

Intervening With Men for Violence Prevention

Richard M. Tolman and Jeffrey L. Edleson

This chapter focuses on intervening with men in a variety of contexts to prevent violence against women and children. We first present a brief historical account of intervention programs with men who batter their intimate partners. We then present prevention and ecological frameworks as lenses through which we consider current and possible strategies for intervening with men.

Men, Violence, and Intervention

Earlier chapters in this book have focused on intimate partner violence in heterosexual and same-sex relationships, sexual assault, and a variety of other forms of violence against women. As pointed out in earlier chapters, although women can be violent to their partners, the overwhelming evidence is that intimate partner violence is most often committed by men. In fact, as Hamby (2009) has outlined, men commit more than 90% of sexual violence, create higher levels of fear in their partners, and injure and murder their partners at

much higher rates than do women. This is not to say that women do not commit violent acts against their partners; they commit violence, however, at a much lower rate than men, and it appears to be less severe. Stanko (2006) identifies gender as vitally relevant to how domestic violence is conceptualized, spoken of, and challenged, noting that, “To lose sight and insight by ignoring how gender matters impoverishes any analyses of violence” (p. 549). We also acknowledge that intimate partner violence occurs in same-sex relationships, as was also pointed out earlier in this book. Our focus here, however, is on men’s violence directed at their intimate female partners.

Although we sometimes tend to think of intimate partner violence as an issue only recently addressed by society, violence by intimate partners has long been recognized as a problem (Davidson, 1977; Dobash & Dobash, 1978), was discussed in the popular press more than a century ago (Killoran, 1984), and has historically been the subject of social intervention efforts (Edleson, 1991; Gordon, 1988; Pleck, 1987).

The current wave of interventions focused on violence against women began in the mid-1970s

as small groups of women formed to aid other women fleeing violence by their intimate partners. These efforts evolved into “safe homes” and temporary shelters and have now expanded to include several thousand battered women’s shelters and related service programs. With this expansion came efforts to coordinate these services with other necessary community programs to best provide safety to battered women and their children. Activists working on behalf of battered women in North America began pressuring local governments to intervene in personal relationships to stop violence against women. These efforts, in turn, led to the development of coordinated interventions with violent men.

Social service intervention with men who batter is a more recent development; the first group treatment programs for men who batter were founded in the late 1970s. Early innovators in group treatment programs included EMERGE in Boston, RAVEN in St. Louis, and AMEND in Denver. Interventions with men who batter have dramatically increased over the past three decades. With this increase came efforts to coordinate these services with other necessary community programs to best provide safety to victims and accountability for perpetrators. Early efforts to coordinate interventions were created in Colorado (Domestic Violence Task Force, 1988), California (Soler & Martin, 1983), and elsewhere (see Brygger & Edleson, 1987; Goolkasian, 1986). One of the earliest and best-known coordinated responses was established in 1980 in the small city of Duluth in northern Minnesota. Ellen Pence and other activists in Duluth developed the Domestic Abuse Intervention Project (DAIP; see Pence & Shepard, 1999), which sought to coordinate the efforts of various system responses to violent men and their victims in what is now commonly called “the Duluth Model.” Chapter 14 in this book, by Susan Miller and her colleagues, describes in greater detail coordinated community response models.

These new coordinated responses emerged in a context of change in policies and practices

regarding violence against women (Pence & Shepard, 1999). Throughout the 1970s and into the early 1980s, police responses to intimate partner violence incidents were guided primarily by a crisis intervention orientation to family conflict. In the early 1980s, new pressures on police departments began to build. Pressure from women’s organizations and victim rights groups grew, and their agendas converged to bring about a major shift in police and judicial responses to men who batter. These activists’ influence was reinforced by successful law suits against police inaction brought by several battered women around the country (e.g., *Thurman v. City of Torrington*, 1984). Victim rights advocates pushed for more severe punishment of offenders by courts, while women’s groups advocated for a consistent police and judicial response to crime regardless of where it occurred. Police who arrested perpetrators of violence on the street but did not arrest them for violence in the home were seen by women’s groups as perpetuating violence against women and the unequal treatment of women. At the same time, new research showing the greater effectiveness of deterrence (arrest) when intervening with violent men was also being widely disseminated (e.g., Sherman & Berk, 1984).

Increased public pressures, landmark cases, and research showing the effectiveness of arrest combined to dramatically increase the arrests by police of men who batter. Sherman and Cohn (1990) found in a survey of 146 police departments in the United States that over a period of three years (1984 to 1986), police pro-arrest policies increased from 10% to 46%. As a result of these increased arrests, the number of offenders entering the court system from arraignment to trial and sentencing increased dramatically. For the first time, many prosecutors and judges were forced to deal directly with large numbers of intimate partner violence cases (again, see Chapter 14 for more detail on criminal justice responses).

