending woman batterers. *International Review of Victimology, 7,* 207-226.

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.

Fagan, J. (1989). Cessation from family violence: Deterrence and dissuasion. In L. Oholin, & M. Tonry (Eds.), *Family Violence, Volume 11 of Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research* (pp. 357-426). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fagan, J. (1996). *The criminalization of domestic violence: Promises and limits.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

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

Farmer, A., & Tiefenthaler, J. (2003). *Explaining the Recent Decline in Domestic Violence. Contemporary Economic Policy, 21(2),* 158-172.

Feder, L., & Dugan, L. (2002). A test of the efficacy of court-mandated counseling for domestic violence offenders: The Broward Experiment. *Justice Quarterly, 19(2),* 343- 375.

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

Federal Bureau of Investigation (2001). *Crime in the United States 2000; Uniform Crime Reports.* Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Fiebert, M. (1997). Annotated bibliography: References examining assaults by women on their spouses/partners. *Sexuality and culture, 1,* 273-286.

Fine, M., & Vanderslice, V. (1999). Qualitative activist research: Reflections on methods and politics. *Methodological Issues in Applied Social Psychology, 2,* 199-218.

Flynn, C. P. (1990). Relationship violence by women: Issues and implications. *Family Relations, 39(2)*, 194-198.

Ford, D.A. (1993). The Indianapolis domestic violence prosecution experiment. Final Report, Grant 86-IJ-CX-0012 to the National Institute of Justice. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University.

Ford, D.A. (2003). Coercing victim participation in domestic violence prosecutions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18 (6),* 669-684.

Ford, D., & Regoli, M.J. (1993). The criminal prosecution of wife assaulters. In Z.

Hilton (Ed.), *Legal responses to wife assault: Current trends and evaluation*

(pp.127-164). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Fried, C.S., Reppucci, N.D., Woolard, J.L. (2000). Violence prevention. In J.

Rappaport & E. Seidman (Eds.). *Handbook of community psychology.*

(pp. 965-973). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Friere, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Herder & Herder.

Fugate, M., Landis, L., Riordan, K., Naureckas, S., & Engel, B. (2005). Barriers to

domestic violence help seeking: Implications for intervention. *Violence Against*

Women, 11(3), 290-310.

Fusco, L.J. (1989). Integrating systems: Police, courts, and assaulted women. In B.

Pressman, G. Cameron, & M. Rothery (Eds), *Intervening with assaulted women:*

Current theory, research and practice, (pp. 125-136). Hillsdale, NJ: Erbaum

Associates.

Gamache, D., & Asmus, M. (1999). Enhancing networking among service providers:

Elements of successful coordination strategies. In M.F. Shepard, & E.L. Pence

(Eds.), *Coordinating community responses to domestic violence: Lessons from*

Duluth and beyond (pp. 65-88). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Ganley, A. (1987). Perpetrators of domestic violence: An overview of counseling the

court-mandated client. In D. Sonkin (Ed.), *Domestic Violence on Trial*. New

York: Springer.

Geffner, R.A., & Rosenbaum, A. (2001). Domestic violence offenders: Treatment and intervention standards. In R.A. Geffner, & A. Rosenbaum (Eds.), *Domestic Violence Offenders: Current Interventions, Research and Implications for Policies and Standards,* (pp. 1-9). Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Maltreatment & Trauma Press.

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

Gelles, R., & Straus, M., (1979). Determinants of violence in the family: Toward a theoretical integration. In W.R. Burr, R. Hill, R.I. Nye, & I. L. Reiss (Eds.), *Contemporary theories about the family* (pp. 188-207). New York, NY: Free Press.

Gerlock, A.A. (2001). A profile of who completes and who drops out of domestic violence rehabilitation. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 22*, 379-400.

Goldman, J., & Du Mont, J. (2001). Moving forward in batterer program evaluation: Posing a qualitative, woman-centered approach. *Evaluation & Program Planning, 24(3),* 297-305.

Gondolf, E.W. (1987). Evaluating programs for men who batter: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Family Violence, 2(1),* 95-108.

Gondolf, E.W. (1988). Who are those guys? Toward a behavioral typology of batterers. *Violence and Victims, 3,* 187-203.

Gondolf, E. W. (1993). Treating the batterer. In M. Hansen, & M. Harway (Eds.),
Battering and family therapy: A feminist perspective (pp. 105-118). Thousand
Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Gondolf, E. W. (1997). Batterer Program: What we know and need to know. *Journal of
Interpersonal Violence, 12,* 83-98.

Gondolf, E.W. (1997a) Patterns of reassault in batterer programs. *Violence and Victims,
12(4).* 373-387

Gondolf, E.W. (1997b). Expanding batterer program evaluation. In G. K. Kantor, J.L.
Jasinski (Eds.), *Out of Darkness: Contemporary Perspectives on Family Violence*
(pp. 208-218). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Gondolf, E.W. (1999). MCMI-III Results for batterer program participants in four cities:
Less "pathological" than expected. *Journal of Family Violence, 14(1),* 1-17.

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

Gondolf, E.W. (2000). Mandatory court review and batterer program compliance.
Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15(4), 428-437.

Gondolf, E.W. (2001). Culturally Focused Batterer Counseling For African American
Men. *Trauma, Violence and Abuse, 2(4),* 283-295.

Gondolf, E.W. (2001a). Limitations of experimental evaluation of batterer programs.
Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 2(1), 79-88.

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

Gondolf, E.W. (2002a) Service barriers for battered women with male partners in batterer programs. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17(2).* 217-227.

Gondolf, E.W., & Foster, R. A. (1991). Pre-program attrition in batterer programs. *Journal of Family Violence, 6 (4),* 337-349.

Gondolf, E.W., & Williams, O. J. (2001). Culturally focused batterer counseling for African American men. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse, 2(4)*, 283-295.

Gordon, J.A., & Moriarty, L.J. (2003). The effects of domestic violence batterer treatment on domestic violence recidivism: The Chesterfield County Experience. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 30(1),* 118-134.

Gordon, L., (1988). *Heroes of their own lives: The politics and history of family violence – Boston 1880-1960.* New York: Viking Penguin Inc.

Grann, M., & Wedin, I. (2002). Risk factors for recidivism among spousal assault and spousal homicide offenders. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 8(1),* 5-23.

Grauwiler, P. (2008). Voices of women: Perspectives on decision-making and the management of partner violence. *Children and youth services review, 30,* 311-322.

Grauwiler, P., & Mills, L.G. (2004). Moving beyond the criminal justice paradigm: A radical restorative justice approach to intimate abuse. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 31(1),* 49-69.

Green, A.F. (1999). Biological perspectives on violence against women. In M. Harway, & J.M. O'Neil (Eds.), *What causes men's violence against women?* (pp. 51-60). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Gregory, C., & Erez, E. (2002). The effects of batterer treatment programs: the battered woman's perspective. *Violence Against Women, 8,* 206-232.

Gross, M., Cramer, E. P., Forte, J., Gordon, J. A., Kunkel, T., & Moriarty, L. J. (2000). The impact of sentencing options on recidivism among domestic violence offenders. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 24(2),* 301-312.

Grusznski, R.J., & Carillo, T.P. (1988). Who completes batterer's treatment groups? An empirical investigation. *Journal of Family Violence, 3(2)*, 141-150.

Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1981). *Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1988). Do inquiry paradigms imply inquiry methodologies. In D.M. Fetterman (Ed.), *Qualitative approaches to evaluation in education* (pp. 89-115). New York: Praeger.

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.

Haaken, J., &Yragui, Nan. (2003). Going underground: Conflicting perspectives on domestic violence shelter practices. *Feminism & Psychology, 13(1),* 49-71.

Hamberger, L.K., & Hastings, J.E. (1990). Recidivism following spouse abuse abatement counseling: Treatment program implications. *Violence & Victims, 5 (3),* 157-170.

Hamberger, L. K., & Hastings, J. E. (1993). Court-mandated treatment of men who assault their partner: Issues, controversies, and outcomes, In Z.N. Hilton (Ed.), *Legal responses to wife assault: Current trends and evaluation* (pp.188-229). Newbury Park: Sage Publications, Inc.

Harrell, A. (1991). Evaluation of court-ordered treatment for domestic violence offenders: Final report. Washington, DC: Institute for Social Analysis.

Hart, B.J. (1993). The legal road to freedom. In M. Hansen, & M. Harway (Eds.), *Battering and Family Therapy: A feminist perspective* (pp. 13-28). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hartman, J.L., & Belknap, J. (2003). Beyond the gatekeepers: Court professionals' self-reported attitudes about and experiences with misdemeanor domestic violence cases. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 30(3),* 349-373.

Harway, M., & O'Neil, J.M. (1999). *What causes men's violence against women*? Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hawkins, J.W., Pearce,C.W., Skeith, J., Dimitruk, B., & Roche, R. (2009). Using technology to expedite screening and intervention for domestic abuse and neglect. *Public Health Nursing, (26)1,* 58-69.

Healey, K., Smith, C., & O'Sullivan, C. (1998). *Batterer intervention: Program approaches and criminal justice strategies.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Heany, J.J. (2006). Social regularities between police officers and victims of male violence: Identifying the limitations of mandatory arrest policies. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 66(7-B),* 3948.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations.* New York: Wiley.

Hemmens, C., Strom, K., & Schlegel, E. (1998). Gender bias in the courts: A review of the literature. *Sociological Imagination, 35,* 22-42.

Hendricks, B., Werner, T., Shipway, L., & Turinetti, G.J. (2006). Recidivism among spousal abusers: Predictions and program evaluation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21 (6)*, 703-716.

Henning, K., & Feder, L. (2005). Criminal prosecution of domestic violence offenses: An investigation of factors predictive of court outcomes. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 32(6),* 612-642.

Henning, K., & Holdford, R. (2006). Minimization, denial, and victim blaming by batterers: How much does the truth matter? *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 33(1),* 110-130.

