



VCU

Virginia Commonwealth University
VCU Scholars Compass

Theses and Dissertations

Graduate School

2014

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE: CONTEMPORARY INTERVENTIONS AND THE RISE OF SPECIALIZED DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNITS

Laura E. Anderson

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/etd>

© The Author

Downloaded from

<https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/etd/3566>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at VCU Scholars Compass. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of VCU Scholars Compass. For more information, please contact libcompass@vcu.edu.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE: CONTEMPORARY INTERVENTIONS AND THE RISE OF
SPECIALIZED DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNITS

By Laura E. Anderson

A Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy at Virginia Commonwealth University

Virginia Commonwealth University, 2014

Acknowledgements

There is no possible way to fully and properly thank everyone who has played a part in my journey towards dissertation completion. Nevertheless, I would be remiss if I did not try! I hope that I will make you all proud with what I do with the doctorate. Your support has made all the difference.

My Committee

I have been blessed with the best dissertation committee, comprised of such brilliant and inspirational women who will always be beacons of light to me as I move through my professional and academic life. Eternal thanks go out to Drs. Sarah Brubaker, Robyn Diehl, Katherine Ingram, and Jill Gordon. You all inspire me so much, and I must say a special word of thanks to Dr. Gordon, who has functioned as both a life mentor as I struggled to complete the dissertation under the shadow of a personal situation. I have improved immeasurably as a writer under your guidance, and I so appreciate both your life guidance and academic mentorship throughout this process. I can truly never thank you enough!!

My Localities

My eternal thanks go to Glen Peterson and Tisha Skinner of Chesterfield Community Corrections Services for their wonderful cooperation, professionalism, and help, and many thanks to their amazing staff. Many thanks as well to Bettina Coghill of Riverside Criminal Justice Agency for her similar level of help, and her staff's amazing responsiveness.

My Family

I know that every mother feels this way, but I feel that I am truly the luckiest mother on earth! Thank you so much to my ten-year-old, Connor, for his brilliance, charm, strength of spirit

and character, and consideration as I went through the doctoral process. This is all for you and I love you so much. I also am blessed with the greatest and most supportive mother ever! Thanks to Julia “Jules” Shannon, for all your support throughout my life and academic trek. You are the best! Thanks to my Aunt Beth, my Grandma Betty, and many others for their support and

encouragement. Also, I am lucky to have wonderful grandparents who, while no longer here on earth, are with me in spirit. I feel their presence as I complete this dissertation and hopefully give them a huge smile in heaven: Julia and Howell F. Shannon. I love and miss you both every day of my life and live my life in tribute of you.

My Friends

As an only child, I always grew up yearning for a sibling, only to realize as an adult that God gave me my sisters not through birth, but through his Grace in placing them in my life. All of you are not just great friends, but you have helped me in some immeasurable yet tangible way to get through this program: Krissy Suwal, Dr. Mikel Pride, Dr. Ariel Ham, Jenny Shieh Aronson, Carey Lowe Rongitsch, Brooke Brockdorff, Ann Harbour, Libby Anderson, Camden Parks, Christine Senn, Ashley Martin, Candace Banton, Erica Sumpter, Amanda Powell, Caroline Williams, Erin Wilson, Nicole Wilson, Heather Martin, Lauren Thompson, Kristen Baker, Jessica Schaefer, Katja Schubl, Jamie Blair, Kara Barton, and last but certainly not least, Erica Mangum. I can never thank you lovely ladies enough but here is a good start!

My Guides and Role Models

Everyone needs helpers and mentors to lead them to success, and this dissertation is the culmination of a great deal of guidance from many sources. Thanks to Kim Giancaspro for her wisdom and wonderful suggestions; to Nick, Hossein, and Jon for their statistical acuity, patience, and humor; to Candace Wallace for being my second mother and role model in life; and to Scott Steinour for being tennis coach extraordinaire as well as life coach when I needed a boost or life advice! Thank you all!

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Abstract.....	ix
Chapter	
1 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	1
Overview of Problem.....	1
Overview of Dissertation.....	5
Research Plan.....	6
Limitations of Study.....	8
Summary.....	9
2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	11
Overview and Definition of Domestic Violence.....	11
Theoretical Explanations of Domestic Violence.....	13
Social Situation/Stress and Coping Theory.....	13
Social Learning Theory.....	15
General Systems Theory.....	18
Resource Theory.....	19
Exchange/Control Theory.....	20
Patriarchy Theory.....	21
Individual Psychological Explanations of Domestic Violence.....	24
Biological Explanations of Domestic Violence.....	26
Summary of Theories.....	27

Scope of the Domestic Violence Issue.....27

The History of Domestic Violence Laws in the U.S.....29

Who Are the Batterers?.....34

 General Characteristics.....34

 Characteristics of Male Batterers.....35

 Characteristics of Female Batterers.....36

 Psychological Dysfunctionality of Batterers.....37

 Socioeconomic Issues of Batterers.....38

 Offender Typologies.....40

The Criminal Justice Response to Domestic Violence.....41

 The History of the Police Response.....42

 Virginia Law.....44

 The Effectiveness of Arrest Policy.....45

 The History of the Courts’ Response.....48

 The Effectiveness of the Courts.....50

 Suggestions for Police and Prosecutors.....51

 The History of Corrections.....52

 Challenges to Corrections.....54

The Three Main Treatments in Corrections.....57

 Batterer Intervention Programs (BIP’s).....57

 The Characteristics of BIP’s.....59

 The Effectiveness of BIP’s.....62

 The History of the Coordinated Community Response.....67

The Major Players in the Coordinated Community Response.....	69
Central Features of the Coordinated Community Response.....	75
Effectiveness of the Coordinated Community Response.....	77
Specialized Probation Units.....	79
The History of Specialized Domestic Violence Units.....	80
Components of Specialized DVU's.....	82
Examples of Specialized DVU's.....	83
The Effectiveness of DVU's.....	86
The Principles of Effective Correctional Interventions.....	88
The Empirical Context.....	88
The Development of Effective Correctional Interventions.....	92
The Updated Principles.....	95
Concluding Thoughts.....	98
3 METHODOLOGY.....	100
Introduction.....	100
The Study Sites.....	100
Chesterfield Community Corrections Services (CCS).....	100
Riverside Criminal Justice Agency (RCJA).....	103
Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	105
Research Design.....	106
Sample.....	106
Data Collection.....	107
Variables and Measurement.....	107

Dependent Variables.....	107
Independent Variables.....	108
Control Variables.....	109
Data Analysis Plan.....	113
Study Limitations.....	114
4 FINDINGS.....	116
Introduction.....	116
Overall Sample Characteristics.....	117
Demographic Information.....	117
Offender Criminal History.....	117
Probation Pre-Screening.....	119
Examining Probation Characteristics by Locality.....	120
Examining Re-offenses by Locality.....	122
Testing the Hypotheses.....	123
Explanation of Statistical Choices.....	123
A Look at Technical Violations.....	125
A Look at Overall Re-arrests.....	126
A Look at Domestic Violence Re-arrests.....	128
Summary of Findings.....	130
CCS Models.....	131
Technical Violations.....	133
Overall Re-arrests.....	134
Domestic Violence Re-arrests.....	136

CCS Summary.....	137
Study Limitations.....	138
Sample Size.....	138
Summary.....	139
Basic Recidivism Conclusions.....	139
5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	141
Introduction.....	141
Analysis of Technical Violations.....	142
Consistency of the Findings with Past Literature.....	142
Strain Theory Explanations.....	143
Analysis of Re-offenses.....	145
Disparities by Locality.....	146
Consistency with Literature.....	146
Interpretations of Findings.....	146
Analysis of Offender Characteristics at CCS.....	148
Interpretation of Findings.....	148
Prior Literature.....	148
Domestic Violence Policy Suggestions.....	150
Caseload Size.....	151
Baseline Drug Testing at Both Localities.....	152
Judicious Use of Technical Violations.....	153
Targeted Interventions.....	154
Future Research Recommendations.....	155

Analysis of More Comparable Localities.....	155
Analysis of Female Intimate Partner Violence.....	156
Data from Victims.....	157
Additional Data on Offenders.....	158
Concluding Remarks.....	159
References.....	161

Abstract

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE: CONTEMPORARY INTERVENTIONS AND THE RISE OF SPECIALIZED DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNITS

By Laura E. Anderson

A Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Virginia Commonwealth University

Virginia Commonwealth University, 2014

Major Director: Jill Gordon, Ph.D.

This dissertation examines recidivism for domestic violence offenders under both traditional probation and specialized probation conditions. This research compares recidivism at a traditional probation locality (Riverside Criminal Justice Services) and a specialized domestic violence unit (Chesterfield Community Corrections Services) in order to determine the nature of recidivism at both localities. In addition, the research aims to identify individual risk factors which are statistically associated with recidivism. The research is based on secondary data and draws on offender criminal records generated by the Virginia State Police, as well the extraction of information from probation files at both localities. The multivariate models indicate that a higher degree of recidivism occurs at the specialized domestic violence unit, and that the experimental

locality, along with a younger age, are consistently statistically significant predictors for recidivism. Less consistent but still statistically significant risk factors included positive drug tests, higher supervision levels, and unsuccessful probation completion. The implications of these findings, as well as policy recommendations and directions for future research are fully discussed.

Chapter 1:

Problem Statement:

Overview of the Impact of Domestic Violence, Recidivism within Community Corrections, and Specialized Domestic Violence Units

Domestic violence, and particularly spousal abuse, is an issue that gained national attention following high-profile incidents like the Nicole Brown Simpson/Ronald Goldman homicide in 1994, but increased public attention and tougher laws to combat it have not dramatically lowered this violence. Domestic violence is defined as assaultive behavior involving adults who are married, cohabitating, or who have an ongoing or prior intimate relationship (Goolkasian, 1986). It is characterized by “a pattern of assaultive and coercive behaviors, including physical, sexual, and psychological attacks, along with economic coercion, that adults or adolescents use against their intimate partners” (Ganley, 1995, 16). Intimate partner violence is further defined as “a constellation of abusive and controlling behaviors including psychological abuse, sexual coercion, financial abuse, isolation, threats, stalking, and physical violence that taken together, create a climate of fear and intimidation that maintain one partner in a position of domination and control with the other partner in a position of subordination and compliance” (Family Violence Prevention Fund, 2004). Domestic violence is certainly not limited to spousal abuse, but spousal abuse will be the specific focus of this literature review, since male-perpetrated domestic violence against an intimate partner is the concentration of this dissertation.

The official statistics indicate that the scope of the problem of intimate partner violence in the United States is overwhelming. Further, domestic violence constitutes a public health crisis which takes a considerable societal and economic toll on the nation, and thus must be

addressed by criminal justice system practitioners. Intimate partner homicides account for about 11% of murders nationwide (Rennison and Welchans, 2000), and the NCVS suggested that there were approximately 1 million violent crimes committed against persons by their current or former spouses/significant others in 1998, and the vast majority (85%) involves male perpetrators and female victims (Rennison and Welchans, 2000). Domestic violence is the most common violent crime that is reported to police (Greenfeld and Rand, 1998; Sherman, Schmidt, and Rogan, 1992). Twenty-six percent of female murder victims and 3 percent of male murder victims are killed by intimate associates, per the Victimization Survey in 1992. Between 75% and 90% of all hostage takings in the U.S. are linked to domestic violence (Hart, 1990). Recent statistics suggest that women aged 20-24 are at greatest risk for intimate partner violence (BCJS, 2006).

Domestic violence poses a particularly acute threat to U.S. women. In fact, a 1993 national survey indicated that 7 percent of women in the US (3.9 million) had been assaulted by a spouse or partner in the previous year (Healey et al., 1998). Another study asserted that 14 percent of women reported that they had been abused by a spouse or intimate partner at some point during their lifetime (Healey et. al, 1998). Additional research from the 1980s indicates that 11.3 percent of U.S. women (Straus and Gelles, 1986) had been abused in the previous twelve month period. More recent data suggests that up to three million women are abused by their intimate partners each year (U.S. Department of Justice, March 1998). Very sadly, domestic battering is responsible for twenty-six percent of suicide attempts by women (Tark and Flitcraft, 1991). More than half of American couples experience domestic violence at some point during the course of their relationship (Feld and Straus, 1989).

As shockingly high as the official figures are, it is critical to further note that studies indicate that the majority of domestic assaults go unreported. In fact, it is estimated that six out of seven such crimes go unreported (National Clearinghouse for the Defense of Battered Women, 1994) while other studies conclude that only half of domestic violence crimes were reported to the police (Rennison and Welchans, 2000). Additionally, less than 25 percent of physical assaults, less than 20 percent of intimate partner rapes, and half of intimate partner stalking were reported to police (Tjaden and Thoennes, 2000). Finally, the National Coalition of Domestic Violence even asserted that only one in one hundred incidents of domestic violence is actually reported to police (Welch, 1994). Thus, the studies are consistent that official statistics on domestic violence vastly underreport the problem, even if the estimates vary as to the extent of the underreporting of such offenses.

The economic costs of domestic violence are also quite high, as almost 1.5 million visits to U.S. emergency rooms each year are the result of domestic violence (Zorza, 1994). The American Medical Association estimates that domestic violence accounts for 21,000 hospitalizations and almost 100,000 days in the hospital each year (Meyer, 1992). In total, domestic violence likely costs employers between three and thirteen billion dollars each year (Zorza, 1994).

The focus of this dissertation concerns domestic violence offenders who are on probation, which is the most common nationwide sentence for offenders. In fact, research indicates that in jurisdictions in which domestic violence is now aggressively prosecuted, the majority of sentenced batterers are placed on probation (Klein, Wilson, Crowe, and DeMichele, 2008). However, domestic violence offenders have a demonstrably-high rate of recidivism. In fact, it

has been estimated that 35 percent of domestic violence offenders recidivate (Domestic Violence Initiative, Passaic County, NJ, 2003).

As a result of both the high rates of recidivism for domestic violence offenders within community corrections, as well as the special needs of this particular population, practitioners within probation have developed multiple strategies and innovations to address this problem. One such innovation is the specialized domestic violence unit, which is the focus of this dissertation. Although the specifics of DVU's vary by jurisdiction, these units generally share four major general goals, which are: 1) lowering domestic violence recidivism, 2) enabling the facilitation of the victim's liaison with the criminal justice system by reaching out to victims (Klein and Crowe, 2008), 3) empowering victims to help change dynamics behind battering, via increased services to batterers and helping victims to either leave their abusers or work with probation officials and counselors to end the abuse (Klein and Crowe, 2008) and 4) addressing the major causes of domestic violence recidivism, such as a lack of information sharing among the criminal justice system practitioners, probation officers being overworked with too many cases, a lack of proper supervision over offenders, and inadequate substance abuse treatment for offenders. An increased focus on the creation of a victim safety plan and responsiveness to the victim's needs is also a major concentration of specialized domestic violence units (Friday, Lord, Exum, and Hartman, 2006). The idea is that probation officers with a much smaller clientele will be able to deliver highly offender-specific services and make the proper referrals to mental- health and substance-abuse treatment, as well as to more closely monitor the progress and challenges faced by the offenders. Funding from the Federal Violence Against Women Act of 1994 was helpful in financing some of these early specialized units (Klein, Wilson, Crowe,

DeMichele, 2008). The 1994 Act provided for the allocation of 1.6 billion federal dollars towards the prosecution of those who perpetrated violent crimes against women.

The early research on the effectiveness of the DVU has been mixed and is also quite limited. In short, because the specialized domestic violence unit is a relatively recent innovation, there has not been opportunity to exhaustively study the topic and thus the literature is lacking (Friday, Lord, Exum, and Hartman, 2006). Other than process evaluations, minimal research on the actual effectiveness of various probation methods in domestic violence supervisions has been done (Klein, Wilson, Crowe, and DeMichele, 2008). This dissertation aims to fill this gap within the literature by explaining the impact, if any, of the specialized DVU in Chesterfield County, Virginia on the recidivism of male clients.

This study also furthers the literature because the criteria on which the experimental and comparison localities are matched is more refined than in previous studies. For example, a National Institute of Justice study based in the Rhode Island Specialized Domestic Probation Supervision Program, which was instituted in 1994, compared half the state for which a specialized DVU had been instituted with the other half of the state which was still operating under regular probation conditions. In short, there was no matching based on demographics. This study was still useful in indicating the areas in which the DVU was most effective, which related to victim satisfaction, increased officer-offender contact, increased offender accountability, and longer periods without re-arrest (Klein and Crowe, 2008). Perhaps one reason for this satisfaction is that treatment group probation officers were more successful in encouraging victims to report probation violations, such as violations of no-contact orders (Klein and Crowe, 2008).

Overview of Dissertation

This chapter provides an introduction to the issue of domestic violence, the issue of chronic recidivism within community corrections, and the specialized DVU. The second chapter will be comprised of an extensive literature review, including an examination of the history of the laws governing domestic violence, the most relevant theoretical frameworks which seek to explain domestic violence, and the various legal responses to domestic violence from a police, courts, and corrections standpoint. For purposes of this study, the main theoretical frameworks that will be utilized are social situation/strain theory and social control theory, both of which will be comprehensively explained in the second chapter. Next, various strategies within community corrections including batterer intervention programs (BIPs) and the coordinated community response will be explained thoroughly and their effectiveness will be examined. Then the discussion will turn to the rise of specialized domestic violence units and the mixed research to date into the effectiveness of DVU's, which is the gap that this dissertation aims to fill. The third chapter will comprehensively explain the methodology utilized in this dissertation, the two study sites, the research question and hypotheses, the research design, the dependent, independent, and control variables, the tentative data analysis plan, as well as potential limitations therein. Chapters four and five will fully address the research questions based upon the data collected from both agencies, and will explain both the conditions under which the specialized DVU reduces recidivism, as well as direction for further research in this area.

The Research Plan

The primary goal of this research is to understand the impact, if any, of the specialized domestic violence unit in Chesterfield County on the recidivism of male clients. In order to do this, the researcher will compare case progress and outcomes with male clients from a second demographically-comparable and geographically-accessible locality which does not have a

specialized domestic violence unit (Riverside Criminal Justice Agency in Prince George County). The results of this study will advance the literature in this area: to enable criminal justice system practitioners to better understand how the DVU reduces recidivism, as well as to develop more targeted interventions for domestic violence offenders, by illustrating the differences in outcomes between clients in a DVU and clients under regular probation conditions.

There are two primary hypotheses:

- 1) Clients at Chesterfield Community Corrections will have a lower likelihood and number of technical violations while on probation than clients at Riverside Criminal Justice Agency.
- 2) Clients at Chesterfield Community Corrections will have a lower likelihood and number of re-offenses than clients at Riverside Criminal Justice Agency.

The above hypotheses will be considered with a variety of control variables to understand the impact of the DVU.

In terms of the research design, this dissertation is a retrospective study examining discharge from probation in calendar year 2010 in order to allow for sufficient follow-up. This study is longitudinal, as the offenders' re-offenses and technical violations will be examined for at least one year after release from probation. As mentioned, there are two groups for this study, male domestic violence offenders under supervision at CCS (experimental) and at Riverside (comparison).

Data collection will be conducted in the following manner: the researcher will extract variables of interest from two main data sources that have already been compiled as part of each client's official records. First, the researcher will extract these variables from the closed case

files from calendar year 2010 of male clients of both Riverside Criminal Justice Agency and Chesterfield Community Corrections in order to assess case progress and outcomes.

Additionally, information on the individual clients' criminal records will be requested from the Virginia State Police. Both Chesterfield Community Corrections and Riverside Community Corrections will request this information from the State Police. In turn, this information will be provided to the researcher (with Study ID numbers only) in order for the researcher to determine the individual client's recidivism. After all data is collected and cleaned, it is anticipated that descriptive and multi-variate analyses will be conducted in order to answer the main research questions.

Limitations of the Current Study

There are a number of limitations to this study which indicate that further research into specialized DVU's and the conditions under which they are most effective is necessary. First, the extraction of information from closed case files means that the researcher has to rely upon the thoroughness of the individual probation officers' note-taking on clients, and the comprehensiveness therein does vary, sometimes dramatically, by probation officer in Chesterfield Community Corrections Services, as well as at Riverside Criminal Justice Agency.

Also, there are potential limitations inherent in relying on official agency records. There are three general limitations to agency records: 1) data is socially produced; 2) data is not designed for research and 3) error increases with data volume (Maxfield and Babbie, 2009). This dissertation will be relying on probation officers' case records and official data from the State Police, which are not designed for research purposes. In short, official records are not the richest source of data and clearly do not reflect the true volume of domestic violence recidivism. This does not mean that the results of this study are necessarily quite flawed; rather, it is important to

acknowledge this potential limitation at the outset and understand that there will be domestic violence recidivism that is not captured in this study.

Obviously, this study only encompasses male domestic violence offenders and thus the results are not generalizable to female offenders, who certainly do exist. It is quite possible that gender is a factor in domestic violence recidivism within a DVU setting, as well as under regular probation conditions. Because this study is focused on male offenders, it will not be able to explore gender-related re-offending. However, the matching of male offenders is necessary in order to keep the experimental and comparison populations as similar as possible, and to reduce the possibility of confounding variables influencing the results.

Summary

This dissertation will ultimately contribute to the literature by clarifying the conditions under which the specialized DVU is helpful in reducing recidivism, as compared to imposing regular probation conditions on male domestic violence offenders. This is one of the few studies that closely matches localities, one of which has a DVU and one of which does not, in order to try to isolate what unique factors of the specialized DVU can reduce recidivism. This is an important contribution to the literature because it will enable policymakers to further refine the components and services of the DVU to maximize service to the target population. Additionally, this dissertation will help policymakers to understand which types of offenders are most vulnerable to recidivism, so that these offenders can receive the necessary services and supervision.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Overview and Definition of Domestic Violence

Domestic violence is defined as assaultive behavior involving adults who are married, cohabitating, or who have an ongoing or prior intimate relationship (Goolkasian, 1986). It is characterized by “a pattern of assaultive and coercive behaviors, including physical, sexual, and psychological attacks, along with economic coercion, that adults or adolescents use against their intimate partners” (Ganley, 1995, 16). Intimate partner violence has further been defined as “a constellation of abusive and controlling behaviors including psychological abuse, sexual coercion, financial abuse, isolation, threats, stalking, and physical violence that taken together, create a climate of fear and intimidation that maintain one partner in a position of domination and control with the other partner in a position of subordination and compliance” (Family Violence Prevention Fund, 2004). Anne Ganley, a pioneer in the establishment of batterer intervention programs in the late 1970s (Healey, Smith, and O’Sullivan, 1998), put forth the “Power and Control Wheel,” in which several common abusive behaviors were pinpointed. These behaviors included physical violence, intimidation, threats, isolation, emotional abuse, and sexual abuse (Healey, Smith, and O’Sullivan, 1998). Domestic violence is shown to constitute a serious societal issue, given the cyclical nature of the violence.

“Battered Women Syndrome” has been applied to explain the dynamics of domestic violence from a victim’s perspective. It addresses many of the factors that keep the victim of domestic violence mired in such relationships. Perhaps the most recognizable expert on domestic violence victims is Dr. Lenore Walker, who divides the cycle of domestic violence into three

distinct phases. The first one is the tension-building phase, in which the batterer escalates his control of the victim. The second refers to the actual battering incident. The third phase refers to the honeymoon phase, which is the loving and calm behavior that the batterer exhibits after the battering incident (Walker, 1979). Additionally, the “battered woman” demonstrates four discernible characteristics. She believes the violence is her fault, she demonstrates an inability to blame anyone else for the violence, she fears for her life and/or her children’s lives, and she has an “irrational” belief that the batterer is omnipotent/omnipresent (Walker, 1984). However, “Battered Women Syndrome” has been classified by the American Psychological Association as a subcategory of post-traumatic stress disorder, and not as a generalized form of mental illness or as a personality disorder (Walker, 1989). In fact, “Battered Women Syndrome” has been considered as a factor in criminal cases in the courts since the 1970’s.

The so-called “Stockholm Syndrome” has even been applied to the mentality of severely abused women. The idea is that hostages and abuse victims begin to identify with the captor’s wants and needs more than their own, and victims actually start to envision their tormentors as protective (American Probation and Parole Association, 2009). Thus, these women are essentially psychologically brainwashed and are unable to leave the relationship, no matter the level of abuse.

While victims of domestic violence are important to the study of the issue of intimate partner violence, the focus of this project is on the batterer. Specifically, the current research adds to the body of knowledge regarding specialized domestic violence units and contributes to policy decisions in Chesterfield County, Virginia regarding the effectiveness of such a strategy. This chapter will address what domestic violence is, the scope of the problem in the United States and why it is important from a public policy standpoint, the historical context of domestic

violence laws within the United States, the historical progression of the police, courts, and corrections' response to domestic violence, and the development of batterer intervention programs, specialized domestic violence units (DVU's), and coordinated community responses in combating domestic violence.

Theoretical Explanations of Domestic Violence

Multiple explanations have been applied to all aspects of domestic violence, seeking to shed light on the perspectives of both the batterer and the victim. In fact, Okun (1986) suggests that there are up to twenty theories which seek to explain domestic violence. No one theory holds the monopoly on explaining domestic violence, and research has supported the validity of multiple theories in explaining parts of domestic violence. Overall, six theoretical models hold the most popularity in their ability to address domestic violence from the most comprehensive perspective: social learning theory, social situational/stress and coping theory, general systems theory, resource theory, exchange/social control theory, and patriarchy. The clear trend in the literature on domestic battering is an eclectic and integrative approach that addresses multiple dynamics behind the violence. For purposes of this dissertation, social situation/strain theory and social control theory will be the main theoretical orientation, but elements of each of the following theories will be integrated into the overall theoretical framework: social situational/stress and coping theory, social learning theory, general systems theory, resource theory, social learning theory, and patriarchy. Each theory will be described and present an assessment on the ability to explain domestic violence as a phenomenon.

Social Situation/Stress and Coping Theory

Social situation/stress and coping theory is a powerful theoretical explanation for the situational nature of domestic violence. Theorists posit that domestic violence occurs because of

both structural stress and a lack of coping resources within the family (Gelles, 1998). In other words, this theory is based on the idea that America society as a structure is overwhelmingly stressful and that the family is not the best measure to cope with this stress. One theorist has posited that two factors or stresses in American society place the American family at unique risk for violence. First, the family may not be the ideal vehicle overall with which to deal with the structural stress triggers of modern American society, such as unemployment, concomitant with other and more static challenges like illness and financial issues (Farrington, 1986). Other social institutions and organizations may represent a stronger vehicle for dealing with these challenges. Second, the legitimization of violence as a family norm seems to play a bigger role within American families as compared to families in other countries (Farrington, 1986).

Part of the violence within the American family may stem from the fact that American culture seems to accept some form of violence as a legitimate method of conflict resolution (Anderson, 1997). The United States is one of the most violent industrialized countries (Zimring and Hawkins, 1997), both in terms of crime and in terms of violence depicted in the mass media. In fact, violence is so widespread therein that it has been estimated that by the time the average U.S. child graduates from elementary school, he/she will have witnessed 8,000 murders and 10,000 other acts of violence on television (Huston, Donnerstein, Fairchild, Fashbach, Katz, Murray, Rubenstein, Wilcox, and Zuckerman, 1992).

Economic stress in families has been identified as a foremost stressor and trigger for domestic violence (Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz, 1980). For example, there is evidence that suggests that husbands/fathers who are employed part-time manifest twice the rates of abuse towards their children and three times the rate of spousal abuse as do husbands who are employed full-time (Straus et al., 1980). Families with unemployed husbands have even higher

rates of violence (Straus et al., 1980). Thus, when the offender is failing economically, it is clear that this stress can be a catalyst for domestic violence.

In short, there is some evidence to support social situation/coping theory as explaining a portion of domestic violence. Even so, there is also some contradictory evidence arguing against the explanatory power of strain. Prominent domestic violence researcher Richard Gelles testified before the U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary in May 2010 and indicated that while FBI data on domestic violence fatalities increased after the 1990 to 1991 recession, there was no increase in domestic violence homicides following the 2000-2001 recession. Additionally, female-on-male domestic violence homicide has declined significantly from 1976 to 2005, and this decline has not been affected by economic downturns. Such factors question the influence structural strain has on domestic violence.

This theory, while certainly not solely explanatory for domestic violence, does seem to offer good insight into the structural factors that can serve as catalysts for domestic violence, and thus will form the main theoretical framework of this dissertation. Social learning theory captures the dynamics of the cycle of violence in the families of domestic violence offenders, so these two theories will form the main theoretical discussion of the dissertation.

Social Learning Theory

Social learning explanations are a popular theoretical explanation for domestic violence. Theorist Albert Bandura (1973) postulated that people learn to be violent via reinforcement from others, and also by watching the behavior of others and then modeling that behavior. The main idea in terms of social learning's explanatory power for domestic violence is that individuals who witness violence within their families are more likely to later use violence themselves

within their adult families, hence the perpetuation of domestic violence through generations of families.

The “culture of violence” theory which is predicated upon social learning but is larger in scope than the familially-based social learning theory, is sociologically-based and is centered around the pervasiveness of violence in modern society through various cultural media, not simply family (Wolfgang and Ferracuti, 1967). Because of this widespread societal violence, the thought pattern underlying this theory is that such violence becomes normalized within the family structure. This is the main example of social learning theory on a macro level.

In fact, there is tangible support for the explanatory power of social learning theory in accounting for domestic violence. For example, corporal punishment as a child seems to increase the risk later in life of assaulting a spouse. One study indicated that, controlling for age, socio-economic status, ethnic group, and witnessing violence between parents, corporal punishment in adolescence was associated with increased probability of condoning violence against one’s spouse in adulthood, adult depression, and increased risk of marital conflict (Straus and Yodanis, 1996). An additional study of delinquent males concluded that exposure to family violence was linked to lower competence, increased support of aggression, and the use of aggression as a coping skill (Spaccarelli, Coatsworth, and Bowden, 1995). Interestingly, the effect of witnessing familial violence is even stronger for women, as it has been found to be the best predictor of future violence and this effect was more dramatic for women than for men (Mihalic and Elliott, 1997).

Given the link between childhood exposure to domestic violence and adult battering, as mentioned above, this theoretical link between social learning and domestic violence is strong and compelling (Straus et al., 1980). The evidence is clear that children who grow up in a

household characterized by domestic violence are at a greater risk for behavioral and developmental problems, substance abuse, juvenile delinquency, suicide, and abusive adult relationships (Schechter and Edleson, 1994; Straus, 1991). In fact, children who witness domestic violence (but who are not hit themselves) exhibit behavioral, somatic, and emotional problems that are actually consistent with the trauma experienced by physically abused children. Children who are exposed to domestic violence also demonstrate more anxiety, depression, and temperament problems (Holden and Ritchie, 1991). Additionally, these children also suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder later in life (Jaffe, Wolfe, and Wilson, 1990). Children who live in domestic violence situations are more aggressive, antisocial, and fearful (Jaffe et al., 1986) It is important to note that childhood exposure to domestic abuse triples the risk factor for men using physical violence as adults (Straus et al., 1980), as well as the risk factor for the severity of this violence (Kalmuss, 1984), though this effect is not as direct for women (Hughes, 2007).

While there is convincing evidence that social learning theory does have explanatory power for domestic violence, it is also important to note that there are some weaknesses therein. For example, social learning theory in domestic violence fails to account for how individuals learn to inhibit family violence, which is an important issue given the fact that anger management is also a learned phenomenon (Emery, 1989). Additionally, social learning theory in domestic violence tends to be retrospectively-based in data, which means that accurate memory on the part of the parties is a potential weakness (Emery, 1989; Sommer, 1994). Lastly, some social learning researchers have failed to delineate between actually experiencing child abuse vs. witnessing parental abuse (Neidig and Thorn, 1995). Thus, there is an empirically demonstrated connection between social learning and domestic violence, but this theory certainly cannot be said to hold sole explanatory power for domestic violence

General Systems Theory

The main idea of general systems theory, which was developed by Murray Straus (1973) and Jean Giles-Sims (1983), is that family systems can control the level of violence within, and can play a maintenance, escalation, or violence reduction role (Gelles, 1998). Thus, domestic violence is conceptualized as a systems issue rather than an individually disturbed one. There are eight conceptual bases to general system theory. These include the idea that violence between family members has many causes/roots, only some of which is attributable to stress and conflict and personality clashes; more family violence occurs than that which is officially reported; most family violence is denied; family violence is learned in childhood via other family members; ordinary social interactions and the normalized violence within mass media images continually reinforce violence; violent actions tend to be rewarded within families; use of violence can create additional family conflicts; and persons who are labeled violent generally may be encouraged to actually fulfill this role.

This theoretical model originated from research into child abuse (Emery, 1989), before its popularity expanded into explaining other areas of family violence. One of the most powerful aspects of this theory is how it can be integrative with other theoretical models in domestic violence, foremost the feminist (Bograd, 1984), and the social learning (Emery, 1989) theories. However, despite the comprehensive and integrative nature of this approach, it has been criticized by some feminists for a “subtle bias” against women, mostly in light of the language used in describing the genesis of domestic violence (Sommer, 1994; Bograd, 1984). Violence is conceptualized as the result of a pathological dynamic in the familial group rather than as a crime being perpetrated by one individual against his/her partner. In fact, one controversial study found that reductions in domestic violence were correlated with the man taking responsibility for the

change but even more so with the woman's actively decreasing her vulnerability and attempting to balance power in the relationship (Wileman and Wileman, 1995) Obviously, such a theoretical approach could be viewed as "blaming the victim" in some manner.

However, there is empirical support for this theoretical basis. Studies have found that the interrelating patterns within couples are stronger predictive factors of violence than are intrapersonal or demographic characteristics (Lloyd and Emery, 1994; Stets, 1992). This lends credence to the idea that familial dynamic is an important variable to explore. Communication patterns within the relationship have also been highlighted, as increased levels of rigidity, hostility, and verbal aggression and decreased problem-solving skills and communication have also been implicated in domestic violence (Babcock, Waltz, Jacobson, and Gottman, 1993; Burman, John, and Margolin, 1992). However, this theoretical approach has been limited in its practical application to domestic violence treatment, as it has been seen as "victim blaming" and it also has been seen to present safety concerns in terms of batterer-victim joint therapy (Hansen, 1993).

Resource Theory

William Goode, the main resource theorist, asserted that all social systems, including families, depends on some level of force in order to function, and the more resources an individual can marshal (social, personal, and economic), the more force he can command (Gelles, 1997). Resource theory's explanatory link to domestic violence is that such violence can result when a husband lacks power and knows it, and thus tries to overcompensate for his lack of wealth, prestigious occupation, and charm with violence at home. In fact, research has indicated that lower-class families have fewer alternatives to violence and thus are more prone to employ such methods (Goode, 1971; Makepeace, 1987; Peterson, 1991). These families tend to express

greater frustration and bitterness as a result of their lack of funds and prestige. Unsurprisingly, this frustration and bitterness can escalate to violence. Resource Theory also addresses the motivations of the victims. Goode (1971) asserted that women who were in vulnerable positions of dependency on their husbands (i.e. unemployed women or housewives or women who were financially subservient to their husbands) fear the financial implications of leaving their marriages and lack the resources to simply leave.