The interests of victim rights advocates and women’s groups converged again in the courts. The push for victim rights reinforced pressure from

women's groups to make battered women's wishes more influential on court decisions. Many courts, wishing to avoid overcrowded jails, favored a rehabilitation approach that diverted or mandated men who batter into social service treatment programs. It is interesting that arrest by police and mandated rehabilitation sentences were exactly what many coordinated community responses were designed to achieve (see Brygger & Edleson, 1987; Pence, 1983). While seemingly inconsistent, this approach offered men who batter clear and immediate sanctions through arrest (deterrence) as well as motivation to enter treatment to avoid serving a jail sentence (rehabilitation).

In short, changing public attitudes, the outcomes of several landmark cases, pressure from women activists, and new research results led to a greater readiness among police, prosecutors, judges, and social service professionals to work more closely in a multifaceted coordinated community response to men who batter.

Prevention and Ecological Frameworks

This short history of coordinated response demonstrates the need to use a multiple systems perspective to think about ending men's violence against their female partners. However, these criminal justice-based responses primarily deal with violent and abusive behavior after it has occurred. A comprehensive approach to ending violence requires a prevention perspective as well as a multisystem focus. We draw upon both prevention and ecological frameworks in our work with men to end their abuse, but we organize the remaining sections of this chapter around prevention strategies while making reference, where appropriate, to the ecological levels that a particular strategy addresses.

Prevention efforts, as described earlier in Chapter 11, are often classified into three major strategies. For example, in attempting to stop men's intimate partner violence, we can classify

various efforts as *indicated* (strategies focused on boys or men who have already acted abusively or aggressively), *selective* (strategies targeting men or boys at greater risk of developing the problem), and *universal* (strategies targeting all boys and men regardless of risk status; Chamberlain, 2008).

Alternatively, an ecological framework provides a way to describe current efforts to end men's violence and also highlights existing gaps. In our earlier description of this model (Edleson & Tolman, 1992), we described how Bronfenbrenner's (1977, 1979, 1986) conceptualization of the human ecology could be applied to intervention efforts with men who batter. Other authors (Carlson, 1984; Douglas, Bathrick, & Perry, 2008; Dutton, 1985, 1988; Heise, 1998) have also suggested ecological frameworks as a way to more broadly understand intimate partner violence.

The ecological framework views human social environments as organized in a series of interacting systems. The *microsystem* is an individual's immediate environment and those directly interacting with him or her. The *mesosystem* is the linkages between systems that directly interact with an individual, for example, overlapping interaction between a man's family, peer group, and his faith community (because members from each of those microsystems may interact with one another). Coordination may also be viewed in terms of the consistency of values and practices within each microsystem (e.g., if messages about the unacceptability of aggression are similar in each microsystem, then the mesosystem exerts more influence than when these values vary among microsystems). The *exosystem* is the set of systems whose interaction may indirectly affect a man's behavior, for example, coordination between police, prosecutors, and the courts. The *macrosystem* is the set of broader social values underlying the way our social institutions are organized. Bronfenbrenner (1986) also added a fifth system, the *chronosystem*, which represents the time dimension over which all other systems are dynamically changing.

Combining the prevention and ecological frameworks, we might consider existing batterer intervention programs and criminal justice responses as *indicated* prevention at the microsystem and mesosystem levels. We will address these types of interventions first. Following this, we focus on *selected* and then *universal* prevention efforts that may be at any level and sometimes at multiple levels. Most of the selected and universal prevention efforts described later in this chapter have not yet been rigorously evaluated, but we will highlight some promising practices as well as consider some other possible preventive efforts where major gaps occur.

Indicated Prevention Strategies

Batterer Intervention Programs

There is great controversy surrounding current interventions with men who batter. First, some object to the extensive use of a “power and control”-based system like law enforcement and the courts to mandate men into rehabilitation services. Use of systems like these model coercive behavior we hope men will turn away from using with their partners. Perhaps even more controversial is the degree to which group psychoeducational programs, to which men are often court mandated, are seen as effective. Several authors argue that current approaches do not work (Dutton & Corvo, 2006); there is an overreliance on both the criminal justice system (Mills, 2003) and psychoeducational groups for men that do not recognize alternative forms of treatment (Dutton & Corvo, 2006). Although efficacy has not been strongly established, the research literature on group intervention approaches provides a basis for continuing these efforts. Clearly, there is need for more rigorous studies (see Gondolf, 2002, 2004) as well as continued development, refinement, and innovation in approaches.

Group programs for men who batter, often called “batterer intervention programs” or “BIPs,”

are generally offered by one to two professionally trained facilitators working with a group of about 8 to 10 men. These programs vary in length from an intensive weekend retreat to 52 weekly meetings lasting from one and a half to two hours. For example, both Washington state and California require court-mandated men to be engaged with programs for 52 weeks.

The predominant model for most BIPs across North America is some combination of didactic teaching and psychosocial or therapeutic processing among group members. Many programs draw heavily on cognitive-behavioral and social learning models of intervention and on a gendered lens for analyzing power relationships in violence between intimates (see Edleson & Tolman, 1992; Gondolf, 2002; Pence & Paymar, 1993).