Henning, K., & Renauer, B. (2005). Prosecution of women arrested for intimate partner abuse. *Violence and Victims, 20(3),* 361-376.

Henning, K., Renauer, B., & Holdford, (2006). Victim or offender? Heterogeneity among women arrested for intimate partner violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 21,* 351-368.

Hester, M. (2006). Making it through the Criminal Justice System: Attrition and domestic violence. *Social Policy and Society, 5,* 79-90.

Hill, C.E., Thompson, B.J., & Williams, E.N (1997). A guide to conducting consensual

  qualitative research. *The Counseling Psychologist, 25 (4),* 517-572.

Hills, M., & Mullett, J. (2000). *Community-based research and evaluation: Collaborative*

  action for health and social change. Victoria, BC: Community Health Promotion

  Coalition.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (2001). Standards for batterer treatment programs: How can

  research inform our decisions? In R.A. Geffner, & A. Rosenbaum (Eds.),

  Domestic Violence Offenders: Current Interventions, Research, and Implications

  for Policies and Standards (pp. 165-180). Binghamton, NY: The Haworth

  Maltreatment & Trauma Press.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Meehan, J.C. (2004). Typologies of men who are martially

  violent: Scientific and clinical implications. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*

  (12), 1369-1389.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Meehan, J.C., Herron, K., Rehman, U., & Stuart, G.L. (2003).

  Do subtypes of maritally violent men continue to differ over time? *Journal of*

  Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68, 1000-1019.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Stuart, G.L. (1994). Typologies of male batterers: Three

  subtypes and the differences among them. *Psychological Bulletin, 116,* 476-497.

Hotaling, G.T., & Sugarman, D.B. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife

  violence: The current state of knowledge. *Violence and Victims, 1,* 101-124.

Hooks, B. (1981). *Ain't I a woman: black women and feminism.* Boston, MA: South End

  Press.

Hovell, M.F., Seid, A.G., & Liles. S. (2006). Evaluation of police and social services domestic violence program: Empirical evidence needed to inform public health policies. *Violence Against Women, 12,* 137-159.

Huffine, C., Moore, D., Moore, J., Johnston, M., Llohn, M., & Mankowski, E. (2004). *Oregon Batterer Intervention Providers Directory*. Portland, OR: Portland State University.

Hughes, D., & DuMont, K. (1993). Using focus groups to facilitate culturally anchored research. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 21(6),* 775-806.

Hutchinson, I., Hirschel, J., & Pesackis, C. (1992). Family violence and police utilzation. *Violence and Victims, 9,* 299-313.

Incite!. (2003). *Incite! Women of color against violence: Community accountability, principles, concerns, strategies and models.* March 5. Retrieved January 5, 2010 (http://www.incite-national.org/index.php?s=93).

Iovanni, L., & Miller, S.L. (2001). Criminal justice response to domestic violence: Law enforcement and the courts. In C.M. Renzett, J. Eddleson, & R. Bergen (Eds.), *Sourcebook on violence against women* (pp. 303-327). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Jacobson, N.S., Gottma, J.M., Waltz, J., Rushe, R., Babcock, J., & Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (1994). Affect, verbal content, and psychophysiology in the arguments of couples with a violent husband. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62(4),* 982-988.

Janssen, P.A., Nicholls, T.L., Stefanakis, H., Spidel, A., & Simpson, E.M. (2005). Of mice and men: Will the intersection of social science and genetics create new approaches for intimate partner violence? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20(1),* 61-71.

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.

Jennings, J.L. (1987). History and issues in the treatment of battering men: A case for unstructured group therapy. *Journal of Family Violence, 2(3),* 193-213.

Johnson, H. (2000). The role of alcohol in male partners' assault on wives. *Journal of drug issues, 30,* 725-741.

Johnson, M.P. (1995). Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: Two forms of violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57,* 283-294.

Johnson, R.B. (1997). Examining the validity structure of qualitative research. *Education, 118 (2),* 282-292.

Johnson, R.B. (1998). Toward a theoretical model of evaluation utilization. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 21*, 93-110.

Jolin, A. (2008). Domestic violence reformed. In T. Goergen, K. Hoffmann-Holland, H. Schneider, & J. Stock (Eds.), *Interdisziplinaere Kriminologie: Festschrift fuer Arthur Kreuzer.* (pp. 291-303). Frankfurt, Germany: Verlag fuer Polizeiwissenschaften.

Jones, A.S., D'Agostino Jr., R.B., Gondolf, E.W., & Heckert, A. (2004). Assessing the
    effect of batterer program completion on reassault using propensity scores.
    Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19(9), 1002-1020.

Jones, A. S., & Gondolf, E.W. (2001). Time-varying risk factors for reassault among
    batterer program participants. *Journal of Family Violence, 16(4),* 345-359.

Jordan, C.E. (2004). Intimate partner violence and the justice system: An examination of
    the interface. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19 (12),* 1412-1434.

Kalmuss, D.S. (1984). The intergenerational transmission of marital aggression. *Journal
    of Marriage and the Family, 46,* 11-19.

Katz, J. (2006). *The Macho Paradox: Why Some Men Hurt Women and How All Men
    Can Help*. Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks, Inc.

Kaufman, J.S., Crusto, C.A., Quan, M., Ross, E., Friedman, S.R., O'Rielly, K., & Call, S.
    (2006). Utilizing program evaluation as a strategy to promote community change:
    Evaluation of a comprehensive community-based, family violence initiative.
    American Journal of Community Psychology, 38, 191-200.

Kaufman, M. (1994). Men, feminism, and men's contradictory experiences of power. In
    M. Kaufman, & H. Brod (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities* (pp. 142-164).
    Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Kelly, J. G., (2006). *Becoming ecological: An expedition into community psychology.*
    New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Kelly, J.G., Mock, L.O., & Tandon, S.D. (2001). Collaborative inquiry with African-
    American community leaders: Comments on a participatory action research

process. In P. Reason, & H. Bradbury (Eds). *Handbook of Action Research* (pp. 348-355). London: Sage Publications, Inc.

Kidder, L.H., & Fine, M. (1997). Qualitative inquiry in psychology: A radical tradition. In D. Fox and I. Prilleltensky (Eds.), *Critical Psychology: An Introduction* (pp 34-50). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Kim, M. (2010). Alternative interventions to intimate violence: Defining political and pragmatic challenges. In J. Ptacek (Ed.), *Restorative justice and violence against women*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kimmel, M.S. (2002). "Gender symmetry" in domestic violence. *Violence Against Women, 8 (11),* 1332-1363.

Kingsnorth, R. (2006). Intimate partner violence: Predictors of recidivism in a sample of arrestees. *Violence against women, 12 (10),* 917-935.

Kivel, P. (1992). *Men's work: How to stop the violence that tears our lives apart.* New York: Ballantine Books.

Klein, E., Campbell, J., Soler, E., & Ghez, M. (1997). Ending domestic violence: Changing public perceptions/halting the epidemic. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Klevens, J., Baker, C.K., Shelley, G.A., & Ingram, E.M. (2008). Exploring the links between components of coordinated community responses and their impact on contact with intimate partner violence services. *Violence Against Women, 14(3).* 346-358.

Krueger, R.A. (1998). *Analyzing and reporting focus group results.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Krueger, R.A., & Casey, M.A. (2000). *Focus Groups Third Edition: A Practical Guide for Applied Research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Laing, L. (2002). Responding to men who perpetrate domestic violence: Controversies, interventions and challenges. *Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse, 7.* Record #1259.

Lambert, M.J., & Barley, D.E. (2001). Research summary o the therapeutic relationship and psychotherapy outcome. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 38,* 357-361.

Lambert, M.J., & Ogles, B.M. (2004). The efficacy and effectiveness of psychotherapy. In M.J. Lambert (Ed.), *Bergin and Garfield's handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change.* (5th ed., pp. 139-193). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2005). Top 10 greatest "hits": Important findings and future directions for intimate partner violence research. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20(1),* 108-118.

LaViolette, A. (2001). Batterers' treatment: Observations from the trenches. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 5 (2),* 45-56.

Lehmann, P., & Simmons, C.A. (2009). *Strengths-based batterer intervention: A new paradigm in ending family violence.* New York: Springer Publishing Company, LLC.

Lehrner, A., & Allen, N.E. (2009). Still a movement after all these years? Current

tensions in the domestic violence movement. *Violence Against Women, 15(6),*

656-677.

Lendaris, G. G. (1986). On systemness and the problem solver: Tutorial comments. *IEEE*

Transaction on Systems, Man, & Cybernetics, July, 603-610.

Lerner, M.J., & Simmons, C.H. (1966). Observers' reaction to the innocent victim:

Compassion or rejection? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4,* 203-

210.

Levine, M. (1988). An analysis of mutual assistance. *American Journal of Community*

Psychology, 16(2), 167-188.

Lewin, K. (1942). Field theory and learning. In N.B. Henry (Ed), *The forty-first*

yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: Part II, The

psychology of learning (pp. 215-242). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage

Publications, Inc.

Linstone, H. A. (1999). *Decision making for technology Executives: Using multiple*

perspectives to improve performance. Boston, London: Artech House.

Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches by Audre Lorde.* Freedom: CA,

The Crossing Press.

MacKinnon, C.A. (1989). *Towards a feminist theory of the state.* Cambridge, MA:

Harvard University Press.

Magdol, L., Moffitt, T.E., Caspi, A., & Silva, P.A. (1998). Developmental antecedents of partner abuse: A prospective-longitudinal study. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 107(3),* 375-389.

Maiuro, R.D., Cahn, .T.S., & Vitalian, P.P. (1986). Assertiveness deficits and hostility in domestically violent men. *Violence and Victims, 4,* 277-289.

Maiuro, R.D., Hagar, T.S., Lin, H., & Olson, N. (2001). Are current state standards for domestic violence perpetrator treatment adequately informed by research? A question of questions. In R.A. Geffner & A. Rosenbaum (Eds.) *Domestic violence offenders: Current interventions, research, and implications for polices and standards* (pp. 21-44). New York: The Haworth Press, Inc.