Support for this theory is found in the empirical connection between “struggling” men on the margins and domestic violence. A foremost example is African-American men who perceive that they have a lack of societal power often make excessive demands on their partner for “respect” (White, 1998). In this manner, battered spouses are almost a surrogate for the frustrations of men on the margins who are largely rejected or ignored by wider society. However, other research has indicated only limited support for this theory. One study specifically tested the main tenets of Resource Theory and found that the middle-class tolerates instrumental domestic violence less than working-class families do, so male assertion of power through violence only holds true in working-class households (Allen and Straus, 1980). Thus, this theory has implications for this dissertation in that it addresses the dynamics behind “struggling” men and domestic violence, but it is not the central theoretical framework.

Exchange/Social Control Theory

The main idea underlying this theory, which was developed by Gelles (1983) is that domestic abuse, like many other phenomena, is governed by the principle of costs and rewards, and that violence is used when the costs outweigh the rewards. The underlying principle of exchange/social control theory is that human interaction is guided by the pursuit of rewards and the avoidance of costs, and that this is true in wider society as well as in more micro-level,

familial interactions (Gelles and Straus, 1979). The main proposition of this theory as it relates to domestic violence is that families are private institutions in which shocking things can go on behind closed doors, public agencies have historically shown an unwillingness to intervene, and there is a tacit cultural approval of violence within American society. As a result of the privacy of families, the lack of intervention of public agencies, and the quiet condoning of domestic violence in American society, there has historically been a higher reward and a lower cost/risk of punishment for the commission of domestic violence, which has allowed it to continue.

Implicit support for this theory is found in the connection between the reduction of domestic violence after the heightened criminal justice system response to domestic violence and its more interventionist approach. Between 1993 and 2001, non-fatal crimes against females by intimate partners decreased from 1.1 million to 588,490 yearly crimes and intimate partner murders also declined (Rennison, 2003). The strengthening of the laws against domestic violence are also integral to this theory, since the changing laws indicate that society is taken a much harsher view of domestic violence overall.

However, there is not significant evidence overall for this theory because certain tenets of it are not particularly testable. For example, this theory relies on the implicit approval of violence within American society but this idea is rather amorphous and philosophical, and is hard to quantitatively measure as a variable in a study. Therefore, this theory will not form a main theoretical basis for this dissertation, but it is one of the major explanatory theories of domestic violence and thus is presented and discussed.

Patriarchy Theory

The underpinning of Patriarchy Theory is, as feminist Gloria Steinem has asserted, that the most dangerous place for women is “not an unknown man in the street, or an enemy in

wartime, but a husband or a lover in the isolation of their own home” (Corry, 2002). The central idea of patriarchy theory is that the economic and social system operates both deliberately and unconsciously in order to support a patriarchal society and family structure in the United States (Gelles, 1997). This patriarchy, in turn, is said to foster the systematic oppression of women and abuse of wives (Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Pagelow, 1984). The presence of reinforcing peers is crucial to this explanation, as some theorists assert that males function in abuse-supporting peer groups which reinforce abusive norms regarding dominant patriarchal patterns, traditional conceptions of masculinity/femininity, the overwhelming sexual objectification of women, and the condoning of excessive alcohol use (DeKeseredy and Schwartz, 1993). Therefore, proponents of Patriarchy Theory assert that domestic violence is inherent in the culture because of these violent and destructive patriarchal norms.

The gender gap in domestic violence is clear and convincing and provides strong evidence for the explanatory power of Patriarchy Theory. The ratio of male to female batterers is overwhelming, and has been repeatedly demonstrated in research. In fact, a recent study found that men were defendants in 90 percent of misdemeanor domestic violence cases, 85 percent of felony cases, and 75 percent of civil cases (Healey et al, 1998). Other research indicates that women are the victims in 95 percent of battering incidents (Bachman, 1994; Dobash, Dobash, Wilson and Daly, 1992). Women are also 10 times more likely than men to be victimized by their intimate partners, according to a NCVS survey (Zawitz, 1994). This survey found that 20.4 percent of women had been physically assaulted by their partners at some point in the relationship, as compared with 7 percent of men (Tjaden and Thoennes, 2001). Additionally, women battered by men are generally battered more severely than men battered by women.

Women also seem to use more minor aggression than men do and are more fearful of their partners (Belknap and Melton, 2005; Kimmel, 2002).

The evidence for this theory does extend beyond the sheer gender breakdown of domestic violence. For example, one analysis of low-income young men, predominantly gang members, concluded that underprivileged men on the margins of society often use violence towards the women in their lives as a way to still adhere to patriarchal norms even though they have very little access to modes of societal success (Totten, 2003). Understandably given all the gender evidence, theorists generally agree that Patriarchy Theory is the most widely used perspective on domestic violence (Gosselin, 2005).

However, there are several holes in the explanatory power of patriarchy theory for domestic violence, which means that this theory is obviously not the sole explanation, though it is currently the most popular. Patriarchy theory fails to account for why only some men are violent in their intimate relationships even though many more non-abusive men are exposed to the same (presumptively anti-female/misogynistic) attitudes, beliefs, and societal norms, and why many men still express feelings of powerlessness in their relationships (Dutton, 1995). Additionally, a meta-analysis of patriarchy theory's relationship to domestic violence found support for the hypothesis that assaultive husbands endorsed notions of marital violence more than non-violent husbands did and also that battered wives also held more traditional gender-role notions than did non-battered wives (Sugarman and Frankel, 1996). However, the researchers notably did not find support for the hypotheses that assaultive husbands hold the idea that their wives should exhibit traditional gender roles of obedience, loyalty, and deference; that assaultive men were more likely to maintain a traditional gender schema; and that battered wives maintained traditional gender schemas (Sugarman and Frankel, 1996).

Although Patriarchy Theory has mixed support, it is important to note that it is the theoretical basis for most batterer intervention treatment programs (Healey, Smith, and O'Sullivan, 1998; Jennings, 1987), and the re-shaping of gender norms among domestic violence offenders is a topic of interest in this dissertation. While the files of probation clients in Chesterfield County do not generally capture the clients' views on traditional notions of patriarchy, this theory will still be integrated into this dissertation in terms of the gender disparities of probationers.

Individual Psychological Explanations

Psychologically-oriented theories have traditionally pervaded within domestic violence research, as offenders have been conceptualized to be maladaptive in some emotional way, especially the re-offenders (Klein, Wilson, Crowe, DeMichele, 2008). In fact, additional research has concluded that approximately 2 percent of batterers can be classified as habitual, and exhibit both widespread criminal behavior and a complete lack of empathy to the suffering of their partners (Dutton and Golant, 1995). In short, the research is overwhelming that batterers generally exhibit at least some level of psychological dysfunction and that this dysfunction is overwhelming in some cases.

While the backgrounds of incarcerated batterers are similar to defendants who were convicted of violence against strangers (Healey et al, 1998) batterers seem to exhibit more psychological dysfunction and substance abuse. One study indicated that 25 percent of batterers exhibited major or severe psychological symptoms, such as paranoia, borderline tendencies, thought disorders, and significant depression (Gondolf, 1996 interview quoted in Healey et al). Additionally, previous data has indicated that between 71 and 85 percent of domestic violence cases involve batterers who are substance abusers (Doherty, 1997). Other studies indicate that

more than 50 percent of batterers in criminal justice, mental health, and/or social service settings are substance abusers (Hamilton and Collins, 1981; Leonard and Jacob, 1988). Certainly, the underlying psychological and substance use issues that batterers demonstrate illustrates why treatment for domestic violence is so difficult.

One particularly difficult and challenging psychological disorder that appears to be disproportionately present in batterers is Borderline Personality Organization (BPO), which appeared to be present in 79% of batterers in one therapeutic site (Dutton and Starzomski, 1994), as compared to around 11 percent within the general population (Dutton and Golant, 1995). Those with BPO and its more severe form, Borderline Personality Disorder (BPD), are thought to be highly distrustful of the world, emotionally fragile, and sufferers often view everything in black and white polarities, among other symptoms. For example, women are conceptualized as either “madonnas or whores” (Dutton and Golant, 1995). Men with this disorder fear abandonment deeply and will do anything to avoid this possibility, including the use of violence against their partners.

Additional investigatory work has been conducted into the application of psychoanalytic theory to the cycle of domestic violence. The general tenor of this theory is that batterers abuse their wives in order to “confirm” their masculinity and identity (Gondolf, 1985). In this way, the batterer is able to control for and minimize the feminine aspects of his personality. However, a key limitation in this theory is that it has only been applied to men thus far and has not been formulated for the application to female batterers (Sommer, 1994). At the same time, most women do not traditionally need to “confirm their masculinity,” so this limitation is certainly not crippling to psychoanalytic theory.

However, it is important to note that there is a difference between a focus on the psychological factors that can explain some aspects of domestic violence vs. relying on the personality factors of offenders as any sort of excuse for it. Prominent theorist Richard Gelles asserts that only 10 percent of domestic violence cases are attributable to psychological illness on the part of the offender and that the other 90 percent must be explained via sociological theories. Despite Gelles' general dismissal of the explanatory power of psychologically-based theories and general methodological weaknesses in some previous studies (i.e. the omission of some key variables), research has generally at least suggested that psychological factors should be considered in the body of domestic violence research (Sommer, 1994). For purposes of this dissertation, psychological theories of domestic violence are only applicable in that some files on offenders do indicate if an individual has been given a specific diagnosis, like Bipolar Disorder.

Biological Explanations

While biological explanations of any criminal phenomenon are incredibly controversial, several different biological arguments have been applied to the field of domestic violence. Studies have indicated that many abusive men disclose a history of head trauma, and that there was subsequently a clear link between head trauma and domestic violence (Rosenbaum and Hoge, 1989). Researchers posit that head injuries and neurological impairment serve to reduce impulse control, distort judgment, and cause heightened sensitivity to alcohol (Rosenbaum and Hoge, 1989). However, head injury researchers acknowledge that such a link could be viewed as controversial, as it may somehow mitigate the criminal responsibility of offending men. Additionally, the head trauma that was observed on medical tests could be the result of child abuse, which would obviously be a massive confounding variable (Rosenbaum and Hoge, 1989). Head trauma research in domestic violence has also been stymied by the fact that other studies

indicated that brain-injured men did not display greater aggressiveness at home (Warnken, Rosenbaum, Fletcher, Hoge, and Adelman, 1994). Overall, biological theories do not have much explanatory power for domestic violence, and the only real connection between biological theories and this dissertation will be if there is evidence of head trauma for specific offenders.

Summary of Theories

Overall, the theories that this dissertation will most directly utilize to provide a theoretical framework are social situation/strain and coping theory, with overtones of control, in order to capture the extent to which familial violence and dysfunction and economic struggles play a role in domestic violence recidivism. To a lesser extent, resource theory and patriarchy theories will also be drawn upon, in order to explore hypotheses on the male gender and struggling socioeconomic status of offenders.

Framing Domestic Violence within a Public Policy Context: The Scope of the Problem and Societal Cost

Before the scope of domestic violence can be considered, the actual definition of domestic violence must be further delineated. Initial research into spousal abuse was based solely upon physical injuries from husbands to wives (Gelles, 1974; Martin, 1976), but more contemporary domestic violence researchers have broadened that definition considerably, to include sexual abuse and rape, emotional and physical abuse, and coercive behaviors (Gelles, 1974). Domestic violence can be perpetrated against all family members, not simply spouses, and includes elder violence, child abuse, sibling abuse, and abuse against parents, for example. Domestic violence is certainly not limited to spousal abuse, but spousal abuse will be the specific focus of this literature review.

The official statistics indicate that the scope of the problem in the United States is staggering. Intimate partner homicides account for about 11% of murders nationwide (Rennison and Welchans, 2000), and the NCVS suggested that there were approximately 1 million violent crimes committed against persons by their current or former spouses/significant others in 1998, and the vast majority (85%) involves male perpetrators and female victims (Rennison and Welchans, 2000). As of 2003, the official numbers had increased to 1.3 victimized females at the hands of their intimate partners every year (Costs of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in the United States, 2003). Domestic violence is the most common violent crime that is reported to police (Greenfeld and Rand, 1998; Sherman, Schmidt, and Rogan, 1992). Twenty-six percent of female murder victims and 3 percent of male murder victims are killed by intimate associates, per the Victimization Survey in 1992. Between 75% and 90% of all hostage takings in the U.S. are linked to domestic violence (Hart, 1990).

Furthermore, in a 1993 national survey, 7 percent of women in the US (3.9 million) indicated that they had been assaulted by a spouse or partner in the previous year (Healey et al., 1998). Another study indicated that 14 percent of women reported that they had been abused by a spouse or intimate partner at some point during their lifetime (Healey et. al, 1998). Additional research from the 1980s indicates that 11.3 percent of U.S. women (Straus and Gelles, 1986) had been abused in the previous twelve month period. More recent data suggests that up to three million women are abused by their intimate partners each year (U.S. Department of Justice, March 1998). Very sadly, domestic battering is responsible for twenty-six percent of suicide attempts by women (Tark and Flitcraft, 1991). More than half of American couples experience domestic violence at some point during the course of their relationship (Feld and Straus, 1989).

As stark as the official statistics are, it is important to further note that studies indicate that the majority of domestic assaults go unreported. To illustrate, six out of seven such crimes go unreported (National Clearinghouse for the Defense of Battered Women, 1994) and only half of domestic violence crimes were reported to the police (Rennison and Welchans, 2000). Additionally, less than 25 percent of physical assaults, less than 20 percent of intimate partner rapes, and half of intimate partner stalking were reported to police (Tjaden and Thoennes, 2000). Finally, the National Coalition of Domestic Violence even asserted that only one in one hundred incidents of domestic violence is actually reported to police (Welch, 1994). Thus, the studies are consistent that official statistics on domestic violence vastly underreport the problem, even if the estimates vary as to the extent of the underreporting of such offenses.

Fortunately, there has been a general recent increase of domestic violence reporting, with the reporting rate of 48% in 1993 rising to 59% in 1998 (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2000). Concomitantly, research indicates that the rate of domestic violence has declined in recent years. Between 1993 and 2001, non-fatal crimes against females by intimate partners decreased from 1.1 million to 588,490 yearly crimes and intimate partner murders also declined (Rennison, 2003). Nonetheless, the rate of domestic violence in the U.S. is still shockingly high.

The economic costs of domestic violence are also quite high, as almost 1.5 million visits to U.S. emergency rooms each year are the result of domestic violence (Zorza, 1994). The American Medical Association estimates that domestic violence accounts for 21,000 hospitalizations and almost 100,000 days in the hospital each year (Meyer, 1992). In total, domestic violence likely costs employers between three and thirteen billion dollars each year (Zorza, 1994). Intimate partner violence also has been found to result in more than 18.5 million

mental health visits each year (Costs of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in the United States, 2003).

The History of Domestic Violence Laws in the United States

Despite the societal threat posed by domestic violence, it was only in the 20th century that such conduct became officially designated as criminal, and not simply a private matter between husband and wife. Historically, domestic violence interventions centered around the family, church, and community, with legal intervention in the U.S. quite inconsistent (Fagan, 1995). Given the fact that Anglo-American common law granted the male head of the household the right to personally discipline all those who fell under his domestic realm, domestic violence did not originally constitute official concept. Under the category of coverture laws, a married woman's identity became tantamount to her husband's, and she could not independently engage in a variety of functions (Taylor, Rush, and Munro, 1999). Women were actually considered "chattel" until the early twentieth century, and violence against them was tolerated unless the violence was "excessive" or inflicted permanent injury (Dobash and Dobash, 1979). In fact, husbands could even be held liable for the misconduct of their dependents, so it could be said that husbands had similar disciplinary duties for both their wives and their children. Thus, a wayward wife was legally subject to the same "discipline" as a rebellious child. Not surprisingly, prosecutions for domestic violence were almost non-existent. For example, only 12 cases of domestic violence were prosecuted in Plymouth, MA between 1633 and 1802 (Pleck, 1982).

Industrialization and urbanization in the 19th century, which loosened the community ties that had also fostered the conventional mores that sanctioned domestic violence, slowly helped to alter the social paradigms and thus the laws surrounding domestic violence (MacKinnon, 2001). In 1864 in *State v. Jesse Black*, a North Carolina man was found guilty of assault and battery for

viciously beating his estranged wife. The state supreme court overturned this verdict on the grounds that Black's wife had acted to provoke the incident, but organizations like the Woman's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU), which was the largest women's organization of the 19th century, focused great attention on domestic violence as the most worrisome consequence of alcohol abuse (Gordon, 1988). In 1871, Alabama became the first state to criminalize domestic violence, with the court asserting that "the wife had the right to the same protection of the law that the husband can invoke for himself" (Fagan, 1995). The gradual changes of the 19th century paved the way for the more interventionist state policies that characterized the Progressive era—laws that extended the boundaries of childhood, mandated that children stayed in school and out of the work force, the establishment of a juvenile justice system, and increasing control for women involved in child custody cases.

The criminal justice system's response to domestic violence has been influenced by overall concern with the status of women, as well as the legal response to social problems (Dobash and Dobash, 1979). Accordingly, the civil rights movement represented an early legal culmination in the fight against archaic domestic violence laws, and codifying familial abuse as a crime. State intervention increasingly focused on family violence, as a result of the efforts of feminists, rape crisis counselors, researchers, and workers in battered women's shelters (Fagan, 1995). Rape crisis program, hotlines, and victim/witness programs helped victims to increasingly make contact with the criminal justice system (Fagan, 1995). Increased programs for victims resulted, as the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the U.S. Department of Justice funded 23 programs starting in 1976, which were centered around shelters, special prosecution units, treatment programs, mediation, and civil intervention (Fagan, Friedman, Wexler, and Lewis, 1984).

In fact, reforms in civil protection for battered women preceded reforms in arrests and laws (Fagan, 1995). Prior to the late 1970's, a woman could not obtain a restraining order against her husband unless she agreed to file for a divorce at the same time (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1982). The Pennsylvania Protection from Abuse Act in 1976 was the genesis for protection orders in domestic violence cases, and today every state provides such protection (Fagan, 1995). Protection orders which mandate no contact between the domestic violence offender and victim was a very important reform in the sense that it theoretically would help to isolate victims from the offenders, thereby serving as an attack on the cycle of domestic violence.

However, in practicality it offered only limited protection to victims. Research indicates that 60 percent of 300 women who were interviewed twice in one year after receiving a protective order were re-abused at least once, with one in five reporting homicide threats and 29 percent reporting severe violence. This violence did not subside over time (Harrell, Smith, and Newmark, 1993). Given the limitations in the effectiveness of restraining orders, legal reforms were an important part of the overall response of the criminal justice system.

The sweeping legal changes of the 1970's were centered around improving the legal response in order to protect domestic violence victims and to punish domestic violence offenders (Fagan, 1996). Feminists had actively campaigned to bring legal action to the issue of violence against women, which stimulated a rise in anti domestic violence laws (Lerman, 1981). While battered women's advocates were largely responsible for these new laws, lawsuits against previously unhelpful police departments also prompted the criminal justice system to become more proactive in addressing domestic violence (Frisch, 1992). Historical correction of the lack of protections granted to battered women was also a goal of the criminal justice system (Zorza,

1992). The idea was to reduce violence through specific deterrence, by imposing a retributive punishment to the offender and with the reduction of violence thought to be rooted from the deterrent impact of legal punishment (Dutton, 1995; Fagan and Browne, 1994).

Laws in the 1970s gave victims increasing rights at the state and federal level, though early interventions for domestic violence were centered solely around married couples, which was a significant problem for the police (Bard and Zacker, 1971). By 1980, 47 states had passed domestic violence legislation, based on changes in protection orders, warrantless arrest, and legal defenses for battered women who killed (Fagan, 1995). In 1984, Congress passed the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act to fund domestic violence programs on the national level. The 1994 Violence Against Women Act provided further federal funding to combat domestic violence. In fact, the Violence Against Women Office indicated that federal funding of domestic violence programs increased to 1.6 billion in the five years post-the passage of the VAWA Act (Clark, Biddle, and Martin, 2002). Additionally, the Violence Against Women Act marshaled the federal government's power and precluded interstate travel to commit domestic violence, interstate stalking, and interstate travel to violate an order of protection (Klein, Wilson, Crowe, DeMichele, 2008).

Additional laws aimed to reduce the threat of lethality posed by domestic violence offenders, as considerable research has demonstrated the link between firearms and lethal offenses by domestic violence offenders (Bailey et al., 1997; Salzman et al., 1992). The Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 added a provision to the Gun Control Act of 1968 to state that anyone who is under a current protection order may not possess, receive, or transport either firearms or ammunition (American Probation and Parole Association). The Lautenberg Amendment of 1996 put further controls on domestic violence offenders and

amended the Gun Control Act to provide that people convicted of certain domestic violence crimes may not purchase, possess, or transport firearms or ammunition. Numerous challenges have been posed to these laws, but none of them have been sustained in the courts (Mitchell and Carbon, 2002). The expansion of domestic violence laws to the federal realm is also indicative of the trend of these laws transcending physical assaults only to include a constellation of other abusive behaviors (Klein, Crowe, Wilson, and DeMichele, 2008).

While there is an unquestionable and documented strengthening of the laws combating domestic violence, improvements can still be made. On the positive side, all state laws forbid physical assault or threatened assaults between intimate partners, with non-physical, yet coercive and intimidating behaviors, also being prohibited in many states (Klein, 1987). However, multiple states still do not allow abused spouses to receive compensation through victim compensation programs (Klein, 1987). This is a severe limitation because such funds are often essential to allowing a battered spouse to escape from an abusive environment. Thus, there is still a ways to go in terms of continuing to strengthen domestic violence laws, though the laws have evolved dramatically from the common law era.

Who are the Batterers?

General Characteristics of Batterers

Domestic violence offenders are found in all racial/ethnic/religious groups, ages, educational and professional levels, and both genders. However, there are some very broad similarities that can be drawn in categorizing batterers, in terms of gender, psychological issues, substance issues, and socioeconomic/employment issues. Overwhelmingly, statistics indicate that batterers are male and that there are certain socioeconomic demographics that some of them seem to share, though these similarities do not exclude wealthier and more educated men from

the battering group. It is important to note that female batterers do exist and their typologies will be discussed in more detail in this section, but overall the data is consistent that intimate partner abusers are largely male. It is also important to note that while batterers are generally not “insane,” according to either a layman’s definition of insanity or the legal standard of insanity, they do exhibit more psychological dysfunction and substance abuse issues than defendants who were convicted of violence against strangers. This dysfunction has implications for the success of batterers on probation, since they often seem to bring into their treatment pre-existing issues that go well beyond the isolated act of battering. Additionally, the most high-risk batterers in terms of recidivism can be classified in general terms as having fewer social ties than batterers who do not recidivate.

One commonality that batterers seem to share, according to various studies of batterer programs, is that many of the men enrolled are in their twenties and thirties and are underemployed laborers. Additionally, minorities are slightly over-represented in some treatment programs (Gondolf, 1995). Other studies have found that the characteristics of batterers in the criminal justice system, specifically those in recovery, reveal that they are in their late twenties to early thirties, under-employed laborers, often afflicted with drinking problems, prior arrest records and suffering from personality disorders (Esikovits and Edleson, 1989; Tolman and Bennett, 1990). Therefore, the stereotype of the batterer as a “loser” taking his frustrations out on his partner has taken hold, but such a view is shortsighted and does not capture the full dimension of domestic violence.

Characteristics of Male Batterers

The majority of arrested batterers are heterosexual males (Healey et al, 1998). Women certainly can be batterers, but as the 1985 National Family Violence Resurvey noted, men’s

greater physical strength and aggressiveness is more likely to result in a serious injury to the woman. In fact, a recent study found that men were defendants in 90 percent of misdemeanor domestic violence cases, 85 percent of felony cases, and 75 percent of civil cases (Healey et al, 1998). Research indicates that males are overwhelmingly the perpetrators in domestic violence cases, and are the aggressive party around 95 percent of the time (Bachman, 1994; Belknap, 1996; Dobash, Dobash, Wilson, and Daly, 1992). Regardless of what the actual number is, it is clear that men are the aggressors in the vast majority of domestic violence cases, and that women are their victims the majority of the time. In fact, according to the 1994 National Crime Victimization Survey, women are ten times more likely than men to be victims of their intimate partners (Zawitz, 1994).

Characteristics of Female Batterers

Female batterers do exist, and generally fall into one of four groups: lesbian batterers, women arrested for violent self-defense, angry victims who have engaged in pre-emptive violence to ward off further abuse, and the more intrinsically violent batterer, herself often a victim of some type of previous violence (Healey et al., 1998). For purposes of this chapter, the most important types of female batterers are retaliatory/pre-emptive/self-defense-based and more intrinsically violent female batterers who do so for reasons apart from self-preservation.

Female battering is obviously equally wrong; however, it is important to note that while any violence is wrong, the dynamics underlying battery from females are fundamentally different from male offenders yet the consequences for the victims are equally severe. Research has indicated that even though male victims are not generally injured as frequently or severely as female victims, they do sustain sometimes significant injuries (Hines and Douglas, 2009) and report a multitude of emotional and physical consequences stemming from the abuse (Cook,

2009; Hines, 2007). Additionally, male victims of female batterers face social humiliation and the fear that if they come forward and file a complaint, they will be viewed as liars and labeled as the actual aggressors (Douglas and Hines, 2009).

Despite the predomination of male batterers in the criminal justice system, there is controversy among researchers about whether the female batterers who do exist are predominantly retaliatory/pre-emptive/self-defensive (e.g. Loseke and Kurz, 2005; Belknap and Melton, 2005) or more intrinsically violent people who are deliberately seeking control over their partners (Hines and O'Malley-Morrison, 2001). That question remains to be settled but the most important aspect of the gendered issue of battering is that male batterers greatly outnumber female batterers in the criminal justice system.

The Psychological Dysfunctionalities of Batterers and Substance Abuse Issues

The research indicates that domestic violence offenders are generally not “insane,” in laymen’s terms, but that they do present with more mental-health challenges than other similarly violent offenders whose violence is directed at strangers rather than intimate partners. This has strong implications for their treatment within the criminal justice system because the totality of the batterers’ issues must be considered in order for any treatment to be a success, and the pre-existing psychological and substance issues of domestic violence offenders must be addressed.

The backgrounds of convicted batterers are basically similar to defendants who were convicted of violence against strangers (Healey et al, 1998). However, batterers also seem to exhibit more psychological dysfunction and substance abuse than defendants whose targets were strangers. One study indicated that 25 percent of batterers exhibited major or severe psychological symptoms, such as paranoia, borderline tendencies, thought disorders, and significant depression (Gondolf, 1996 interview quoted in Healey et al, 1998). Additionally,

previous data has indicated that between 71 and 85 percent of domestic violence cases involve batterers who are substance abusers (Doherty, 1997). Other studies indicate that more than 50 percent of batterers in criminal justice, mental health, and/or social service settings are substance abusers (Hamilton and Collins, 1981; Leonard and Jacob, 1988). Certainly, the underlying psychological and substance use issues that batterers demonstrate illustrates why treatment for domestic violence is so difficult. Even though the studies do not always produce the same statistics for drug abuse or mental illness among batterers, it is clear that there is a connection between both issues and batterers.

Gondolf's evaluation of batterer intervention programs in four different urban sites in the Northeast, Central South, and West confirmed previous research about the psychological and substance abuse issues that are pervasive among batterers. Over a third of men reported violent family backgrounds and in addition to the severe personality disorders that one-quarter of the men evidenced, the heavy majority of men scored positive on at least one subscale of personality disorders (Gondolf, 1996). Narcissistic and antisocial personality tendencies were evident in 39% of men in the sample (Gondolf, 1996). A third of men reported angry outbursts, mood swings, and anxiety, and a fifth of the men reported previous and severe depression (Gondolf, 1996). Finally, a third of the men reported alcohol-based legal problems, like DUI arrests and fights (Gondolf, 1996). Thus, based on Gondolf's research, one could posit that there is a subgroup of pathologically emotionally-troubled batterers, even though batterers as an overall group still manifest at least some emotional issues and dysfunction.

Socioeconomic/Employment Issues and Fewer Social Ties

There has also been demonstrated a link between economic/employment stress in the families of batterers and the commission of domestic violence (Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz,

1980). For example, there is evidence that suggests that husbands/fathers who are employed part-time manifest twice the rates of abuse towards their children and three times the rate of spousal abuse as do husbands who are employed full-time (Straus et al., 1980). Families with unemployed husbands have even higher rates of violence (Straus et al., 1980). Thus, when the offender is failing economically, it is clear that this stress can be a catalyst for domestic violence, and in this manner, men situated on the lower rungs of the socioeconomic stratum may be at a higher risk for the commission of domestic battery.

A study of over 3,000 misdemeanor domestic violence offenders in Ohio between August 1993 and May 1996 expanded this idea of a link between socioeconomic stress and battering to posit that chronic batterers seem to have less social ties and a lower stake in social conformity (Wooldredge and Thistlethwaite, 1999). At the time in question, Hamilton County had a mandatory arrest policy for domestic violence when police officers determine that there is an immediate threat to the victim, which resulted in an 80 percent arrest rate for domestic violence calls to the police (Wooldredge and Thistlethwaite, 1999). While the researchers found support for the impact of filing charges against suspects on reducing recidivism as well as the utilization of offender treatment programs, certain characteristics that chronic batterers shared were also identified as significant to continued recidivism.

In fact, of the 17 percent of offenders who were re-arrested for domestic violence during the study, one-fourth were not sharing a residence with their partner at the time of the arrest, forty percent were unemployed, and eighteen percent were receiving zero financial support, not even welfare (Wooldredge and Thistlethwaite, 1999). Additionally, two-thirds of the sample had not been employed for at least a year, 96 percent lacked college degrees, and almost two-thirds had previous convictions, with 35 percent having been incarcerated for an offense other than

domestic violence (Wooldredge and Thistlethwaite, 1999). These findings allowed the researchers to make a connection between informal social control variables like education, length of employment, and family ties and domestic violence, with the finding that batterers with reduced social ties have a reduced stake in social conformity and thus a greater risk of recidivism (Wooldredge and Thistlethwaite, 1999). Drawing on the “stake in conformity” work of Jackson Toby (1957), the researchers posited that people with a lower stake in conformity may be less likely deterred from committing additional acts of domestic violence simply as the result of an arrest, because they have less to lose after committing such crimes (Wooldredge and Thistlethwaite, 1999). Therefore, employed and married individuals have a higher stake in conformity as compared to unemployed and unmarried persons and thus have more to lose from formal criminal justice sanctions such as arrest and prosecution.

Offender Typologies

Contemporary research has been conducted with the goal of developing typologies of male domestic violence offenders (Babcock, Greene, and Robie., 2004; Cavanaugh and Gelles, 2005). Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) attempted to create batterer typologies based upon three factors: a) the severity of the violence b) the generality of the violence (intra vs. inter-family) and c) the presence of psychopathology within the male batterer. As a result, they generated three separate types, and each with different risk levels. Family-only offenders were posited to be the least violent, as they generally exhibit little violence or pathology outside the home, and this type of offender generally represents about 50 percent of batterers (Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart, 1994). The dysphoric-borderline batterer, a second typology, exhibits moderate violence, primarily towards his partner, but also some violence outside the home. These batterers exhibit the most profound psychological pathology and make up 25% of the

batterer population (Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart, 1994). The third subtype is the generally violent-antisocial batterer who are the most violent/highest risk and who have lengthy criminal histories and long records of marital violence, as well as exhibiting signs of antisocial personality disorder. They make up 25 percent of the batterer population (Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart, 1994).

In the years since the 1994 typology research, a fourth subtype has been delineated. The typologies of domestic violence offenders are now said to include “family-only” abusers who demonstrate little violence and anti-social activity outside the home, “low-level” antisocial violent men, more generally criminal men who are violent and generally sociopathic outside the confines of the home, and more “borderline” typological men who exhibit extreme dependency, jealousy, and a striking fear of abandonment (Holtzworth-Munroe, et al., 2000). It is important to note that research into the psychopathology of female batterers has concluded that women arrested for domestic assault shared some of the traits of the aforementioned “borderline” batterer (Hughes, 2007), which has implications for treatment because borderline personality disorder is very different from antisocial personality disorder.

Additional psychological research has indicated that male domestic violence offenders react aggressively to non-aggressive communication from their partners (Holtzworth-Munroe et al., 2000; Lloyd, 1999). Studies also indicate that domestic violence offenders tend to exhibit traits consistent with attachment disorders (Sonkin and Dutton, 2003). In this manner, pronounced deficits in the abusers’ communication and perception skills must also be addressed in a holistic program that also encompasses psychological treatment and/or substance abuse treatment in order for domestic violence offenders to overcome the myriad issues that face them and that often pre-dispose them to re-assault their partners.

The Criminal Justice Response to Domestic Violence

Introduction

The criminal justice system's response to domestic violence has strengthened considerably over time. The general historical sequence of the criminal justice system's response consists of mandatory arrest policies, no drop prosecution policies, and the expansion of treatment to batterers in probation. The historical development of each strategy will be addressed below, the effectiveness of each strategy will be analyzed, and the current state of each response will be discussed. The three criminal justice responses will be categorized chronologically as police, courts, and corrections.

The History of Arrest Policies for Domestic Violence (Police)

Arrest policies for domestic violence crimes have changed dramatically since the 1970's due in part to the women's rights movement's focus on enhancing penalties for domestic violence and protection for victims, as well as police departments changing their policies towards domestic violence as a result of civil suits against them from battered women. In short, lawsuits against the police and pressure from women's groups led to increased arrest policies (Tolman and Edleson, 1995). Prior to the 1970's, police were shown to avoid arrest in domestic violence cases, even when there was probable cause to do so (Black and Reiss, 1967).

Police avoidance of domestic violence arrests prior to 1983 was largely a result of the widespread view in the police world that domestic violence situations were the most dangerous to deal with, even though data indicated that such concerns were unfounded (Garner and Clemmer, 1986). Police culture was so anti-arrest that manuals actually mandated that arrest should be avoided whenever it was possible (IACP, 1967). Police departments also counseled officers to avoid arresting domestic violence offenders whenever possible because of concerns

that arrests would actually stimulate future violence against victims when offenders presumably bailed out of jail and returned to the marital home (Garner, 1997). Therefore, many departments aggressively discouraged arrest, emphasizing counseling on the scene and drug/alcohol treatment for offenders (Bard and Zacker, 1971). Police officers were also trained to look for a correlation between battering and alcoholism and to offer mediation on the scene, as well as referrals to the appropriate agency, so the response was essentially short-term and they were trained to do everything possible to avoid arresting batterers (Bard, 1970).

