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**Plan for presentation**

- Make a case for the utility of a systemic perspective in evaluating the effectiveness of programs for male perpetrators of DV
- Marital distress and domestic violence in U.S.A., lack of political will to attend to the well-being of our citizens, and the evolution of BIP programs
- DV experts’ conclusions about the effectiveness of BIP
- Review empirical literature on interventions with male perpetrators of DV
- Present ideas and engage audience in reflection about what a more comprehensive and dynamic systemic response to domestic violence may look like

---

**Incidence of Marital Distress**

- In the US-approx. 90 to 96% of adults will marry
- Approx. 40-45% of marriages end in divorce
- Approx. 25% of couples divorces within 3 years
- Approx. 80% will remarry
- About 60% of remarriages end in divorce
1 out of 6 American households reports some form of physical violence between husbands and wives (13% of all marriages)

25 to 30% of married women in the US experience some form of spouse abuse at some point in their marriage (approx. 15 million women have experienced violence in their marriage)

13% or about 5 million women have been chronically and severely abused by husbands

40% of newly married couples report verbal aggression against partner (verbal to physical violence progression)

Rates of violence in dating relationships range from 9% to 69% among young dating couples

8% to 67% life time prevalence of IPV against women around the world

Over half of the reporting countries have IPV prevalence rates of at least 20%

No region in the world has IPV prevalence rates less than 13%
**Contextual Markers and Political Will**

- Large numbers of intimate partners are having a very difficult time sustaining harmonious relationships and honoring their commitments to loved ones.
- The amount of distress and violence in intimate relationships suggests that there are systemic forces at play.
- Should not lose sight of this fact when setting up expectations about the effectiveness of interventions with male perpetrators of domestic violence.

**We should ask...**

- How committed are we as a society to promoting the well-being of our people, our relationships, our organizations, and our communities?
- How committed are we to promoting the conditions under which harmonious intimate relationships can flourish?

**Allocation of financial resources in U.S.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTINUUM OF SERVICES</th>
<th>WELLNESS PROMOTION &amp; PREVENTION</th>
<th>PREVENTION</th>
<th>REMEDIAL TREATMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%-3%</td>
<td>97%-99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUDGET ALLOCATION**
When it comes to DV we should ask...

- Who is responsible for advancing the conditions of justice needed for our individual, relational and community well-being?

US-Collective Ambivalence

- Government officials?
- Criminal justice system?
- Shelters for battered women?
- National/state coalitions?
- Batterer intervention programs?
- Nonprofit organizations?
- Men?
- Women?
Collective ambivalence & blame

- In the absence of a clearly articulated systemic response to DV, and given the persistence of DV in our communities, much too often we end up blaming intervention programs for men for our collective failure to protect women and children from the violence perpetrated by men.

Batterer intervention programs in the United States of America

- Small part of a systemic response to DV
- Late 1970’s & early 1980’s men’s programs (part of social movement, volunteer men; slow growth)
- 1990’s Criminalization of DV
  - Explosion in # of programs for men
  - Development of BIP’s as one component of the criminal justice response to DV
  - Favored adoption of structured curriculum-based behaviorally-oriented programs over other alternatives
  - Expansion of services came along with very high expectations for success

Backlash against BIPs in the U.S.

- 2000’s backlash against BIP’s
- Rates of DV remain reprehensibly high
- Efforts to apply biomedical criteria and methodology to the evaluation of the effectiveness of BIP’s
- Increased efforts to professionalize services for men
- Emergence of culturally proficient programs (e.g., Caminar Latino, Cultural Context Model, El Hombre Noble)
Research on Interventions for Men Perpetrators of DV

- Protection orders
- Arrest
- Batterer Intervention Programs
- Coordinated community response networks

Listening to the experts

“[T]he incremental benefit of court-ordered treatment over the deterrent effects of traditional criminal justice system remedies is unclear.” (Rosenfeld, 1992, p. 205)

“[T]here is fairly consistent evidence that treatment works and that the effect of treatment is substantial.” (Davis & Taylor, 1999)