Mankowki, E., Galvez, G., Rollins, C., Hanson, G., Perrin,N., & Glass, N. (August, 2009). Work-related intimate partner violence tactics and consequences: A statewide survey of men in Oregon batterer intervention programs.

Mankowski, E.S., Haaken, J., & Silvergleid, C.S. (2002). Collateral damage: An analysis of the achievements and unintended consequences of batterer intervention programs and discourse. *Journal of Family Violence, 17(2),* 167-184.

Mankowski, E.S., Wilson, D.J., Silvergleid, C., Chamberlain, M., Truesdell, & Huffine, C. (October, 2002). A survey of Oregon batterer intervention providers. *Oregon Council on Crime and Delinquency Bulletin*, 1-4.

Marin, A.J., & Russo, N.F. (1999). Feminist perspectives on male violence against women: Critiquing O'Neil and Harway's Model. In M. Shepard, & E. Pence

(Eds.), *Coordinating community responses to domestic violence: Lessons from Duluth and beyond* (pp. 18-35). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Martin, S.L., Coyne-Beasley, T., Hoehn, M., Mathew, M., Runyan, C.W., Orton, S., & Royster, L. (2009). Primary prevention of violence against women: Training needs of violence practitioners. *Violence Against Women, (15)1*. 44-56.

Maxwell, C.D., Garner, J.H., & Fagan, J. A. (2001). *The effects of arrest on intimate partner violence: New evidence from the spouse assault replication program.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

McDermott, M.J., & Garofalo, J. (2004). When advocacy for domestic violence victims backfires: Types and sources of victim disempowerment. *Violence Against Women, 10(11),*1245-1266.

McKay, M. M. (1994). The link between domestic violence and child abuse: Assessment and treatment considerations. *Child Welfare, 73(1), 29-39.*

McMahon, M., & Pence. E. (2003). Making social change: Reflections on individual and institutional advocacy with women arrested for domestic violence. *Violence Against Women, 9 (1),* 47-74.

Mears, D.P. (2003). Research and interventions to reduce domestic violence revictimization. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse, 4(2)*, 127-147.

Mears, D.P., Carlson, M.J., Holden, G., & Harris, S.D. (2001). Reducing domestic violence revictimization: The effects of individual and contextual factors and type of legal intervention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16(12).* 1260-1283.

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.

Melton, H.C., & Kelknap, J. (2003). He hits, she hits: Assessing gender differences and similarities in officially reported intimate partner violence. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 30 (3),* 328-348.

Merrick, E. (1999). An exploration of quality in qualitative research: Are "reliability" and "validity" relevant? In M. *Kopala, & L. A. Suzuki (Eds.), Using qualitative methods in psychology (pp. 25-36).* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Messerschmidt, J.W. (1993). *Masculinities and crime: Critique and reconceptualization of theory.* Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Meyer, S. (2005). *Twilight.* New York: Little, Brown and Company.

Mihalic, S. W., & Elliott, D. (1997). A social learning theory model of marital violence, *Journal of Family Violence, 12 (2),* 21-47.

Miller, J. (2003). An arresting experiment: Domestic violence victim experiences and perceptions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18(7).* 695-716.

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., (1989). Unintended side-effects of pro-arrest policies and their race and class implications for battered women: A cautionary note. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 3,* 299-317.

Miller, S.D., Duncan, B.L., & Hubble, M.A. (1997). *Escape from Babel: Toward a unifying language for psychotherapy practice.* New York: Norton.

Miller, S.D., Duncan, B.L., & Hubble, M.A. (2004). Beyond integration: The triumph of outcome over process in clinical practice. *Psychotherapy in Australia, 10,* 2-19.

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.

Mills, L.G. (1997). Intuition and insight: A new job description for the battered woman's prosecutor and other more modest proposals. *UCLA Women's Law Journal, 7,* 183-199.

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.

Mills, L.G. (1999). Killing her softly: Intimate abuse and the violence of state intervention. *Harvard Law Review, 113,* 551-613.

Mills, L.G. (2003). *Insult to injury: Rethinking our responses to intimate abuse.* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Milner, J. (2004). From "disappearing" to "demonized": The effects on men and women of professional interventions based on challenging men who are violent. *Critical Social Policy, 24,* 79-101.

Moore, T.M., & Stuart, G.L. (2005). A review of the literature on masculinity and partner violence. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 6 (1),* 46-61.

Morgan, D.L. (1997). *Focus groups as qualitative research.* Thousands Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Morse, J.M. (1991). Strategies for Sampling. In J.M. Morse (Eds.), *Qualitative Nursing Research: A Contemporary Dialogue* (pp. 127-145). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Moscicki, E. (1989). Epidemiological surveys as tools for studying suicidal behavior: A review. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 19,* 131-146.

Ms. Foundation for Women. (2003). *Safety and justice for all: Examining the relationship between the women's anti-violence movement and the criminal legal system.* New York, NY: Author.

Muftic, L.R., Bouffard, J.A., & Bouffard, L.A. (2007). An exploratory study of   women arrested for intimate partner violence: Violent women or violent   resistance? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22(6),* 753-774.

Murphy, C.M., & Baxter, V.A. (1997). Motivating batterers to change in the treatment context. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12 (4).* 607-613.

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.

Murphy, C.M., & O'Farrell, T.J. (1996). Marital violence among alcoholics. *Current*

    Directions in Psychological Science, 5(6), 183-186.

Murphy, C.M., & O'Leary, K.D. (1994). Research paradigms, values, and spouse abuse.

    Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 9(2), 207-223.

Murphy, S.B., & Ouimet, L.V. (2008). Intimate partner violence: A call for social work

    action. *Health & Social Work, 33(4),* 309-314.

National Institute of Justice and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2000).

    Full report of the prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against

    women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women survey.

    Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Neidig, P., & Freidman, D.H., & Collins, B.S. (1985). Domestic conflict containment: A

    spouse abuse treatment program. *Social Casework: The Journal of Contemporary*

    Social Work. 195-204.

Nutt, R.L. (1999). Women's gender-role socialization, gender-role conflict, and abuse: A

    review of predisposing factors. In J.M. O'Neil, & M. Harway (Eds.), *What causes*

    men's violence against women? (pp. 117-134). Thousand Oaks: Sage

    Publications, Inc.

O'Neil, J.M., & Harway, M. (1999). Revised multivariate model explaining men's risk

    factors for violence against women: Theoretical propositions, new hypotheses,

and proactive recommendations. In M. Harway, & J.M. O'Neil (Eds.), *What causes men's violence against women?* (pp. 207-241). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Orchowsky, S.J. (1999). *Evaluation of a coordinated community response to domestic violence: The Alexandria Domestic Violence Intervention Project –* Final report to U.S. Department of Justice. Award # 95-WT-NX-0004.

Oregon Department of Human Services (2005). *Summary of services provided by domestic and sexual violence service programs funded by DHS January 2005 through December 2005.* Salem, OR: Author.

Oregon Department of Justice (2005). *Batterer intervention program rules (ORS 137-087-0000 – ORS 137-087-0100).* Retrieved November 20, 2005 from http://www.doj.state.or.us/crimev/sb_81.shtml

Pandya, V., & Gingerich, W.J. (2002). Group therapy intervention for male batterers: A microethnographic study. *Health & Social Work, 27(1),* 47-55.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Pence, E. (1999). Some thoughts on philosophy. In M.F. Shepard, & E.L. Pence (Eds.), *Coordinating community responses to domestic violence: Lessons from Duluth and beyond* (pp. 25-40). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

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

Pence, E.L., & Shepard, M.F. (1999). An introduction: Developing a coordinated community response. In. M.F. Shepard, & E.L. Pence (Eds.), *Coordinating community responses to domestic violence: Lessons from Duluth and beyond* (pp. 3-23). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Phillips, D. A. (2000). Social policy and community psychology. In J. Rappaport, & E. Seidman (Eds.), *Handbook of community psychology* (pp. 397-419). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Pittman, F. (1985). Gender myths: When does gender become pathology? *Family Therapy Networker, 9,* 25-33.

Pleck, E. (1987). *Domestic tyranny: The making of social policy against family violence from colonial times to the present.* New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Pollack, S., & MacKay, L. (2001). *Report of the women's safety project pilot study: Evaluation of batterers' programs.* Toronto, Canada: Woman Abuse Council of Toronto.

Prochaska, J., & DiClemente, C. (1984). *The transtheoretical approach: Crossing traditional boundaries of therapy.* Homewood, IL., Dow Jones-Irwin.

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

Quigley, B.M., & Leonard, K.E. (2000). Alcohol, drugs, and violence. In V. B. Van Hasselt, & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Aggression and violence: An introductory text* (pp. 259-283). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

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

Rand, M., & Strom, K. (1997). *Violence-related injuries treated in hospital emergency departments* (NCJ 156921). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice.

Rappaport, J. (1977). From Noah to Babel: Relationships between conceptions, values, analysis levels, and social intervention strategies. In I. Iscoe, B.Bloom, & C.D. Spielberger (Eds.), *Community psychology in transition* (pp. 175-184). Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere.

Rappaport, J. (1981). In praise of paradox: A social policy of empowerment over prevention. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 9,* 1-26.

Rasche, C.E. (1995). Minority women and domestic violence: The unique dilemmas of battered women of color. In B.R. Price, & N.J. Sokoloff (Eds.), *The criminal justice system and women: Offenders, victims, and workers (*2nd ed., pp. 246-261). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Renzetti, C.M. (1994). On dancing with a bear: Reflections on some of the current debates among domestic violence theorists. *Violence and Victims, 9(2),* 195-200.