Concomitant with the pervasive anti-arrest attitudes throughout law enforcement, domestic violence laws were almost an oxymoron and the policies on the books prior to the 1970's and early 1980's truly tied the hands of law enforcement officials, even those who were willing and eager to intervene and assist domestic violence victims. In fact, prior to 1981, fourteen states including Virginia specifically refused to authorize law enforcement officials to arrest offenders for committing misdemeanor battery, unless they committed the battery in the presence of officers (Loving, 1980). As recently as 1984, only ten percent of large city police departments in the U.S. had pro-arrest policies for domestic violence, forty percent had policies that encouraged mediation, and fifty percent had no domestic violence policies at all (Hoctor, 1997).

The result of this non-interventionist attitude from the policing world was lawsuits against departments across the country on behalf of battered women, who ultimately alleged that police indifference violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (Frisch, 1992). One of the groundbreaking first suits was a wrongful death lawsuit filed against the San Jose Police Department, after a battered woman named Ruth Bunnell was murdered by her estranged husband in 1972. Mrs. Bunnell had called the police at least 20 times between 1971

and 1972 to report assaults, but her husband Mark was only arrested once for assault (Hector, 1997). When Mrs. Brunnell called to report a death threat from her estranged husband, the San Jose police took forty-five minutes to respond, and Ruth Bunnell was already dead at the time of their arrival. While this lawsuit was dismissed on the grounds that the police enjoy immunity, personal injury attorneys learned valuable lessons and filed new lawsuits on the grounds that the plaintiffs' equal protection rights were being violated by police inaction towards enforcing domestic violence laws (Hector, 1997).

Class action lawsuits for multiple plaintiffs were filed in both New York and Oakland, and these suits encouraged police departments across the country to tighten up their policies towards domestic violence in order to forestall expensive legal confrontations (Hector, 1997). A major object lesson for police departments occurred in 1984, when a federal court in Connecticut awarded Tracey Thurman, a battered woman, \$2.3 million in her lawsuit against the City of Torrington and twenty-four police officers, because of the police department's policy of non-arrest in domestic violence cases (Frisch, 1992).

In this section, the shift in arrest policies for domestic violence from adamantly avoiding arrest to mandatory arrests, which heavily correlates with the ascending feminist movement of the 1970's, is discussed and the ultimate effectiveness of mandatory-arrest policies is evaluated. Since this dissertation is based in a Virginia jurisdiction, contemporary Virginia domestic violence laws are included. The effectiveness of overall arrest policies are analyzed in light of the most notable research. Particular attention is paid to the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment, since that was a seminal study in the eyes of the public and policymakers, and to the subsequent research into the potency of mandatory arrest policies in preventing subsequent domestic violence.

Virginia Law

Virginia law is particularly of interest for purposes of this dissertation. Adopted in 1997, VA Code 19.2-81.3 essentially lays out the arrest of the “predominant physical aggressor” in domestic violence situations, if the aggressor can be determined using evidence such as visible injuries on victims, which party initiated the physical violence, and which party seems more capable of inflicting injuries (Garner, 1997). However, this “presumptive arrest” policy is slightly different from “mandatory arrest” policies because an arrest will not be made 100% of the time in Virginia if a primary aggressor cannot clearly be determined. Even though an arrest is not absolutely mandatory, police in Virginia must assist the victim in requesting an emergency protective order from a magistrate and transport the victim to receive medical attention, if necessary. Thus, it is clear that Virginia law heavily encourages police officers to make an arrest as long as it is clear who the primary aggressor is, and even in cases when the aggressor cannot be determined, the police still have a prescribed course of action to assist complaining victims. In other words, police must be proactive and responsive, and cannot simply separate the parties, tell them to calm down, and leave it at that.

The Effectiveness of Arrest Policies for Domestic Violence

After the heightened criminalization of domestic violence in the 1970's, policymakers increasingly viewed mandatory arrest as the most effective police response to domestic violence, largely because of Minneapolis research that found that arrest was almost twice as effective as any other action in reducing domestic violence (Sherman and Beck, 1984). This research is known as the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment and the results were released in 1983 (Garner, 1997). In this study, researchers randomly assigned police officers' selection of options in domestic violence cases in Minneapolis to three different groups: 1) arrest of the offender 2)

ordering one party out of the residence and 3) simply advising the couple (Garner, 1997). Researchers employed victims' interviews and official records and ultimately concluded that subsequent offending was reduced by 50% when the battering suspect was arrested (Sherman and Beck, 1984). This study had a huge effect on both the views of the public at large and policymakers because of the widespread dissemination of the results of the study. The study was publicized in over 300 major newspapers and on all three major news network broadcasts (Sherman and Cohn, 1989). In fact, in 1984 in the immediate wake of the study, the U.S. Attorney General's Task Force on Family Violence both endorsed the results of the study and recommended that both state and local agencies adopt a pro-arrest policy towards domestic violence (Garner, 1997).

However, this research has not been successfully replicated in the researchers' subsequent studies in other communities, and the actual results were mixed. Studies in similar jurisdictions in Omaha, Charlotte, and Milwaukee indicated that arrest was not found to be any more effective than other options, such as advising the parties or separating them (Dunford, Huizinga, and Elliot, 1990; Sherman, Schmidt, Smith, and Rogan, 1992). Research in Colorado Springs and Dade County, Florida found that arrest was shown to have a deterrent effect in the short-term (Sherman, 1992), but was actually associated with increased long-term recidivism (Sherman, 1992). Thus, it appears from that research that arrest only affects the short-term behavior of the offender, perhaps as a shock tactic.

Critics of the original Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment point to the relative weakness of the overall research design as a main reason that the power of arrest as a sanction has not been successfully replicated. For example, the original study included only 330 cases, with arrest as the choice in 114 of those cases (Garner, 1997). Additionally, other critics have

pointed to the overall non-representativeness of Minneapolis to other jurisdictions (Garner, 1997). Therefore, the question remained as to whether studies with stronger and more rigorous designs would offer additional evidence for the power of police arrest policies.

The National Institute of Justice's (NIJ) Spouse Assault Replication Program (SARP) carried out a number of research experiments between 1981 and 1991 in six police departments to attempt to reconcile the mixed data as to the power of arrest in deterring future violence. The first study was actually the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment (MDVE), discussed above, which concluded that arresting batterers cut future violence in half over the subsequent six months (NIJ, 2001). The subsequent jurisdictions were Charlotte, Colorado Springs, Dade County, Milwaukee, and Omaha, as mentioned above. However, when the researchers attempted to replicate the results in these five jurisdictions, three studies indicated that arrest-group offenders actually had higher levels of recidivism, while in the other two studies, researchers found a modest but statistically significant reduction in recidivism in the batterer group (NIJ, 2001).

Thus, more contemporary NIJ researchers tried to standardize the research designs and statistical analysis in the previous experiments in order to control for previous limitations in research (NIJ, 2001). As a result, the researchers concluded that arrest is associated with less recidivism based upon all major measures of recidivism, that reductions in recidivism are larger and statistically significant in two measures based upon interviews with victims, and not in measures that are based upon official police records, and that the effectiveness of arrest is not influenced or effected by jurisdiction (NIJ, 2001). However, the analysis also concluded that the impact of arrest is modest as compared with other variables like the batterer's age and prior criminal record, both of which have a greater impact on recidivism. Additional research has

indicated that arrests had a strong impact only on employed and married offenders, who were said to “have a stake in conformity” (Crowe, Klein, Wilson, and DeMichele, 2008). Secondary analysis from four of the five arrest study replication sites was consistent that arrest is effective for married and employed suspects, but results in increased violence for unmarried and unemployed batterers who have a lower stake in conformity and less to lose from formal sanctions from the criminal justice system (Crowe, Klein, Wilson, and DeMichele, 2008).

However, regardless of arrest, half of suspects did not recidivate at all during the follow-up period in the 2001 standardization study, while a minority of offenders continued to recidivate, and whether they were arrested, counseled, or separated from their partner did not matter. Thus, the researchers suggested that future research should be targeted towards efforts to correctly predict high-risk repeat offenders: “Policies requiring arrests for all suspects may unnecessarily take a community’s resources away from identifying and responding to the victims most at risk” (NIJ, 2001: 13). Therefore, the research does seem to indicate that arrest policies do have an impact on reducing recidivism, but indiscriminate arrests are likely not the most effective use of police energy and resources. Because immediate law enforcement action in domestic violence cases has been shown to be effective, a potential arrest strategy in domestic violence is immediate and coordinated criminal justice system action, involving the courts, corrections, and victims’ advocates with initial law enforcement first responders (Crowe et al, 2008).

The History of Prosecution in Combating Domestic Violence (Courts)

This section discusses the initially non-aggressive prosecution of domestic violence cases, which was sometimes due to the perceived lack of cooperation of victims, as well as a lack of trust in prosecutors on the part of victims. Next, the no-drop prosecution strategy is discussed

and the effectiveness of this strategy is analyzed. The history of aggressive, no-drop prosecution in domestic violence has been shaky, though contemporary innovations are improving the relationships between individual victims and prosecutors. Prosecution of domestic violence cases also historically been low (Dutton, 1988; Ford, 1983), which also may have led to historically low numbers of domestic violence arrests because officers felt that the cases would not result in further legal action (Dutton, 1987; Ferrero and Pope, 1993). Prosecutors did not aggressively pursue domestic violence cases, because they felt that women would drop the charges (Parnas, 1967). Additionally, it was shown that prosecutorial screening of cases generally treated domestic violence cases as less serious, regardless of circumstances (Davis and Smith, 1982).

On the other side, victims had low opinions about the protectiveness of police and prosecutors, which probably made them less willing to cooperate with prosecutions against the people whom they most feared (Ferraro and Boychuk, 1992; Jaffe, Hastings, Reitzel, and Austin, 1993). Some research has indicated that the legal classification of battering as a misdemeanor seemed to reinforce to the victims that the behavior of the batterer is being “trivialized,” which reduced their willingness to cooperate in prosecutions (Hart, 1993). Additionally, long delays and lack of protection for the victim led to lower levels of victim cooperation (Tolman and Edleson, 1995). The dearth of victim/witness protection (Family Violence, 1991), and the insensitivity of prosecutors (McGuire, 1991; Hart, 1991) also resulted in low levels of victim cooperation. While victim-batterer reconciliation is thought to be an impediment to prosecution, this is not generally the reason for a termination in charges against the batterer (Ford and Burke, 1987). Rather, some victims seem to believe that simply initiating charges against the defendant will be sufficient to cease the abuse (Ford, 1991).

As a result of this mutual victim-prosecutorial misunderstanding and the difficult relationship therein, domestic violence prosecutions up until the 1980's were fraught with difficulties. Both judges and prosecutors often dismissed or abandoned cases in which the victims did not come to court and testify against the batterer (Davis, Smith, and Davies, 2001). Accordingly and not surprisingly, domestic violence cases had a disproportionately high rate of dismissal as compared to other crimes (Davis, Smith, and Davis, 2001). Largely as a result of this prosecutorial futility, in San Diego in the 1980's, prosecutors adopted a mandatory, no-drop prosecution strategy in domestic violence cases, in which cases with the proper evidence would proceed, regardless of the level of victim cooperation. Research in the jurisdictions which first employed no-drop prosecutions in domestic violence cases in Everett, WA and Klamath Falls, OR indicated that there was a sharp increase in the number of guilty pleas in these cases, as well as a significant reduction in domestic violence dismissals (Davis, Smith, and Davies, 2001). However, the early evidence on mandatory prosecution strategies also indicated that they increased the adversarial atmosphere in the courtroom, were significantly more expensive than discretionary prosecutions, and might inhibit domestic violence reports since victims could be sure that there would be an automatic prosecution regardless of their wishes (Davis, Smith, and Davies, 2001). Regardless, multiple jurisdictions still employ no-drop prosecutorial policies.

The Effectiveness of Mandatory Prosecution Strategies in Combating Domestic Violence

Research into the effectiveness of aggressive prosecution strategies has been mixed (Sherman, Schmidt, and Rogan, 1992), in terms of keeping the victims safe from future battering. Overall, the level of danger on the part of victims is borne out by the official data, which indicates that 32% of battered women were re-assaulted within six months of the criminal justice intervention, with an average of three assaults. In contrast, only 13% of victims of

stranger-perpetrated crimes were victimized again during that six-month time period (Langan and Innes, 1986). Even more disturbingly, battered women are most often the victims of homicides when they participate in the criminal justice system and when they get out of the abusive relationship (Browne, 1987; Sonkin, Martin, and Walker, 1985). The threat of battering is also a very real phenomenon during the criminal justice process, as at least 50% of batterers threaten retaliation during this phase (Davis, Smith, and Henley, 1990), with at least 30% of batterers acting on the threat (Goldsmith, 1991). Obviously, prosecutors cannot be held hostage by the threat of future violence to the victims and not prosecute cases as a result, but it should be noted that there is evidence to indicate that mandatory prosecutions are certainly not a panacea for the issue of domestic violence. Nor have such prosecutions been demonstrated to significantly deter the offender.

Suggestions for More Effective Utilization of Police and Prosecutorial Resources

Given the demonstrated limitations of mandatory arrest and mandatory prosecutions in singularly combating domestic violence, policymakers have focused on improving the relationship between police, prosecutors, and victims. There are several strategies that police and prosecutors can employ in order to facilitate victim trust and cooperation. While the research is somewhat contradictory on the power of arrest in reducing recidivism in battering, as mentioned earlier, the overall tenor of the studies to date indicate that arrest is still a crucial component of police response to domestic violence (Hart, 1991). Arrest additionally can improve victims' trust in the level of seriousness with which law enforcement treats the crimes perpetrated against them. Several researchers have concluded that arrest provides the strongest deterrence, as compared to other options, even when a conviction is not obtained (Ford, 1990; Sherman and Berk, 1984).

The prosecution community has also employed a variety of strategies to improve the relationship that they have with domestic violence victims. Specialized prosecution units have increased the success of domestic violence prosecutions (Fagan, 1988) via improved investigations and preparation for trial, and increased protections for victims. These units will be discussed in a later section. In addition, timelier prosecutions are also central for victim cooperation (Ford and Burke, 1987). Empowering the victim is also essential to fostering increased cooperation, as allowing the victims a role in plea negotiation and disposition has been shown to be an effective measure (McGuire, 1991).

It is important to note that while women's rights activists generally advocate for the arrest and prosecution of batterers in order to protect women and demonstrate that society takes the crime of domestic violence seriously (Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Yilo, 1993), not all activists hold this viewpoint (Mills, 1999). Feminists are sometimes much more focused on the rehabilitation of batterers than are other parties, as their goals are based on fundamental social transformation and not simple punishment. Additionally, women's advocates have at times taken the pragmatic view that victims often have children in common with their abuser and thus some contact may be inevitable, so a strictly punishment-based model does not address the needs of victims—supporting the need for rehabilitation and treatment (Mills, Grauwiler, and Pezold, 2006). As the aforementioned authors note, as many as half of domestic violence victims will remain in their relationships and the process by which many of the others leave is painstaking (Mills, Grauwiler, and Pezold, 2006). Accordingly, treatment for batterers is an important part of the current criminal justice intervention in battering, and 1970's feminists were among the earliest advocates for this treatment.

The History of Domestic Violence Offenders in Corrections

As more batterers entered the criminal justice system as a result of the increasing mandatory arrest policies of the 1970's, this widening of the net meant that the corrections system, probation and community corrections in particular, would also inevitably take on more domestic violence offenders. Domestic violence increasingly became conceptualized as criminal behavior that must be stopped and not a natural exercise of maintaining household order (Klein, Wilson, Crowe, and DeMichele, 2008). Accordingly, prosecutorial rates for domestic violence rose from 2 percent of domestic violence arrests in Minnesota in the 1984 study (Sherman and Berk, 1984) to a 61-percent prosecution rate in Omaha a few years later (Dunford, Huizinga, and Elliot, 1990). This meant that many more domestic violence offenders were formally a part of the criminal justice system, having been convicted of domestic violence offenses and in need of treatment.

The research indicates that in jurisdictions in which domestic violence is now aggressively prosecuted, the majority of sentenced batterers are placed on probation (Klein, Wilson, Crowe, and DeMichele, 2008). In fact, 98 percent of domestic violence batterers sentenced in San Diego are placed on probation and in Everett, Washington, almost 80 percent of batterers are sentenced to probation (Smith, Davies, Nickels, and Davis, 2002). Accordingly, nationwide probationary rates reflect judges' increasing reliance on probation as a sentencing choice for domestic abusers. The Bureau of Justice Statistics indicates that in 2002 and 2003, 7 percent of probationers nationwide were convicted of domestic violence as their most serious crime, a number which represented 285,179 probationers nationwide in 2003 (Glaze, 2002; Glaze and Palla, 2003). Obviously, the statistics indicate that probation is an overwhelmingly popular sentencing option for domestic violence offenders, and this section will discuss the history of domestic violence offenders in probation (discussed above), challenges to the

effectiveness of corrections in domestic violence probation, and the overall effectiveness of domestic violence probation.

Challenges to the Effectiveness of Corrections in Domestic Violence Interventions

Not surprisingly given the instability of a significant percentage of domestic violence offenders, recidivism is chronic within domestic violence probation (Healey, Smith, and O'Sullivan, 1998). In fact, research indicates that domestic batterers are substantively different from overall probationers in terms of their motivations, target choice, and cognitive processes (Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart, 1994; Saunders, 1995). This is because crimes of domestic batterers are intensely personal, and these offenders often bring with them a host of challenges that are more complex than a probationer who assaulted a stranger in a drunken melee, for example.

Certain risk factors for recidivism in domestic violence offenders seem to be especially acute. Not surprisingly, alcohol abuse has consistently been identified (DeMaris and Jackson, 1987; Hamberger and Hastings, 1990). In fact, the connection between substance abuse and battering is compelling. Data has indicated that between 71 and 85 percent of domestic violence cases involve batterers who are substance abusers (Doherty, 1997). Additional studies indicate that more than 50 percent of batterers in criminal justice, mental health, and/or social service settings are substance abusers (Hamilton and Collins, 1981; Leonard and Jacob, 1988).

Other factors are also associated with high rates of domestic violence recidivism. In terms of psychological dysfunction, the presence of severe personality disorders in domestic violence offenders is also associated with re-abuse (Jones and Gondolf, 1997; Hamberger and Hastings, 1990). This makes intuitive sense given the connection between severe personality disorders, self-medication via substance abuse, and later impulsive behavior. Also, the chronic nature of the

abuse (Tolman and Bhosley, 1991), as well as the severity of the abuse before the arrest and treatment (Jones and Gondolf, 1997), are important predictors of recidivism after arrest and treatment.

Social standing and community ties, such as the offender's age, educational attainment, employment status, income, and marital status can often be predictors of satisfactory/unsatisfactory probation completion and whether a violation of probation petition is filed, though the research is not conclusive on the topic. Certain factors like marital status and age also have been evaluated as factors in offenders' success in completing probation in a satisfactory fashion. Never married/divorced offenders are more likely to be terminated from probation in an unsuccessful manner (Liberton, Silverman, and Blount, 1992). However, marital status has not been shown to predict whether a VOP is filed against the offender (Gray et al., 2001). An additional factor that did not seem to have an impact on re-arrest for domestic batterers, based on an Illinois study, is race (Olson and Stalans, 2001).

A study into Rhode Island's specialized domestic violence unit indicated that criminal history and a youthful age are both strongly associated with domestic violence recidivism (Klein and Crowe, 2008). This finding is consistent with the prior research that offenders who have one or more prior adult convictions have been found to be more likely to have a violation of probation (VOP) order filed against them than offenders who have no prior adult criminal convictions (Martin, Olson, and Lurigio, 2000). However, the past evidence on age is a predictor is a bit more complicated. Some studies have indicated that younger offenders are more likely to have their probation revoked (Crew, Lutz, Fahrney, and Moriarty, 1998). Other studies have indicated that age is not a significant predictor of probation completion vs. recidivism (Gray et al., 2001).

Unemployed offenders (English, Pullen, and Colling-Chadwick, 1996; Morgan, 1994) and high school dropouts (English, Pullen, and Colling-Chadwick, 1996; Olson and Lorigio, 2000) are more likely to have unsatisfactory probation termination than offenders who are employed full-time or who had a high school diploma. Other studies indicate that employment is actually not a significant predictor of unsatisfactory probation termination (Liberton et al., 1992) or of a VOP (violation of probation) filing (Martin, Olson, and Lurigio, 2000). However, the research does indicate that low-income offenders are more likely to be terminated unsuccessfully from probation (Liberton et al., 1992) and to have a VOP filed against them (Martin, Olson, and Lurigio, 2000). Consistent with the overall theme of community ties as being a strong predictor of recidivism, a Canadian study of domestic batterers indicated that re-arrest for new violent crimes within five years of sentencing was strongly correlated with offender residential instability, employment instability, and financial instability, as well as the association with criminal peers. Additional correlating factors included a longer offender substance abuse history, prior arrests, and prior violent arrest charges (Hanson and Wallace-Capretta, 2004).

Despite the fact that the research is not conclusive as to which socioeconomic and demographic factors have the greatest impact on recidivism, it is at least possible that both judges and probation officers consider these various demographic factors in their decisions to file VOPs or to terminate offenders from probation, even though the evidence is mixed on the strength of these factors as predictors of recidivism and unsuccessful completion of probation (Stalans, Juergens, Seng, and Lavery, 2004). It is clear that general ties to the community are predictive overall of success while on probation, but the studies have differed somewhat as to which of these factors are most crucial.

It also bears mention that an additional obstacle to successfully treating batterers within the correctional setting is the once pervasive idea among policymakers that domestic violence offenders were not treatable (Dobash and Dobash, 1979), and also that batterer treatment programs create a false sense of security for victims and thus represent a reckless endangerment of women (Holtzworth-Munroe, Beatty, and Anglin, 1995). It is not hard to imagine why recidivism has been chronic within domestic violence given the prevalence of such “defeatist” notions on the part of policymakers themselves.

The Three Main Treatments in Corrections

In the following sections, the main three treatment modes in corrections for domestic violence will be discussed and analyzed. These treatment strategies consist of batterer intervention programs, coordinated community response, and specialized domestic violence units (the focus of this dissertation). Each will be fully defined, the components therein will be explained, its implementation will be analyzed from a historical perspective, and its effectiveness will be evaluated in light of the available research. Additionally, the principles of effective correctional intervention will also be identified and analyzed, in order to understand the context of correctional interventions and their prospects for success.

Batterer Intervention Programs

This section will discuss the development of batterer intervention programs from a historical perspective, as well as the development of batterer treatment overall. Batterer intervention programs were originally instituted by men’s groups, social services, and battered women’s shelters (Gondolf, 2002). Since then the programs have blended into probation departments, jails, and prisons. This was largely in response to frustration with the effectiveness of the battered women’s shelter in reducing domestic violence. Shelters represented one of the

earliest responses to domestic violence (Johnson and Kanzler, 1993), but were limited in dealing with domestic violence recidivism and the reconciliation of the victim and the batterer (Hamberger and Hastings, 1993; Jennings, 1987; Snyder and Scheer, 1981). Additionally, shelters could not control whether or not batterers simply recidivated with new partners (Farley and Magill, 1988; Gondolf, 1987). Thus, domestic violence activists began to view changing the behavior/beliefs of the batterer as central to the reduction of domestic violence (Feazell, Mayers, and Deschner, 1984).

In 1977, eight men who were friends of female activists in Boston formed a men's group known as Emerge Counseling and Education to Stop Domestic Violence (Adams and McCormick, 1982), with the purpose of providing services to batterers. Along with AMEND (Abusive Men Exploring New Directions) in Denver, which was another male-generated anti-domestic violence organization, Emerge served as a consciousness group, promoting an anti-sexist message (Gondolf, 1995). Group services to batterers continued to expand around the country after the founding of Emerge (Feazell, Myers, and Deschner, 1984), and rather than simply advocating against violence, these groups also started to use skill-building and brief therapeutic treatments (Gondolf, 1995). However, the earliest batterer groups were very loosely-structured and focused both on self-improvement through peer help and raising awareness of domestic violence, and were non-theoretically based in the counseling they offered (Adams and McCormick, 1982; Johnson and Kanzler, 1993). Batterer Intervention Programs (also known as BIP's) ultimately built upon these early male treatment groups and adopted similar ideas about the centrality of positive peer influence in changing battering behaviors.

The creation of batterer intervention programs has its genesis in the 1970's, with the feminist movement's focus on the lack of resources available to battered women and the lack of

punishment for abusers (Tolman and Edleson, 1995). Female activists viewed male-perpetrated domestic violence as the starkest example of the constant violation of women's rights in the U.S (Schechter, 1982). Treatment programs for batterers, aimed at stopping the abuse through a variety of psychological approaches, became increasingly popular with judges, as arrest and prosecution became normalized sanctions of domestic violence in the 1980's (Buzawa and Buzawa, 1996). The pool of sentenced batterers increased and treatment programs took on a new importance (Rebovich, 1996; Hanna, 1996), as a result of offenders initially receiving jail sentences. This prompted criminal justice policymakers to increasingly recognize the need to respond to the desire of some victims that their partners not be incarcerated (Jackson, Feder, Forde, Davis, Maxwell, and Taylor, 2003). In 1980, California became the first state to mandate treatment for domestic violence offenders (Sonkin, 1988; Johnson and Kanzler, 1993), though the treatment mode/orientation was not specified. In fact, by the late 1990's, almost every state utilized BIP's (Batterer Intervention Programs), also known as SAAP's (Spousal Abuse Abatement Programs) and nearly 80% of the program clients were court-referred (Healey et al., 1998).

The Characteristics of Batterer Intervention Programs

Prior to the rise of batterer groups, batterers were generally treated in individual and couples therapy as a part of their treatment within corrections. However, couples therapy rapidly lost favor and attracted controversy because of the perception that the couples therapy model views both the man and the woman as equal participants in the violent dynamic of the relationship (Babcock and LaTallaide, 2000). As a result of this "blaming the victim" controversy, couples therapy was actually banned in 20 states as a court-mandated intervention for domestic violence (Healey et al., 1998).

Accordingly, the changing paradigm of the batterer treatment group was that group treatment for batterers is more appropriate than individual treatment because it expands the social network of batterers to men who support non-abusive norms of behavior (Crowell and Burgess, 1996). From the earliest treatment groups, more contemporary BIP's have become much more structured and utilize small groups focused upon cognitive behavior techniques to end violent behavior (Pirog-Good and Stets-Kealey, 1985). The overall theoretical framework of contemporary BIP's is still feminist-based (Healey, Smith, and O'Sullivan, 1998; Jennings, 1987).

Because the earliest BIP's were psychoeducationally-oriented, such programs aimed to teach offenders about the relationship between patriarchal theory and domestic violence, and sought to teach offenders to confront their controlling attitudes and learn new modes of interaction with their partners (Jackson, Feder, Forde, Davis, and Maxwell, 2003). This Duluth Model, based upon confronting patriarchal theory, is still the most widespread BIP in the nation (Jackson et al., 2003). However, cognitive-behavior BIP's are also popular and concentrates on cultivating the offenders' skills and improving their anger management, since cognitive-behavior BIP practitioners view battering as the result of thinking errors (Jackson et al., 2003). The last major BIP model, group practice, views battering as stemming from multiple causes and thus needed a psychoeducational, cognitive-behavioral, and group intervention (Jackson et al., 2003).

While the batterer program methods are diverse and eclectic, some common themes have emerged, along with a fairly standardized curriculum (Taylor and Maxwell, 2005). In terms of the program emphases, one 1985 survey indicated that more than 80 percent of these programs were geared towards boosting the offenders' self-esteem and altering their troublesome attitudes towards traditional sex-roles (Pirog-Good and Stets-Kealey, 1985). In Gondolf 's 1985 survey of

15 model programs and 15 randomly selected programs, programs were characterized as therapeutic if they were focused on treating psychological issues, psychoeducational if they were based upon education in increasing cognitive and social skills, and didactic/confrontational if they were geared towards increasing the offenders' knowledge of and responsibility towards the consequences of domestic violence. Psychoeducational programs were the most popular (47 percent of the survey). Sixty-three percent of programs combined court and non-court related offenders in the same groups. The length and intensity of the programs can vary from days to a year, with one or two sessions per week, and the degree of structure and treatment approach also varies (Taylor and Maxwell, 2005). Most of the programs are short-term, ranging from 6 weeks to 32 weeks (Eisikovits and Edleson, 1989). The overall goals of BIPs focus on justice and accountability, victim safety, and the batterer's successful rehabilitation through skills training, attitude change, and emotional development (Bennett and Williams, 2001).

Saunders (1996) noted the importance in batterer treatment programs of skills training, cognitive approaches, sex role re-socialization, family systems, and trauma-based approaches based upon the idea that domestic batterers are more likely to have witnessed parental violence than non-batterers (Browne, Saunders, and Staecker, 1997). Skills training often consist of modeling of positive behavior by group leaders and other role models. Cognitive approaches are predicated on the assumption that skewed patterns of thinking are the catalyst for negative emotions, which often prompt abuse behavior. Sex role resocialization is based upon aiding batterers to understand the harmful effects of "constricted" male roles and to promote ideas of gender equity. Family systems approaches are based on the idea that the batterer-victim relationship is characterized by destructive cycles of interaction between the partners (Neidig and Freidman, 1984).

Research into the Effectiveness of Batterer Intervention Programs

It is fair to say that Batterer Intervention Programs (BIPs) are highly controversial, and ultimately the research to date reflects this dissent. Critics note that BIPs generally minimize individual batterer cultural, racial, or religious differences, as well as prior histories of abuse, because of fears that such a focus might excuse battering and turn the focus away from the discussion of the impact of male privilege on battering (Mills, Grauwiler, and Pezold, 2006). However, the general proclivity of BIP leaders to focus away from the batterer's family history and identity may be problematic and not helpful, because there is an empirical connection between a childhood history of domestic violence, sexual abuse, and neglect, and a heightened risk of adult offending (Mills, Grauwiler, and Pezold, 2006). Thus, the sometimes-myopic focus of BIPs on male privilege, often to the exclusion of family history, may account for the mixed performance of BIPs in numerous studies.

Some researchers assert that there has not been expansive research into the effectiveness of these various programs (Klein and Crowe, 2008), and the available evidence is mixed and some of it is limited by a lack of scientifically rigorous research design (Maxwell and Taylor, 2005). While there are more than three dozen evaluations of batterer treatment programs (Davis and Taylor, 1999), these studies often conflict and may suffer from poor research designs. There are multiple reasons for the inconsistencies that are replete in the batterer intervention program literature. In short, the main methodological issues with BIP studies include small sample sizes, lack of comparison groups, and improper measurement of treatment outcome (Hamberger and Hastings, 1993; Palmer, Brown, and Barrera, 1992; Tolman and Bennett, 1990). Additional obstacles have included low response rates, high attrition rates, and failure to maintain contact with victims (Mills, Grauwiler, and Pezold, 2006).

One major issue in studies evaluating the success of BIP's is that defining success in treatment is not standardized. Some researchers consider a program as successful if there is a statistically significant reduction in violence (e.g. Neidig, 1986). However, other researchers demand a more transformative manifestation of the batterer, and view programs as successful only if the batterer completely renounces violence against women and pledges to work against it (e.g. Gondolf, 1987). Needless to say, measuring tangible societal change on the basis of a particular batterer treatment program is fraught with difficulty. It is also important to note that high attrition from offenders is also an issue that has limited research into the effectiveness of BIP's (Harrell, 1991), since having a legitimate sample size for a BIP can be a tangible issue.

Additionally, the source of measurement has varied among researchers, as some studies use official indicators, like police records of recidivism, in order to assess program effectiveness. Other researchers use batterer self-report or reports from victims. The source of measurement has a significant impact on the validity of the study, as police data seems to underreport incidents, as compared to victims' reports (Dutton, 1986; Straus, 1991), and batterer self-report is obviously problematic and is likely to be deceptively low. Thus, the best measure is probably one that combines all three source reports (Hamberger and Hastings, 1988), but such a study would be extremely difficult given the voluminous data that would need to be obtained from multiple parties, some of whom might be less than thrilled to be participating.

Regardless of difficulties with research design and controversies over definitional issues, the overall tenor of the research to date indicates that various batterer intervention programs have only a modest effect on preventing recidivism and re-abuse, according to two influential meta-analyses (Babcock, Green, and Robie, 2004; Feder and Wilson, 2005). In fact, when partner reports of physical abuse are considered, successful program outcomes ranged from 53 to 85%

(Tolman and Edleson, 1995), which seems like a great result. However, this may be a misleading finding because a longitudinal study of batterers who had not been enrolled in any treatment groups concluded that many of them ceased their physical abuse (Feld and Straus, 1990). Additionally, lower percentages of success were reported in programs that had lengthier follow-ups and when success was predicated upon victim reports rather than official police data or batterer's self-reports (Deschner, 1984). In fact, contemporary research has indicated that there is actually an inverted relationship between the design rigor of the study and the likelihood of BIP effectiveness (Feder and Forde, 2000; Weisburd, Lum, and Petrosino, 2001). Thus, the question of the effectiveness of the BIP lingers within domestic violence research and it certainly seems fair to say that the research indicates that the real impact of BIPs, if there is one, is short-term and essentially lasts the duration of the batterer's supervision by the courts.

In fact, there have been approximately 35 studies of BIP's to date, and the general theme is that the early, quasi-experimental studies found small results for BIP's but when more methodologically stringent research designs were employed, the results were underwhelming (Babcock, Green, and Robie, 2004). The later studies found a small decrease in re-offending among BIP participants but also indicated that the most motivated offenders in BIP's did seem to alter some of their behaviors (Babcock and LaTallaide, 2000).

One major methodological limitation of the current research overall has been the lack of experimental studies into the topic, though there are a couple of such studies (Tolman and Edleson, 1995). Purely experimental studies are favored by researchers because of the methodological strength of the design therein and the ability to discern the true effects of the program vs. the impact of other factors (Jackson et al., 2003). However, because BIP research is criminal-justice based research, researchers are by definition relying on the judicial system in

order to conduct research and do not have the full control that would be needed in order to employ experimental designs. Therefore, the dearth of experimental research within the BIP literature is a limitation, but with properly-designed quasi-experimental studies, important information can still be obtained.

Based on a synthesis of four major experimental studies in the literature (Dunford, 2000; Feder and Forde, 2000; Palmer, et al., 1992; and Taylor, Davis, and Maxwell, 2001), batterer programs seem to “have modest but positive effects of violence prevention and there is little evidence at present supporting the effectiveness of one BIP approach over another” (Tolman and Edleson, 1995). Two of these four experiments (Dunford, 2000; Feder and Forde, 2000) found no difference in recidivism for men in the batterer program vs. men in the control condition. However, the other two experiments (Palmer, et al., 1992; Taylor, Davis, and Maxwell, 2001) found “small but significant reduction” for men in batterer programs.