Listening to more experts

“[T]he effect size due to group battering intervention on recidivism of domestic violence is in the ‘small’ range....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 through a batterers’ program than by a man who was simply arrested and sanctioned.” (Babcock et al., 2004, pp. 1003-1004)
"Alternate programs cannot be implemented and tested even as evidence builds indicating that the batterer intervention programs, a least as designed and implemented today, may not be effective." (Feder & Wilson, 2005, p. 258)

"In terms of studies on recidivism following interventions with men who batter, the data shows that each level of intervention is making modest and important contributions to stopping and reducing violent behavior by men against their female partners. Protective orders are an effective form of violence deterrence for more than one-half of the men. Approximately two-thirds of all men arrested for domestic violence offences do not reassault within six months. About the same number of men (66%) who complete BIPs remain nonviolent following treatment. There is evidence that coordinated community networks enhance the efficacy of various interventions and further reduce IPV recidivism." (Aldarondo & Fernandez, 2008, p. 26)
Coordinated Community Response

- Partnership between multiple organizations and services such as BIPs, the criminal justice system, shelters for battered women, social service agencies, and health services into a community wide violence intervention network

Assumptions of a Coordinated Community Response (CCR)

- Each part of the community network of interventions contributes something to the reduction of violence
- Coordination of activities enhances the efficacy of the individual parts
- The combined effects of CCR are greater than the individual effects of each part
**Coordinated Community Response Evaluations**

- **Minneapolis, MN**: CCR resulted in significant increases in arrests, successful prosecutions, and referrals to BIP (Gamache et al. 1998)
- **Seattle, WA**: 2-yr evaluation period CCR increased compliance with BIP which was associated with significantly lower levels of rearrest (Babcock & Steiner 1999)
- **DuPage County, Ill**: 18-mo evaluation period found lower recidivism (25%) when CCR protocol was exercised than when it was not (35%) (Tolman & Weisz, 1995)

**Coordinated Community Response Evaluations**

- **Baltimore, ME**: 12 to 18 mo evaluation period; men in CCR system were 56% less likely to generate new charges, also recidivism rates for men not successfully prosecuted, men found guilty, men ordered to BIP, and men who completed BIP were 19%, 13%, 9%, and 0% respectively (Murphy et al., 1998)

**Towards a Systemic and Cultural Reform of BIPs**

- Improve our ability to engage male perpetrators of dv in BIPs and in the change process (ind. treatment planning, SA, social barriers)
- Improve services for men by promoting the development and integration of practices conceived with an appreciation of the needs of specific cultural and ethnic groups (e.g. Caminar Latino, Cultural Context Model)
- Rethink the role that BIPs can play in our efforts to eliminate domestic violence (social control, healing, and social transformation)
Towards a Systemic and Cultural Reform of BIPs

- Support the operation of BIPs as part of a broader systemic coordinated effort to both curb the violence, prevent it, and promote healthy harmonious living arrangements.
- Shift the context of our work from “providing services” to male perpetrators of DV to “generating solutions” to the problem of domestic violence.
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4 P’s of DV Solution Networks

Protection

Prevention

Promotion

Partnership
Through context specific programs guided by the following principles:

- **Protection:** Is your program doing the best it can to protect the safety of women, children, men and the communities they live in?
- **Prevention:** Is your program doing the best it can to prevent the reoccurrence of violence and the development of sexist attitudes, toxic constructions of femininity and masculinity, and oppressive conditions that foster DV?
- **Promotion:** Is your program intentionally promoting values, practices, and policies that foster individual, relational, and community well-being? Do the organizational practices of your organization promote cultural proficiency?
- **Partnership:** Is your organization intentionally linking existing resources and talents in your community to end DV? (Are shelters, police, schools, places of worship, hospitals, the courts, et cetera involved in the process? How do your program initiatives benefit the operation of other partners? How do other partners initiatives benefit your organization? Are your combined efforts helping “move the needle”?

**Words of wisdom...**

“As one steeped in the culture and values of public health, I must note the long-held public health dictum: No pathological condition has ever been eliminated by intervention with individuals one at a time. In other words no disease or disorder has ever been treated out of existence. The benefit of working with individuals damaged by the exploitative system is that we learn the nature and causes of injustice that produce the toxic social stresses. Then, we must move beyond treating individuals to unified efforts to change the system.”

George Albee (Preface, Aldarondo, 2007)
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