Renzetti, C.M., Edleson, J.L., & Bergen, R.K. (2001). Intervention programs for men who batter. In L.W. Bennet, & O.J. Williams (Eds.), *Sourcebook on violence against women* (pp. 261-277). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rempel, M., Labriola, M., Davis, R.C. (2008). Does judicial monitoring deter domestic violence recidivism? Results of a quasi-experimental comparison in the Bronx. *Violence Against Women, 14(2)*, 185-207.

Richards, T.J., & Richards, L. (1994). Using computers in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 445-462). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Richie, B.E. (1996). *Compelled to crime: The gender entrapment of battered black women.* New York: Routledge.

Ritchie, B.E. (2000). A black feminist refelction on the antiviolence movement. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 25(4)*. 1133-1137.

Rigazio-Digilio, S., & Lanza, A.S. (1999). Inter-gender relational dimensions of violence towards women. In M. Harway, & J.M. O'Neil (Eds.), *What Causes Men's Violence Against Women* (pp. 153-203). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Roberts, A.R. (1988). Substance abuse among men who batter their mates: The dangerous mix. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 5*, 83-87.

Romkens, R. (2006). Protecting prosecution: Exploring the powers of law in an intervention program for domestic violence. *Violence Against Women, 12(2)*. 160-186.

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.

Roy, M. (1977). *Battered women: A psychosociological study of domestic violence.* New

York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Ruttenberg, M. (1994). A feminist critique of mandatory arrest: An analysis of race and

gender in domestic violence policy. *Journal of Gender, Social Policy & the Law,*

2, 171-174.

Sabol, W.J., Coulton, C.J., & Korbin, J.E. (2004). Building community capacity for

violence prevention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19(3),* 322-340.

Sanchez-Hucles, J., & Dutton, M.A. (1999). The interaction between societal violence

and domestic violence: Racial and cultural factors. In M. Harway, & J.M. O'Neil

(Eds.), *What causes men's violence against women?* (pp. 183-203). Thousand

Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Saunders, D. (1992). A typology of men who batter: Three types derived from cluster

analysis. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 62*, 264-275.

Saunders, D.G. (1996). Feminist-cognitive-behavioral and process-psychodynamic

treatments for men who batter: Interaction of abuser traits and treatment models.

Violence and Victims, 11 (4), 393-413.

Saunders, D.G. (2002). Are physical assaults by wives and girlfriends a major social

problem? *Violence Against Women, 8(12),* 1424-1448.

Saunders, D.G., & Size, P.B. (1986). Attitudes about woman abuse among police

officers, victims and victim advocates. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1,* 24-

42.

Schafer, J., Caetano, R., & Cunradi, C.B. (2004). A path model of risk factors for intimate partner violence among couples in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19(2),* 127-142.

Schechter, S. (1982). *Women and male violence: The visions and struggles of the Battered Women's Movement*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Schechter, S. (1987). *Guidelines for mental health practitioners in domestic violence cases.* Washington DC: National Coalition Against Domestic Violence.

Schmidt, J.D., & Sherman, L.W. (1996). Does arrest deter domestic violence? In E. S. Buzawa, & C.G. Buzawa (Eds.), *Do Arrests and Restraining Orders Work?* (pp. 43-53). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Scott, K.L. (2004). Predictors of change among male batterers: Application of theories and review of empirical findings. *Trauma Violence Abuse, 5(3),* 260-284.

Scott, K. L, & Wolfe, D.A. (2000). Change among batterers: Examining men's success stories. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15(8),* 827-842.

Shaver, K. (1970). Defensive attribution: Effects of severity and relevance on the responsibility assigned for an accident. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 14,* 101-113.

Shepard, M. (1999). Evaluating coordinated community responses to domestic violence. Retrieved November 1, 2003 from http://www.vaw.umn.edu/documents/vawnet/ccr/ccr.html.

Shepard, M. (2005). Twenty years of progress in addressing domestic violence: An agenda for the next 10. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20(4),* 436-441.

Shepard, M.F., Falk, D.R., & Elliott, B.A. (2002). Enhancing coordinated community responses to reduce recidivism in cases of domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17(5),* 551-569.

Shepard, M.F., & Pence, E. (1988). The effect of battering on the employment status of women. *Affilia, 3(2),* 55-61.

Shepard, M.F., & Pence, E.L. (1999). *Coordinating community responses to domestic violence: Lessons from Duluth and beyond*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Sherman, L.W., & Berk, R.A. (1984). *The Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment.* Washington, DC: Police Foundation.

Sherman, L.W., Smith, D.A., Schmidt, J.D. & Rogan, D.P. (1992). Crime, punishment, and stake in conformity: Legal and informal control of domestic violence. *American Sociological Review, 57,* 680-690.

Silvergleid, C.S., & Mankowski, E.S. (2006). How batterer intervention programs work: Participant and facilitator accounts of processes of change. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21(1)*, 139-159.

Smith, A. (2001). Domestic violence laws: The voices of battered women. *Violence and Victims, 16(1),* 91-110.

Smith, A., (2009). Beyond restorative justice: Radical organizing against violence. In J. Ptacek (Ed.), *Restorative justice and violence against women* (pp. 255-278). New York: Oxford University Press.

Smith, M.D. (1991). Male peer support of wife abuse: An exploratory study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6(4),* 52-519.

Soler, E. (1987). Domestic violence is a crime: A case study: San Francisco Family Violence Project. In D. Sonkin (Ed.), *Domestic violence on trial.* New York: Springer.

Sonkin, D.J., & Durphy, M. (1997*). Learning to live without violence: A handbook for men.* Volcano, California: Volcano Press.

Stark, E. (2005). Reconsidering state intervention in domestic violence cases. *Social Policy & Society, 5(1),* 149-159.

Stark, E. (2007). *Coercive control: How men entrap women in personal life.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Stefanakis, H. (2000). Desistence from violence: Men's stories of identity transformation. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: the Sciences & Engineering, 60*(8-B).

Stewart, S. H., & Israeli, A. L. (2002). Substance abuse and co-occurring psychiatric disorders in victims of intimate violence. In C. Wekerle, & A.Wall (Eds.), *The violence and addiction equation: Theoretical and clinical issues in substance abuse and relationship violence* (pp. 98-122). New York: Brunner-Routledge.

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.

Straus, M.A. (1974). Leveling civility and violence in the family. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36,* 13-29.

Straus, M.A., & Gelles, R.J., (1990). Societal change and change in family violence from

    1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys. In M.A. Straus, R.J. Gelles, &

    C. Smith (Eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and*

    Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families. New Brunswick: Transaction

    Publishers.

Straus, M.A., Gelles, R.J., & Smith, C. (1990). *Physical Violence in American Families:*

    Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families. New Brunswick, NJ:

    Transaction Publishers.

Stringer, E. (1996). *Action Research: A handbook for practitioners.* Thousand Oaks, CA:

    Sage Publications, Inc.

Stuart, G.L. (2005). Improving violence intervention outcomes by integrating alcohol

    treatment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20(4),* 388-393.

Stuart, G.L., Moore, T.M., Kahler, C.W., and Ramsey, S.E. (2003). Substance abuse and

    relationship violence among men court-referred to batterers' intervention

    programs. *Substance Abuse, 24(2),* 107-122.

Stuart, G.L., Ramsey, S.E., Moore, T.M, Kahler, C.W., Farrell, L.E., Recupero, P.R., &

    Brown, R.A. (2003). Reductions in martial violence following treatment for

    alcohol dependence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18(10),* 1113-1131.

Sugg, N.K., & Inui,T. (1992). Primary care physicians' response to domestic violence:

    Opening Pandora's box. *JAMA, 267,* 3157-3160.

Sullivan, M., Bhuyan, R., Senturia, K., Shiu-Thornton, S., & Ciske, S. (2005).

    Participatory action research in practice: A case study in addressing domestic

violence in nine cultural communities. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20(8),* 977-995.

Swanberg, J.,E., Logan, TK., & Macke, C. (2005). Intimate partner violence, employment, and the workplace: Consequences and future directions. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 6(4),* 286-312.

Swanberg, J., Macke, C., & Logan, TK. (2007). Working women making it work: Intimate partner violence, employment, and workplace support. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22(3),* 292-311.

Taft, C.T., Murphy, C.M., Elliott, J.D., & Keaser, M.C. (2001). Race and demographic factors in treatment attendance for domestically abusive men. *Journal of Family Violence, 16 (4),* 385- 400.

Tedeschi, J.T., & Felson, R.B. (1994). *Violence, aggression, & coercive actions.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Thackeray, J., Stelzner, S., Downs, S., & Miller, C. (2007). Screening for intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22,* 659-670.

Thistlewaite, A., Woolredge,J., & Gibbs, D. (1998). Severity of dispositions and domestic violence recidivism. *Crime and Delinquency, 44,* 388-398.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). *Full report of the incidence, prevalence and consequences of violence against women.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

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

Tolman, R.M., & Bennett, L. (1990). A review of quantitative research on men who batter. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 51,* 87-118.

Tolman, R., & Edleson, J.L. (1989). Behavioral group treatment for men who batter. In B.A. Thyer (Ed.), *Behavioral family therapy* (pp. 169-190). Springfield, IL: C.C. Thomas.

Tolman, R.M., & Weisz,A. (1995). Coordinated community intervention for domestic violence: The effects of arrest and prosecution on recidivism of women abuse perpetrators. *Crime & Delinquency, 41,* 481-495.

U.S. Department of Labor (1997). Occupational Safety and Health Administration. *Workplace violence.* Online at www.osha.gov.

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

Vaughn, S., Schumm, J. S., & Sinagub, J. M. (1996). *Focus group interviews in education and psychology.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc

Waldo, M. (1987). Also victims: Understanding and treating men arrested for spouse abuse. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 65,* 385-388.

Walker, L. E. (1991). Post-traumatic stress disorder in women: Diagnosis and treatment of battered woman syndrome. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 28(1),* 21-29.

Walster, E. (1966). Assignment of responsibility for an accident. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3,* 73-79.