Multiple meta-analyses, or standardized syntheses of previous studies, have looked at court-mandated counseling in reducing domestic violence recidivism and have yielded similarly inconsistent findings. Davis and Taylor (1999) found a “fairly substantial effect size” for domestic violence interventions. Babcock, Green, and Robie (2004) looked at a larger number of evaluations than the aforementioned research and found a “small” effect size for BIP programs on recidivism. Feder, Wilson, and Austin’s meta-analysis in 2008 “does not offer strong support that court-mandated treatment for misdemeanor domestic violence offenders” (257) reduces recidivism, as the researchers included only methodologically rigorous studies in their meta-analysis and thus avoided the earlier, methodologically-flawed and likely overly-optimistic studies.

Additional research has yielded key findings on predicting recidivism that included the fact defendants with prior criminal convictions were more likely to re-offend, older defendants were more likely to complete their programs and less likely to be re-arrested, black defendants were less likely to complete their program mandates and more likely to be re-arrested, education does not predict recidivism, defendants with prior drug convictions are less likely to be successful, severity of the current charge (i.e. felony-level charges) does not predict program success, and early compliance predicts future success (Cissner and Puffett, 2006). Other factors that have been found to increase the likelihood of program dropout are low socioeconomic status, abusive and alcoholic early families, mental health and alcohol problems, and previous arrests (Hamberger and Hastings, 1989).

It is also interesting to note that men who attend batterer intervention programs on a voluntary basis are twice as likely to drop out of treatment by three months and are 10% more likely to re-assault their partners (Gondolf, 1996). This finding seems somewhat counterintuitive given the fact that voluntary attendees may be seen as more self-motivated to change, and are also more likely to have college educations, work in a white-collar capacity, maintain employment, and be married (Gondolf, 1996).

The Coordinated Community Response

The needs of battered women are not limited to the narrow confines of the criminal justice system, though it is imperative that the criminal justice system function as a major player in the effort to combat domestic violence. Mandatory arrest policies and protection of women through civil measures have served as a link between the victims and the criminal justice system, but victims also seek protection through other community channels, like battered women's shelters, hospitals, clergy, and other agencies. In fact, the coordinated community response is

essentially a strategy aimed at combating domestic violence which is predicated upon the notion that the criminal justice system is only one component of the community's response to domestic violence. In other words, the criminal justice response simply cannot be society's only form of combating domestic violence; a much more integrated and holistic approach is necessary if domestic violence is going to be seriously attacked from a societal standpoint.

The coordinated community response is a strategy that developed from the Domestic Abuse Intervention Project (DAIP) in Duluth, MN and is centered around the notion that the criminal justice system should partner with various entities in the community, including battered women's shelters, health care workers, government agencies, the media, clergy, etc. in order to have better success in protecting victims and holding batterers accountable (Pence and McMahon, 1999). The central idea of the coordinated community response is that the best interventions for domestic violence occur when every agency within the criminal justice system "clarifies and coordinates" their policies and procedures in order to meet three major goals: 1) to provide for victim safety 2) to promote offender accountability and create specific deterrence and 3) to create a general deterrence for domestic violence within the community (Thelen, 2000). The paramount goal in the coordinated community response is to protect the victim and all other goals are secondary to this most important one (Thelen, 2000). This section will trace the historical roots of the rise of the coordinated community response before discussing the major players in the response, the major components of the response, and research into the overall effectiveness of the coordinated community response.

The Historical Rise of the Coordinated Community Response

In the past 20 years, domestic violence laws and policies have changed dramatically throughout the United States, but the majority of these changes, which largely focus on increased

offender accountability and victim safety, have occurred within the confines of the criminal justice system (Clark, Burt, Schulte, and Maguire, 1996). Along with these changes in the criminal justice system are alterations in societal attitudes which now recognize that domestic violence is a much more complex problem than previously understood, and that an effective response to it requires the effective coordination of multiple agencies and entities that extend well beyond the confines of the actual criminal justice system (Clark, Burt, Schulte, and Maguire, 1996), including health-care providers, shelters, clergy, the media, businesses, and child-welfare agencies. The community at large has also been mobilized in multiple jurisdictions via increased domestic violence education and prevention efforts, but this strategy is relatively new within the overall coordinated community response (Clark, Burt, Schulte, and Maguire, 1996). The coordinated community response is also a manifestation of the systems advocacy that developed in the fight against domestic violence since the mid-1970's, in which the idea is to reform the traditional institutional response to domestic violence and take the totality of battered women's experiences into account in order to promote victim safety and offender accountability (Thelen, 2000).

Coordinated community responses to domestic violence have often been adopted in the wake of high-profile incidents with tragic consequences. For example, Kansas City adopted the response in the aftermath of a domestic violence murder which was largely the result of failures in the city's civil protection procedures, and San Diego did the same following a child-abuse case (Clark et al., 1996). In this way, high-profile cases have galvanized some communities into action, so shocking cases have been linked to the development of this strategy. The coordinated community response recognizes that the traditional criminal justice institutional response to domestic violence has been unsuccessful and that unless all criminal justice and community

agencies work together to defeat domestic violence, batterers will “take advantage of the fragmentation, misunderstanding, and bias of the criminal justice system” to avoid prosecution and conviction for domestic violence (Thelen, 2000: 3).

The Major Players in the Coordinated Community Response

Battered Women’s Shelters

Battered women’s shelters have historically played a large role in the community’s response to domestic violence. Prior to the 1970’s, few shelters even existed (Clark, Burt, Schulte, and Maguire, 1996). Just a decade later, there were more than 800 shelters nationwide (Gelles and Straus, 1988), as part of the increased societal focus on domestic violence. Shelters offer an array of services that are not limited to simply housing victims, including psychological counseling and legal aid. However, most women do not utilize these shelters, as less than 2% of severely abused women seek help from shelters (Gelles and Straus, 1988). Because shelters may be seen as a “last resort” for women (Clark et al., 1996), other community services and agencies also have a significant role to play in the fight against domestic violence. Shelters have an important role to play in the care of victims, but they cannot and do not do it alone. Other domestic violence advocates have asserted that because shelters are both temporary and not used by the majority of battered women, the funding focus of the fight against domestic violence needs to center around better victim protection via holding the offender legally accountable, not simply via the flight of the victim (Frisch, 1992). It is important to note that immediate contact with the victim by a victims-rights advocate is an important part of the coordinated community response, and shelters can at least assist victims in their immediate emergency housing needs, as well as ongoing support meetings (Thelens, 2000).

The Health Care System

The health care system is an essential partner in this fight, even if historically it has not played an active role (Clark et al., 1996). Battered women do seek treatment for their physical and/or psychological symptoms of abuse (Council on Scientific Affairs, AMA, 1992). In fact, some studies indicate that between one-fifth and one-third of women in hospital emergency rooms are there because of domestic violence symptoms (Council on Scientific Affairs, AMA, 1992). Even though these women do not generally self-identify as victims of domestic violence (Clark et al., 1996), health care providers have in recent years recognized the central role they can play in domestic violence interventions. Logically, the goal of protection of the victim which is central to the coordinated community response also depends on medical advocacy for victims (Thelens, 2000).

Thus, certain jurisdictions have now instituted mandatory reporting in cases of suspected domestic violence (Clark et al., 1996). In fact, the Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Hospitals (JCAH) now requires that emergency rooms institute domestic violence screening protocols, though this is not always done routinely (Clark et al., 1996). However, this order is essential because the police do not receive domestic violence reports in almost half of cases—44 percent (Bachman and Carmody, 1994), so it is important that other members of the community are vigilant for signs of abuse because the police cannot be aware of all incidents that transpire. Health-care workers are as likely as any other community member to see the aftermath of domestic violence, and mandated proactive reporting on their part is essential.

Child Protective Services

Child Protective Services has a strong role to play in the fight against domestic violence, given the strong correlation between spousal abuse and child abuse. Children who grow up in a household characterized by domestic violence are at a greater risk for behavioral and

developmental problems, substance abuse, juvenile delinquency, suicide, and abusive adult relationships (Roberts and Burger, n.d., 107). In fact, children who witness domestic violence (but who are not hit themselves) exhibit behavioral, somatic, and emotional problems that are actually consistent with the trauma experienced by physically abused children. Children who are exposed to domestic violence also demonstrate more anxiety, depression, and temperament problems (Holden and Ritchie, 1991). Additionally, these children also suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder later in life (Jaffe, Wolfe, and Wilson, 1990). Children who live in domestic violence situations are more aggressive, antisocial, and fearful (Jaffe et al., 1986) and demonstrate lower social competence than other non-abused children (Wolfe, Zak, Wilson, and Jaffe, 1986). Equally tragic, witnessing parental violence has been shown to be a stronger predictor of future domestic violence than being an abused child. Thus, the cycle of domestic violence transcends the offender-victim relationship and seems to have a generational impact.

Child Protective Services (CPS) has a clear mandate in standing as a strong partner to combat domestic violence, given the fact that domestic violence exists in one-third of families who come into contact with the agency (Findlater and Kelly, 1999). Historically, CPS has not played an active role in addressing domestic violence and has taken a more narrow focus on the abuse and neglect of children. This approach has proven to be short-sighted, given the connection between spousal battery and child abuse (Findlater and Kelly, 1999). In recent years, policymakers have recognized that a more collaborative relationship is needed between CPS and leading domestic violence agencies. In fact, the Duluth, MN Domestic Abuse Intervention Project (DAIP) Advocacy Response, a coordinated community response in that locality, now offers separate parenting classes for men and women in the program in order to convey the

effects of witnessing violence on children, which is a step short of seizing children from the home (Thelens, 2000).

Police Officers

The coordinated community response's level of success depends strongly on the competency of police officers in understanding the dynamics surrounding domestic violence. Thus, most patrol officers receive specialized domestic violence training (Clark et al., 1996), and some jurisdictions like Baltimore and Kansas City have specialized domestic violence units to respond to suspected incidents. This enables officers to specialize in domestic violence and while building up expertise, to also build close working alliances with the prosecutors who present domestic violence cases in court, as well as other victim advocates in the community (Clark et al., 1996).

This training in dealing with domestic violence victims is essential for police officers in promoting the success of the coordinated community response, in order to help change negative attitudes from victims and to further educate victims in the cycle of domestic violence and their future options in protecting themselves and holding their abusers accountable (Frisch, 1992). Street-level officers have the most important contact with victims, often at their most vulnerable and most desperate moments, and it is critical that officers are properly trained in order to ensure that the victims do not cut off contact with the criminal justice system. Unfortunately, battered women are sometimes arrested in error for acts of self-defense, so it is especially crucial that police agencies are properly trained to distinguish between battering and self-defense, and that responding officers do not simply arrest whichever party engaged physically (Thelens, 2000). Therefore, a main goal of the Domestic Violence Project (DVP) in Washtenaw County, Michigan is to ensure that police understand the importance of differentiating between violence

meant to establish power and control and violence which is motivated by self-defense (Thelens, 2000).

Prosecutors

Prosecutors also have an essential role to play in the coordinated community response to domestic violence. Specialized prosecutorial units for domestic violence exist in multiple major localities, and enable prosecutors to both gain insight from victims and also to encourage them to carry through with the process to trial (Clark et al., 1996). However, because victim non-cooperation is common in domestic violence cases, prosecutors in jurisdictions that have specialized units as part of the coordinated community response seem to be better equipped to present their cases around the non-cooperative victims (Clark et al., 1996). Additionally, specialized prosecutorial units often offer the presence of a victim advocate, who facilitates a closer working relationship with the victim. Legal advocacy is an essential part of the coordinated community response, as legal advocates provide direct advocacy for victims, monitor the progress of the case through the legal system, and facilitates training for judges, prosecutors, and probation (Thelens, 2000). For example, as part of the Domestic Violence Project (DVP), legal advocates focus on staying current with all domestic violence laws, translating the stilted legal language of the criminal justice system into the victim's vernacular, keeping the victim informed of all developments in their cases, and supporting victims in making their own decisions as to how to proceed (Thelens, 2000).

Courts

Courts can also play an important role in the coordinated community response, though specialized courts are more common for protection orders in domestic violence cases than for actual criminal cases (Clark et al., 1996). In fact, Kansas City, Mo has established a special

docket in municipal court which deals only with domestic violence cases. While judges initially opposed this effort on the grounds that judges should be “generalists,” not simply specialists of domestic violence, proponents of the docket pointed out that it would likely improve victim’s advocacy services to only have to concentrate on one courtroom. (Clark et al., 1996). In addition, specialized courts as part of a coordinated community response can offer more judicial consistency. Specialized training for judges and other court employees by advocates for battered women also ensures that court personnel remain knowledgeable about all the intricacies of domestic violence (Thelens, 2000).

Probation

Specialized domestic violence units in probation can be a very effective tool in the fight against domestic violence, and communities are also making the pre-trial services/probation department a part of the coordinated community response to domestic violence. The components of specialized DVU’s will be discussed extensively in a following section, so for purposes of this section, the linkage between specialized DVU’s and the coordinated community response is that probation officers have a unique opportunity to interact with many principals in the domestic violence criminal justice system. These principals include offenders, victims, judges, police officers, victim advocates, and mental-health professionals, among others (Clark et al., 1996). Thus, specialized units can allow probation officers to develop closer relationships with all parties, in order to be more responsive to victims’ concerns and offenders’ needs in order to not re-offend (Clark et al., 1996).

Central Features of the Coordinated Community Response and Examples

As mentioned above, central elements of the coordinated community criminal justice response often consist of the expedition of domestic violence cases and the use of specialized

domestic violence units and centralized dockets, as well as the implementation of a more effective and sophisticated system to record information on the offender, the use of specialized and culturally competent interventions, and an increased focus on the interplay between batterer treatment and substance abuse counseling (Healey, Smith, and O'Sullivan, 1998). Additional main tenets of the coordinated community response are the utilization of pretrial screeners, special prosecutors, victim advocates, judges, and probation officers, all of whom specialize to some degree in domestic violence (Healey, Smith, and O'Sullivan, 1998). Thus, the overall theme is that all interested parties work together and work in the most effective and specialized fashion possible.

There are several examples of major US cities that have implemented a coordinated community response to domestic violence. For example, Baltimore, MD centers its response around the Domestic Violence Coordinating Committee (DVCC) (Clark et al., 1996). This committee has existed since 1985, but has benefited from increased funding in 1995 and 1996 in the wake of the Violence Against Women Act (Clark et al., 1996). DVCC members include judges, criminal justice agency members, and board members from the House of Ruth shelter. Additionally, the Baltimore Police Department, Pretrial Release Services, Department of Parole and Probation, and the Maryland State Attorney's Office all have specialized domestic violence units (Clark et al., 1996).

The coordinated community response in the Kansas City, MO area had its genesis largely in the murder of Sherrie Stewart in 1986, who was murdered in front of her children by her estranged husband on Christmas Eve (Clark et al., 1996). This case shocked the consciousness as it illustrated several judicial shortcomings, including the perpetrator's numerous previous domestic violence convictions, as well as the denial of the victim's request for a protection order

because she lacked the \$66 filing fee (Clark et al., 1996). Accordingly, the community instituted many changes, including a 1988 domestic violence task force comprised of various stakeholders in the community and under the leadership of the new police chief, changes in the Circuit Court's protection order processes, the consolidation of the domestic violence docket in Municipal Court, and specialized domestic violence units in both the police and prosecution (Clark et al., 1996). Additionally, two Kansas City hospitals have established specialized programs for domestic violence victims and the Domestic Violence Network (DVN) has helped to coordinate efforts between Kansas City's six shelters and the court system (Clark et al., 1996).

In the wake of 1986 legislation in California which established domestic violence as a felony, the San Diego Domestic Violence Council began in 1989 as a formal task force and forms the cornerstone of San Diego's coordinated community response to domestic violence (Clark et al., 1996). The evolving domestic violence protocol for prosecutors that the task force brainstormed lay the groundwork for San Diego's no-drop prosecutions in domestic violence, as well as San Diego's specialized domestic violence prosecution unit (Clark et al., 1996). In fact, the San Diego Police Department, State and City Attorney's Offices, Probation Department, Children Services Bureau, and South Bay Municipal Court all have specialized domestic violence units (Clark et al., 1996). Ultimately, the San Diego Domestic Violence Council has come to include over 200 members from agencies all over the community, which include social service agencies, the medical community, law enforcement, the prosecution, judges, and the military, and they have 12 subcommittees which deal with issues encompassing all aspects of domestic violence, including law enforcement, shelter, medical, legal, child abuse, ethnic issues, grants and data collection, and education and prevention efforts (Clark et al., 1996).

Research into the Effectiveness of the Coordinated Community Response

The coordinated community response can be quite effective in reducing actual recidivism, as it emphasizes the messages of batterer intervention programs and serves as a motivator to batterers to change their behavior (Latessa, Parks, Allen, and Carlson, 1979). The coordinated community response can also be quite helpful in stimulating new social norms, in a manner that the legal system alone cannot. In other words, involving religious, economic, medical, media, and educational institutions may make a much stronger social reconstitution of the concept of domestic violence than any anti-battering law in itself does (Shepard and Pence, 1999). This is because such an overwhelming show of community cohesiveness demonstrates that the social norms that once tacitly condoned domestic violence are completely shifting, and domestic violence offenders are committing crimes that the community strongly abhors. The coordination of such disparate elements of the community helps to send a message that domestic violence is unacceptable in any form.

Initial analysis of the efficacy of such programs indicates that the coordinated community response may be well-suited to reducing the factors that increase recidivism by the batterer. Gondolf (1995) found that the speed of enrollment in batterer treatment may actually be a better predictor of batterer recidivism than the actual type of criminal justice referral—i.e., diversion vs. conviction, length of program, or content of program (Latessa et al., 1979). Additionally, Puffett and Gavin (2004) found that early non-compliance by a defendant (i.e. failure to promptly enroll in an intervention program) predicts later non-compliance, culminating in re-arrest.

Thus, communities with centralized domestic violence response seem likely to be able to reduce the time between sentencing and official batterer intervention program intake (Latessa et al, 1979). Also, specialized units seem to improve service to victims—e.g. judges who

understand the dynamics of domestic abuse may take more seriously repeat offenders who appear in court and understand the terrible dangers posed by the increased escalation of this violence (Healey, Smith, and O’Sullivan, 1998). In this way, the coordinated community response seems to offer the most effective and targeted intervention for domestic violence.

Additionally, coordination between all agencies involved in domestic violence intervention leads to better information-sharing, which is critical for understanding and assessing the danger level posed by the batterer—many batterers have engaged in domestic violence on numerous occasions which precede their arrest and/or conviction (Latessa et al., 1979). Most importantly perhaps, coordinated community response may be more successful in reducing recidivism among batterers than any one program or philosophy because of the message that it sends to not only the individual batterer, but also society as a whole (Tolman, 1996). Thus, the close cooperation that the coordinated community response encourages and fosters among criminal justice agencies, batterer interventionists, victim advocates, battered women’s agencies, and the community at large will likely produce less recidivism than any discrete anti-domestic violence program or initiative. Coordinated community response also sends a “consistent and clear message” that society views domestic violence as unequivocally unacceptable and that it will not be tolerated (Healey, Smith, and O’Sullivan, 1998).

There is empirical evidence that coordinated community response can be most successful in reducing domestic violence recidivism (Steinman, 1990, 1991; Syers and Edleson, 1992).

Additionally, information sharing among criminal justice agencies regarding the assessment of the danger posed by batterers seem to be effective (Shepard, Falk, and Elliott, 2002). Research also indicates that community corrections agencies combined with specialized DVU’s are effective in reducing future violence (Klein, Wilson, Crowe, and DeMichele, 2005). Thus, there

is rather convincing empirical support for the power of the coordinated community response to domestic violence in reducing recidivism.

Specialized Units in Probation

While the specialized domestic violence is relatively modern strategy to combat domestic violence, specialized units in probation have a long history within criminal justice overall. A foremost example of a specialized unit occurred in 1973 with the Pima County, Arizona Adult Probation Department, which implemented a specialized unit for mentally challenged and handicapped probationers, with assignment to the program delineated by I.Q. scores (Latessa, Parks, Allen and Carlson, 1979). The goals of the program centered around reducing recidivism and helping probationers to integrate professionally and personally into the community via increased training. The Connecticut Department of Adult Probation's specialized drug units in three major state localities demonstrated similar progress (Latessa et al, 1979). These units were characterized by decreased caseloads and the assignment of clients who were generally more problematic than regular probationers. The results after two years of probationary supervision indicated that the specialized drug unit had a recidivism rate of 20 percent, as compared to 32 percent recidivism for the general population of probationers.

Additionally, Maryland established a Special Offender's Clinic in May 1972, which was focused on intensive probation supervision for sex offenders, via weekly support and psychotherapy groups for both sexual and violent offenders (Latessa et al, 1979). Similar to the Maryland specialized units which focused on the recidivism of sex offenders, four Illinois counties created specialized sex offender probation units in 1997 (Stalans, Juergens, Steng, and Lavery, 2004). These units were predicated on the containment model and a strong focus on

intense contact with offenders, reduced caseloads, strict guidelines on sanctions for non-compliance, and mandatory relapse-prevention group therapy.

Accordingly, the specialized DVU was created based on the models of specialized units in Arizona, Connecticut, Maryland, and Illinois, which were predicated upon offering specialized services and attention to handicapped probationers, drug addicts, and sex offenders, respectively. In the sections below, the history of the specialized DVU will be analyzed historically, its components will be explained, several prominent DVU's will be discussed including Chesterfield Community Corrections Services (the focus of this particular dissertation), and the effectiveness of the DVU will be evaluated in light of the available research.

The History of Specialized Domestic Violence Units (DVU's)

There has been a widening of the net in the criminal justice system in the past three decades, as many more domestic violence offenders have found their way into the criminal justice system via increased arrests and prosecution. Research indicates that in jurisdictions in which domestic violence is now aggressively prosecuted, the majority of sentenced batterers are placed on probation (Klein, Wilson, Crowe, and DeMichele, 2008). Accordingly, nationwide probationary rates reflect judges' increasing reliance on probation as a sentencing choice for domestic abusers. The Bureau of Justice Statistics indicates that in 2002 and 2003, 7 percent of probationers nationwide were convicted of domestic violence as their most serious crime, a number which represented 285,179 domestic violence probationers nationwide in 2003 (Glaze, 2002; Glaze and Palla, 2003).

However, domestic violence offenders have a demonstrably-high rate of recidivism. In fact, it has been estimated that 35 percent of domestic violence offenders recidivate (Domestic Violence Initiative, Passaic County, NJ, 2003). Given this troubled track record of domestic

violence offenders in probation, the specialized domestic violence unit became an increasingly-popular approach within the probationary realm to combat domestic violence. Funding from the Federal Violence Against Women Act of 1994 was helpful in financing some of these early specialized units (Klein, Wilson, Crowe, DeMichele, 2008). The 1994 Act provided for the allocation of 1.6 billion federal dollars towards the prosecution of those who perpetrated violent crimes against women.

The rise of the specialized DVU can also be traced to the sheer number of calls to law enforcement regarding repeated domestic violence victimization (Friday, Lord, Exum, and Hartman, 2006). In other words, the corrections system became over-taxed with domestic violence offenders, as a result of tougher policies in the 1980s in the criminal justice system, and the specialized unit became one prominent solution. In fact, the notion upon which the DVU is predicated was largely related to this idea of chronic domestic violence recidivism and the stress that such violence creates on the criminal justice system's resources as a whole. Ultimately, the DVU was designed to perfectly combat this recidivism. In addition, the creation of specialized domestic violence units was also designed to improve victim satisfaction with their experience in the criminal justice system (Friday, Lord, Exum, and Hartman, 2006), since victims had historically been left confused and discouraged following that experience (Waits, 1985).

There are many more specialized domestic violence courts throughout the country than there are specialized domestic violence units in policing, as around 300 jurisdictions have courts fitting this description (Friday, Lord, Exum, and Hartman, 2006). Court personnel have cited the improved services to victims offered by specialized DVU's, as well as increased safety for victims and increased accountability for batterers which these units also offer, as the impetus behind the development of specialized domestic violence courts (Friday, Lord, Exum, and

Hartman, 2006). These courts are able to effectively screen and schedule domestic violence cases based upon their complexity and level of priority (Tsai, 2000). Specialized domestic violence courts with specialized structures, processes, and practices to address domestic violence have also enabled the integrative systems approach that has been shown to be necessary to fully address domestic violence, hence the trend nationwide towards these courts (Keilitz, 2000).

The Components of Specialized Domestic Violence Units (DVU's) in Corrections

The underlying theme of specialized DVU's in corrections is that probation officers who concentrated solely on an abuser caseload would be equipped to more effectively deter abusers from recidivism through increasing supervision, accountability, consequences/sanctions, and treatment (Klein and Crowe, 2008). In this way, a targeted unit would be best able to reduce the over-taxation of the criminal justice system's resources as a result of domestic violence recidivism. The hope was that fewer offenders would be sliding through the cracks and that targeted services would improve the chances of domestic violence offenders by addressing the root causes of their criminality—e.g. mental health and substance abuse issues, as well as employment and education challenges. As will be discussed in the principles of effective correctional interventions section, this underlying theme of DVU's is very consistent with both the risk and need principles, in which interventions are used primarily with high-risk offenders (e.g. Andrews, Bonta, and Hoge, 1990) and that practitioners should target the best predictors of crime and recidivism (e.g. Andrews et al., 1990; Gendreau, 1996). In fact, some researchers have recommended that specialized DVU's accept only those offenders who have committed the worst domestic violence crimes, such as injuring the victim to the extent that long-term medical care is required, committing rape in the course of domestic violence, kidnapping, stalking,

repeatedly violating protective orders, and/or having cases of great complexity (Friday, Lord, Exum, and Hartman, 2006).

Although the specifics of DVU's vary by jurisdiction, these units generally share four major general goals, which are: 1) lowering domestic violence recidivism, 2) enabling the facilitation of the victim's liaison with the criminal justice system by reaching out to victims (Klein and Crowe, 2008), 3) empowering victims to help change dynamics behind battering, via increased services to batterers and helping victims to either leave their abusers or work with probation officials and counselors to end the abuse (Klein and Crowe, 2008) and 4) addressing the major causes of domestic violence recidivism, such as a lack of information sharing among the criminal justice system practitioners, probation officers being overworked with too many cases, a lack of proper supervision over offenders, and inadequate substance abuse treatment for offenders. An increased focus on the creation of a victim safety plan and responsiveness to the victim's needs is also a major concentration of specialized domestic violence units (Friday, Lord, Exum, and Hartman, 2006). The idea is that probation officers with a much smaller clientele will be able to deliver highly offender-specific services and make the proper referrals to mental- health and substance-abuse treatment, as well as to more closely monitor the progress and challenges faced by the offenders. There are several promising examples of specialized DVU's in corrections that will be discussed in the next section, which seem to combine lower measures of recidivism with higher levels of victim satisfaction.

Examples of Specialized DVU's in Corrections

In this section, various specialized DVU's across the country will be discussed. While each have different program emphases, admission criteria, personnel, and level of financial resources, they share the goal of confronting and reducing domestic violence recidivism, often

with funding from the Violence Against Women Act (Klein and Crowe, 2008) and via intensive supervision of offenders, strict accountability, and careful protection of victims. These programs started in the 1970s and continue to the present day.

Several of the specialized DVU's actually have their genesis in the 1970's. Pittsburgh's Domestic Abuse Counseling Center (DACC) is a short-term batterer intervention program which has a strong emphasis on inter-agency coordinated response and collaboration with the wider community, including social service agencies, battered women's agencies, and health organizations (Latessa et al, 1979). The DACC is in existence today, which is a testament to its effectiveness. Baltimore's specialized DVU is similarly proactive. Founded in 1974, city's Family Assault Supervision Team (FAST) consists of probation officers supervising reduced caseloads, thus facilitating greater contact with victims (Latessa et al, 1979). This unit has permitted contact with the most severe batterers, i.e. those who demonstrate the most violence and female/poverty-stricken offenders (Latessa et al., 1979). In this manner, Baltimore's specialized DVU ensures that the most high-risk offenders get the most attention and that they do not fall through the cracks, which also demonstrates adherence to the principles of effective correctional interventions.

Similarly innovative, the Denver Deputy Probation Officer Program is characterized by group of 45 volunteers who supervise low-risk batterers, while staff members supervise high-risk probationers, a victim advocate works with victims, and a psychologist conducts assessments of batterers (Latessa et al, 1979). This is a most ingenious strategy because it frees up a main staffer to supervise high-risk probationers and this enables the participation of staff coordinators, a victim advocate, and a consultant psychologist. It is also important to note that the Denver

specialized DVU epitomizes the “brain trust” idea behind DVU’s, as the Denver unit is marshaling a variety of resources which are not limited to corrections/probation personnel.

Ultimately, the District Court Probation Department in Quincy, Massachusetts has separated itself from other specialized domestic violence units via its heavy focus on substance abuse issues, as well as its trailblazing inception. In fact, the Quincy unit was the first DVU unit within probation and was implemented during the 1980s (Klein and Crowe, 2008). The unit epitomizes a “comprehensive and integrated” approach to domestic violence built on comprehensive collaboration among criminal justice agencies and a stronger emphasis on maximum intensity probation and focus on substance abuse as a major risk factor for domestic violence recidivism (Healey et al, 1998). Practitioners in the unit strongly believe that substance abuse is a catalyst for ultimate domestic violence recidivism and the department actually pays for the weekly mandatory substance abuse tests and screening for individual probationers who cannot afford such tests (Healey et al, 1998). Regardless of whether a particular DVU emphasizes substance abuse treatment as strongly as Quincy does, each of the aforementioned DVUs aims to address domestic violence recidivism through increased contact with and accountability for offenders.

Champaign, Illinois is a contemporary and prototypical case of both the necessity for and the promise offered by specialized DVU’s. In response to the increase in domestic violence arrests in the 1990s, the State Attorney’s Office received federal funding to hire additional staffers to prosecute domestic violence cases (Crowe, Wilson, Klein, and DeMichele, 2008). Subsequently, domestic violence probation caseloads increased from 60 in 1996 to 313 by 1999, which is a four-fold increase. This massive increase over a three-year-span meant that the probationary supervision needed to change, and as a result, a specialized DVU was established

(Crowe, Wilson, Klein, and DeMichele, 2008). In this way, the unit was designed to respond to and alleviate the over-stress on the criminal justice system's resources in chronic domestic violence cases.

Research into the Effectiveness of Specialized DVUs in Corrections

Given the contradictory and confusing tenor of some of the research into overall domestic violence interventions to date, the early research on the effectiveness of the DVU has been predictably mixed and is also quite limited. In addition, because the specialized domestic violence unit is a relatively recent innovation, the literature is lacking (Friday, Lord, Exum, and Hartman, 2006). In fact, other than process evaluations, minimal research on the actual effectiveness of various probation methods in domestic violence supervisions has been done (Klein, Wilson, Crowe, and DeMichele, 2008). This remains a problematic area within the overall framework of domestic violence research, though there have been some interesting studies conducted.

An NIJ study into the Quincy-based specialized DVU concluded that the while probation unit was quite proactive in the supervision of offenders, ensuring frequent contact with and services to the most at-risk offenders (Buzawa, Hotaling, and Klein, 1998), 57 percent of those who received probation for the domestic violence arrest were re-arrested for a new crime within two years of the initial arrest, and 43.6% were arrested for domestic violence (Klein, 2000). However, while research has concluded that merely increasing the number of contacts between offenders and probation officers does not reduce recidivism (Petersilia and Turner, 1991), there is also evidence that suggests that increased supervision combined with therapeutic treatment for batterers does reduce recidivism (Cullen and Gendreau, 2000). This is suggestive of the idea that the success of the DVU is heavily based on how well the component parts work together (i.e. the

community and courts, corrections, and other major players within the criminal justice system), the efficacy of various substance abuse treatments and interventions, and the effectiveness of close probationary supervision and job training initiatives. In addition, these findings are indicative that when specialized domestic violence units adhere to the need, risk, and responsivity principles of effective correctional intervention, successful outcomes often are the result.

A National Institute of Justice study based in the Rhode Island Specialized Domestic Probation Supervision Program, which was instituted in 1994, indicates the conditions under which the specialized DVU has been the most effective in reducing recidivism and the areas within domestic violence that it has been the most helpful. These areas of maximum effectiveness are victim satisfaction, increased officer-offender contact, increased offender accountability, and longer periods without re-arrest. First, Rhode Island's specialized DVU had a positive impact on the level of victim satisfaction as compared to the comparison group of traditional probation offenders (Klein and Crowe, 2008). Perhaps one reason for this satisfaction is that treatment group probation officers were more successful in encouraging victims to report probation violations, such as violations of no-contact orders (Klein and Crowe, 2008).

Additionally, DVU offenders in Rhode Island were much more likely to be identified as having violated their probation conditions as compared to the comparison group (Klein and Crowe, 2008), most likely because of the increased officer-offender contact. In fact, 44% of offenders in the DVU unit were charged with technical violations as compared to just 25% of probationers on traditional probation (Klein and Crowe, 2008). It definitely seems that probation officers in the specialized units held their offenders more accountable for their conduct than did officers in the traditional probation units, based upon their heightened technical violation

statistics. Lastly, the study indicated that the specialized DVU reduced the likelihood of offenders recidivating in terms of new domestic violence offenses, but only for probationers who were not at the highest levels of supervision within the overall specialized unit. Furthermore, specialized DVU's in Rhode Island also resulted in significantly-reduced rates of re-arrest and more lengthy arrest-free periods for most domestic violence offenders within this unit (Klein and Crowe, 2008).

Research into Charlotte, NC's specialized DVU also offered evidence as to the conditions under which the DVU can be most effective, as well as implications for future studies. The data from Charlotte indicated that the DVU selected the most serious and severe cases of domestic violence and that suspects who go through the DVU have less future incidents than suspects who went through regular police patrol procedures (Friday, Lord, Exum, and Hartman, 2006). In fact, offenders selected for the Charlotte DVU generally committed the most serious and injurious domestic violence. However, the success of the DVU was much more questionable in terms of victims because re-victimization appeared to be significantly more related to the severity of the individual domestic violence relationship rather than assignment to the DVU (Friday, Lord, Exum, and Hartman, 2006). Thus, Friday et al (2006) concluded that the best predictor of recidivism was not assignment to the DVU, but was the prior record of domestic violence.

The Principles of Effective Correctional Interventions

Offender Intervention Programs—the Empirical Context

This section will analyze the historical context for the development of the principles of effective correctional interventions, what the principles are, their empirical validity, and how they relate to the analysis of the effectiveness of treatment for domestic violence batterers within the corrections system. While the specialized domestic violence unit (DVU) does not necessarily

represent the strongest example, on face value, of integration of these principles, it is still important to understand the development of these principles in corrections in order to assess the effectiveness of the DVU.

The principles of effective correctional intervention have their genesis in the 1970s, as a result of an article written by Robert Martinson in *The Public Interest*, in which Martinson conducted a meta-analysis and analyzed 231 treatment studies which had been conducted between 1945 and 1967 (Martinson, 1974). As a result of his research, Martinson concluded that most offender treatment programs had no obvious impact on recidivism (Martinson, 1974). Martinson's work represented a direct challenge to the predominant rehabilitative ideal that was the framework of corrections in the United States (Gendreau, Smith, and French, 2006). In fact, the "nothing works" philosophy served as one of numerous factors to the "get tough" policies of the criminal justice system (Erwin, 1986; Wilks and Martinson, 1976). The "nothing works" idea became very appealing to those on both the political left and the right, because liberals were concerned with indeterminate sentences based upon rehabilitation ideals, while conservatives supported the longer prison terms and enhanced capital punishment laws that a non-rehabilitative public policy would likely engender, especially in the socially-chaotic 1970's, post-Vietnam America (Cullen and Gendreau, 1989).

However, there was considerable controversy about this article even when it was published, and Martinson's conclusions were immediately challenged. Martinson had conducted his correctional research with two colleagues, Dr. Doug Lipton and Judith Wilks, and they reviewed programs including intensive supervision, psychotherapy, group therapy, vocational training, educational approaches, medical interventions, and other programs (Sarre, 1999). Martinson actually joined this research team after their work was well underway, so his mastery

of the research material is also questionable (Sarre, 1999). Pivotaly, Martinson published his article which assessed the state of the research without the consent of his co-authors and one year before the final report of the colleagues was issued in 1975 (Sarre, 1999). It is also important to note that the public climate in the U.S. was ripe for acceptance of Martinson's conclusions, as Reagan's very conservative administration came to power in 1980, representing a rightward shift for the country (Hollin, 2000).

Despite the fact that the "nothing works" doctrine became popular and gained widespread public acceptance, Martinson's work and conclusions came under immediate fire from scholars in criminal justice, largely on methodological grounds. One central critique was that Martinson targeted under-funded programs which were unable to provide the services that they advertised (Sarre, 1999). Additionally, Martinson assessed "success" vs. "failure" of a program in a rather rudimentary and simplistic way, as he focused solely on testing programs against re-arrest and conviction rates, and he did not consider a gradual diminishing of criminal activity as a measure of success (Sarre, 1999). Other researchers have pointed out that Martinson also did not consider "program integrity" (McGuire and Priestly, 1993). Ultimately, Martinson himself recanted his initial position that "nothing works" in an article in *Hofstra Law Review*, asserting in 1979 that some correctional treatment programs do work (Martinson, 1979).

An entire school of researchers came to disagree with Martinson's "nothing works" thesis, upon its publishing. The "Canadian School" of rehabilitation provided the strongest challenge to Martinson's initial findings (Cullen, 2002). Members of the "Canadian School" were largely psychologists who found support for their rehabilitative theories in Canadian correctional and governmental policies (Gendreau, Smith, and French, 2006). Members of the Canadian School (e.g Andrews and Kiessling, 1980; Ross and Fabiano, 1985) and their

sympathetic American associates (e.g. Cullen and Gilbert, 1982; Davidson and Robinson, 1975) published a large number of literature reviews and studies to offer evidence that offender treatments do work and to create a more unified theory of effective correctional treatment (Gendreau, Smith, and French, 2006). In fact, in 1987, Gendreau and Ross analyzed over 200 studies on rehabilitation that were originally conducted from 1981 to 1987, and they concluded that many programs analyzed in well-designed studies were demonstrated to work, sometimes reducing recidivism by as much as 80 percent (Gendreau and Ross, 1987). Additionally, one foremost “what works” study was a re-analysis of Martinson’s very own data, which showed that more interventions were helpful than the original analysis indicated (Palmer, 1975).

These studies provided overwhelming evidence for the power and success of correctional treatment programs when conducted under the empirically correct conditions, but the public climate in the U.S. was already strongly oriented against rehabilitation (Sarre, 1999). In fact, in *Mistretta v. United States* decided in 1989, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld new federal sentencing guidelines that removed rehabilitation as a serious aim when sentencing offenders (Sarre, 1999). The 1970’s and 1980’s became characterized by the shift in government funding away from rehabilitation programs towards both crime prevention (i.e. policing), and deterrence (i.e. boot camps and “scared straight” interventions) (Anstiss, 2003).

However, even though the work of the “what works” scholars was overlooked by many U.S. policymakers and practitioners, there are other positive legacies from the research. Perhaps foremost, as a result of the methodical analysis of treatment studies in the various “what works” literature, the principles of effective correctional intervention were identified and will be further discussed in the following sections.

The Development of Effective Correctional Interventions

The primary mechanism through which the principles of effective correctional intervention were empirically developed was the meta-analysis, which eventually became the centerpiece of the “what works” debate in corrections (Gendreau, Smith, and French, 2006). While the principles were developed well before the meta-analysis became a formidable tool in criminal justice and psychological research, the principles were modified through the meta-analysis. The reason that the meta-analysis became a powerful research tool was as a result of the myriad problems within the offender literature (Gendreau and Ross, 1979). These problems included a lack of precision in measuring the impact of offender intervention programs (Gendreau, Goggin, and Smith, 2000), as well as the predominance of “testimonials” in the literature (Gendreau and Ross, 1979).

Meta-analyses represented a chance to address and control for many of these methodological shortcomings that had plagued the literature, as a result of the quantitative rigor that is inherent within this type of analysis, making it a favored research tool in medicine (Copas, 1999). The meta-analysis has generally consisted of, in broad terms, identifying a large number of case-control studies, summarizing each study by effect size, and then examining the observed connection between effect size and study variables related to both treatment and design (Copas, 1999). In fact, meta-analyses of offender intervention programs provided valuable insights for “what works” within corrections, and thus became considered “the way forward in the rather sterile debate over what works” (Copas, 1999: 97).

Overall, many meta-analytical studies concluded that at least some correctional treatment programs had proven effective (Andrews, 1995; Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Gendreau, and Cullen, 1990; Dowden and Andrews, 1999, 2000; Izzo and Ross, 1990; McGuire and Priestly, 1995). These analyses further concluded that the most effective treatment programs were cognitive-

behavioral in nature, highly structured, demonstration-based, and delivered in the community rather than an institution (Izzo and Ross, 1990; Lipsey, 1999). Additionally, meta-analyses concluded that offender treatment programs can be highly-cost effective when even modest reductions in recidivism result (Aos, Lieb, Mayfield, Miller, and Pennucci, 2004). Lastly, effective programs were also shown to focus on specifically addressing the risk factors for recidivism (Andrews, 2001; McGuire, 2002), and were shown to be evidence-based in nature (Aos, Miller, and Drake, 2006).

The exciting and encouraging meta-analytic findings prompted researchers to attempt to further delineate more specific principles of what works in offender treatment programs (Gendreau, Smith, and French, 2006). The initial framework for the principles of effective correctional interventions was formed when researchers began coding the treatment literature and developed the data set with 374 effect sizes (Andrews et al., 1990). This data set was what the authors drew upon in order to generate the principles of effective correctional intervention (Gendreau, Smith, and French, 2006). Ultimately, the following specific principles were identified as having the strongest empirical support, and these principles have been increasingly tightened and specified over the past decade. During the 1990s and early 2000s, Andrews, Cullen, and Gendreau were the leading scholars in developing general principles of effective correctional interventions, which centered around four main guiding concepts:

- Risk Principle—interventions should be used primarily with high-risk offenders (e.g. Andrews, Bonta, and Hoge, 1990). In other words, higher-risk offenders need more intensive services over a longer period of time in order to reduce recidivism.

This principle is based on research that indicates major risk factors for reoffending include a history of antisocial behavior, antisocial attitudes, antisocial associates, problems with family

and parents, substance abuse, school/work problems, and antisocial personality problems (Chapman, 2007). These risk factors can be static or dynamic. In short, the Risk Principle tells practitioners whom to target, and the “what works” literature has indicated that targeting high-risk offenders gives the greatest reduction in criminal behavior, matching levels of treatment services to the risk level of the offender is warranted, and intensive community-based treatment must be used for low-risk, high-needs offenders (Chapman, 2007).

- **Need Principle**—practitioners should target the best predictors of crime and recidivism, also known as criminogenic needs, such as antisocial attitudes and delinquent associations with peers (e.g. Andrews et al., 1990; Gendreau, 1996). This refers to the centrality of a treatment program targeting the dynamic/changeable needs that have been empirically shown to have an impact on recidivism (Fretz, 2006). For example, antisocial attitudes are a criminogenic need because they have an impact on recidivism, while self-esteem is not a criminogenic need, as research does not indicate a connection between self-esteem and recidivism (Fretz, 2006). In fact, programs that target a minimum of four to six criminogenic needs in a high-risk offender population significantly reduce recidivism rates (Gendreau, French, and Taylor, 2002).
- **Responsivity Principle**—refers to the assumption that offenders should not all be treated as the same (Bonta, 1995). The most effective correctional treatment programs match their services to the ability and cognitive style of the offender (Bonta and Andrews, 2003). This principle is divided into general responsivity and specific responsivity, with general responsivity associated with the use of the most effective correctional treatment to alter the criminogenic needs of the offender (Fretz, 2006). Specific responsivity refers to the utilization of program services that match the individual offender’s personality

characteristics, such as gender, language, reading level, ethnicity, and motivation for treatment (Fretz, 2006).

- Fidelity Principle—adherence to program integrity and values must be maintained at all times, and practitioners must focus on the qualifications, skills, and values of staff (Andrews et al., 1990; Cullen, 2002; Gendreau, 1996). The utilization of the first three principles is known as RNR (Fretz, 2006), and the success of the program depends on the ability of the staff to be highly trained and set the proper tone to carry out the RNR principles (Fretz, 2006).

Over time, these four principles were delineated into a highly specific mandate for intervening agencies, which will be discussed in the following section. This mandate became known as the principles of effective correctional intervention.

The Updated Principles of Effective Correctional Intervention

The most current principles are as follows:

- The organization must have a positive organizational culture that is open to new ideas, ethical, responsive, addresses problematic issues in a timely manner, and proactive in terms of solving problems. The organization will ideally have low staff-turnover, frequent training, and open information-sharing (Gendreau, Smith, and French, 2006). This principle is based on an expansion of the original treatment principle.
- The implementation of the treatment program will be based on an exhaustive review of the treatment literature and data, and will occur at a time that the organization does not face any major issue that could jeopardize the program's success (Gendreau, Smith, and French, 2006). This principle is linked to the documented success evidence-based treatment programs (i.e. Aos, Miller, and Drake, 2006).

- The organization will have highly professional management and staffers, including a director with an advanced degree and with several years' experience working within the helping professions, and the majority of the staff will have undergraduate degrees and clinical experience working with offenders (Gendreau, Smith, and French, 2006). This principle is also linked to the original treatment principle.
- Offenders will be assessed on a risk instrument that has proper predictive power and which gives information on their risk-needs, and this assessment will be re-done over time in order to provide optimal treatment and monitor changes (Gendreau, Smith, and French, 2006). This principle is linked to the risk principle.
- The program will employ behavioral treatment modalities and will target the needs of the highest-risk offenders, offenders will spend at least 40% of their time in the program developing pro-social skills, and the ratio of reinforcements to punishments is 4:1 (Gendreau, Smith, and French, 2006). This principle is linked to the need principle, which asserts that by assessing and targeting criminogenic needs for change, agencies can reduce recidivism (Gendreau, French, and Taylor, 2002).
- Program therapists engage in certain core correctional practices, including anti-criminal modeling, effective reinforcement and disapproval, problem-solving techniques, structured learning procedures for skill-building, effective use of authority, relationship practices, and motivational interviewing (Gendreau, Smith, and French, 2006). This principle is linked to both evidence-based correctional treatment programs, as well as to the treatment principle overall.

- The organization will practice inter-agency communication and will refer offenders to other community agencies that can provide relevant services to them (Gendreau, Smith, and French, 2006). This program is also linked to the treatment principle.

These principles have been empirically tested via the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI-2000), which was originally developed in 1989 and which includes 131 items designed to measure the therapeutic validity of a particular program (Gendreau and Andrews, 2001). The CPAI-2000 was specifically designed to assess the quality of therapeutic interventions and has been used to evaluate over 400 offender treatment programs (Gendreau, Goggin, and Smith, 2001; Lowenkamp, 2004), and it is a highly selective evaluation tool, only yielding a passing grade to 30 percent of the offender treatment programs it has evaluated (Gendreau, Smith, and French, 2006). The CPAI-2000 is as a tool that combines both quantitative and qualitative analysis, as individuals who are trained in the application of the CPAI conduct site visits to therapeutic intervention programs and score program characteristics that are included in the CPAI based on a combination of interviews with program directors (qualitative-based research) and a more quantitatively-based review of program materials and data (Lowenkamp, Latessa, and Smith, 2006).

Two studies used an earlier version of the CPAI-2000 to measure the predictive validity of the principles of effective correctional interventions. The first study, a meta-analysis of 173 studies of offender treatment programs (Nesovic, 2003), concluded that Principle 2 has the lowest validity, while Principles 4 and 5 were the strongest (Gendreau, Smith, and French, 2006). The strongest individual predictors were: the program receives appropriate clients, assesses the offenders' dynamic risk factors, has a written manual, practices relapse prevention, hires and trains staff based upon their knowledge and therapeutic skills, and involves evaluators

in the program (Gendreau, Smith, and French, 2006). Another study used the CPAI (an earlier version of the CPAI-2000) to evaluate Ohio-based offender treatment programs (Lowenkamp, 2004). This study concluded that Principles 2, 4, and 5 were the strongest predictors of recidivism (Gendreau, Smith, and French, 2006). In terms of the importance of individual items, the strongest were the following: program designer qualifications, staff trained by the program director, the program valued by the criminal justice stakeholders and the community at large, the offenders' risk level and dynamic needs assessed, the close monitoring of offenders, offenders spending at least 40% of their time in therapeutic activities, program and staff properly matched, the program possessing external quality controls, the assessment of in-program progress, and the presence of ethical guidelines in the program (Gendreau, Smith, and French, 2006). These studies provide compelling evidence for the strength of the theory of effective correctional interventions in determining program success.

Concluding Thoughts

In this chapter, all aspects of domestic violence have been analyzed, including the definition of domestic violence, the widespread scope of domestic violence as a public policy concern, the history of domestic violence laws in the United States and evolution of the strengthening of formal sanctions, the characteristics of domestic violence batterers, the theories of what causes domestic violence, and the criminal justice system response to it from the police, courts', and corrections' perspectives. The development in correctional strategies from batterer intervention programs to specialized domestic violence units in probation to the coordinated community response was discussed in the context of innovations in correctional treatments, as well as the limitations in the successes of specialized domestic violence units which are generally not predicated upon theories of effective correctional interventions.

This dissertation focuses on the topic of specialized domestic violence units; specifically, Chesterfield County's Community Corrections Services is studied, in order to determine which factors seem to have the greatest impact on recidivism/non-successful completion of probation. Social situation and coping theory's link to recidivism form the major theoretical framework of this dissertation, and the state of the research will be advanced via a more thorough understanding of the relationship between a lack of coping resources/stress/lifestyle instability on the part of the offender and ultimate recidivism. Specific measures of lifestyle vulnerability/instability, such as lack of money, lack of education, inability to maintain a steady job, residential instability, substance abuse, and criminal history will be closely analyzed.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Introduction

This chapter discusses the methodology that was utilized in order to examine the effectiveness of the specialized domestic violence unit at Chesterfield Community Corrections Services. The primary goal of this research is to understand the impact, if any, of the specialized domestic violence unit on the recidivism of male clients. In order to do this, the researcher compares case progress and outcomes with male clients from a second locality (Riverside Criminal Justice Agency in Prince George County). The results of this study advances the literature in this area: to enable criminal justice system practitioners to better understand how the DVU reduces recidivism, as well as to develop more targeted interventions for domestic violence offenders, by illustrating the differences in outcomes between clients in a DVU and clients under regular probation conditions.

The Study Sites

Specialized Domestic Violence Unit: Chesterfield Community Corrections

Chesterfield Community Corrections Services (CCS) is located in Chesterfield County, VA, which is the fourth-largest municipality in the state with a population of 316,236 as of 2010. The population is 65% white or Caucasian, 32 percent Black or African-American, and a smaller percentage of other races. Chesterfield Community Corrections' specialized domestic violence unit is the unit under study in this dissertation. CCS provides services to Chesterfield County, VA, as well as Colonial Heights, VA, and was initially created in 1981. The stated mission of CCS, as published on the agency's website, is to "enhance public safety by providing alternatives

to incarceration, effective supervision, treatment options, and victim services to reduce recidivism and improve quality of life.”

The specialized domestic violence unit itself was phased in between 2005 and 2006 with the task of supervising adult offenders referred from the Chesterfield County Juvenile Domestic Relations Court for offenses involving family and/or household members, which includes the intimate partner caseload on which this study concentrates. Additionally, the DVU at CCS also handles cases from Chesterfield County Circuit Court which have been appealed from a lower court and are domestic in nature. The adult offenders supervised at CCS consist of individuals with deferred and/or suspended sentences who have also been ordered by the court to participate in community-based sanctions. The specialized DVU probation officers perform a variety of functions, including working with victim advocates to provide safety planning, education, and support for victims; providing risk needs assessments; supervising caseloads; meeting with clients; and running educational groups. Lastly, the specialized DVU maintains community partnerships with treatment providers, community organizations and government agencies as part of the Chesterfield County Domestic Violence Coordinated Community Response.

The current staff at Chesterfield Community Corrections Services consists of six DVU probation officers, including the supervisor. Caseloads range from 80-145 on average, although the ideal caseload for the unit is between 55-65 cases. This ideal caseload has actually never happened because of the volume of domestic offenses in Chesterfield, many of which are first offenses which makes the offender eligible for CCS and leads to a high caseload per officer.

The following describes the case management of the specialized DVU at CCS as of 2010. Assignment to anger-management counseling or the lengthier and more comprehensive domestic violence group (with a duration of six months as opposed to the two months of anger

management for more minor domestic violence offenses) largely depended on the nature of the offense, the client's previous criminal record, and MOST/OST scores. The anger management classes consisted of more basic-level skills and were taught by CCS probation officers. The six-month domestic violence classes were taught by a licensed clinical social worker who was an expert in domestic violence and who sent written assessment of all clients to individual probation officers, assessing clients' participation, willingness to accept feedback, and likeliness to re-offend. Clients could be expelled from either anger management or the domestic violence group for excessive absences, tardiness, inappropriate behavior, sleeping, or leaving during class.

All clients were screened (but not drug-tested) for substance abuse at initial intake, and depending on specific needs, addicted clients were placed on random color-coded testing in which clients' specific colors were called at unpredictable intervals early in the morning and they were directed to report for drug/alcohol screening. If drugs were detected, clients were then referred to substance abuse treatment with Chesterfield County Mental Health and/or private mental-health practitioners. Scores on the MOST/OST (if necessary) were also helpful towards determining how often clients needed to meet with probation officers (weekly, biweekly, or monthly).

Unlike at RCJA, a positive drug test would not automatically result in a show-cause hearing, if the client was willing to enroll in substance abuse treatment and to make other positive changes in his life. The overall philosophy at CCS is not as much punitive as it is to assist the client to make changes in his life by meeting him where he is at the present time and that change is a process with some bumps along the road. Clients are frequently "congratulated" for completing classes, obtaining jobs, and other positive milestones. While there is strict monitoring of clients at CCS, there is some tolerance for missteps along the way as long as the

client is demonstrating consistent progress overall. Thus, the overall role of the probation officer at CCS is to monitor the client's participation and progress in either anger management or a domestic violence group, completion of community service hours if so assigned, payment of fines, sobriety (if it is an issue), adherence to societal laws, and cognitive/behavioral adjustment in order to make sure that such incidents do not recur in the future.

The Comparison Agency: Riverside Criminal Justice Agency (RCJA)

Riverside Criminal Justice Agency is located in Prince George County, VA which has a population of 25,725 as of 2010. Like Chesterfield County, it is part of the Richmond Metropolitan Statistical Area. The racial makeup of the county is approximately 60% white or Caucasian, 22.5% Black or African-American, and a smaller percentage of other races.

RCJA provides services to Hopewell, Prince George, and Surry. RCJA has three full-time probation officers and one supervisor, who carries a partial caseload of approximately thirty cases. The three full-time probation officers typically each oversee between 50-75 active cases. The mission of the agency is to “encourage offenders and defendants to become productive, law-abiding members of society by personal choice. We want to encourage offenders and defendants the opportunity to acquire the skills and tools necessary to achieve these goals through enhanced supervision and the necessary services.”

RCJA has three levels of supervision for offenders which is determined by a risk assessment performed by a clinician. If it is a first-offense case, the offender is automatically placed on administrative supervision and anger management, without this personal assessment by the clinician, unless something about the offender or the case suggests that a higher level of supervision is needed. An administrative supervision case is seen only once every three months, a medium supervision case is seen once every two months, and a high supervision case is seen

every other week. All clients are referred to anger management therapy a minimum of one time per week. All clients are also called in randomly for drug screens.

In terms of how case management was conducted in 2010, the following best describes the strategy therein. Probation clients were assigned a weekly or biweekly level of supervision (phone contacts or in-person contacts) based upon criminal history and a substance abuse assessment, comprised of the SSI and an initial drug test at intake. Depending on the client's initial performance on probation (i.e. reliability in checking in with his probation officer, not picking up any new criminal charges, obtaining/maintaining steady employment/paying court fines/attending the requisite anger management classes), clients could then be "promoted" to monthly check-ins. However, sanctions for failed check-ins/skipped office visits were immediate, with a letter of non-compliance sent to the client and placed in his file. Sanctions for a failed drug test included immediate notification of the Commonwealth Attorney and generally a Show-Cause hearing, which generally resulted in the extension of probation and substance abuse treatment. Anger management was the generally assigned program for domestic violence clients in RCJA, and consisted of six 90-minute classes taught by a licensed clinical social worker, with written reports on individual clients sent to RCJA upon program completion. Substance abuse treatment varied, depending on the individual client's needs. The local mental health agency provided some classes to clients, while other clients enrolled in therapy with private practitioners or through military providers, since some RCJA clients came from nearby Ft. Lee.

While the penalty for failed drug tests is immediate notification of the Commonwealth Attorney and show-cause notification, there is also a similar philosophy of praising accomplishments of clients at RCJA. It is noteworthy that probation officers at RCJA frequently

congratulate clients for turning their initial attitudes around and become “model clients,” and it is equally clear that probation officers try to meet clients where they are, even if they are in desperate circumstances, in order to help them. RCJA, unlike CCS, does waive court fines if clients are willing to do community service and one probation officer arranged for a client to work at the Boys and Girls’ Club right around the corner from his house as his license was suspended. Thus, client service is a clear goal of RCJA as well as CCS.

Research Hypotheses

There are two primary hypotheses:

- 1) Clients at Chesterfield Community Corrections will have a lower likelihood and number of technical violations while on probation than clients at Riverside Criminal Justice Agency.
- 2) Clients at Chesterfield Community Corrections will have a lower likelihood and number of re-offenses than clients at Riverside Criminal Justice Agency.

The above hypotheses will be considered with a variety of control variables to understand the impact of the DVU.

Research Design

This is a retrospective study examining discharge from probation in calendar year 2010 in order to allow for sufficient follow-up. This study is longitudinal, as the offenders’ re-offenses and technical violations will be examined for at least one year after release from probation. As demonstrated, there are two groups for this study, male domestic violence offenders under supervision at CCS (experimental) and at Riverside (comparison). The comparison site was selected due to the close proximity, demographic similarity, and convenience to the experimental site.

Sample

The target population is domestic violence male offenders from Chesterfield and Riverside Community Corrections who have perpetrated intimate-partner violence. While CCS did not have computerized records of the number of intimate partner cases closed in calendar year 2010 with a male offender, the estimate was several hundred. Per the initial research plan that if that number exceeded 100, a random sample of clients was taken from Chesterfield, with 71 files selected overall.

The comparison sample at RCJA consisted of all intimate-partner cases from calendar year 2010, which totaled 31. This is obviously a disparity between jurisdictions, the implications of which will be discussed further in the next chapter. However, the overall sample size was 101, which still yields informative conclusions for researchers of specialized domestic violence units.

Data Collection

In short, the researcher will extract variables of interest from two main data sources that have already been compiled as part of each client's official records. First, the researcher will extract variables of interest from the closed case files from calendar year 2010 of male clients of both Riverside Criminal Justice Agency and Chesterfield Community Corrections in order to assess case progress and outcomes. Additionally, information on the individual clients' criminal records will be requested from the Virginia State Police. Both Chesterfield Community Corrections and Riverside Community Corrections will request this information from the State Police. In turn, this information will be provided to the researcher (with Study ID numbers only) in order for the researcher to determine the individual client's recidivism. This will help the researchers to address the overall effectiveness of the specialized DVU.

Variables and Measurement

Dependent Variables

There are two dependent variables: recidivism and technical violations. Recidivism is measured as the likelihood (yes/no) and the number of offenses in the calendar year following discharge from probation. In addition, re-offense will be measured by felony vs. misdemeanor and specific criminal code. The criminal code will allow for examination of domestic violence-related re-offenses or not. The second main dependent variable is the clients' technical violations on probation, which encapsulates the client's performance on probation and compliance with the terms of probation. Technical violations will be measured as the likelihood (yes/no) and number during the period of probation. Both of these variables are measured according to the table below.

Table 3.1: Dependent Variables

Dependent Variables	Conceptualization
Re-offense	-yes or no -number of new offenses
Technical Violation	-yes or no -number of technical violations

Independent Variables

The researchers will obtain a variety of data from the closed case files of clients in both the study group and in the control group, in order to understand what factors are correlated with recidivism for domestic violence. The independent variables are the clients' participation in

RCJA (regular probation) vs. clients' participation in CCS (specialized DVU). These variables are measured according to the table below.

Table 3.2: Independent Variables

Independent Variable	Operationalization
Type of Supervision	Specialized DVU=1 Regular Probation=0

Control Variables

The following information on clients in both groups will constitute the main control variables, and can be approximated as three types of controls: demographic, economic, and supervision. The main demographic information consists of clients' age, ethnicity, marital status, educational level, relationship to the victim, and number of children with whom the offender lives. The researchers will also obtain a variety of economic data pertaining to the offender's income level, employment status, household income, home ownership status, receipt of public assistance, residential stability, and insurance status as additional control variables. Finally, in the supervision area, the offender's individual criminal/substance/mental health history will be explored, the nature of the domestic violence offense itself will be further delineated, the offender's M-OST and (if applicable) OST scores will be assessed, as will the level of supervision for the offender in Chesterfield, and the types of services to which the offender was referred. The M-OST is a screening intake questionnaire that all probationers receive. This assessment is only used to determine if the full assessment (the OST) is necessary. The M-OST

was initially developed to aid local probation services filter out unnecessary assessments, given the overwhelming workload which many probation officers face. Because of the unique demands that probationers in the specialized domestic violence unit create, most of them now receive the OST. These control variables are measured according to the table below.

Table 3.3: Control Variables

Variable	Measure
Demographic	
Age	In years
Race	0=White 1=non-white
Marital Status at the time of arrest	0=single 1=married 2=widowed 3=divorced 4=separated
Offender's level of education	0=less than high school 1=high school or GED 2=some college 3=completed college 4=postgraduate/masters

Offender resides with the victim	0=no 1=yes
Economic	
Offender owns his own home	0=no 1=yes
Offender resides with the victim	0=no 1=yes
Offender's employment status	0=unemployed 1=employed part-time 2=employed full-time
Offender's yearly household income at the time of arrest	Amount
Offender receives which type of public assistance	0=none 1=Social Security 2=food stamps 3=disability 4=TANF 5=other
Offender's length of time residing at current residence in months	# of months
Offender's military status	0=never served 1=currently serving

	<p>2=previously served, honorable discharge</p> <p>3=previously served, dishonorable discharge</p>
<p>Offender has medical insurance</p> <p>Supervision</p>	<p>0=no</p> <p>1=yes</p>
Offender's specific psychiatric diagnosis	<p>0=no specific diagnosis is given</p> <p>1=Bipolar disorder</p> <p>2=Depression</p> <p>3=Anxiety</p> <p>4=Anger-management</p> <p>5=other</p>
Was an order of protection in effect at time of defendant's arrest?	<p>0=no</p> <p>1=yes</p>
Did victim in this case require medical attention?	<p>0=no</p> <p>1=yes</p>
Offender's risk score as measured by M-OST	<p>0=low</p> <p>1=medium</p> <p>2=high</p>
Offender's risk score as measured by OST (if applicable)	<p>0=low</p> <p>1=medium</p>

	2=high
Level of probation supervision which offender was placed on	0=low 1=medium 2-high
Outside services to which the offender was referred.	0=none 1=anger-management 2=domestic violence treatment 3=drug/alcohol treatment 4=other
Offender's criminal history	-#of prior offenses -felony or misdemeanor
Length of Time on Probation	# of months

Data Analysis Plan

The researcher will use a combination of Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) and Logistic Regression (Logit) in order to analyze each element of recidivism and test the main hypotheses that offenders at Chesterfield Community Corrections Services will have a lower number and likelihood of technical violations during probation, overall re-arrest, and domestic violence re-arrests than offenders at Riverside Criminal Justice Agency. Ordinary Least Squares Regression in SPSS will allow the researcher to first include the appropriate statistical and theoretical variables in a potential model, test for multicollinearity and remove highly interrelated variables, and then finalize a statistically significant model for the number of re-arrests, domestic violence re-arrests, and number of technical violations while on probation for the agencies.

The researcher will then use the appropriate variables (based on established theoretical and statistical principles and the test of multicollinearity) to create Logit models in SPSS for the likelihood of technical violation while on probation, re-arrest, and domestic violence re-arrest by agency. These SPSS-based models will allow the researcher to reject or affirm the two research hypotheses, while also gaining insight into which variables are most linked to each of the three main elements of recidivism.

The researcher will also create OLS and Logit models in SPSS for the number and likelihood of technical violations, re-arrest, and domestic violence arrest at CCS only, in order to examine which variables are most significant towards predicting recidivism under specialized probation conditions.

Limitations of the Study

There are a number of limitations to this study. First, the extraction of information from closed case files means that the researcher has to rely upon the thoroughness of the individual probation officers' note-taking on clients, and the comprehensiveness therein does vary, sometimes dramatically, by probation officer in Chesterfield Community Corrections Services, as well as at Riverside Criminal Justice Agency.

Second, there are potential limitations inherent in relying on official agency records. There are three general limitations to agency records: 1) data is socially produced; 2) data is not designed for research and 3) error increases with data volume (Maxfield and Babbie, 2009). This dissertation will be relying on probation officers' case records and official data from the State Police, which are not designed for research purposes.

Third, while the two localities in which the agencies under examination are located are comparable in demographics, they are obviously not identical. Chesterfield County is a much

larger county, for example, so there is the risk that differences in clients' performance on probation could be at least partially due to differences between the counties. For example, Chesterfield could offer more job opportunities, just as Prince George might have more affordable housing. Both of those factors influence the overall economic and residential stability of offenders, and thus can have an impact on recidivism. It is clear that Chesterfield County is more economically affluent than Prince George County, as in calendar year 2010, the median household income in Chesterfield was over \$58,537 while in Prince George, the median household income was \$49,877. Additionally, only 4.5% of the population in Chesterfield County was living below the poverty line in 2010, whereas 8.0% of the population in Prince George was. It is possible that the disparate economic conditions in the counties could act as a confounding variable in this research.

Lastly, as mentioned in the sample discussion, there were more than twice as many cases in Chesterfield as there were in RCJA which comprised the overall sample. Even though there were unavoidable reasons for this disparity, there is the risk that due to the small number of cases from RCJA, there are quirks or outliers that are distorting the overall results. Despite these limitations, the overall sample yielded useful information about conditions of recidivism in a specialized DVU. These results will be fully discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter 4

Findings and Data Analysis

Introduction

In this chapter, the results of the data analysis will be presented and discussed. This data was compiled into a database in SPSS and then analyzed using Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) and Logistic Regression (Logit) in response to two primary hypotheses:

- 1) Clients at Chesterfield Community Corrections will have a lower likelihood and number of technical violations while on probation than clients at Riverside Criminal Justice Agency.
- 2) Clients at Chesterfield Community Corrections will have a lower likelihood and number of re-offenses after probation completion than clients at Riverside Criminal Justice Agency.

Ultimately, it is hoped that the results presented in this chapter will enable a further understanding of conditions of recidivism in a domestic violence unit, and how probation officers in both regular and specialized units can deliver the best services to probation clients in order to minimize recidivism.

This chapter is organized in the following manner: a discussion of the overall descriptive statistical results, hypothesis testing, subsequent regression models, with a concluding focus on the study limitations, as well as the summary of findings and a transition to the focus of Chapter 5, the concluding chapter.

Overall Descriptive Statistics: An Investigation of Similarities and Differences Between Chesterfield Community Corrections Services and Riverside Criminal Justice Agency

This section will present information about the overall pre-screening characteristics, probation and performance experiences, and re-arrest information of the offenders. Before overall results are discussed, the statistical veracity of the chapter must be assured. A power analysis was first performed to substantiate the statistical strength of the dissertation and to further investigate whether to retain or reject the null hypothesis. The power analysis for this dissertation yielded an effect size which was 0.80. Overall, the sample size was appropriately large that the researcher would be able to draw meaningful conclusions, based on the power analysis.

Overall Sample Characteristics

Table 4.1 shows the main offender demographic characteristics for both localities and is broken into three categories: demographics, prior criminal history, and probation assessment. There are a number of similarities and differences between the two localities.

Demographic Information

The overall sample is comparable in terms of age. That is, the offenders, on average, are both in their early thirties with the average age of CCS offenders being 32.39 years old and RCJA offenders being 33.65 years old. Chesterfield's overall ethnicity percentages are 61% white and 39% non-white, while RCJA is more ethnically disparate with 52% white and 48% non-white. Even though the majority of offenders are white, there are statistically significant jurisdictional differences ($t=-9.7$, $df=100$). Additionally, most offenders have not been married.

Specifically, 47 percent of CCS offenders have never been married while a higher percentage, approximately 65 percent of RCJA offenders, have never been married.