Wangsgaard, S.M. (2001). The participants' perspectives: Factors of batterer group treatment that facilitate change. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: the Sciences & Engineering, 61(11-B), 6153, US: University Microfilms International.*

Watzlawick, P., Weakland, J.H., & Fisch, R. (1974). *Change: Principles of problem formation and problem resolution*. Oxford, England: W. W. Norton.

Webb, J., (2009). Now is the time to reform our criminal justice system. *Criminal Justice Ethics. 28(2),* 163-167.

Weisz, A.N., Tolman, R.M., & Bennett, L. (1998). An ecological study of nonresidential services for battered women within a comprehensive community protocol for domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 13(4)*, 395-415.

Wekerle, C., & Wolfe, D.A. (1999). Dating violence in mid-adolescence: Theory, significance, and emerging prevention initiatives. *Clinical Psychology Review, 19(4)*, 435-456.

Wexler, D.B. (2000). *Domestic violence 2000: An integrated skills program for men. Group leaders manual.* New York: Springer Publications, Inc.

Whitfield, C.L., Anda, F.A., Dube, S.R., & Felitti, V.J. (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.

Wilkinson, S. (1998). Focus groups in feminist research: Power, interaction, and the co-construction of meaning. *Women's Studies International Forum, 21(1),* 111-125.

Wilkinson, S. (1999). Focus groups: A feminist method. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 23(2),* 221-244.

Wilkinson, S. (1999a). How useful are focus groups in feminist research? In R.S. Barbour, & J. Kitzinger (Eds), *Developing focus group research: Politics, theory and practice* (pp. 64-78). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Williams, L.M. (2004). Research-advocate collaborations to end violence against women: Toward liberating methodologies for action research. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19(11),* 1350-1357.

Williams, O. (1995). Treatment for African American men who batter. *CURA Reporter, 25,* 610.

Williams, O.J., (1998). Healing and confronting the African American male who batters. In R.Carrillo, & J. Tello (Eds.), *Family violence and men of color: Healing the wounded male spirit (pp. 74-94).* New York: Springer.

Williams, O., & Becker, R. (1994). Domestic partner abuse treatment programs and cultural competence: The results of a national survey. *Violence and Victims, 9,* 287-295.

Wolfe, D.A., & Jaffe, P.G. (1999). Emerging strategies in the prevention of domestic violence. *The Future of Children, 9(3),* 133-144.

Yllo, K. (1988). Political and Methodological Debates in Wife Abuse Research. In. K. Yllo & M. Bograd (Eds.), *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse* (pp. 28-50). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Yllo, K., & Bograd, M. (1988). *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Yoshioka, M.R., & Choi, D.Y. (2005). Culture and interpersonal violence research: Paradigm shift to create a full continuum of domestic violence services. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20(4),* 513-519.

Young, V. (1986). Gender expectations and their impact on black female offenders and victims. *Justice Quarterly, 3 (3).* 305-327.

Zorza, J. (2010). The new DV typologies: An accurate reconceptualization or another trivialization? *Domestic Violence Report, (Dec/Jan),* 19-20 & 27-32.

Appendix A

Script for Recruiting Police and Probation Officers, Victim Advocates and Program Facilitators at Naturally Occurring Meetings

"Hi, my name is Courtenay Silvergleid and I'm a graduate student at Portland State University. I've been involved in the domestic violence field for the past 15 years and for the past several years have been doing evaluation work on batterer intervention programs along with Dr. Eric Mankowski. Currently, I am interested in exploring some of the strengths and limitations of current domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men. I'm wondering if your group would be willing to share their thoughts on this topic with me at your next regularly scheduled meeting in the form of a focus group. The discussion will last for approximately 120 minutes and be digitally recorded in order to insure that we accurately capture your opinions. I will provide snacks during the meeting as a way of saying thank you."

Appendix B

Script for Advocates to use when
Presenting Focus Group idea to the Members in their Group

"A researcher from Portland State University is interested in coming to one of our upcoming group meetings. She would like to ask you all some questions regarding your opinions and experiences with the police, courts, probation and batterer intervention programs. Her goal is to evaluate and improve the current intervention system. Your participation would be of great benefit. I will not be here for the discussion, which will last about 120 minutes and be digitally recorded. She will take every precaution to protect your confidentiality so that your comments are not linked with your name. Instead, your comments will be grouped together with comments made by other women in other programs. If the group is willing to participate, then we should select a date for them to come. If you choose not to participate, then you will simply participate in regular group activities."

Appendix C

Script for Calling Police and Probation Officers,
Victim Advocates, and Program Facilitators

"Hi, my name is Courtenay Silvergleid and I'm a graduate student at Portland State University. I got your name and number from X (fellow police and probation officers, victim advocate, or program facilitator). I've been involved in the domestic violence field for the past 15 years and for the past four years have been doing evaluation work on batterer intervention programs with Dr. Eric Mankowski. Currently, I am interested in exploring some of the strengths and limitations of current domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men. I am wondering if you would be willing to share your thoughts on this topic with me. If you are, I'd like to invite you to come to a focus group with other (police and probation officers, program facilitators, or victim advocates). The focus group will last for approximately 120 minutes and be digitally recorded in order to insure that we accurately capture your opinions. I will provide snacks during the meeting as a way of saying thank you."

Appendix D

Script for Program Facilitators to use when
Presenting Focus Group idea to the Members in their Group

"A researcher from Portland State University is interested in coming to one of our upcoming group meetings. She would like to ask you all some questions regarding your opinions and experiences with the police, courts, probation and here at the program. Her goal is to evaluate and improve the current intervention system. Your participation would be of great benefit. I will not be here for the discussion, which will last about 120 minutes and be digitally recorded. She will take every precaution to protect your confidentiality so that your comments are not linked with your name. Instead, your comments will be grouped together with comments made by other men in other programs. If the group is willing to participate, then we should select a date for them to come. If you choose not to participate, then you will simply participate in regular group activities. "

Appendix E

Discussion Guide for Focus Groups

Welcome & Introductions

Overview of focus group topic

Review of ground rules:

- **confidentiality**

- **treating other members with respect**

Questions

1. Within the coordinated community response, what do you believe is the most widely endorsed explanation for men's domestic violence against women?
2. Locally, what are the dominant strategies for intervening in men's violence against women?
3. Despite progress, domestic violence continues to occur. In your opinion, why isn't domestic violence intervention with abusive men more effective?
4. What discrepancies, if any, do you perceive between the dominant conceptualization of domestic violence and our current strategies for intervening in this violence?
5. How do you understand or experience these discrepancies?
6. What is your understanding of the Duluth Model of coordinated community response?
7. What discrepancies, if any, exist between the Duluth Model and current domestic violence intervention strategies for abusive men?
8. How do you understand or experience these discrepancies?
9. What limitations or unintended consequences, if any, are associated with a heavily criminal justice response to domestically abusive men?
10. What strategies or interventions for domestically abusive men do you wish were being implemented in addition to the current strategies?
11. What resources in our community do you think should be involved in intervening in men's violence against women?

Appendix F

CONSENT FORM
(Victim Advocates, Batterer Intervention Providers,
Police and Probation Officers)

"Evaluating Domestic Violence Intervention with Abusive Men"

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Courtenay Silvergleid, M.S. from Portland State University, Psychology Department. The researcher hopes to learn about the strengths and limitations of current domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men. You were selected as a possible participant in the study because you are either a police or probation officer, victim advocate, or batterer intervention program provider and therefore have through your professional role had the opportunity to develop opinions about these challenges.

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to participate in a focus group with other probation officers, police officers, victim advocates, or batterer intervention providers which will last for approximately 120 minutes and will be digitally recorded. You may not receive any direct benefit from taking part in this study, but the study may help to increase knowledge about how to improve domestic violence intervention in our local community.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be linked to you or identify you will be kept confidential to the extent possible by the researcher. When the digital recordings of the discussions are transcribed, all identifying information including name, gender, place of employment, employment title, etc. will be excluded. Your consent form with you name will be kept in a locked file cabinet in Courtenay Silvergleid's office. There is a small chance that someone else in the group will reveal what you share in the group, however this risk will be minimized by emphasizing to each member the importance of maintaining confidentiality. By signing this consent form, you are agreeing to protect and keep private what others in the group say.

Your participation is voluntary. You do not have to take part in this study, and it will not affect your relationship with your place of employment or this group. You may also withdraw from this study at any time without affecting your relationship with your place of employment or this group.

If you have concerns or problems about your participation in this study or your rights as a research subject, please contact the Human Subjects Research Review Committee, Office of Research and Sponsored Projects, 111 Cramer Hall, Portland State University, (503) 725-3423. If you have questions about the study itself, contact Courtenay Silvergleid, MS. (503) 465-2025 or her supervisor, Dr. Eric Mankowski at (503) 725-3901.

Your signature indicates that you have read and understand the above information and agree to take part in this study. Please understand that you may withdraw your consent at any time without penalty, and that, by signing, you are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies. The researcher should provide you with a copy of this form for your own records.

_____   _____
Signature   Date

Appendix G

CONSENT FORM
(Batterer Intervention Program Participants)

"Evaluating Domestic Violence Intervention"

Courtenay Silvergleid, M.S., from the Psychology Department at Portland State University is doing a research study on the limitations of current domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men.

What Will I Have To Do?

If you decide to take part in the study, you will be asked to share your opinions at one of your regularly scheduled group meetings. The meeting will last for approximately 120 minutes and at the meeting you and the other men will be asked to talk about:

  ➢ Your opinions regarding any problems associated with current domestic violence intervention
  ➢ Your views of the criminal justice response to domestic violence
  ➢ Your suggestions for how to improve domestic violence intervention

Are There Any Risks?

Domestic violence is very personal. You do not have to take part in this study. If you do agree to take part, you may feel uncomfortable, angry, said, guilty, scared or embarrassed because of the questions asked or the discussion that ensues. You don't have to talk if you don't want to. And if you don't want to stay in the meeting, you don't have to. You can leave at any time. If you are upset after the interview and need to talk with someone, please contact your program facilitator.