Table 4.1: Overall Offender Characteristics:

Variables	CCS Sample (n=70)	Percentage	RCJA Sample (n=31)	Percentage
Demographic Characteristics				
Age				
17-26	24	34%	9	29%
27-34	21	30%	6	19%
35-40	11	16%	9	29%
Older than 40	14	20%	7	23%
Mean	32.39		33.65	
Standard Deviation	10.8		10.5	
Race*				
White	43	61%	16	52%
Non-White	27	39%	15	48%
Marital Status				
Never Married	33	47%	20	65%
Married	24	34%	7	23%
Divorced	7	10%	4	13%
Separated	6	9%	0	0%
Education Level*				
Less than H-School	15	21%	11	36%
High School/GED	37	53%	14	45%
Some College	12	17%	3	10%
College	5	7%	3	10%
Post-graduate/Master'	1	1%	0	0%
Employment Level*				
Employed	44	65%	16	53%
Unemployed	24	35%	14	47%
Offender Criminal History				
Total # of Prior Arrests:*				
0	17	24%	4	13%
1	14	20%	3	10%
2	8	11%	3	10%
3 or more	31	44%	21	68%
Mean	2.84		4.13	
Standard Deviation	0.72		0.71	
Assessment:				
Level of Supervision*				
Low	37	53%	2	7%
Medium	30	43%	8	27%
High	3	4%	20	67%
Number of Required Monthly Meetings with Probation Officer*				
1	66	94%	2	6.5%
2	4	6%	2	6.5%
3	0	0%	0	0%
4 or more	0	0%	26	87%
Mean	1.06		3.67	
Standard Deviation	2.03		0.88	

*T-tests indicate statistical significance at 0.05 level

In terms of educational level, there is a statistically significant difference between the localities ($t=-4.0$, $df=100$). CCS has more educated offenders overall, as 53% of their offenders have high school/GED while 36% of RCJA offenders have a lower than high school education and 45% of their offenders have a high school education only. There are also statistically significant jurisdictional differences in employment level according to the t-test ($t=-4.97$, $df=97$), as CCS offenders are more likely to be employed (65% vs. 53%).

Offender Criminal History

Table 4.1 also examines the offender's total number of prior arrests. The reported differences are statistically significant, according to t-tests. Chesterfield offenders have an average of 2.84 prior arrests overall while RCJA offenders have a mean prior arrest record of 4.13 arrests, which constitutes a statistically significant difference ($t=-4.5$, $df=100$). Almost twice as many CCS offenders have never been arrested before, as compared to RCJA offenders (24% to 13%). In contrast, a staggering 68% of RCJA offenders have 3 or more prior arrests while a significantly lower percentage of CCS offenders have that number of prior arrests.

Probation Pre-Screening

The information regarding the probation assessment for classification is provided in Table 4.1. A comparison of localities reveals a statistically significant difference in levels of assigned supervision ($F=69.9$, $df=99$) and required meetings by locality ($t=-6.5$, $df=99$). Specifically, fifty-three percent of offenders in CCS were assigned to low supervision compared to only 7% of RCJA offenders; almost forty-three percent of CCS offenders were assigned to medium supervision with about 27 percent of RCJA offenders, while 67 percent of RCJA offenders and only four percent of CCS offenders were assigned to a high level of supervision.

Finally, a statistically significant difference also exists with the number of assigned monthly meetings. The direction of the relationship shows that RCJA offenders were required to attend more office visits (a mean number of 3.67 visits per month) than CCS offenders (a mean number of 1.06 visits per month). These differences in both supervision level and required meetings are not surprising given that RCJA offenders have a higher number of prior arrests, a predictive risk factor, than CCS offenders.

Examining Probation Characteristics by Locality

Table 4.2 illustrates the main probation performance characteristics for offenders from both localities. As shown, the majority of offenders, regardless of jurisdiction, successfully completed probation. There are, however, a number of statistically significant differences to discuss.

First, there is a statistically significant difference in the time spent on probation according to t-tests ($t=-19.6$, $df=100$), as CCS offenders had a mean probation time of 12.2 months compared to 7.1 months for RCJA offenders. Additionally, there are statistically significant difference in terms of both the number of missed meetings ($t=-5.1$, $df=100$) and the number of positive drug tests over the course of probation. While most CCS offenders (46%) did not miss a single meeting with their probation officer, a significant percentage (almost 67 percent) of RCJA offenders missed 3 or more meetings. This statistically significant difference is reflected in the average number of meetings missed (1.73 for CCS compared to 5.8 for RCJA). However, these results are not surprising because RCJA offenders were assigned more meetings at the outset due to policy differences between the jurisdictions.

Table 4.2: Probation Performance Characteristics:

Variables	CCS Sample		RCJA Sample	
	(n=70)	Percentage	(n=31)	Percentage
Total Number of Months on Probation*				
Mean	12.2		7.1	
Standard Deviation	5.4		2.7	
Number of Missed Meetings*				
0	32	46%	4	13%
1	11	16%	3	10%
2	7	10%	3	10%
3 or more	20	29%	20	67%
Mean	1.7		5.8	
Standard Deviation	2.2		6.1	
Successful Probation Completion				
Yes	55	79%	25	81%
No	15	21%	6	19%
Number of Positive Drug Tests*				
0	62	89%	19	61%
1	2	3%	5	16%
2 or more	6	9%	7	23%
Mean	0.39		0.74	
Standard Deviation	1.58		1.12	

*Statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level according to t-tests

Additionally, although most offenders in both localities did not have a positive drug screen, there are differences in the average number of positive screens by jurisdiction. That is, RCJA offenders were statistically more likely to have a positive drug screen, with 0.74 average positive screens at RCJA vs. 0.39 at CCS ($t=1.26$, $df=100$).

Examining Re-offenses by Locality

Table 4.3 reports the bivariate relationships for technical violations, re-arrests, and domestic violence re-arrest. As shown, most offenders regardless of jurisdiction did not receive a technical violation (61% and 52%, respectively). However, CCS offenders exhibited a higher number of overall re-arrests and specifically domestic violence re-arrests, as compared to RCJA offenders, and these differences are statistically significant.

Table 4.3: Recidivism by Agency

Variables	CCS Sample		RCJA Sample	
	(n=70)	Percentage	(n=31)	Percentage
Technical Violations				
0	43	61%	16	52%
1-2	15	21%	14	45%
3-4	7	10%	1	3%
5+	5	7%	0	0%
Mean	1.11		0.74	
Standard Deviation	1.92		0.89	
Total Number of Re-arrests*				
0	14	20%	19	61%
1-2	34	49%	5	16%
3-4	14	20%	5	16%
5+	8	11%	2	7%
Mean	1.94		1.23	
Standard Deviation	1.82		1.96	
Total Number of Domestic Violence Re-arrests*				
0	25	36%	23	74%
1-2	44	63%	7	23%
3-4	1	1%	1	3%
Mean	0.76		0.36	
Standard Deviation	0.74		0.71	

*Statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level according to t-tests

The mean number of technical violations at CCS averaged at 1.11 and 0.74 for RCJA offenders. However, this difference is not statistically significant. Table 3 indicates that there is a statistically significant difference in the number of re-arrests by jurisdiction, with 1.94 re-arrests for CCS versus 1.23 re-arrests for RCJA ($t=-4.5$, $df=100$). Most RCJA offenders were not re-arrested (61 percent), but most CCS offenders were in fact re-arrested (80%).

Finally, Table 4.3 examines the likelihood of a domestic violence re-arrest by jurisdiction. As shown, the average number of domestic violence charges is higher for CCS clients in a statistically significant manner ($t=3.1$, $df=100$). CCS clients were much more likely to have a re-arrest than RCJA clients. To illustrate, approximately 74 percent of RCJA clients had no domestic violence re-arrests as compared to only 36 percent of CCS offenders. The mean number of domestic violence charges at CCS is 0.76 while it is only 0.36 at RCJA.

Table 4.4: Type of Recidivism by Agency

Agency	Type of Recidivism			Total
	none	misdemeanor only	felony	
Prince George	20 (58.8%)	3 (10%)	8(25.8%)	31
CCS	14(41.2%)	39(55.7%)	17(24.3%)	70
Total	34	42	25	101

A closer look at the type of re-arrests for the charged offenders indicates differences in the level of charges by jurisdictions. Specifically, the data in Table 4.4 indicates that CCS offenders were less likely to receive serious felony charges as compared to RCJA offenders. Almost sixty percent of Prince George offenders received no charges post-probation while only about forty percent of CCS offenders received zero post probation charges. Over fifty-five

percent of CCS offenders had solely misdemeanor arrests post-probation completion while only twenty-four percent of CCS offenders had more serious post-probation felony records. In contrast, over twenty-five percent of RCJA offenders had both misdemeanor and felony arrests post-probation completion and only around 13 percent had solely misdemeanor arrests.

Testing the Hypotheses

Explanation of Statistical Choices

To test both main hypotheses, OLS (Ordinary Least Squares Regression) and Logit (Logistic Regression) was the statistical methods selected in SPSS. There are three primary dependent variables being tested: 1) technical violations 2) re-arrest 3) domestic violence re-arrest only. All dependent variables were measured in two ways: the likelihood (yes/no) and the total number. Therefore, OLS was used for the ratio-level variables and Logit was used for nominal variables. The primary independent variable of interest is locality defined as specialized domestic violence unit probation (CCS=1) or traditional probation (RCJA=0). In order to identify the impact of potential relationships, it is also important to consider control variables in the multivariate models. As such, the following variables were included in each multivariate model: age, race, marital status, the number of treatment referrals, and level of supervision (low, medium, and high). It is important to note that all models were initially run with prior criminal history included as a variable. However, this variable proved to be multicollinear with levels of supervision. Therefore, models were run which included only prior criminal history and excluded levels of supervision. However, most of those models were not significant and lacked explanatory power; therefore, level of supervision was included in the multivariate models, while prior criminal history was excluded.

Employment status and the presence of positive drug tests were excluded from one model each in which multicollinearity was an issue but were included in all other final models; additionally, successful probation completion status was excluded from three models for the same reason but was included in all other final models. The variables were included due to theoretical and statistical appropriateness. Examination of the variables included in each final model does not reveal collinearity issues as indicated by high Variance Inflation Factors (VIF's) and closely-related variables

A Look at Technical Violations

Table 4.5 reflects the OLS model of technical violations by locality. It is important to note that the overall model is statistically significant and explains 18 percent of variation overall. The F-value of 2.785 indicates the goodness of fit of the model and explanatory power of at least one statistically significant variable in the model. In addition, there are two statistically significant predictors of technical violations: locality and supervision level. There is a relationship between the locality and the technical violations, indicating that the experimental locality (CCS) is associated with a higher number of technical violations. This relationship is not in the expected direction. Additionally, there is also a relationship between the level of supervision and technical violations, indicating that, as expected, a higher level of supervision is associated with a higher number of technical violations.

Table 4.5: OLS Model Examining the Number of Technical Violations

Variables	B	SE	Beta	T	Sig
Locality	1.15*	0.48	0.311	2.41	0.018
Ethnicity	-0.265	0.28	-0.095	-0.943	0.348
Marital Status	-0.145	0.15	-0.102	-0.951	0.344
Age	-0.017	0.02	-0.11	-1.048	0.297
Employment Status	0.057	0.18	0.033	0.316	0.753
Supervision Level	0.745*	0.30	0.337	2.512	0.014
Treatment Referrals	0.121	0.07	0.172	1.666	0.099
(Constant)	0.208	1.04		0.201	0.841
R-squared	0.426				
Adjusted R-squared	0.181				
F-value	2.785*				

*Statistically significant variables using alpha=0.05

Table 4.6 reflects the Logit likelihood analysis examining for the likelihood of technical violations. The model is not statistically significant despite the justifiably-chosen variables. In terms of the goodness of fit tests, Cox and Snell R-Square and Nagelkerke R-square indicate that this model explains a lower amount of variation than necessary for a strong model. The statistically significant predictors for the likelihood of technical violations are positive drug tests and levels of supervision. The direction of the relationship for both indicates that positive drug tests and higher supervision levels are statistically significant predictors for a higher likelihood of technical violations.

Table 4.6: Logit Model Examining the Likelihood of Technical Violations

Variables	B	SE	Wald	df	Sig	Exp(B)
Locality	1.233	0.850	2.105	1	0.147	3.431
Age	-0.048	0.032	2.201	1	0.138	0.953
Ethnicity	-0.273	0.510	0.285	1	0.593	0.761
Marital Status	0.213	0.225	0.895	1	0.344	1.237
Positive Drug Tests	2.838*	1.102	6.633	1	0.01	17.084
Supervision Level	0.93*	0.474	3.84	1	0.05	2.534
Treatment Referrals	0.073	0.115	0.404	1	0.525	1.076
Employment	-0.309	0.297	1.079	1	0.299	0.734
Cox and Snell R-square	0.37					
Nagelkerke R-square	0.496					

*Statistically-significant variables in the model at the alpha 0.05 level

A Look at Overall Re-Arrest

Table 4.7 investigates the impact of the specialized domestic violence program on the overall number of re-arrests. The model is statistically significant and accounts for about 45 percent of total variation. When the model for the number of re-arrest is examined, it is found that locality, age, positive drug tests, and successful probation completion are significant predictors, while ethnicity, marital status, employment status, treatment service referrals, and supervision levels are not significant predictors. The positive value for locality and positive drug tests indicate that the specialized domestic violence program (CCS) and positive drug tests are statistically significant predictors for a higher number of re-arrests. Based on the negative values for age and successful probation completion, a younger age and unsuccessful probation completion status are associated with a higher number of re-arrests.

Table 4.7: OLS Model Examining the Total Number of Re-arrest

Variables	B	SE	Beta	t	Sig
Locality	1.098*	0.449	0.267	2.444	0.017
Age	-0.045*	0.016	-0.258	-2.863	0.005
Ethnicity	-0.313	0.260	-0.101	-1.201	0.233
Marital Status	0.061	0.142	0.038	0.428	0.669
Employment Status	-0.263	0.168	-0.135	-1.566	0.121
Treatment Referrals	0.019	0.069	0.025	0.282	0.779
Supervision Level	0.291	0.285	0.118	1.021	0.31
Positive Drug Tests	0.288*	0.111	0.226	2.599	0.011
Successful Probation Comp	-1.56*	0.402	-0.341	-3.881	0.000
(Constant)	3.976	1.006		3.951	0
R=squared:	0.670				
Adjusted R-square:	0.449				
F-value:	7.783*				

*Statistically significant variables in the model according to the alpha=0.05 level

Table 4.8 examines the likelihood of overall re-arrest upon completion of probation. Analysis of model fit reveals that the model is statistically significant and there are three statistically significant variables: age, locality, and level of supervision. The direction of the relationship indicates that the specialized domestic violence unit (CCS) is associated with a higher likelihood of re-arrest. Similarly, the positive value for level of supervision also indicates that a higher supervision level is statistically associated with a higher likelihood of re-arrest. The negative value for age indicates that younger individuals are more likely to be re-arrested. Ethnicity, marital status, positive drug tests, and treatment referrals are not statistically significant predictors of likelihood of re-arrest.

Table 4.8: Logit Model Examining the Likelihood of Re-arrest

Variables	B	SE	Wald	df	Sig	Exp(B)
Locality	3.959*	1.078	13.481	1	0	52.38
Age	-0.068*	0.027	6.263	1	0.012	0.935
Ethnicity	0.273	0.486	0.316	1	0.574	1.314
Marital Status	0.208	0.243	0.735	1	0.391	1.232
Positive Drug Tests	0.369	0.381	0.938	1	0.333	1.447
Supervision Levels	1.367*	0.618	4.895	1	0.027	3.923
Treatment Referrals	-0.065	0.128	0.259	1	0.611	0.937
(Constant)	-1.122	1.748	0.412	1	0.521	0.325
Cox and Snell R-Square	0.339					
Nagelkerke R-Square	0.477					

*Statistically-significant variables in the model at the alpha 0.05 level

A Look at Domestic Violence Re-arrest Only

Table 4.9 reflects the OLS model of domestic violence re-arrest. Analysis of model fit indicates that the model is statistically significant and explains about 12 percent in the total variation in the number of domestic violence arrests. There are two statistically significant predictors in the model: locality and successful probation completion. Ethnicity, treatment referrals, employment status, supervision levels, treatment service referrals, positive drug tests, and age are not statistically significant predictors of the number of domestic violence re-arrests. The direction of the relationship indicates that the specialized DVU (CCS) is statistically associated with a higher number of domestic violence re-arrests, while unsuccessful probation completion status is associated with a higher number of domestic violence re-arrests.

Table 4.9: OLS Model Examining the Number of DV Re-arrests

Variables	B	SE	Beta	t	Sig
Locality	0.45*	0.216	0.272	2.08	0.04
Age	-0.012	0.008	-0.165	-1.53	0.13
Ethnicity	0.07	0.125	0.056	0.559	0.578
Marital Status	0.037	0.068	0.059	0.546	0.587
Employment Status	-0.02	0.081	-0.025	-0.245	0.807
Treatment Referrals	0.024	0.033	0.075	0.713	0.478
Supervision Levels	0.003	0.137	0.003	0.02	0.984
Positive Drug Tests	0.031	0.053	0.06	0.572	0.569
Successful Probation (Constant)	-0.428*	0.193	-0.233	-2.214	0.029
	0.859	0.484		1.773	0.08
Adjusted R-squared	0.124				
F-value	2.488*				

*Statistically significant variables in the model according to the alpha=0.05 level

Table 4.10 examines the likelihood of specifically domestic violence re-arrest. Analysis of model fit indicates that this model is not statistically significant, and both the Cox and Snell and Nagelkerke R-square values are low and thus indicate that this model only explains a small percentage of the overall variation in outcome. The only statistically significant variable in this model is locality, and the direction of this relationship indicates that the specialized DVU (CCS) is associated with a higher likelihood of domestic violence re-arrests. None of the other variables, including age, ethnicity, marital status, positive drug tests, supervision levels, treatment referrals, and employment status are statistically significant predictors of the likelihood of domestic violence re-arrest.

Table 4.10: Logit Model Examining the Likelihood of DV Re-arrest

Variables	B	SE	Wald	df	Sig	Exp(B)
Locality	2.462*	0.782	9.908	1	0.002	11.734
Age	-0.038	0.024	2.537	1	0.111	0.962
Ethnicity	0.498	0.467	1.137	1	0.286	1.646
Marital Status	0.331	0.231	2.055	1	0.152	1.393
Positive Drug Tests	0.396	0.321	1.527	1	0.217	1.486
Supervision Levels	0.251	0.452	0.308	1	0.579	1.285
Treatment Referrals	0.041	0.110	0.142	1	0.707	1.042
Employment	-0.244	0.263	0.861	1	0.353	0.783
(Constant)	-1.594	1.57	1.029	1	0.311	0.203
Nagelkerke R-square	0.311					
Cox and Snell R-Square	0.233					

*Statistically-significant variables in the model at the alpha 0.05 level

Summary of Findings

The overall findings indicate that the experimental locality (CCS) and age (younger) are the most consistent predictors of a higher likelihood and number of re-offenses in general and with regards to domestic violence, specifically. Unsuccessful probation completion, higher levels of supervision, and positive drug tests are associated with higher levels of recidivism, but these variables are statistically significant predictors in the models in a more sporadic, less consistent manner. Because of the unexpected findings regarding the experimental locality (CCS), it is important to examine the sample of CCS offenders only. It is essential to look at only the CCS clients in order to determine if there are risk, program, or demographic factors that assist in identifying characteristics of successful clients.

Models for CCS Outcomes

Examination of only CCS means the availability of additional variables to consider since some information was collected solely at this locality. Specifically, CCS collected information on the offender's M-OST scores. Recall from Chapter 3 that all clients at CCS took the M-OST as an intake screening tool to determine their individual risk level. The M-OST classifies three levels of risk: low (0-2), medium (3-5), or high (6-8). The scores are determined on items ranging from prior criminal history, specific domestic violence history, substance use self-report, and other lifestyle risk factors. The assessment was administered and scored by the individual probation officer. Scores on the MOST were ultimately helpful towards determining how often clients needed to meet with probation officers (weekly, biweekly, or monthly). The M-OST is not the only assessment tool that CCS uses in order to make supervision assignments, as other individual factors are considered with the M-OST results. Overall however, CCS does rely on the M-OST results to at least establish a baseline risk level.

Accordingly, because the specialized domestic violence unit is located at CCS, it is also important to create OLS and Logit models for that agency only, in order to determine what variables are the most important predictors for the number and likelihood of technical violations, post-probation arrests, and domestic violence re-arrests. This will enable a better understanding of conditions of recidivism under specialized probation.

There are three primary dependent variables being tested at CCS: 1) technical violations 2) re-arrest 3) domestic violence re-arrest only. All dependent variables were measured in two ways: the likelihood (yes/no) and the total number. Therefore, OLS was used for the ratio-level variables and Logit was used for nominal variables. In order to determine if there are risk, program, or demographic factors that further explain the unexpected results from CCS, the

following variables were initially included in each multivariate model: age, ethnicity, marital status, employment status, education level, M-OST risk level, the number of outside treatment referrals, and probation completion status. Levels of supervision was initially included as a variable but was dropped due to high correlations with the M-OST risk factor variable; because M-OST is a variable that was only captured at CCS and influences supervision level decisions, it is important to consider.

Ultimately, the variables included in the CCS-specific models are the same as in the overall models for both agencies, with three main exceptions. As mentioned, the M-OST risk level was included in the CCS models, since that is a CCS-specific variable, and education level was also included in order to examine the link in the prior literature on the effectiveness of specialized DVU's between lower education level of offenders and higher levels of recidivism. Because 89 percent of CCS offenders received zero positive drug tests over the course of probation, positive drug tests were not included as a variable in the CCS models. All aforementioned variables were included in the initial models due to theoretical and statistical appropriateness. Examination of the variables included in each final model does not reveal collinearity issues as indicated by high VIF's and closely-related variables. In terms of the expected differences between recidivism models overall and recidivism models for CCS only, the researcher is interested in examining other variables that are more characteristic of specialized probation conditions than traditional probation, such as treatment service referrals, in order to see if these variables are predictors for recidivism.

A Look at the Technical Violations at CCS

First, the model for the number of technical violations at CCS is shown in Table 4.11. Analysis of model fit indicates that the model is statistically significant and accounts for almost 58.6 percent of overall outcomes. The statistically significant predictors in the model are probation completion status and the number of outside treatment service referrals. The direction of the relationship is as expected, as unsuccessful probation completion status is associated with a higher number of technical violations at CCS. Additionally, the direction of the relationship between an increased number of treatment assignment referrals and a higher number of technical violations makes sense because to have a violation, one has to have something that they are supposed to do and then fail to do it (for example, attend domestic violence/anger management classes). A higher number of treatment referrals increase the requirements for offenders, and thus are associated with a higher number of technical violations.

Table 4.11: OLS Model Examining the Number of Technical Violations at CCS

Variables	B	SE	Beta	t	Sig
Age	0.008	0.016	0.046	0.513	0.61
Ethnicity	-0.185	0.249	-0.062	-0.744	0.46
Marital Status	-0.082	0.138	-0.053	-0.593	0.556
Education	-0.04	0.200	-0.018	-0.201	0.841
Employment	-0.07	0.181	-0.034	-0.385	0.701
M-OST Risk Level	-0.044	0.297	-0.014	-0.149	0.882
Treatment Services	0.17*	0.072	0.209	2.375	0.021
Successful Prob. Compt	-3.486*	0.397	-0.751	-8.788	0
(Constant)	3.522	0.87		4.047	0
R-square	0.636				
Adjusted R-square	0.586				
F	12.693*				

*Statistically significant variables in the model according to the alpha=0.05 level

Table 4.12 reflects the model for the likelihood of technical violations at CCS. Analysis of model fit indicates that the model lacks statistical significance; additionally, the Cox and Snell R-square and Nagelkerke R-square are low, suggesting that this model explains a lower amount of variation than would be necessary in a strong model. The only statistically significant predictor in the model is unsuccessful probation completion status, which is associated with a higher likelihood of technical violations while at CCS. Age, education, employment status, marital status, M-OST risk level, and treatment referrals are not statistically significant predictors for the likelihood of technical violations while at CCS.

Table 4.12: Logit Model Examining the Likelihood of Technical Violations at CCS

Variables	B	SE	Wald	df	Sig	Exp(B)
Age	-0.018	0.033	0.29	1	0.59	0.982
Ethnicity	-0.227	0.600	0.143	1	0.706	0.797
Marital Status	0.043	0.276	0.025	1	0.875	1.044
Education	-0.393	0.448	0.768	1	0.381	0.675
Employment	-0.33	0.380	0.757	1	0.384	0.719
M-OST Risk Level	-0.271	0.614	0.196	1	0.658	0.762
Treatment Services	0.177	0.153	1.334	1	0.248	1.193
Successful Probation	-3.736*	1.163	10.321	1	0.001	0.024
(Constant)	3.873	2.005	3.73	1	0.053	48.083
Cox and Snell R-square	0.345					
Nagelkerke R-square	0.466					

*Statistically significant variables in the model according to the alpha=0.05 level

A Look at Overall Re-arrests at CCS

Table 4.13 illustrates the model for the number of re-arrests at CCS. Analysis of model fit indicates that the model is statistically significant and explains about 35 percent of the overall variation in the model. There are four statistically significant predictor variables in the model:

ethnicity, age, employment, and probation completion status. There is a statistically significant relationship between the offender’s non-minority ethnicity, younger age, unemployment, and unsuccessful probation completion at CCS with a higher number of post-probation arrests.

Table 4.13: OLS Model Examining the Number of Re-arrests at CCS

Variables	B	SE	Beta	t	Sig
Age	-0.054*	0.019	-0.323	-2.847	0.006
Ethnicity	-0.658*	0.293	-0.236	-2.248	0.028
Marital Status	0.099	0.163	0.069	0.61	0.544
Education Level	0.431	0.236	0.205	1.827	0.073
Employment	-0.452*	0.213	-0.236	-2.117	0.039
M-OST Risk Level	0.383	0.349	0.132	1.096	0.278
Treatment Services	0.044	0.084	0.058	0.525	0.602
(Constant)	5.637	1.024		5.507	0
Successful Probation	-1.723*	0.467	-0.397	-3.692	0
R-square	0.423				
Adjusted R-square	0.353				
F-value	5.311*				

*Statistically significant variables in the model according to the alpha=0.05 level

Table 4.14 is a model examining the overall likelihood of re-arrest at CCS. Analysis of model fit indicates that the model is statistically significant, and both the Cox and Snell and Nagelkerke R-square values are within an acceptable range of model variation. There are two statistically significant predictors in the model: younger age and higher education level. Significantly, the direction of the relationship reveals that CCS individuals with a higher level of education have a higher likelihood of re-arrest, which is not an unexpected finding. Ethnicity, employment status, marital status, treatment services, M-OST risk level, and successful probation completion are not statistically significant predictors of likelihood of re-arrest at CCS.

Table 4.14: Logit Model Examining the Likelihood of Overall Re-arrest at CCS

Variables	B	SE	Wald	df	Sig	Exp(B)
Age	-.094*	0.04	5.537	1	0.019	0.91
Ethnicity	-.121	0.731	0.027	1	0.869	0.886
Marital Status	.524	0.375	1.96	1	0.162	1.689
Education	1.011*	0.529	3.651	1	0.056	2.75
Employment	-.394	0.473	0.693	1	0.405	0.675
M-OST risk	.624	0.759	0.676	1	0.411	1.866
Treatment Services	-.121	0.188	0.415	1	0.519	0.886
Successful Probation	-20.264	0.953	0	1	0.998	0
(Constant)	23.872	0.536	0	1	0.998	2.32
<hr/>						
Cox and Snell R-square	0.225					
Nagelkerke R-square	0.371					

***Statistically significant variables in the model according to the alpha=0.05 level**

A Look at Domestic Violence Re-arrests at CCS

Table 4.15 is a model for the likelihood of domestic violence re-arrests at CCS. Analysis of model fit indicates that the model is statistically significant, while the Cox and Snell R-square and Nagelkerke R-square values indicate that the model explains an acceptable amount of overall variation in outcomes. The only statistically significant predictor variable in the model is the offender's education level. The direction of the relationship is that a higher education level is associated with a higher likelihood of domestic violence re-arrests at CCS.

It is important to note that the OLS model for the number of re-arrests at CCS was not included in the models below because analysis of model fit indicates that the model lacks statistical significance and explains only 0.5% of overall variation of outcomes. This is not surprising because there is no variation when one looks at the number of re-arrests for CCS in Table 4.3, as 63 percent of offenders are arrested between 1 and 2 times for domestic violence offenses. Additionally, the only statistically significant predictor in the model is unsuccessful

probation completion status, which is associated with a higher number of domestic violence re-arrests at CCS. Given the lack of variation, the OLS model for CCS domestic violence re-arrests was omitted.

Table 4.15: Logit Model Examining the Likelihood of Domestic Violence Re-arrest at CCS

Variables	B	SE	Wald	df	Sig	Exp(B)
Age	-0.051	0.03	2.911	1	0.088	0.95
Ethnicity	0.102	0.567	0.032	1	0.858	1.107
Marital	0.339	0.258	1.725	1	0.189	1.404
Education	0.809*	0.415	3.806	1	0.051	2.246
Employment	-0.242	0.341	0.502	1	0.478	0.785
Supervision	1.529	0.959	2.545	1	0.111	4.616
MOST risk	-1.268	0.893	2.016	1	0.156	0.281
Successful Probation	-0.581	0.758	0.588	1	0.443	0.559
Treatment Services	-0.059	0.136	0.19	1	0.663	0.942
(Constant)	1.951	1.67	1.359	1	0.244	7.035
Cox and Snell R-square	0.104					
Nagelkerke R-square	0.144					

*Statistically significant variables in the model according to the alpha=0.05 level

CCS Summary

The findings from CCS were in the expected direction in some cases, but were surprising in other aspects. These results will be examined in depth in the next chapter, but for summary purposes, CCS clients who were younger and who were unsuccessful on probation were more likely to engage in activities leading to an increased chance of technical violation or re-arrest. Lack of employment was also implicated (less consistently) in higher levels of recidivism at CCS, which is also a logical finding, as is the link between a higher number of treatment assignments with higher numbers of technical violations at CCS. However, the sporadic association between non-minority ethnicity/higher levels of education with higher recidivism, as

well as the insignificance of the M-OST in predicting levels of recidivism at CCS is surprising in light of both theoretical principles and the previous domestic violence literature.

Study Limitations

Sample Size and Jurisdictional Differences

There are a number of factors that limit the current research which can be strengthened in future studies. First among these are the sample size differences between CCS and RCJA. Over twice as many cases in the sample came from CCS; the result of this disparity is that the thirty-one cases selected from Riverside Criminal Justice Agency could simply represent an aberration in the overall agency handling of intimate-partner violence cases. For example, personnel turnover in probation officer composition could have a huge impact on recidivism numbers in such a small sample, whereas the researcher can be much more confident that given the much larger size of the Chesterfield Community Corrections Services sample, accurate and legitimate trends in probation performance and recidivism were gleaned. Therefore, the major threat to the generalizability of the study, in other words the external validity therein, is the fact that only thirty-one cases could be selected from RCJA. This limitation compromises the researcher's ability to conclude that the results from RCJA can be applicable to other similarly-situated groups, like non-specialized domestic violence probation units. Given the low number of cases in RCJA, there is a legitimate concern about population validity and whether or not the selected cases represent domestic violence probation clients in a non-specialized domestic violence unit.

Additionally, given any study which is based on human records, there is the potential of biases, errors, and inconsistent treatment of probation clients threatening the validity of the study. For example, one probation officer might treat positive drug tests as normal relapses to be expected as part of the rehabilitation process for substance-addicted clients. Another probation

officer might treat such violations as overall intransigence to probation conditions and then formally request probation revocation for addicted clients. It is impossible to “standardize” how government agencies treat clients, so some subjectivity is to be expected, but this could have an impact on the results and the conditions of recidivism both between and among agencies.

Therefore, a potentially significant threat to the internal validity of the study is the confounding variable of different treatment strategies by different probation officers in the experimental and control agencies.

Finally, because this dissertation utilized only official records, there was no possibility to explore in depth the offender’s family background and childhood exposure to violence.

Realistically, such data could only be obtained by a combination of quantitative-qualitative approach, in which offenders under both specialized and traditional probation approaches are interviewed about their early childhood experiences and these recollections are combined with official criminal data. However, this limitation meant that a possibly-significant predictor of future domestic violence (i.e. childhood and familial violence) was not able to be examined in this research.

Also, the fact that this study only followed up one year post-probation completion meant that there was a considerable dimension of recidivism that the researcher could not capture, due to time constraints. One year is not a long enough period of time to say that a domestic violence offender will not re-offend again. It simply means that for twelve months, he has not been re-arrested within the Commonwealth. A study with a ten-year recidivism window would very likely have considerably different results.

Summary and Findings

Basic Recidivism Conclusions

Overall, the bivariate analysis and results for both agencies indicates lower domestic violence re-arrests and overall re-arrests for RCJA offenders. Offenders at CCS had a higher mean number of domestic violence re-arrests, re-arrests overall, and technical violations, and the former two categories were statistically significant. Both the OLS and Logit models for overall re-arrest and domestic violence re-arrests indicated that experimental locality was a statistically significant predictor of higher number and likelihood of arrests and domestic violence arrests. While locality was a statistically significant predictor in the OLS model for the number of technical violations, it was not a statistically significant predictor of the likelihood of technical violations according to the Logit model. Regardless, there is a clear relationship between the locality and the established number of lower technical violations for RCJA.

In terms of specific recidivism at the experimental agency of CCS, younger offenders who are unemployed and do not complete probation successfully are at the greatest risk of recidivism, regardless of any other factors. Counter-intuitively, non-minority ethnicity and a higher level of education have also been implicated in certain levels of higher recidivism at CCS. These findings suggest particular strategies and best-practices that CCS can implement in order to reduce recidivism among this population.

Ultimately, the researcher must reject the research hypotheses: 1) that offenders at CCS will have a lower number and likelihood of technical violations than offenders at RCJA and 2) that offenders at CCS will have a lower number and likelihood of re-offenses (general and domestic violence) than offenders at RCJA. Overall, older offenders at RCJA who have been supervised at a lower level, who successfully complete probation, and who do not have positive drug tests are less likely to recidivate.

Possible reasons for these somewhat surprising findings will be discussed in greater depth in the next chapter, with connections made to the main theoretical bases of the studies.

Significant attention will be paid to the most important predictors for recidivism at CCS, as well as recommendations for how to improve the agency's performance in light of these predictors.

Finally, future research directions will be indicated in light of the limitations of this dissertation.

Chapter 5

Summary and Conclusions

Introduction

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine the effectiveness of Chesterfield Community Corrections Services' specialized domestic violence unit by comparing recidivism at that locality to recidivism at a comparison, traditional-supervision agency, Riverside Criminal Justice Agency. There were three main research questions at the outset: 1) does a specialized domestic violence unit (DVU) result in more favorable outcomes for clients than regular probation conditions? 2) what are the individual variables that are correlated with recidivism on the part of clients in both CCS and RCJA? 3) what are the individual variables that are correlated with non-recidivism on the part of clients in both CCS and RCJA? This dissertation was completed in order to advance the literature on domestic violence community corrections, to enable criminal justice system practitioners to better understand the conditions under which the DVU reduces recidivism, and to allow practitioners to develop more targeted interventions for offenders based upon the findings in this study.

The chapter is organized in the following manner: first, an exposition of the main findings regarding technical violations, re-offenses (general and domestic violence), and offender characteristics implicated in recidivism under specialized probation conditions. Specific connections will be made to the theoretical bases of the study in each main area, along with an analysis of the consistency/inconsistency with the prior literature. Next, tangible policy-based suggestions to improve services for clients of specialized probation will be made followed by overall recommendations for future research based on the limitations of this study, before a final conclusion is offered.

An Analysis of Technical Violations

The data analysis indicates that clients in Chesterfield actually had a higher number of mean technical violations as compared to clients at RCJA (1.11 on average, as compared to 0.74). The findings from the main multivariate models indicate that the main independent variable of the experimental locality (CCS), as well as higher supervision levels, were statistically significant predictors for a higher number of technical violations. Additionally, positive drug tests and higher supervision levels were statistically significant predictors of a higher likelihood of technical violations. It is common-sense that higher supervision levels and higher positive drug screens result in more technical violations, a connection which is reflected in the past research (Gray, Smith, & Maxwell, 2001).

Consistency of the Findings with the Past Literature and Possible Explanations

The finding that CCS offenders received more technical violations than offenders at RCJA was generally consistent with the past literature, which asserts that specialized DVU's do a better job of holding offenders accountable for their mistakes while on probation than traditional probation offices do. According to a study examining a Rhode Island specialized DVU, offenders at the DVU were much more likely to be identified as having violated their probation conditions as compared to the comparison group (Klein and Crowe, 2008), most likely because of the increased officer-offender contact. In fact, 44% of offenders in the DVU unit were charged with technical violations as compared to just 25% of probationers on traditional probation (Klein and Crowe, 2008).

Additionally, the findings in this study concerning the relatively high number of technical violations issued at CCS were consistent with past literature which found that technical violations can actually be a common part of the probation process. In fact, successful probation

completion has been shown to occur even in light of numerous technical violations (Taxman and Cherkos, 1995). Technical violations did not mean automatic probation failure in this study, which was consistent with the past research.

Policy differences between jurisdictions are most likely at the center of this finding, given the statistical significance of positive drug tests as a predictor for the number of technical violations. As outlined in Chapter 3, CCS and RCJA treat their clients in substantially different ways when it comes to the diagnosis and management of substance abuse. RCJA's intake procedure for all clients is to administer a surprise drug test upon reception in the office in order to establish a baseline understanding and identification of substance abuse dependency, a schedule of testing, and assignment to the necessary treatment providers. In contrast, CCS's drug-diagnostic and treatment protocol is largely predicated upon a self-report survey about drug/alcohol use and past record which is administered to clients upon arrival at the office and there is no surprise drug test. In fact, almost 73 percent of CCS clients receive zero drug tests over the course of probation while all RCJA clients are drug-tested at least once.

The problem with this disparity is that, as demonstrated in this study, CCS offenders performed less impressively on probation and post-probation than RCJA offenders did. A possible explanation is that CCS's initial diagnostics simply do not manage to capture all of the substance abuse that is negatively impacting clients' lives. More sophisticated and criminally-experienced clients may understand that self-reporting substance (ab)use will earn one designated random drug and alcohol testing during appointments and perhaps even assignment to COLORS (CCS's system for random and heightened drug-alcohol testing clients in community corrections). Thus, some clients may not answer substance-related questions honestly. It is not hard to understand how a client with undiagnosed substance abuse concerns will perform more

poorly on probation and have a higher likelihood of receiving technical violations, and RCJA seems to do a stronger job of capturing substance abuse needs at the outset of probation.

RCJA and Social Situation/Strain Theory Explanations

An additional explanation for the higher number of technical violations at CCS is that RCJA probation officers understood that their clients generally came into probation with a heightened criminal history and would need a high degree of supervision, patience, and coaching in order to successfully navigate their probation. Recall that social situation/stress and coping theory is a powerful theoretical explanation for the situational nature of domestic violence. Theorists posit that domestic violence occurs because of both structural stress and a lack of coping resources within the family (Gelles, 1998). RCJA clients, as shown in Table 4.1, came into probation with more serious criminal histories and “checkered pasts,” than CCS clients.

An examination of the files reflects that many clients from both localities had lost their licenses for driving offenses and unpaid fines, and thus faced difficulties in getting to appointments. Therefore, while supervision was strict with the small RCJA caseload, the realities of the clients’ lives meant that formally technically violating clients and requiring them to appear at formal show-cause hearings for probation revocation often made very little sense. Clients living in transitory, struggling circumstances do face special obstacles, which require services and referrals to assisting agencies and parties. In other words, even without formally articulating it, RCJA probation officers issued a lower number of formal technical violations and an implicit understanding of Strain Theory’s role in the promulgation of domestic violence could a part.

Both the significant difference in caseload size between the localities, as well as differences in jurisdictional culture, could also play a role in the difference in technical violations by locality. The average amount of cases at RCJA was around 95 per year distributed to two

probation officers while at CCS, the annual caseload was around 550 per year, with each probation officer having a roster of 80-120 cases. Thus, probation officers at CCS may not have had time for the degree of personal coaching that RCJA probation officers did for their male intimate-partner caseload.

Based on the literature, it is also possible that cultural differences in processing offenders may influence differences in the number and likelihood of technical violations as seen between localities. Prior probation research has indicated that minority, drug-using, less educated offenders were more likely to receive technical violations than white, non-drug using, more educated offenders (Gray, Smith, & Maxwell, 2001). Given the findings regarding technical violations, it is possible that CCS processes less-educated minority offenders who fail drug screens in a more punitive manner than RCJA treats similarly-situated offenders.

An Analysis of Re-offenses (General and Domestic Violence)

The results of this research indicate that RCJA has a lower recidivism rate than CCS, both in terms of overall re-arrests and specifically domestic violence re-arrests. The model for the number of re-arrests indicates that the experimental locality (CCS), a younger age, positive drug tests, and unsuccessful probation completion are statistically significant predictors of a higher number of re-arrests. The model for the likelihood of re-arrests indicates that a younger age, experimental locality (CCS), and higher levels of supervision are statistically significant predictors for a higher likelihood of overall re-arrests.

In terms of specifically domestic violence re-arrests, only about 36 percent of CCS offenders were not re-arrested for domestic violence following probation completion, while almost 75 percent of RCJA offenders were not re-arrested for a specifically domestic violence-based crime. The model for the number of domestic violence re-arrests indicates that the

experimental locality (CCS) and unsuccessful probation completion are statistically significant predictors for a higher number of domestic violence re-arrests. Thus, the researcher concluded that a larger volume of recidivism was occurring at the experimental locality.

Disparities in Severity of Re-arrest by Locality

It is important to look beyond the significant differences and understand the types of offenses for which offenders were arrested. The RCJA offenders were more likely to be arrested for a more serious charge. That is, of the CCS offenders who did get re-arrested post-probation completion, the data indicates that almost 70 percent were arrested for only misdemeanors, while of the re-arrested RCJA offenders, almost 67 percent, were arrested for a combination of misdemeanors and felonies. Due to the lack of two mutually exclusive categories, such data cannot be assessed beyond descriptive statistics.

Consistency of the Findings with the Past Literature and Possible Explanations

The prior literature on the effectiveness of specialized domestic violence units has been mixed and fairly limited. Because the specialized domestic violence unit is a relatively recent innovation, the literature is lacking (Friday, Lord, Exum, and Hartman, 2006). However, a major NIJ study was conducted into the Quincy-based specialized DVU which focused heavily on substance-abuse interventions (Buzawa, Hotaling, and Klein, 1998). In this study, the researchers found a generally moderate level of recidivism: 57 percent of those who received probation for the domestic violence arrest were re-arrested for a new crime within two years of the initial arrest, and 43.6% were arrested for domestic violence (Klein, 2000). The two study localities in Virginia obviously are different localities from the main, northeastern-based jurisdictions which have had expansive DVU studies (Quincy, Massachusetts and the entire state of Rhode Island). Despite potential confounding variables caused by jurisdictional and demographic differences, it

is still fair to note that CCS clients were not successful as previous clients in studies examining the effectiveness of specialized DVU's.

Given the findings on re-offenses, it is clear to the researcher that the initial hypothesis could have been better phrased in order to delineate the degree of criminality, rather than simply conceptualizing recidivism as post-probation criminal charges. One interpretation for these surprising findings relates to the fact that RCJA offenders came into their experience on probation with a higher degree of criminal histories than CCS offenders (recall that 24 percent of CCS clients had zero previous arrests while 68 percent of RCJA clients had three or more past arrests). Thus, based on on their past interactions with the system, it is possible to assume knowledge of the system benefitted RCJA clients and they conducted themselves accordingly while on probation and post-probation.

An additional interpretation of these findings is that because RCJA has a smaller ratio of officers to clients, probation officers at that agency had more time to coach offenders. Even though CCS is a specialized domestic violence unit, their caseload is substantial and it is possible that some offenders slip through the cracks simply by not making huge mistakes as opposed to truly learning the lessons they are supposed to while on domestic violence probation.

Analysis of Offender Characteristics at CCS

Unsuccessful probation completion status is associated with a higher number of technical violations at CCS, along with assignment to a higher number of treatment services. The only statistically significant predictor in the model for the likelihood of technical violations is unsuccessful probation completion status. There is a statistically significant relationship between a higher number of re-arrests at CCS and the offender's non-minority ethnicity, younger age, lack of employment, and unsuccessful probation completion status. Also, younger offenders at

CCS with a higher level of education had an increased likelihood of overall re-arrest. Finally, there is a relationship between unsuccessful probation completion at CCS and a higher number of domestic violence re-arrests. Surprisingly, a higher education level is associated with a higher likelihood of domestic violence re-arrests at CCS.

Relationship to the Past Literature and Possible Explanations

The findings in this study that the offenders facing certain lifestyle vulnerabilities were most likely to recidivate were consistent with some risk factors of recidivism such as lower age, unemployment, and positive drug tests. Research suggests that offenders with less “stake in conformity” tended to do more poorly overall than offenders who had a stronger stake in society. Such a concept has been applied to previous domestic violence research revealing that batterers with reduced social ties have a reduced stake in social conformity and thus a greater risk of recidivism (Wooldredge and Thistlethwaite, 1999). For example, Gondolf’s main research indicated that younger, underemployed laborers were highly represented in lack of completion of batterer treatment programs (Gondolf, 1995). Additionally, multiple studies have indicated that younger offenders are more likely to have their probation revoked (Crew, Lutz, Fahrney, and Moriarty, 1998) or to be re-arrested after probation completion (Irish, 1989; Sims & Jones, 1994). Similarly, unemployed offenders (English, Pullen, and Colling-Chadwick, 1996; Morgan, 1994) are more likely to have unsatisfactory probation termination than offenders who are employed full-time. Also, substance has consistently been identified as a factor in recidivism (DeMaris and Jackson, 1987; Hamberger and Hastings, 1990). The above factors assessing one’s stake in conformity (age, employment, and substance abuse) were important indicators of success in the current study.

The surprising finding that a higher education level at CCS is associated with a higher likelihood of domestic violence re-arrest is consistent with some of the prior literature, though other studies have found that higher levels of education generally were associated with greater probation success (Irish, 1989; Sims & Jones, 1997). However, an NCJRS study of reconviction data for over 95,000 men and women who were convicted of felonies or who had that label withheld after conviction found that those who were “formally” designated as felons were significantly more likely to re-offend within two years than those who were not labeled as felons (Chiricos, Barrick, Bales, & Bontrager, 2007). Furthermore, the researchers found that this effect was particularly strong for offenders from higher socioeconomic statuses, such as whites and those who had no prior convictions before the age of 30 (Chiricos et al., 2007).

Accordingly, the findings in this study that there was a higher volume of recidivism at CCS among non-minority and more educated offenders may similarly be connected to Durkheim’s Labeling Theory. In essences, CCS practitioners seemed to face certain risks from offenders on both ends of the spectrum. The danger from the young, unemployed offenders who struggle to successfully complete their probation is that they will become so alienated from the rehabilitation process and society that they will give up and devolve into further criminality. The danger for the more educated offenders at CCS is that Labeling Theory principles might take hold. The more elite sub-group within this agency might respond to the trauma and humiliation of their immersion into the criminal justice system and formal community corrections by eventually committing actions that fit their labels of “domestic abusers/batterers.” Both the findings from this study and from prior research suggests that labeling issues can be a concern in minimizing recidivism among the more elite/socioeconomically-advantaged clientele population.

Strain and Exchange theories (e.g. Agnew, 1992; Messner and Rosenfeld, 1994) are plausible explanations for the CCS-specific recidivism findings. Younger age, non-minority ethnicity, and unemployment are statistically significant predictors for higher numbers of re-arrests according to the model. Exchange theory argues that domestic violence occurs when the perceived benefits of family violence outweigh the perceived costs. The main idea central to this theory, which was developed by Gelles (1983) is that domestic abuse, like many other phenomena, is governed by the principle of costs and rewards, and that violence is used when the costs outweigh the rewards. The underlying principle of exchange/social control theory is that human interaction is guided by the pursuit of rewards and the avoidance of costs, and that this is true in wider society as well as in more micro-level, familial interactions (Gelles and Straus, 1979). The relationship of this theory to CCS recidivism is that clients who have less formal investment in society and who are already struggling have less to lose from expressing their social frustrations through violence—i.e. young clients who already feel disenfranchised from overall society and from more lucrative employment via their criminal records. This population has less to lose with each successive arrest.

Domestic Violence Policy Suggestions

Based on the aforementioned findings of higher post-probation recidivism and more technical violations at CCS as compared to RCJA, the researcher is able to now make recommendations to the appropriate stakeholders at both localities, as well as to practitioners at large. The goal of these policy recommendations is to improve services during probation to clients in both localities, as well as to reduce recidivism in Chesterfield's specialized domestic violence unit. Hopefully, these recommendations can also help to improve services to domestic violence probation clients on a wider scale and to reduce intimate partner violence.

Caseload Size

Because the results of this study were unexpected and the traditional probation office seemingly functioned more successfully in multiple ways than the specialized domestic violence unit, a closer examination of the results was necessary. It is imperative to fully understand the conditions under which RCJA was more effective in necessary in order to make the proper recommendations to CCS in specific, and practitioners of specialized DVU's overall, in order to enhance client success on probation as well as reduce recidivism.

RCJA probation officers averaged 45 cases per calendar year during the study period, while the roster of CCS probation officers ranged from 80-120 cases. Perhaps largely because of the much smaller caseload at RCJA, it appears that probation officers were better able to supervise and form relationships with their clients. In light of this finding, one potential recommendation to CCS officials is to streamline the caseload and to automatically assign all clients who are employed, have no prior domestic violence record, score low risk on the M-OST, do not demonstrate extreme violence towards their victim (i.e. an overnight hospitalization) and receive assignment only to the anger-management class and not to the more comprehensive domestic violence class, to traditional probation supervision conditions under the auspices of less-senior probation officers. This policy change would enable the specialized DVU (helmed by the most experienced officers) to concentrate solely on offenders who indicate a higher need for services at the outset.

This recommendation is grounded in probation research which has demonstrated the danger posed by large caseloads to the probation officer, to the offender, and to the community.

Researchers found that stressors like large caseloads could eventually lead to psychological withdrawal, frequent absenteeism, and high employee turnover (Slate, Wells, & Johnson, 2003). There is also danger posed to both the offender and the success of community corrections based on caseload and workload size. While the Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice (1967) recommended a caseload of no more than 50 files per probation officer (something that CCS exceeds), more contemporary research has indicated that there is not a magic number as much as there is a concern about the increased workload which probation officers have to put in for more criminally-serious offenders (De Michele, 2007). In other words, over-worked probation officers can become inefficient and ineffective. CCS's caseload and workload per offender in the specialized DVU is significant and this researcher suggests that streamlining the domestic violence segment of the client roster can only improve agency performance and employee retention.

Baseline Drug Testing at Both Localities

As mentioned previously, given the link between substance abuse and domestic violence, it is surprising and problematic that a full 73% of the CCS client roster had zero drug tests over the course of probation. Previous data has indicated that between 71 and 85 percent of domestic violence cases involve batterers who are substance abusers (Doherty, 1997). Other studies indicate that more than 50 percent of batterers in criminal justice, mental health, and/or social service settings are substance abusers (Hamilton and Collins, 1981; Leonard and Jacob, 1988). Additionally, substance-addicted clients perform more poorly on probation, so it is essential that this high-risk population be identified early and accurately in order to give them the best chance at success.

In light of this association between substance abuse and domestic violence cases, it is wise for probation officers to drug test all domestic violence offenders upon program arrival. The past literature on the accuracy of self-report for drug dependency among high-risk populations indicates that hardcore users frequently and heavily underreport their usage (Morral, McCaffrey, & Iguchi, 2000). Therefore, it is essential that a baseline record for drug dependency be established at both localities, independent of a self-report from offenders.

Judicious Use of Formal Technical Violations

There is significant empirical support for the idea that technical violations can be an overly punitive measure which largely ensnares probation clients who simply, because of either a lack of education or substance abuse issues, lack certain necessary skills in order to successfully complete probation. However, these clients do not pose a heightened threat of recidivism, according to the research (Gray, Fields, & Maxwell, 2001). In fact, researchers have found a statistically significant association between less educated, substance-addicted offenders and a higher number of technical violations (Gray et al., 2001). The connection between the lower level of education, substance abuse, and a higher number of technical violations appeared to be that drug-addicted, less educated clients were more likely to be unable to fulfill educational and drug treatment requirements while on probation, but crucially were not any more likely to commit additional criminal offenses (Gray et al., 2001).

While it is essential to the success of the community corrections process that clients respect their probation officers and view them as authority figures, and not as peers or friends, the research indicates that a negative relationship in which the probation officer is seen as overly punitive and loses the clients' trust is totally counterproductive to the change process. These studies have confirmed the importance of rapport between probation officer and client in the

success of community corrections overall. Some research has pointed to the class and race divide between officer and client as one obstacle to reducing recidivism (Walsh & Stohr, 2010).

Additional research indicates that the most effective probation officers are able to combat this divide by building client rapport. These officers appear to adopt a “hybrid” style of supervision which combines the best aspects of law enforcement and counseling, as they enforce rules in a firm but fair fashion, clearly lay out expectations and consequences, but also provide support, counseling, and encouragement (Skeem & Manchak, 2008). The research attests to the success of this “hybrid” approach, as offenders with treatment-oriented officers had twice the recidivism rate of offenders with law-enforcement-type officers; however, only 6% of offenders under the supervision of “hybrid” officers recidivated (Paparozzi & Gendreau, 2005). In short, the researcher worries that an excess of technical violations can unnecessarily alienate the client from a very powerful resource: his probation officer, as well as to undermine the trust between both parties which has been demonstrated to be significant to the success of the community corrections process.

Targeted Interventions for Offenders at Risk

In general, this research found that re-offenses are more likely for younger, non-minority, and unemployed individuals, and thus it is important to consider the implications for this population. Based on previous research linking the importance of job-training programs for probation clients to lower levels of recidivism, as well as the specific findings in this dissertation which linked unemployment to recidivism, certain policy directions are indicated. Foremost among them, the researcher asserts that it would be advisable for both localities to consider instituting a mandatory job-training class. A study into the Workforce Development Program instituted for clients at the U.S. Probation Office in Delaware found that probationers who

participated in the program were 58 percent less likely to recidivate one year post-probation as compared to offenders who did not participate in the program (Visher, Smolter, and O'Connell, 2010). The program curriculum was evidence-based and involved assisting probation clients with both educational and vocational skills, networking with potential employers, the formulation of resumes, and practicing interviewing skills (Visher et al., 2010).

The researcher posits that both localities would likely experience a similar drop in recidivism by adopting a less expansive program which nonetheless involves the core components of the highly successful Workforce Development Program. A simple way to institute a largely inexpensive model of this federal program is to require all unemployed offenders in both localities to attend a mandatory job-skills class, perhaps helmed by leading business members of the community who could be persuaded to teach a Saturday class as a public service. Offering formal training to a population which may lack the necessary technological and social skills would be quite useful in targeting offenders on the margins, at a low cost. The most vulnerable clients cannot be allowed to be unemployed during the duration of probation or to maintain extra-legal means of obtaining money, as the recidivism risks are demonstrably too high.

Recommendations for Future Research

Analysis of More Demographically Comparable Locations

As discussed previously, the two localities under examination in this dissertation, while similar overall, differ from each other in some important ways. Riverside Criminal Justice Agency is located in Prince George County, VA which has a population of 25,725 as of 2010. Like Chesterfield County, it is part of the Richmond Metropolitan Statistical Area. The racial makeup of the county is approximately 60% white or Caucasian, 22.5% Black or African-

American, and a smaller percentage of other races. In contrast, Chesterfield Community Corrections Services (CCS) is located in Chesterfield County, VA, which is the fourth-largest municipality in the state with a population of 316,236 as of 2010. The population is 65% white or Caucasian, 32 percent Black or African-American, and a smaller percentage of other races. In addition to the size and racial differences, there are some economic differences between the two localities.

Chesterfield County is more economically affluent than Prince George County, as in calendar year 2010, the median household income in Chesterfield was over \$58,537 while in Prince George, the median household income was \$49,877. Additionally, only 4.5% of the population in Chesterfield County was living below the poverty line in 2010, whereas 8.0% of the population in Prince George was living in poverty. Therefore, the researcher recommends that future studies into specialized domestic violence units match the experimental and control agencies using as similar localities as possible. It was not possible for this study to utilize Henrico County's traditional probation office as the control agency, but a future direction of research could be comparing CCS with Henrico County's traditional probation supervision. Henrico County is more similar to Chesterfield County than Prince George is, in terms of size, demographics, and economic affluence, and more closely matched jurisdictions reduce the possibility of confounding variables based on locality differences in the study results.

Analysis of the Female Dimension of Intimate Partner Violence as Treated by a DVU

Recall that while male batterers are overwhelmingly represented in the criminal justice system (Healey et al, 1998), female batterers absolutely exist and it is very important to understand the dynamics behind this type of abuse in order to fully address domestic violence. The research indicates that female batterers generally fall into one of four groups: lesbian

batterers, women arrested for violent self-defense, angry victims who have engaged in pre-emptive violence to ward off further abuse, and the more intrinsically violent batterer, herself often a victim of some type of previous violence (Healey et al., 1998). It is critical to understand the female-on-male battering dynamic particularly, because it is obviously under-reported for reasons of male shame. Research indicates that male victims of female batterers face social humiliation and the fear that if they come forward and file a complaint, they will be viewed as liars and labeled as the actual aggressors (Douglas and Hines, 2009).

This research focused on recidivism in both a specialized domestic violence unit and a traditional probation office, only encapsulating intimate-partner violence with male batterers and female victims. However, in order to truly understand the effectiveness of the specialized DVU in reducing relationship violence, all types of relationship violence must be explored. The researcher suggests that future studies on DVU's focus on female-on-male battering, as well as male-on-male and female-on-female battering. LGBT relationships still face unfortunate degrees of social bias and stigma from certain parties, and it is essential to see if domestic violence probation services are properly delivered to this population.

Integration of Data from Victims in Future Specialized DVU Studies

This dissertation focused solely on capturing recidivism from official records, i.e. State Police data on criminal records of offenders which was requested by both the experimental and control agencies. The limitation of this research choice is that the data is clear that official records contain vastly under-reported figures for domestic violence. The previous studies do not agree on the actual "dark figure of domestic violence," but there is overall consistency that most domestic violence is not reported to police. According to some research, six out of seven such crimes go unreported (National Clearinghouse for the Defense of Battered Women, 1994) and

only half of domestic violence crimes were reported to the police (Rennison and Welchans, 2000). Other research suggests that less than 25 percent of physical assaults, less than 20 percent of intimate partner rapes, and half of intimate partner stalking were reported to police (Tjaden and Thoennes, 2000). Finally, the National Coalition of Domestic Violence even asserted that only one in one hundred incidents of domestic violence is actually reported to police (Welch, 1994).

Therefore, the researcher recommends that future studies more robustly integrate the victim's voice into analysis of the effectiveness of specialized DVU's. This could be accomplished without compromising the victim's safety in any way by allowing victims in jurisdictions with specialized domestic violence units to anonymously complete surveys in the company of victim-witness representatives. The surveys would focus on the victim's assessment of the offender's progress on probation and if there are unreported incidents of violence, violations of protective orders, or threats. The integration of self-reports with official records would give a fuller picture of recidivism under both traditional and specialized probation conditions.

Inclusion of Additional Data on Offenders in Future Specialized DVU Studies

As mentioned in previous chapters, both social learning theories and Patriarchy Theory are useful explanations for the phenomenon of domestic violence. Because this study was quantitative and relied only on official records, it was largely impossible to learn anything about offenders' childhood exposure to violence (i.e. in a structured interview) or to administer any sort of survey into their general pre and post-probation attitudes on women. While some probation officers made copies of offenders' worksheets and completed homework assignments for various treatment classes, such information was largely bereft in many files. Therefore, the

researcher recommends the integration of additional data on offenders in future studies, in order to more comprehensively examine social learning theories and patriarchy theories' explanatory power in domestic violence.

Concluding Remarks

The data is clear that domestic violence represents a public health threat to women in particular. As mentioned before, recent data suggests that up to three million women are abused by their intimate partners each year (U.S. Department of Justice, March 1998). Additionally, domestic battering is responsible for twenty-six percent of suicide attempts by women (Tark and Flitcraft, 1991). More than half of American couples experience domestic violence at some point during the course of their relationship (Feld and Straus, 1989). From a moral perspective, a civilized and evolved society in which the next president of the United States could very possibly be a female simply cannot tolerate this level of systemic family violence.

As previously discussed, the economic and health costs of domestic violence are also quite high, as almost 1.5 million visits to U.S. emergency rooms each year are the result of domestic violence (Zorza, 1994). The American Medical Association estimates that domestic violence accounts for 21,000 hospitalizations and almost 100,000 days in the hospital each year (Meyer, 1992). In total, domestic violence likely costs employers between three and thirteen billion dollars each year (Zorza, 1994). From a pragmatic perspective, the rebuilding state of the U.S. economy simply cannot tolerate such a loss.

Ultimately, the researcher hopes that this dissertation advances the domestic violence literature and thus helps to refine policymakers' goals and practices by showing that, regardless of the level of community affluence, domestic violence clients supervised in both traditional and specialized conditions can succeed under the right circumstances. This research indicated that

regardless of criminal history and initial screening concerns, clients at both CCS and RCJA could absolutely succeed if given the right support, guidance, encouragement, services, and direction. Particular attention must be paid to the most vulnerable offenders, most especially young and under-employed offenders, and the proper balance must be struck between holding clients accountable for their mistakes with avoiding the stigma and frustration of formal technical violations and show-cause hearings. If these conditions are satisfied, clients in both traditional and specialized conditions can successfully re-integrate into society, with better tools to manage conflict and to avoid any future criminal involvement. In this way, small and incremental changes in how community corrections agencies handle domestic violence offenders can have profound societal impact in lowering recidivism in a profoundly destructive phenomenon. Hopefully this dissertation can facilitate more effective responses to domestic violence so that the tragic phenomenon in which the sons of abusive fathers one day turn that abuse on others as adults can be markedly diminished: “How many young men fear that there is a monster within them? People are supposed to fear others, not themselves. People are supposed to aspire to become their fathers, not shudder at the thought.”

-Veronica Roth, “Allegiant,” 2013.

References

- Adams, D., & McCormick, A. (1982). Men unlearning violence: A group approach based on the collective model. In M. Roy (Ed.), *The abusive partner: An analysis of domestic battering* (pp. 170-197). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Allen, C., & Straus, M.A. (1980). Resources, power, and husband-wife violence. In M. Straus & G. Hotaling (Eds.), *The social causes of husband-wife violence*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.
- Anderson, K.L. (1997). Gender, status, and domestic violence: An integration of feminist and family violence approaches. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 59, 655-669.
- Andrews, D.A. (1995). The psychology of criminal conduct and effective treatment. In J. McGuire (Ed.), *What works: Reducing re-offending: Guidelines from research and practice* (pp.35-62). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Andrews, D. A. (2001). Principles of effective correctional programs. In L. Motiuk & R.C. Serin (Eds.), *Compendium 2000 on effective correctional programming* (pp. 9-17). Ottawa: Correctional Service Canada.
- Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (1998). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Andrews, D.A., Bonta, J., & Hoge, R.D. (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: Rediscovering psychology, *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17, 19-52.
- Andrews, D. A., & Kiessling, J. J. (1980). Program structure and effective correctional practice: A summary of CaVic research. In R. Ross & P. Gendreau (Eds.), *Effective correctional treatment* (pp. 439-463). Toronto, ON: Butterworths.

- Andrews, D., Zinger, I., Hoge, R., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? *Criminology*, 28, 369-404.
- Anstiss, B. (2003). Just how effective is correctional treatment at reducing re-offending? *New England Journal of Psychology*, 32, 84-91.
- Aos, S., Lieb, R., Mayfield, J., Miller, M., & Pennucci, A. (2004). *Benefits and costs of prevention and early intervention program for youth*. Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- Aos, S., Miller, M., & Drake, E. (2006). *Evidence-based adult correction programs: What works and what does not*. Olympia: Washington Institute for Public Policy.
- Babcock, J.C., Green, C.E., & Robie, C. (2004). Does batterers' treatment work?: A meta-analytic review of domestic violence treatment outcome research. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 23, 1023-1053.
- Babcock, J.C., & LaTailedde, J.J. (2000). Evaluating interventions for men who batter. In J.P. Vincent & E.N. Jouriles (Eds.), *Domestic violence: Guidelines for research informed practice*. Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Babcock, J.C., Waltz, J., Jacobson, N.S., & Gottman, J.M. (1993). Power and violence: The relation between communication patterns, power discrepancies, and domestic violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 61(1), 40-50.
- Bachman, R., & Carmody, D.C. (1994). Fighting fire with fire: The effects of victim resistance in intimate versus stranger perpetrated assaults against females. *Journal of Family Violence*, 9(4), 317-331.
- Bailey, J.E., et al. (1997). Risk factors of violence death for women in the home.

- Archives of Internal Medicine*, 157, 777-782.
- Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A social learning analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bard, M. (1970). *Training police as specialists in family crisis interventions*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Bard, M., & Zacker, J. (1971). The prevention of family violence: Dilemmas of community intervention. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 32(4), 677-682.
- Beck, A. (1999). *Prisoners of hate: The cognitive basis of anger, hostility, and violence*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Belknap, J., & Melton, H.C. (2005). Are heterosexual men also victims of intimate partner abuse? Harrisburg, PA: National Electronic Network on Violence Against Women, Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence.
- Bennett, L., & Williams, O.J. (2001). Intervention programs for men who batter. In C.M. Renzetti, J.L. Edleson, & R.K. Bergen (Eds.), *Sourcebook on violence against women*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Black, D.J. (1980). *The manners and customs of police*. New York: Academic Press.
- Black, D.J., & Reiss, A.J. (1967). *Studies in crime and law enforcement in major metropolitan areas*. Washington, DC: Office of Law Enforcement Assistance.
- Bograd, M. (1984). Family systems approaches to wife battering: A feminist critique. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 54, 558-568.
- Browne, A. (1987). *When battered women kill*. New York: Free Press.
- Browne, K., Saunders, D.G., & Staecker, K. (1997). Process-psychodynamic groups for men who batter: Description of a brief treatment model. *Families in Society*, 78, 265-271.

- Burman, B., Margolin, G., & John, R.S. (1993). America's angriest home videos: Behavioral contingencies observed in home re-enactments of marital conflict. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 61*, 28-39.
- Buzawa, E., & Buzawa, C. (Eds.) (1992). *Domestic violence: The changing criminal justice system response*. Westport, CT: Auburn House.
- Buzawa, E and C. Buzawa (Eds.) (1996). *Do arrests and restraining orders work?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Buzawa, E.S., Hotaling, G., & Klein, A. (1998). *The response to domestic violence in a model court*. Washington, DC: NCJRS.
- Cavanaugh, M.M., & Gelles, R.J. (2005). The utility of male domestic violence offender typologies: New directions for research, policy, and practice. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*, 155-166.
- Chiricos, T., Barrick, K., Bales, W., & Bontrager, S. (2007). The labeling of convicted felons and its consequences for recidivism. *Criminology, 45*, 547-581.
- Cissner, A.B., & Puffett, N.K. (2006). Do batterer program length or approach affect completion or re-arrest rates? *Center for Court Innovation*.
- Clark, K.A., Biddle, A.K., & Martin, S.L. (2002). A cost-benefit analysis of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. *Violence Against Women, 8*, 417-428.
- Clark, S.J., Burt, M.R., Schulte, M.M., & McGuire, K. (1996). *Coordinated community responses to domestic violence in six communities: Beyond the justice system*. Washington, D.C: Urban Institute.
- Cook, P.W. (2009). *Abused men: The hidden side of domestic violence*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

- Corry, C. (1992). The role of patriarchy in domestic violence. Equal Justice Foundation.
- Crew, B.K., Lutz, G.M., Fahrney, K., & Moriarty, M. (1998). *The 1997 Iowa adult crime victimization survey*. Center for Behavioral Research: University of Northern Iowa.
- Crowell, N.A., & Burgess, A.W. (Eds). (1996). *Understanding violence against women*. Washington, D.C: National Research Council.
- Cullen, F.T. (2002). *Rehabilitation and corrections programs. crime and public policy, 2nd edition*. San Francisco, CA: ICS Press.
- Cullen, F.T., & Gendreau, P. (1989). The effectiveness of correctional rehabilitation. In L. Goodstein & D.L MacKenzie (Eds.), *The American prison: Issues in research policy* (pp. 23-24). New York: Plenum.
- Cullen, F.T., & Gendreau, P. (2000). Assessing correctional rehabilitation: Policy, practice, and prospects. In J. Horney (Ed.), *NIJ criminal justice 2000*, (pp. 109-175), Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Cullen, F.T., & Gilbert, K. (1982). *Reaffirming rehabilitation*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Company.
- 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, 137-160.
- Davidson, W. S., II, & Robinson, M. J. (1975). Community psychology and behavior modification: A community based program for the prevention of delinquency. *Journal of Corrective Psychiatry and Behavior Therapy*, 21, 1-12.
- Davis, J.E., & Taylor, B.G. (1999). Does batterer treatment reduce recidivism? A synthesis of the literature. *Women and Criminal Justice*, 10, 69-93.