What Will I Get In Return?

  ➢ Knowing that you are helping others, making Amends
    We can learn so much from you. What we learn may enable policy makers to improve the current system and provide better support to men entering batterer intervention programs.

What Are You Doing To Protect Me?

Your privacy is very important to us. We have done many things to protect you:

  ➢ We won't tell anyone if you take part in this study not.
  ➢ You won't be asked to say your real name during the meeting.
  ➢ Your name and what you tell us during the discussion will be kept private to the extent allowed by law. (By "kept private" we mean that the names of people who take part in the study will not be given to anyone else. And it means that we will only reveal what you say in a way that no one could ever guess or know it was you who said it.) If, in the course of the discussion you

disclose that you are, or are intending to, harm yourself or others, we are ethically and legally required to notify the appropriate authorities.

➢ Only people in the meeting will know what you say. Nothing you say will be reported back to your intervention program or your probation officer.

➢ Your name and other personal information, which we need in order to keep track of who we talk to, will be kept in a locked file cabinet. For example, this form (which has your name on it) will be kept in a locked file cabinet.

➢ When we write or talk about what we learned in this study, we will leave things out so no one will be able to tell who we are talking about.

Any Questions?

If you have any questions about this study, this form, or the discussion, you can talk to Courtenay Silvergleid at (503) 465-2025 or her supervisor, Eric Mankowski at 503-725-3901. You can also contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Committee of Portland State University about your rights as a research participant (someone who takes part in a study). Hours are 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The office is located at Portland State University, Cramer Hall, Room 111, 1721 SW Broadway, Portland, OR 97201. The telephone number is (503) 725-3423, or send email to: hsrrc@lists.pdx.edu

If I Sign, What Does It Mean?

This is a consent form. Your signature below means that:

➢ You have read and understand what this form says.

➢ You are willing to take part in the study by talking with us in the meeting.

➢ You know that you do not have to take part in this study. And even if you agree, you can change your mind and stop at any time.

➢ The program where you are enrolled and your probation officer (if you have one) will not know whether or not you choose to participate in the study.

➢ You will get a copy of this form to keep for yourself.

_____   _____

Participant Signature   Date

_____

Participant name, printed

_____

Interviewer Signature   Date   Interviewer name, printed

Appendix H

CONSENT FORM
(Victim/Survivors)

"Evaluating Domestic Violence Intervention"

Courtenay Silvergleid, M.S., from the Psychology Department at Portland State University is doing a research study on the limitations of current domestic violence intervention strategies with abusive men.

What Will I Have To Do?
If you decide to take part in the study, you will be asked to share your opinions at one of your regularly scheduled group meetings. The meeting will last for approximately 120 minutes and at the meeting you and the other women asked to talk about:
  ➢ Your opinions regarding any problems associated with current domestic violence intervention
  ➢ Your views of the criminal justice response to domestic violence
  ➢ Your suggestions for how to improve domestic violence intervention

Are There Any Risks?
Domestic violence is very personal. You do not have to take part in this study. If you do agree to take part, you may feel uncomfortable, angry, said, guilty, scared or embarrassed because of the questions asked or the discussion that ensues. You don't have to talk if you don't want to. And if you don't want to stay in the meeting, you don't have to. You can leave at any time. If you are upset after the interview and need to talk with someone, please contact your support group leader.

What Will I Get In Return?
  ➢ Knowing that you are helping others who are in your same situation.
    We can learn so much from you. What we learn may enable policy makers to improve the current system, leading to better outcomes for you and other victims/survivors.

What Are You Doing To Protect Me?
Your privacy is very important to us. We have done many things to protect you:
  ➢ We won't tell anyone if you take part in this study not.
  ➢ You won't be asked to say your real name during the meeting.
  ➢ Your name and what you tell us during the discussion will be kept private to the extent allowed by law. (By "kept private" we mean that the names of people who take part in the study will not be given to anyone else. And it means that we will only reveal what you say in a way that no one could ever guess or know it was you who said it.) If, in the course of the discussion you

disclose that you are, or are intending to, harm yourself or others, we are ethically and legally required to notify the appropriate authorities.
➢ Only people in the meeting will know what you say.
➢ Your name and other personal information, which we need in order to keep track of who we talk to, will be kept in a locked file cabinet. For example, this form (which has your name on it) will be kept in a locked file cabinet.
➢ When we write or talk about what we learned in this study, we will leave things out so no one will be able to tell who we are talking about.

Any Questions?
If you have any questions about this study, this form, or the discussion, you can talk to Courtenay Silvergleid, (503) 465-2025 or her supervisor, Eric Mankowski at 503-725-3901. You can also contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Committee of Portland State University about your rights as a research participant (someone who takes part in a study). Hours are 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The office is located at Portland State University, Cramer Hall, Room 111, 1721 SW Broadway, Portland, OR 97201. The telephone number is (503) 725-3423, or send email to: hsrrc@lists.pdx.edu

If I Sign, What Does It Mean?
This is a consent form. Your signature below means that:
➢ You have read and understand what this form says.
➢ You are willing to take part in the study by talking with us in the meeting.
➢ You know that you do not have to take part in this study. And even if you agree, you can change your mind and stop at any time.
➢ You will get a copy of this form to keep for yourself.

_____ _____
Participant Signature   Date

_____
Participant name, printed

_____
Interviewer Signature   Date   Interviewer name, printed

Appendix I

Demographic Survey

This survey asks for information about you. Don't put your name anywhere on this survey. Your answers will not be known to anyone in your program or place of employment.

1. Your age: _____

2. Your birthplace (country): _____

3. If you were **not** born in the U.S., how long have you been in the U.S.? (# of years): _____

4. Circle the highest grade of school that you completed (1 means 1st grade and so on):

   1   2   3   5   6   7   8   9   10   11   12   BA/BS   MA/MS   Ph.D.

   [Elementary]   [Middle]   [High School]

5. What is your relationship status? (*Check one*)

   Single____ Married (or living as married)_____ Separated _____Divorced _____

   Other (desc*ribe)*_____

6. What is your gender?   M   F

7. What is your race? (*May check more than one category*)
   - ☐ White
   - ☐ Black or African American
   - ☐ Asian _____
   - ☐ Spanish/Hispanic/Latino _____
   - ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native   Name of Tribe _____
   - ☐ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
   - ☐ Other_____

8. My role in the Domestic Violence Intervention System might best be described as: (Check all that apply)

☐ Participant in a batterer intervention program

☐ Victim/survivor of domestic violence, participating in a support group

☐ Victim advocate

☐ Batterer intervention provider

☐ Police officer

☐ Probation officer

9. I've been involved in this role for: (please write in the correct number)

_____ weeks, OR _____ months, OR _____ years

Appendix J

Stakeholder group by research question matrix

	Police/ Probation Officers	Victim Advocates	Victims/ Survivors	BIPs	Perpetrators
RQ1 What do stakeholders identify as current DVI with abusive men?	Notifying victims, arresting, prosecuting, and mandating treatment for perpetrators. System is reactive, rather than preventative.	Inadequate CJS response to perpetrators. Unfair treatment and DHS requirements for victims. Unfulfilled need to change societal attitudes.	Little being done to intervene in men's violence. Police unhelpful and unsupportive towards victims. CJS response (arrest, treatment) actually hurtful to victims.	Coordinated, multi-faceted response for perpetrators and victims, community awareness building, and prevention education.	Justice system imposed counseling
RQ2 What do stakeholders believe limits the effectiveness of DVI with abusive men?	Insufficient and ineffective response to perpetrators and inappropriate victim blaming. DV dynamics make police response challenging and scarce resources severely limit scope of probation services.	Insufficient accountability for perps and insufficient support and prioritization of victims and victim safety. Rampant victim blaming throughout the CCR makes true collaboration difficult	Pervasive victim blaming and insufficient accountability for perps. Victims feel abused by police, ignored by DAs and frustrated by BIPs that are woefully ineffective. System blames them and doesn't prioritize their safety.	Insufficient time, scarce resources and non-existent teamwork within CCR. Time and resources needed to change societal attitudes, extend treatment and insure adequate PO supervision of perpetrators.	System is too involved in their lives, disempowering to them and their victims. Can't make them change. Lack of individualized response and consistent punishment limit effectiveness.
RQ3 How do stakeholders make sense of discrepancies between theorized	Current BIP programs insufficient to address diverse, individualized and life-long issues	Services/mandates for victims are over-emphasized and underfunded. Victims held responsible for holding perps	This question was not directly asked of victims. They did however express rage, confusion, and	Doing little to address societal attitudes, primarily because resources are limited and	Not able to answer question as phrased. DV is transactional, yet response focuses on

antecedents for men's DV and current intervention strategies?	that "cause" a man to be intimately violent. Absence of early prevention for children who witness and or primary education programs for all children in school is problematic.	accountable in CJS. Insufficient attention focused on prevention, especially for children who have witnessed DV.	disbelief regarding the amount of responsibility placed on them by the CCR. Also expressed that current strategies don't recognize diverse needs of perps and BIPs often make perps "better "abusers.	crises are prevalent. Community resistance to discussions of male privilege inhibits real change. Over emphasis on physical DV leads to CJS response at the expense of other strategies.	perps. Disconnect with the idea of DV as pre-meditated and controlled. Find it ironic that intervention causes feelings of anger, powerlessness, and frustration.
	Police/ Probation officers	**Victim Advocates**	**Victims/ Survivors**	**BIPs**	**Perpetrators**
RQ4 How do stakeholders make sense of discrepancies between Duluth model of CCR and current intervention strategies for domestically abusive men?	DV is complex. Anxiety making decisions about arrests and "no contact" orders. There isn't enough time to adequately monitor all their cases. Insufficient resources to help perps and victims. Their voices are not respected and they are often at odds with other members of the CCR regarding long term goals for family.	CCR doesn't prioritize victim and her future safety. Insufficient resources to help her walk away. Short sentences and dismal prosecution rates place victim in greater danger. Inadequate comprehension of DV dynamics makes information sharing dangerous. System is inconsistent because of individual players. Advocates not trusted enough as experts.	Unaware of CCR. Don't feel as though the system is working to increase or enhance their safety. They feel powerless and ignored. Perps can manipulate the system to stay within the law and still torment them. Believe there are insufficient financial resources within system to adequately respond. Response varies greatly depending on the individuals involved.	Frustrated by perception of gap between ideal model of coordination and current response. Gap due to: dismissive responses by other members of CCR to BIPs, cultural divides among stakeholders, human variance, rapid turnover and insufficient training.	Minimal to non-existent knowledge of CCR. Frustrated by the costs of BIP – financial strain interferes with their ability to focus. System inconsistent based on individual Pos. Victims are re-victimized when not allowed to release non-contact orders or when they have to pay for their perps to attend treatment.

	Police/ Probation Officers	Victim Advocates	Victims/ Survivors	BIPs	Perpetrators
RQ 5 What do stakeholders believe the role of community should be in domestic violence intervention with abusive men?	Primary prevention education in the schools about healthy relationships. Increased services/screening in the community: housing for victims and perps, more thorough/accurate screening in ERs. Greater involvement from neighbors, friends/family and culturally specific batterer intervention programs.	Need for multi-tiered holistic approach to DV intervention, emphasizing services for individuals, family and peers, community, and society. More services for victims (housing and childcare). Expect perpetrators to pay restitution, do public service education and meet in groups with non-abusive men.	School-based prevention education focused on teaching boys how to treat women with respect. Reduce violence against women on TV and create a safety net for identifying DV victims. Perps might benefit from in-patient treatment, batterer registry, restitution to children, and attending groups with non-abusive men.	Engage the community. Raise awareness through primary prevention education in the schools. Engage leaders of faith community and employers to educate and appropriately refer victims and perpetrators. Need for a full fledged social change campaign utilizing the media to identify and avert DV.	Primary school prevention education, PSAs, religious marital counseling. Provide more information about how to have non-violent relationships and what constitutes DV in the media. Victim impact panels. Some men requested greater compassion and support from the community.

Appendix K

Stakeholder group by major sub-node matrix

	Police/Probation Officers	Victim Advocates	Victims/ Survivors	BIPs	Perpetrators
Sub-node 2(2) Punishment versus rehabilitation	Frustrated by inadequacy of current response to change abusive men's behavior in the long run. Discussed at length the inadequacy of prison and BIPs. Punishment of prison isn't effective because perpetrators are not rehabilitated in prison, yet treatment is not effective because it is too punitive (i.e., mandated, expensive).	Insufficient punishment/ accountability for perps. Ambivalent as to whether or not prison is helpful. Concerned about the degree to which BIP rehabilitates versus enables perps.	Sense of hopelessness about system's ability to change abusers. Unsure what would constitute sufficient punishment so that perpetrators would stop abusive behaviors. Current treatment (putting abusers together in group) is not perceived as helpful.	Punishment impacts behavior in the short term, long term attitude change requires treatment or therapy. Necessary to provide and instill hopefulness about the possibility of change. Need to balance hope with the potential risk to victims if they start to believe that change is possible. One provider asserted that DV is a choice and education and punishment are sufficient for change. Several therapeutic attempts may be necessary before change can be achieved.	Frustrated by tone of community – lack of compassion and support. Punishment sometimes brought on their "ah ha" moments, but they resented being forced into treatment. A person has to want to change. You can't make them.

	Police/Probation Officers	Victim Advocates	Victims/ Survivors	BIPs	Perpetrators
Sub-node 2(3) One size fits all	Disturbed by the one size fits all treatment currently in place for perpetrators. Expressed frustration that this homogeny persists in the face of evidence based practice data suggesting that this is not the most appropriate approach. Suggested conducting more thorough initial assessments and them making more informed and specific placements. Suggested that uniform issuance of "no contact" orders present challenges to overall system success.	Frustrated by the inconsistent responses by the CJS to individual men's abuse, especially with respect to probation.	Concerned about the lack of individual assessment and corresponding treatment for perpetrators	Nothing indexed.	Outraged by the lack of individual assessment and correspond-ingly appropriate treatment. Program length too severe for their specific crimes. Yearned for consistency from Pos who they feel are often arbitrary and inconsistent, yet rejected the notion of a uniform punishment for perps of DV.
Sub-nodes 2(7) and 2(8) Invisibility perpetrators and victim blaming	Victim blaming is prevalent within departments. P/Pos frustrated by these attitudes and beliefs and yet reinforced them; they expressed hopelessness about the potential for working with perpetrators and instead suggested they would rather work to empower victims	Effectiveness of DVI negatively impacted by victim blaming and absence of perpetrator accountability. Suggested that victim blaming is a symptom and contributes to DV. Advocates had few ideas for what to do with abusive men.	System doesn't "dwell" on the abuser, but instead dwells on or blame them. Experienced victim blaming from the police, probation and DHS. Perceive that they are held accountable for what they endure	Recognized tendency within the field to vilify and ignore perpetrators. Providers feel shunned for their work with perps. Talked about the need to educate and empower women to choose non-violent men and hold their partners	Feel victimized by the system. Feel as though their victims are partially, if not equally responsible for the abuse.

	Police/Probation Officers	Victim Advocates	Victims/ Survivors	BIPs	Perpetrators
	to make better choices.			accountable for their abuse. Frustrated that DHS places so much responsibility on victims and refuses to work with perpetrators.	
	Police/Probation Officers	Victim Advocates	Victims/ Survivors	BIPs	Perpetrators
Sub-node 4(1) Human variance	Acknowledged that there is variance in the degree to which individual officers understand and effectively intervene in domestic violence.	DHS/Police and Probation are systems comprised of individuals and those individuals vary not only in their training and knowledge, but also in their attitudes and values with respect to DV	Recognized that individual caseworkers vary in their degree of compassion and concern. Specifically recognized that individual police officers might be abusers themselves and are therefore less sensitive to their plight.	Inconsistencies in the system response as a result of individuals. Despite improvement in training, prejudice and victim blaming still exist in part because of tenure.	Frustrated by their perception that they receive different punishment based on the individual preferences of their probation officers. Some officers are more lenient or supportive than others. One perpetrators suggested that differences also exist among BIP providers.

Appendix L

T.O.P. (Linstone, 1999) by research question matrix

	Technical Lens	Organizational Lens	Personal Lens
RQ1 What do stakeholders identify as current DVI with abusive men?	Arrest Adjudication Probation Counseling Community Awareness Building Prevention Education	Coordinated Multi-faceted approach Over-emphasized services/requirements for victims (Victim blaming) System is reactive rather than proactive.	Perpetrators- Treatment is unfairly mandated by courts Victims - Little is being done to insure their safety and hold men accountable. Police unhelpful and unsupportive.
RQ2 What do stakeholders believe limits the effectiveness of DVI with abusive men?	Lack of sufficient assessment and individualized response. Insufficient time and resources to create needed social change. Insufficient resources to respond appropriately to and monitor every case. Insufficient or inappropriate arrests. Short prison sentences. Ineffective BI programs.	Teamwork virtually non-existent within the CCR. Rampant VB throughout the CCR makes collaboration difficult. Insufficient attention to victim safety and victim needs (housing, child care). Insufficient perpetrator accountability. One size fits all. Wide variability in response due to human variance. Stakeholders struggle with balancing punishment and treatment. Invisibility of perpetrators – no one knows what to do with them and very few think about it.	Perpetrators feel the system is too involved in their lives and is disempowering to victims and perpetrators. Victims abused by police, ignored by Das, frustrated by ineffectiveness of BIPs. System blames victims and doesn't prioritize their safety. Victims frustrated that current intervention strategies often make situation worse – arrest, probation and BIP can all increase rather than decrease abusive behavior.
RQ3 How do stakeholders make sense of discrepancies between theorized antecedents for men's DV and current intervention strategies?	Little is being done to address societal attitudes, gender roles, etc. Response is not individually tailored. Insufficient resources in order to appropriately monitor all cases. Insufficient resources in order to appropriately prosecute and imprison. High turnover and	Generalized resistance to talking about male privilege. Over emphasis on physical DV leads to CJS response at the expense of other more mental health focused strategies. Vilification of perpetrators leads to invisibility within system and overemphasis on victims. Insidiousness of victim blaming and accessibility of victims leads to inappropriate focus on victims.	Perpetrators - DV is transactional and yet intervention focuses solely on them. Perpetrators - Disconnect with the idea of DV as pre-mediated and controlled as they experience themselves as being "out-of-control." Perpetrators - Intervention makes things worse as they are more angry and frustrated and, feel more powerless which leads to greater levels of domestic violence. Victims - Extremely frustrated by the amount of

	insufficient resources for training. Insufficient attention directed at prevention education. Insufficient resources directed at breaking the generational cycle of violence by treating children who witness.		responsibility placed on them by the CCR for their own abuse and for fixing it. Victims - Frustrated that current intervention strategies often make situation worse – arrest, probation and BIP can all increase rather than decrease abusiveness.
	Technical Lens	Organizational Lens	Personal Lens
RQ4 How do stakeholders make sense of discrepancies between Duluth model of CCR and current intervention strategies for domestically abusive men?	Not enough money to train, retain, prosecute, probate, treat, etc. Not enough money available to victims so they can walk away (housing, childcare, etc.). Short sentences and dismal prosecution rates place victim in greater danger. Policies/procedures implemented by individuals which leads to wide variability.	Cultural divides among stakeholders makes teamwork difficult. Stakeholders have different values and long term goals with respect to perpetrators, victims and families. Lack of respect and trust among stakeholders makes information sharing difficult. Insufficient DV training for police/probation/DAs/ judges. Victim and her future safety not prioritized by CCR. Inadequate compression of DV dynamics makes information sharing dangerous.	Perpetrators and victims were largely unaware of the CCR. Perpetrators – Frustrated by costs of BIP – financial strain interferes with their success. Perpetrators – System inconsistent due to human variance. Perpetrators – Victims re-victimized when not allowed to release "no contact" orders. Victims – System not working to increase or enhance their safety. Victims – Feel powerless and ignored. Victims – Insufficient resources to adequately respond to DV. Victims – System response varies greatly depending on individuals involved. Victims- perpetrators can manipulate system to stay w/in the law and still torment them. P/Probation – DV is complex and messy making system response inconsistent, difficult and sometimes dangerous.