- Davis, R.C., Taylor, B.G., & Maxwell, C.D. (2000). Does batterer treatment reduce violence? A randomized experiment in Brooklyn. Final Report submitted to the National Institute of Justice.
- Davis, R.C., Smith, B.E., & Davies, H.J. (2001). The effects of no-drop prosecution of domestic violence upon conviction rates. *Justice Research and Policy*, 3(2), 1-13.
- Davis, R.C., Smith, B.E., & Henley, S. (1990). *Victim-witness intimidation in the Bronx courts*. New York: Victims' Services Agency.
- DeKeseredy, W.S., & Schwartz, M.D. (1993). Male peer support and woman abuse. *Crime and Delinquency*, 26, 129-151.
- DeMaris, A., & Jackson, J.K. (1987). Batterers' reports of recidivism after counseling. *Social Casework*, 68, 458-465.
- Deschner, J.P. (1984). *The hitting habit: Anger control for battering couples*. New York: Free Press.
- Dobash, R.E., & Dobash, R. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy*. New York: Free Press.
- Dobash, R.P., Dobash, R.E., Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1992). The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. *Social Problems*, 39, 71-91.
- Dunford, F.W. (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.
- Dunford, F.W., Huizinga, D., & Elliott, D.S. (1990). The role of arrest in domestic assault: The Omaha police experiment. *Criminology*, 28(2), 183-206.
- Dutton, D.G. (1986). The outcome of court-mandated treatment for wife assault: A

- quasi-experimental evaluation. *Violence and Victims, 1*, 163-175.
- Dutton, D.G. (1987). The criminal justice response to wife assault. *Law and Human Behavior, 11*(3), 189-206.
- Dutton, D.G. (1988). *The domestic assault of women: Psychological and criminal justice perspectives*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Dutton, D.G., & Golant, S. (1995). *The batterer: A psychological profile*. New York: Basic Books.
- Dutton, D.G., & Starzomski, A. (1994). The psychological differences between court-referred and self-referred wife assaulters. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 21*(2), 203-222.
- Edleson, J.L., & Tolman, R.M. (1992). *Intervention for men who batter: An ecological approach*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Eisikovits, Z.C., & Edleson, J.L. (1989). Intervening with men who batter: A critical review of the literature. *Social Service Review, 63*, 384-414.
- Emery, R.E. (1989). Family violence. *American Psychologist, 44*, 321-328.
- English, K., Colling-Chadwick, S., Pullen, S., & Jones, L. (1996). How are adult felony sex offenders managed on probation and parole? Denver: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice.
- Erwin, B. (1986). Turning up the heat on probationers in Georgia. *Federal Probation, 50*, 17-24.
- Fagan, J. (1988). Contributions of family violence research to criminal justice policies on wife assault: Paradigms of science and social control. *Violence and Victims 3*(3).
- Fagan, J. (1995). *Criminalization of domestic violence: Promises and limits*. Washington, D.C: National Institute of Justice.
- Fagan, J., & Browne, A. (1994). Violence between spouses and intimates. In A.J. Reiss and

- J.A. Roth (Eds.), *Understanding and preventing violence: Volume 3*, (pp. 115-292).
Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Fagan, J., Friedman, E., Wexler, S., & Lewis, V.L. (1984). *National family violence evaluation: Final report Volume 1*. San Francisco: URSA Institute.
- Farley, D., & Magill, J. (1988). An evaluation of a group program for men who batter.
Social Work with Groups, 11(3), 53-65.
- Farrington, K. (1986). The application of stress theory to the study of family violence:
Principles, prospects, and problems. *Journal of Family Violence, 1*, 131-148.
- Feazell, C.S., Myers, R.S., & Deschner, J. (1984). Services for men who batter: Implications
for programs and policies. *Family Relations, 33*, 217-223.
- Feder, L., & Ford, D. (2000). *A test of the efficacy of court-mandated counseling for
domestic violence offenders: The Broward experiment*. Washington, DC: U.S.
Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Feder, L., & Wilson, D. (2005). A meta-analytic review of court-mandated batterer intervention
programs: Can courts affect abusers' behavior? *Journal on Experimental Criminology,*
1, 239-262.
- Feder, L., Wilson, D.B., & Austin, S. (2008). Court-mandated interventions for individuals
convicted of domestic violence. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*.
- Feld, S., & Straus, M. (1989). Escalation and desistance of wife assault in marriage.
Criminology, 27, 121-141.
- Ferraro, K., & Boychuk, T. (1992). The court's response to interpersonal violence:
A comparison of intimate and non-intimate assault. In E. Buzawa & C. Buzawa
(Eds.), *Domestic violence: The changing criminal justice response*. Westport, CT:

Auburn House.

Ferraro, K., & Pope, L. (1993). Irreconcilable differences: Battered women, police, and the law. In N.Z. Hilton (Ed.), *Legal responses to wife assault: Current trends and evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Findlater, J., & Kelly, S. (1999). Michigan's domestic violence and child welfare

collaboration. In J. L. Edleson & S. Schechter (Eds.), *In the best interests of women and children: Child welfare and domestic violence services working together* (pp. 167 to 174). Thousand Oaks, CA.

Ford, D. (1990). The preventive impacts of policies for prosecuting wife batterers. In E. Buzawa & C. Buzawa (Eds.), *Domestic violence: The criminal justice response* (pp. 181-208). Westwood, CT: Auburn House.

Ford, D.A. (1983). Wife battery and criminal justice: A study of victim decision-making. *Family Relations*, 2, 463-475.

Ford, D.A. (1991). Prosecution as a victim power resource: A note on empowering women in violent conjugal relationships. *Law and Society Review*, 1 (2).

Ford, D.A., & Burke, M.J. (1987). *Victim-initiated criminal complaints for wife battery: An assessment of motives*. Paper presented at the Third National Conference for Family Violence Researchers, University of new Hampshire, Durham, NH.

Ford, D.A., & Regoli, M.J. (1993). *The Indianapolis Domestic Violence Prosecution Experiment*. Washington, D.C: National Institute of Justice.

Friday, P.C., Lord, V.B., Exum, M.L., & Hartman, J.L. (2006). *Evaluating the impact of a specialized domestic violence unit*. Washington, D.C: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.

- Frisch, L.A. (1992). Research that succeeds, policies that fail. *The Journal of Law and Criminology*, 83.
- Ganley, A.L. (1995). Understanding Domestic Violence. In C. Warshaw (Ed.), *Improving the health care response to domestic violence: A resource manual for health care providers* (pp. 15-45). San Francisco: Family Violence Prevention Fund and Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence.
- Garner, J. (1997). Evaluating the effectiveness of mandatory arrest for domestic violence in Virginia. *William and Mary Journal of Women and the Law*, 223.
- Garner, J., & Clemmer, E. (1986). *Danger to police in domestic disturbances: A new look*. Washington, D.C: ERIC Clearinghouse.
- Garner, J., & Maxwell, C. (2008). *Crime control effects of prosecuting intimate partner violence in Hamilton County, Ohio from 1993-1998*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Garrett, C.G. (1985). Effects of residential treatment on adjudicated delinquents: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 22, 287-308.
- Gelles, R.J. (1974). *The violent home*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gelles, R.J. (1980). Violence in the family: A review of research in the seventies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 42, 873-885.
- Gelles, R.J. (1983). An exchange/social control theory. In D. Finkelhor, R. Gelles, M. Straus, & G. Hotaling (Eds.), *The dark side of families: Current family violence research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gelles, R.J. (1997). *Intimate violence in families*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gelles, R.J. (1998). Family violence. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *The handbook of crime and punishment*.

- New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gelles, R.J., & Straus, M.A. (1979). Determinants of violence in the family: Toward a theoretical integration. In W.R. Burr, R. Hill, F.I. Nye, & I.L. Reiss (Eds.), *Contemporary theories about the family, Volume 1* (pp. 549-581). New York: Free Press.
- Gelles, R.J., & Straus, M.A. (1988). *Intimate violence: The causes and consequences of abuse in the American family*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Gendreau, P. (1996). Offender rehabilitation: What we know and what needs to be done. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 23, 144-161.
- Gendreau, P. & Andrews, D.A. (2001). *Correctional program assessment inventory-2000 (CPAI-2000)*. [Saint John](#), [New Brunswick](#), and Ottawa: T3 Associates.
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., & Smith, P. (2000). Generating rational correctional policies: An introduction to cumulating knowledge. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 4, 52-60.
- Gendreau, P., French, S.A., & Taylor, A. (2002). *What works (what doesn't work) Revised 202*. Invited Submission to the International Community Corrections Association Monograph Series Project.
- Gendreau, P., & Ross, R.R. (1979). Effective correctional treatment: Bibliotherapy for cynics. *Crime and Delinquency*, 25, 463-489.
- Gendreau, P., & Ross, R.R. (1987). Revivification of rehabilitation: Evidence from the 1980's, *Justice Quarterly*, 4(3), 349-407.
- Gendreau, P., Smith, P., & French, S. (2006). The theory of effective correctional intervention: Empirical status and future direction.
- Giles-Sims, J. (1983). *Wife battering: A systems theory approach*. New York: Guilford Press.

- Glaze, L. (2002). *Probation and parole in the United States: 2002*. BJS Bulletin.
- Glaze, L., & Palla, S. (2003). *Probation and parole in the United States: 2003*. BJS Bulletin.
- Goldsmith, S. (1991). Taking spouse abuse beyond a 'family affair.' *Law Enforcement News*, 27(34).
- Gondolf, E.W. (1985). *Men who batter: An integrated approach for stopping wife abuse*. Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications.
- Gondolf, E.W. (1987). Evaluating programs for men who batter: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Family Violence*, 2, 95-108.
- Gondolf, E.W. (1995). Men who batter: A selected bibliography. Indiana University of Pennsylvania: MINCAVA.
- Gondolf, E.W. (1996). *Characteristics of batterers in a multi-site evaluation of batterer intervention systems*. Minnesota Center Against Violence and Abuse.
- Gondolf, E.W. (1997). Batterer programs: What we know and what we need to know. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12, 83-98.
- Gondolf, E.W. (2002). *Batterer intervention systems: Issues, outcomes, and recommendations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Goode, W. (1971). Force and violence in the family. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 33, 624-636.
- Goolkasian, G. (1986). *Confronting domestic violence: The role of criminal court judges*. Washington, D.C: National Institute of Justice.
- Gordon, L. (1988). *Heroes of their own lives: The politics and history of family violence*. New York: Viking Penguin.
- Gosselin, D.K. (2005). *Heavy hands: An introduction to the crimes of family violence*.

- Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gray, M., Fields, M., & Maxwell, S. (2001). Examining probation violations: Who, what, and when. *Crime & Delinquency*, 4, 537-557.
- Greenfield, L.A., & Rand, M.R. (1998). *Violence by intimates: An analysis of data on crimes by current or former spouses, boyfriends, and girlfriends*. Washington, D.C: Bureau of Criminal Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Hamberger, L.K., & Hastings, J.E. (1988). Skills training for treatment of spouse abusers: An outcome study. *Journal of Family Violence*, 3, 121-130.
- Hamberger, L.K., & Hastings, J.E. (1990). Recidivism following spouse abuse abatement counseling: Treatment program implications. *Violence and Victims*, 5, 131-147.
- Hamberger, L.K., & Hastings, J.E. (1993). Court mandated treatment of men who assault their partners: Issues, controversies, and outcomes. In N.Z. Hilton (Ed.), *Legal response to wife assault*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hamilton, C.J., & Collins, J.J. (1981). The role of alcohol in wife beating and child abuse: A review of the literature. In J.J. Collins (Ed.), *Drinking and crime: Perspectives on the relationship between alcoholic consumption and criminal behavior*, (pp. 253-287). New York: Guilford.
- Hanna, C. (1996). No right to choose: Mandated participation in domestic violence prosecutions. *Harvard Law review*, 109(8), 1849-1910.
- Hansen, M., & Harway, M., (Eds.). *Battering and family therapy: A feminist perspective*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hanson, R.K., & Wallace-Capretta, S. (2000). *A multi-site study of treatment for abusive men*. Ottawa: Department of the Solicitor General of Canada.

- Harrell, A. (1991). Evaluation of court-ordered treatment for domestic violence offenders: Summary and recommendations. Unpublished report written for the State Justice Institute.
- Harrell, A., Smith, B., & Newmark, L. (1993). *Court processing and the effects of restraining orders for domestic violence victims*. Washington, D.C: Urban Institute.
- Hart, B. (1990). Gentle Jeopardy. *Mediation Quarterly*, 7, 4.
- Hart, B. (1991). *Domestic violence intervention system: A model for response to women abuse*. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence.
- Hart, B. (1993). Battered women and the criminal justice system. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 36, 626.
- Healey, K., & Smith, C. (1998). *Batterer programs: What criminal justice agencies need to know*. Washington, D.C: National Institute of Justice.
- Healey, K., Smith, C., & O'Sullivan, C. (1998). *Batterer intervention: Program approaches and criminal justice strategies*. Issues and Practices. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Hines, D.A., Brown, J., & Dunning, E. (2007). Characteristics of callers to the domestic abuse helpline for men. *Journal of Family Violence*, 22(2), 63-72.
- Hines, D.A., & Douglas, E. (2010). Intimate terrorism by women towards men: Does it exist? *Journal of Aggression, Conflict, and Peace Research*, 2(3), 35-56.
- Hector, M. (1997). Domestic violence as a crime against the state: The need for mandatory arrest in California. *California Law Review*, 85, 643-700.
- Holden, G.W., & Ritchie, K.L. (1991). Linking extreme marital discord, child rearing, and child behavior problems: Evidence from battered women. *Child Development*, 62,

311-327.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Beatty, S.B., & Anglin, K. (1995). The assessment and treatment of marital violence. In N.S. Jacobson and A.S. Gurman (Eds.), *Clinical Handbook of Couple Therapy*. New York: Guilford.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Meehan, J.C., Herron, K., Rehman, U., & Stuart, G.L. (2000). Testing the Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) batterer typology. *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*(3), 476-497.

Hollin, C.R. (2000). To treat or not to treat? A historical perspective. In C.R. Hollin (Ed.), *Handbook of offender assessment and treatment* (pp. 3-15), Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Hughes, D.M. (2007). *The inconvenient truths of domestic violence*. Paper presented at the 11th Annual Conference on Domestic Violence. Fordham Law School, New York.

Huston, A.C., Donnerstein, E., Fairchild, H., Fashbach, N.D., Katz, P.A., Murray, J.P., Rubenstein, E.A., Wilcox, B.L., & Zuckerman, D. (1992). *Big world, small screen: The role of television in American society*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska.

International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP). (1967). *Training key 16: Handling disturbance calls*.

Irish, J. (1989). Probation and recidivism: A study of probation adjustment and its relationship to post-probation outcome for adult criminal offenders. Mineola, NY: Nassau County Probation Department.

Izzo, R.L., & Ross, R.R. (1990). Meta-analysis of rehabilitation programmes for juvenile delinquents. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 17*, 134-142.

- Jackson, S., Feder, L., Forde, D.R., Davis, R.C., Maxwell, C.D., & Taylor, B.G. (2003). *Batterer intervention programs: Where do we go from here?* Special Report. Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Jaffe, P.G., Hastings, E., Reitzel, D., & Austin, G.W. (1993). The impact of police laying charges. In N.Z. Hilton (Ed.), *Legal responses to wife assault: Current trends and evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Jaffe, P., Wilson, S., & Wolfe, D. (1986). Promoting changes in attitudes and understanding of conflict among child witnesses of family violence. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 18, 356-380.
- Jaffe, P., Wolfe, D., & Wilson, S. (1990). *Children of battered women*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Jennings, J. (1987). History and issues in the treatment of battering men: A case for unstructured group therapy. *Journal of Family Violence*, 2(3), 192-213.
- Johnson, J., & Kanzler, D. (1993). Treating domestic violence: Evaluating the effectiveness of a domestic violence diversion program. *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, 15, 271-289.
- Jones, A.S., & Gondolf, E.W. (1997). *Post-program predictors of re-assault for batterer program participants*. Paper presented at the Fifth International Family Violence Conference, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH.
- Kalmuss, D. (1984). The intergenerational transmission of marital aggression. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 46, 11-19.
- Kimmel, M.S. (2002). Gender symmetry in domestic violence: A substantive and methodological review. *Violence Against Women*, 8, 1332-1363.

- Klein, A. (1996). Re-abuse in a population of court restrained male batterers. In E. Buzawa & C. Buzawa (Eds.), *Do arrest and restraining orders work?* (pp. 192-214). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Klein, A. (2000). Prosecuting and sentencing abusers matter. *National Bulletin on Domestic Violence Prevention*, 3, (11), 6-7.
- Klein, A. (2004). *The criminal justice response to domestic violence*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Klein, A., & Crowe, A. (2008). Findings from an outcome examination of Rhode Island's specialized domestic violence probation supervision program. *Violence Against Women*, 14, 226-246.
- Klein, A., & Tobin, T. (2008). A longitudinal study of arrested batterers, 1995-2005: Career criminals. *Violence Against Women*, 14, 136-157.
- Klein, A., Wilson, D., Crowe, A., & DeMichele, M. (2005). *Evaluation of the Rhode Island Probation Specialized Domestic Violence Supervision Unit*. Waltham, MA: BOTEC Analysis Corporation and American Probation and Parole Association.
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Neidig, P., & Thorn, G. (1995). Violent marriages: Gender differences in current levels of violence and past abuse. *Journal of Family Violence*, 10, 159-176.
- Langan, P.A., & Innes, C.A. (1986). *Preventing domestic violence against women*. Washington, D.C: Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Reports.
- Latessa, E.J, Parks, E., Allen, H., & Carlson, E. (1979). Specialized supervision in probation: Implications, research, and issues. *Prison Journal*, 59(2).

- Leonard, K.E., & Jacob, T. (1988). Alcohol, alcoholism, and family violence. In VanHasselt, Morrison, Bellack, & Hersen (Eds.), *Handbook of family violence*, (pp. 383-406). New York: Plenum.
- Lerman, L. (1980). Protection of battered women: A survey of state legislation. *Women's Rights Law Reporter*, 6.
- Lloyd, S.A., & Emery, B.C. (1994). Physically aggressive conflict in romantic relationships. In D. Cahn (Ed.), *Conflict in personal relationships*, (pp. 27-46). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Liberton, M., Silverman, M., & Blount, W.R. (1992). Predicting probation success for the first-time offender. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 36(4), 335-347.
- Lipton, D.S., Martinson, R., & Wilks, J. (1975). *The effectiveness of correctional treatment: A survey of treatment evaluation studies*. New York: Praeger.
- Loseke, D., & Kurz, D. (2005). Men's violence towards women is a serious societal problem. In D. Loseke, R.J. Gelles, & M.M. Cavanaugh (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence: Second edition*. (pp. 79-96). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Loving, N. (1980). *Responding to spouse abuse and wife beating: A guide for police*. Washington, D.C: Police Executive Research Forum.
- Lowenkamp, C. (2004). *Correctional program integrity and treatment effectiveness: A multi-site program analysis*. Doctoral Dissertation: University of Cincinnati.
- Lowenkamp, C.T., Latessa, E., & Smith, P. (2006). Does correctional program quality really matter? The impact of adhering to the principles of effective intervention. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 5(3), 575 – 594.

- Makepeace, J. (1987). Social factor and victim-offender differences in courtship violence. *Family Relations*, 36, 87-91.
- Martin, C., Olson, D.E., & Lurigio, A.J. (2000). *An evaluation of the Cook County Sheriff's Day Reporting Center Program: Re-arrests and re-incarceration after discharge*. Chicago: Illinois Criminal Justice System Authority.
- Martin, D. (1976). *Battered wives*. San Francisco: Glide.
- Martinson, R. (1974). What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. *The Public Interest*, 10, 22-54.
- Martinson, R. (1979). New findings, new views: A note of caution regarding the sentencing reform. *Hofstra Law Review*, 7, 243-258.
- Maxwell, C., Garner, J., & Fagan, J. (2001). *The effects of arrest on intimate partner violence: New evidence from the spouse assault replication program*. Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- McGuire, J. (Ed.). (2002). *Offender rehabilitation and treatment: Effective programmes and policies to reduce re-offending*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons
- McGuire, L.A. (1991). *Prosecution of domestic violence in Iowa*. Iowa Prosecuting Attorneys' Training Coordinator Council.
- Mihalic, S.W., & Elliot, D. (1997). A social learning theory model of marital violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 12, 21-46.
- Mills, L.G. (1999). Killing her softly: Intimate abuse and the violence of state intervention. *Harvard Law Review*, 113, 550-613.
- Mills, L.G., Grauwiler, P., & Pezold, N. (2006). Justice is in the design: Creating a restorative justice treatment model for domestic violence. In J. Hamel & T.

- Nicholls (Eds.), *Family approaches to domestic violence*. Pre-publication.
- Mitchell, D., & Carbon, S.B. (2002). Firearms and domestic violence: A primer for judges. *Journal of the American Judges' Association*, 39(2), 32-43.
- Morrall A., McCaffrey D, & Iguchi, M. (2000). Hardcore drug users claim to be occasional users: drug use frequency underreporting. *Drug Alcohol Depend*, 57: 193–202
- Neidig, P.H. (1986). The development and evaluation of a spouse abuse treatment program in a military setting. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 9, 275-280.
- Neidig, P.H., & Friedman, D.H. (1984). *Spouse abuse: A treatment program for couples*. Champaign, IL: Research Press.
- Nesovic, A. (2003). *Psychometric evaluation of the Correctional Programs Assessment Inventory (CPAI)*. Doctoral Dissertation. [Carleton University](#): Ottawa.
- Okun, L. (1986). *Woman abuse: Facts replacing myths*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Olson, D.E., & Stalans, L.J. (2001). Violent offenders on probation. *Violence Against Women*, 7(10), 1164-1185.
- Pagelow, M. (1984). *Family violence*. New York: Praeger.
- Palmer, T. (1975). Martinson revisited. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 12, 133-152.
- Palmer, S.E., Brown, R.A., & Barrera, M.E. (1992). Group treatment program for abusive husbands: Long-term evaluation. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 62, 276-283.
- Paparozzi, M., & Gendreau, P. (2005) An intensive supervision program that worked: service delivery, professional orientation, and organizational supportiveness' *Prison Journal*, 85, 445–66.

- Parnas, R.I. (1967). The police response to domestic disturbance. *Wisconsin Law Review*, 31, 914-960.
- Pence, E., & McMahon, M. (1999). *Duluth: A coordinated community response to domestic violence*. London: National Criminal Justice Reference Service.
- Pennell, S., & Burke, S. (2002). *Centralized response to domestic violence: San Diego County Sheriff*. Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Petersilia, J., & Turner, S. (1991). An evaluation of intensive probation in California. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 82, 610-658.
- Peterson, D. (1991). Physically violent husbands of the 1890's and their resources. *Journal of Family Violence*, 6(1), 1-15.
- Pirog-Good, M., & Stets-Kealey, J. (1985). Male batterers and battering prevention programs: A national survey. *Response to the Victimization of Women and Children*, 8(3), 8-12.
- Pleck, E. (1989). Criminal approaches to family violence: 1640 to 1980. In L. Ohlin & M. Tonry (Eds.), *Crime and justice: An annual review of research*, (pp. 19-57). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Puffett, N., & Gavin, C. (2004). *Predictors of program outcome and recidivism at the Bronx Misdemeanor Domestic Violence Court*. New York: Center for Court Innovation.
- Rebovich, D.J. (1996). Prosecution response to domestic violence: Results of a survey of large jurisdictions. In E.S. Buzawa and C. Buzawa (Eds.), *Do arrests and restraining orders work?* (pp. 176-191). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rennison, C.R. (2003). *Intimate partner violence, 1993-2001*. Washington, D.C: Bureau of Criminal Justice Statistics.

- Rennison, C.R., & Welchons, S. (2000). *Intimate partner violence*. Washington, D.C: National Institute of Justice.
- Roberts, L., & Burger, R. (n.d.) Child abuse. In *For shelter and beyond: Ending violence against women and their children, 2nd edition*.
- Rosenbaum, A., & Hoge, S.K. (1989). Head injury and marital aggression. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 146, 1048-1051.
- Rosenbaum, A., Hoge, S.K., Adelman, S.A., Warnken, W.J., Fletcher, K.E., & Kane, R. (1994). Head injury in partner abusive men. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 62, 6, 1187-1193.
- Ross, R.R. & Gendreau, P. (Eds.). (1980). *Effective correctional treatment*. Toronto: Butterworth.
- Saltzman, L., et al.. (1992). Weapon involvement and injury outcome in family and intimate assaults. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 267, 3043-3047.
- Sarre, R.S. (1999, December). Beyond “what works?” A 25-year jubilee retrospective of Robert Martinson. Paper presented at the History of Crime, Policing, and Punishment Conference, Canberra.
- Saunders, D.G. (1995). The tendency to arrest victims of domestic violence: A preliminary analysis of officer characteristics. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 10, 147-158.
- Saunders, D.G., & Hamill, R.M. (2003). *Violence against women: Synthesis of Research of offender interventions*. Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Schechter, S. (1982). *Women and male violence: The visions and struggles of the battered women's movement*. Boston: South End.

- Schechter, S., & Edleson, J.S. (1994). In the best interest of women and children: A call for collaboration between child welfare and domestic violence constituencies. Paper presented at the conference on Domestic Violence and Child Welfare. Wingspread: Racine, WI.
- Shepard, M.F., & Pence, E. (Eds). (1999). *Some thoughts in philosophy in coordinating community responses to domestic violence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Shepard, M., Falk, D., & Elliott, B. (2002). Enhancing coordinated community responses to reduce recidivism in cases of domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*, 551-569.
- Sherman, L. (1992). The influence of criminology on criminal law: Evaluating arrests for misdemeanor domestic violence. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 83*, 1-45.
- Sherman, L., & Berk, R. (1984). The specific deterrent effects of arrest on domestic assault. *American Sociological Review, 49*, 261-272.
- Sherman, L., & Cohn, E.G. (1989). The impact of research on legal policy: The Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment. *Law and Society Review, 23*, 117-144.
- Sherman, L., Smith, D., Schmidt, J., & Rogan, D. (1992). Crime, punishment, and stake in conformity: Legal and informal control of domestic violence. *American Sociological Review, 57*, 680-690.
- Sims, B., & Jones, M. (1997). Predicting success or failure on probation: Factors associated with felony probation outcomes. *Crime & Delinquency, 43*, 314-327.
- Skeem, J. L., & Manchak, S. M. (2008). Back to the future: From Klockar's model of effective

- supervision to evidence-based practice in probation. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, Special Issue, 47(3)*, 1-28.
- Slate, R. N., Wells T. L., & Johnson, W. W. (2003). Opening the manager's door: State probation officer stress and perceptions of participation in workplace decision-making. *Crime and Delinquency, 49(4)*, 519-541.
- Smith, B.E., Davis, R., Nickels, L., & Davies, H. (2002). *Evaluation of no-drop policies for domestic violence cases in San Diego, California, Omaha, Nebraska, Klamath Falls, Oregon, and Everett, Washington, 1996-2000*. U.S. Department of Justice.
- Snyder, D., & Scheer, N. (1981). Predicting disposition following brief residence at a shelter for battered women. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 9*, 559-566.
- Sommer, R. (1994). Male and female partner abuse: Testing a diathesis-stress model. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada.
- Sonkin, D.J. (1988). The male batterer: Clinical and research issues. *Violence and Victims, 3(1)*, 65-79.
- Sonkin, D.J., & Dutton, D.G. (2003). Treating attachment disorders in assaultive men. In D.G. Dutton and D.J. Sonkin (Eds.), *Intimate violence: Contemporary treatment innovations*. Haworth Press.
- Sonkin, D., Martin, D., & Walker, L.E.A. (1985). *The male batterer: A treatment approach*. New York: Springer.
- Spaccarelli, S., Coatsworth, J.D., & Bowden, B.S. (1995). Exposure to serious family violence among incarcerated boys: Its association with violent offending and potential mediating

- variables. *Violence Victimology*, 10 (3), 163-182.
- Stalans, L.J., Juergens, R., Seng, M., & Lavery, T. (2004). Probation officers' and judges' discretionary sanctioning decisions about sex offenders: Differences between specialized and standard probation units. *Criminal Justice Review*, 29.
- Steinman, M. (1990). Lowering recidivism among men who batter women. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 7, 124-132.
- Steinman, M. (1991). Coordinated criminal justice interventions and recidivism among Batterers. In M. Steinman (Ed.). *Woman battering: Policy responses*. Cincinnati: Anderson Press.
- Stark, E., & Flitcraft, A. (1991). Spouse abuse. In M.L. Rosenberg & M.A. Fenley, (Eds.), *Violence in America: A public health approach* (pp. 121-141).
- Stets, J.E., & Straus, M.A. (1992). Gender differences in reporting marital violence and its medical and psychological consequences. In M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families*, (pp. 151-166). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Straus, M.A. (1973). A general systems theory approach to a theory of violence between family members. *Social Science Information*, 12, 105-125.
- Straus, M.A. (1991). Conceptualization and measurement of battering: Implications for public policy. In M. Steinman (Ed.), *Woman Battering: Policy Responses* (pp. 19-47), Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Straus, M.A., & Gelles, R.J. (1986). Societal change and change in family violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 45, 465-479.

- Straus, M.A., Gelles, R.J., & Steinmetz, S.K. (1980). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American Family*. Garden City, NY: Anchor-Doubleday.
- Straus, M.A., & Yodanis, C. (1996). Corporal punishment in adolescence and physical assaults on spouses later in life: What accounts for the link? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58(4), 825-841.
- Sugarman, D.B. & Frankel, S.L. (1996). Patriarchal ideology and wife assault: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Family Violence*, 11.
- Syers, M., & Edleson, J.L. (1992). The combined effects of coordinated criminal justice intervention in women abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 7, 490-502.
- Taxman, F., & Cherkos, R. (1995). Intermediate sanctions: Dealing with technical violators. *Corrections Today*, 57, 47-57.
- Taylor, B.G., & Maxwell, C.D. (2005). *The effects of a short-term batterer treatment program for detained arrestees: A randomized experiment in the Sacramento, California jail*. Germantown, MD: National Institute of Justice.
- Taylor, B.W., Rush, S., & Munro, R.J. (1999). *Feminist jurisprudence, women, and the law: Critical essays, research agenda, and bibliography*. Littleton, CO: F.B. Rothman.
- Thelen, R. (2000). *Advocacy in a coordinated community response: Overview and highlights of three programs*. Gender Violence Institute.
- Thistlethwaite, A., Wooldredge, J., & Gibbs, D. (1998). Severity of dispositions and the likelihood of domestic violence recidivism. *Crime and Delinquency*, 44, 388-398.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). Prevalence and consequences of male-to-female and female-to-male intimate partner violence as measured by the National Violence

- Against Women Survey. *Violence Against Women*, 6(2), 142-161.
- Toby, J. (1957). Social disorganization and stake in conformity: Complementary factors in the predatory behavior of hoodlums. *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 48, 12-17.
- Tolman, R.M. (1996). Expanding sanctions for batterers: What can we do besides jailing and counseling them? In J. Edelson & Z. Eisokovits (Eds.), *Future interventions with battered women and their families*, (pp. 262-274). Minneapolis: National Council on Family Relations.
- Tolman, R.M., & Bennett, L.W. (1990). A review of quantitative research on men who batter. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5(1), 87-118.
- Tolman, R.M., & Bhosley, G. (1991). The outcome of participation in a shelter-sponsored program for men who batter. In D. Knudsen & J. Miller (Eds.), *Abused and battered: Social and legal responses*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Tolman, R.M., & Edleson, J.L. (1995). Intervention for men who batter: A review of research. In S. Stith & M.A. Straus (Eds.), *Understanding partner violence*. Minneapolis: National Council on Family Relations.
- Totten, M. (2003). Girlfriend abuse as a form of masculinity construction. *Men and Masculinities*, 6, 70-92.
- Visher, C., Smolter, N., & O'Connell, D. (2010) Workforce development program: A pilot study of its Impact in the U.S. Probation Office, District of Delaware. *Federal Probation*, 74, 3.
- Walker, L.E. (1979). *The battered woman*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Walker, L.E. (1984). *The battered woman syndrome*. New York: Springer.

- Walker, L.E. (1989). *Terrifying love: Why battered women kill and how society responds*.
New York: Harper-Collins.
- Walsh, A. & Stohr, K. (2010) *Correctional Assessment, Casework and Counseling, 5th Edition*.
Lanham, MD: American Correctional Association
- Weisburd, D., Lum, C., & Petrosino, A. (2001). Does research design affect study outcomes
in criminal justice. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*,
578, 50-70.
- Welch, D.M. (1994). Mandatory arrest for domestic abusers: Panacea or perpetuation of
the problem of abuse? *DePaul Law Review*, 43, 1133.
- Wileman, R., & Wileman, B. (1995). Toward balancing power in domestic violence
relationships. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*, 16 (4),
165-176.
- Wilks, J., & Martinson, R. (1976). Is the treatment of criminal offenders really necessary?
Federal Probation, 40, 3-8.
- Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1992). Who kills whom in spouse killings? *Criminology*, 30,
189-215.
- Wolfe, D.A., Zak, L., Wilson, S., & Jaffe, P. (1986). Child witnesses to violence between
parents: Critical issues in behavioral and social adjustment. *Journal of Abnormal
Child Psychology*, 14, 95-104.
- Wolfgang, M.E., & Ferracuti, F. (1967). *The subculture of violence*. London: Tavistock.
- Wooldredge, J., & Thistlethwaite, A. (1999). *Reconsidering domestic violence recidivism:
Individual and contextual effects of court dispositions and stake in conformity*.
Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice Report.

- Wooldredge, J., & Thistlethwaite, A. (2002). Reconsidering domestic violence recidivism: Conditioned effects of legal controls by individual and aggregate levels of stake in conformity. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 18, 45-70.
- Wright, E. O. (1997). *Class counts: comparative studies in class analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Yllo, K. (1993). Through a feminist lens: Gender, power, and violence. In R.J. Gelles & D.R. Loseke (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Zawitz, M.W. (1994). *Violence between intimates: Domestic violence*. Washington, D.C: Bureau of Criminal Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Zimring, F.E., & Hawkins, G. (1997). *Crime is not the problem: Lethal violence in America*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Zorza, J. (1991). Woman battering: A major cause of homelessness. *Clearinghouse Review*, 28.
- Zorza, J. (1992). The criminal law of misdemeanor violence, 1970-1990. *Criminal Law and Criminology*, 83, 46-72.