	Technical lens	Organizational Lens	Personal Lens
RQ 5 What do stakeholders believe the role of community should be in domestic violence intervention with abusive men?	Primarily school prevention education (teach boys how to treat women with respect). TV public service announcements. Reduce violence on TV (particularly violence against women). Religious marital counseling. Provide information about how to have non-violent relationships and what constitutes domestic violence. Full-fledged social change campaign, like MADD. Greater services/resources for victims and perpetrators (housing, employment aid, childcare, etc.). Registry for batterers like with sex offenders.	Engage leaders of faith community and employers to education and appropriately refer victims and perpetrators. Improve ER/medical facility/mental health facility/employment screening for DV. Multi-tiered holistic approach to DV intervention, emphasizing services for individuals, family and peers, community and society. Consider having perpetrators meet with non-abusive men rather than other abusive men. Culturally specific batterer intervention programs.	Perpetrators – Greater compassion Victims - Less Victim Blaming, prioritize their safety

Appendix M

Project findings

	Police/ Probation Officers	Victim Advocates	Victims/ Survivors	BIPs	Perpetrators
RQ1 What do stakeholders identify as current DVI with abusive men?	System is reactive, rather than preventative. Community outreach. Arresting, prosecuting, and mandating treatment for perpetrators.	Police, probation and BIP. Mandating services for victims (DHS). Holistic services for family. Limited attempts at multi-disciplinary approach.	Nothing is being done to intervene in men's violence. Police are particularly unhelpful.	Coordinated, multi-faceted response for perpetrators and victims that includes arrest, adjudication, BIP, DHS, FVCC, DVERT, community awareness building, and prevention education.	Post-attack, after the attack. CJS gets men into counseling
RQ2 What do stakeholders believe limits the effectiveness of DVI with abusive men?	We don't yet know how to effectively alter batterer's behavior. Punishment (prison and mandating BIP) is ineffective and may make things worse. BIPs are not evidence-based; can't make someone change. POs struggle to simultaneously punish and rehabilitate.	Insufficient accountability for perps, coupled with inappropriate dependency on victims to help hold men accountable. Truncated prison sentences which fail to provide safety for victims. Misdemeanor assignment to crimes send message to victims, perps and community that DV is not taken	Police fail to protect victims or hold perps accountable in terms of arrests and "no contact" orders. DA doesn't prosecute and doesn't communicate with victim. Perps are able to manipulate court; crime of DV doesn't appear to be taken seriously. Prison is not a panacea either because perps	Societal attitudes endorsing violence, power over conflict resolution and misogyny make it difficult to change men. Punishment doesn't change behaviors in the long term. Critical to hold out hope the perps can change in order to work	System is too involved in their lives, disempowering to them and their victims. System response is "overkill" and ultimately hurts the victim ("no contact" orders and class fees). System is focused on punishment as opposed to rehabilitation; punishment is ineffectively because you can't make them change.

	Police/ Probation officers	Victim Advocates	Victims/ Survivors	BIPs	Perpetrators
	Current approach, particularly with respect to treatment and "no contact" orders, is not individualized enough. Inappropriate victim blaming is pervasive, resulting in inappropriate dual arrests. Unable to suggest strategies for how else to work with abusive men; prefer to focus on victim.	seriously. Inconsistent response from CJS is problematic and yet lack of individualized response may also be problematic. BIP not rehabilitative and may actually worsen abuse. Current response mirrors an abusive relationship – victims are bullied, deprived of a voice/adequate communicatio n and blamed for their abuse. Advocates had no ideas or suggestions for what to do with perpetrators.	learn new ways to manipulate from other perps; prison is not rehabilitative particularly with respect to drugs and alcohol. CJS response to perps is neither specific enough nor individualized enough. BIPs are ineffective; perps don't take it seriously and they teach each other how to better manipulate the system and intensify their abuse. Victims suffer as a result of pervasive victim blaming and insufficient communication	with them. Vilification and invisibility of perpetrators. Frustrated by victim blaming they witness and yet exhibited similar attitudes.	Frustrated by lack of individualized assessment and treatment. Victims are partially responsible and should have to attend classes, get help for their behavior too. Lake of individualized response and consistent punishment limit effectiveness.
RQ3 How do stakeholders make sense of discrepancie s between theorized antecedents for men's DV and current	Current BIP programs insufficient to address diverse, individualized and life-long issues that "cause" a man to be intimately violent.	Insufficient efforts to address antecedents on the familial, community and social level. Insufficient attention focused on	This question was not directly asked of victims. They did however express rage, confusion, and disbelief regarding the amount of responsibility	Currently doing little to address societal attitudes, primarily because resources are limited and crises are prevalent.	Not able to answer question as phrased. DV is transactional, yet response focuses on perps. Disconnect

intervention strategies?	Absence of early prevention for children who witness and or primary education programs for all children in school is problematic.	prevention, especially for children who have witnessed DV. Responsibility for stopping abuse rests on the shoulders of victims. Services/mandates for victims are over-emphasized and underfunded. May not make sense to place abusers together for treatment if shared negative attitudes about women contribute to DV.	placed on them by the CCR. Questioned the wisdom of placing perps together with other perps in BIP since they seem to learn how to be "better" at manipulating the system and abusing partner. Also expressed that current strategies may not adequately recognize diverse needs of perps .	Encounter resistance to working with boys or men from other system partners (i.e., DHS). There is resistance to having honest discussions about male privilege. Over emphasis on physical DV leads to CJS response at the expense of other strategies.	between their experiences of being violent and the idea of DV as pre-meditated and controlled. Find it ironic that current intervention causes feelings of anger, powerlessness, and frustration.
	Police/ Probation officers	**Victim Advocates**	**Victims/ Survivors**	**BIPs**	**Perpetrators**
RQ4 How do stakeholders make sense of discrepancies between Duluth model of CCR and current intervention strategies for domestically abusive men?	DV is complex; creating anxiety about making decisions about arrests and "no contact" orders. Variance among officers translates into inconsistent response to perps and victims.	CCR doesn't prioritize victim and her future safety. Short sentences and dismal prosecution rates place victim in greater danger. It is challenging for victim to navigate the system for	Unaware of CCR. Victims are prosecuted for defending themselves. Complex DV dynamics confuse and frighten police. Believe there are insufficient financial resources within system	Frustrated by perception of gap between ideal model of coordination and current response. Complex DV dynamics confuse police, despite increased training. Scarce	Minimal to non-existent knowledge of CCR. Victims lie about their abuse and perps suffer because of it. Frustrated by the costs of BIP – financial strain interferes with their ability to focus.

	Police/ Probation Officers	Victim Advocates	Victims/ Survivors	BIPs	Perpetrators
	Insufficient resources to help perps and victims. There isn't enough time to adequately monitor all their cases. Their voices are not respected and they are often at odds with other members of the CCR regarding long term goals for family.	assistance. Difficult to balance safety and empowerment. Insufficient resources to help her walk away. Inadequate comprehension of DV dynamics makes information sharing dangerous. Advocates are not adequately recognized as experts. System is inconsistent because of individual players involved.	to adequately respond. Response varies greatly depending on the individuals involved.	resources challenge their ability to uphold state standards and challenge POs ability to monitor cases. Frustrated by lack of open dialogue between system participants, particularly between BIPs and probation. Cultural divide exists among stakeholders. Human variance, rapid turnover and insufficient training are all problematic.	System inconsistent based on individual POs.
	Police/ Probation Officers	Victim Advocates	Victims/ Survivors	BIPs	Perpetrators
RQ 5 What do stakeholders believe the role of community should be in domestic violence intervention with abusive men?	Enhance screening in faith organizations and medical community. Raise community awareness about DV. Neighborhood groups or	Enhanced screening for DV. Increase financial resources for victims (i.e., housing, childcare). Provide more prevention education in	Enhance DV training and screening, particularly with medical field. School-based prevention education focused on teaching boys how to treat women with	Engage the community to improve screening and intervention. Need for a full fledged social change campaign , like M.A.D.D., utilizing the	Some men requested greater compassion and support from the community. Engage the religious community – perhaps provide religious

	community-based drop in programs would help children who are struggling with violence in their homes. Increase community resources (i.e., housing) for victims and perps. Primary prevention education in the schools about healthy relationships.	the schools. Large scale community awareness building campaign like M.A.D.D. De-gender DV in order to make it more accessible. Enlist men and former perps in prevention education Need for multi-tiered holistic approach to DV intervention, emphasizing services for individuals, family and peers, community, and society. Develop a community registry of perps.	respect. Increase financial resources available to help victims and perps. Perps might benefit from in-patient treatment. Have perps pay for their children to attend summer camps where they can heal. Train workplaces on how to intervene and hold men accountable. Create an on-line registry of batterers. Reduce violence against women on TV.	media to identify and avert DV. Engage leaders of faith community and employers to educate and appropriately refer victims and perpetrators. Raise awareness through primary prevention education in the schools. Change the way that DV is portrayed and use the media to raise awareness.	marital counseling to coincide with BIP. Require premarital counseling. Primary school prevention education, specifically about how to have non-violent relationships and what constitutes DV. Use the media (PSAs and Internet pop-ups) as a vehicle to provide prevention education
	Police/ Probation Officers	Victim Advocates	Victims/ Survivors	BIPs	Perpetrators