BIPs have been studied intensively over the past several decades, but the results have been interpreted in vastly differing ways. An article in one popular magazine summarized the findings as follows: “Batterer programs simply aren’t working. They are failing. . . . Domestic violence is the only field in which you can fail for 25 years and wind up being considered an expert” (*Esquire Magazine*, cited in Gondolf, 2002, p. 28). Others have, however, drawn much more positive conclusions: “Arrest and treatment of batterers are not a complete solution to the problem of wife assault, but they are probably the best solution we currently have” (cited in Gondolf, 2002, p. 27).

With more than 70 evaluations now published, we do have some ideas about how BIPs work to end violence and threats, but these evaluations have left many questions unanswered. Two reviews of the empirical literature (Bennett & Williams, 2001; Gondolf, 2004) and three additional meta-analyses of selected studies (Babcock, Green, & Robie, 2004; Feder & Wilson, 2005; Saunders, 2008; Smedslund, Dalsbø, Steiro, Winsvold, & Clench-Aas, 2009) have all drawn positive but circumspect conclusions about the success of these programs. In short, there are six key findings about BIPs that can be drawn from the extensive research literature:

1. BIPs have a modest but positive impact on ending violence, with some studies showing them to have a much larger impact on participants when compared to men not participating.

Major reviews of BIPs over this decade have often concluded that these programs have a positive impact on ending and reducing violence by men who participate in them. Meta-analyses, a statistical technique to summarize and average the effect of programs across numerous studies, show small to moderate decreases in recidivism among men who participate in programs, when compared to either program drop outs or those randomly placed in a control group. The strongest results are found in studies using official records of subsequent police arrests and comparing program completers to those who drop out of the program (see Babcock et al., 2004; Feder & Wilson, 2005). In program evaluations where victim reports of the man's behavior were monitored and the program completers were compared to men who were randomly assigned to a no-treatment condition, the results were still positive but less powerful. One caution when interpreting these studies is that men who either dropped out or were assigned to a no-treatment condition may have sought and received help elsewhere, thus shrinking the differences found between BIPs and these groups of men.

2. BIPs help the majority of men end their violence over a period of time.

Perhaps the most comprehensive study of BIPs was funded by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control & Prevention and directed by Dr. Edward Gondolf. This four-city study tracked 840 men participating in group programs and their partners over a four-year period (Gondolf, 2002, 2004). Gondolf found that the great majority of men who reassault their partners will do so within the first 15 months after their intake into a program. After 30 months from program

intake, Gondolf (2004) found that only 20% of the men who participated in these programs had reassaulted a partner in the past 12 months, and at 48 months after program intake, only 10% of the men had reassaulted their partners in the past 12 months. Thus, by four years after intake, approximately 90% of the men had *not* reassaulted their partner in the past year. Gondolf suggests that this increasingly low recidivism rate points to the success of BIPs.

3. It is not yet clear what BIP-specific components help create these changes.

Despite the modestly positive evidence for BIPs, the research does not provide a clear answer to what makes a difference. Studies to date have not provided much insight into what component parts of batterer programs, or which program lengths, lead to change among participants (see Babcock et al., 2004; Bennett & Williams, 2001; Gondolf, 2004). Most programs include some type of cognitive-behavioral therapeutic and educational process, and many address attitudes among men about their relationships with women. It is not clear, however, whether it is these program components, simply the regular monitoring that occurs by participation in a group process, or something else such as enhanced motivation to change that is causing these better outcomes among participants. The studies that have compared components and found no differences further complicate conclusions in this area (see, e.g., Dunford, 2000; Labriola, Rempel, & Davis, 2005).

4. It appears that BIPs incorporating motivational enhancement components help more men change.

One finding that is supported by a few studies indicates that when programs include methods designed to enhance men's motivation to change, the retention and outcomes of men in these programs are improved (see Babcock et al., 2004).

Many of these procedures are based on the widely disseminated motivational interviewing procedures of Miller and Rollnick (2002). These procedures have been found to be successful with substance abusers (see Miller & Wilbourne, 2002) and are only recently being utilized with men who batter (see, e.g., Easton, Swan, & Sinha, 2000; Roffman, Edleson, Neighbors, Mbilinyi, & Walker, 2008).

5. Typologies of men based on personality traits and variation among men based on racial/ethnic group membership do not appear to predict different outcomes.

One approach that has received a lot of attention is differentiating types of men who batter so that treatment may be better matched to specific men. Typologies vary, but often categorize men into generally violent, partner violent, and pathological groups (see Cavanaugh & Gelles, 2005 and Holtzworth-Munro & Meehan, 2004 for reviews). Although researchers have been able to distinguish different types of men, the utility of these typologies to predict differential success in batterer intervention programs has been questioned. White and Gondolf (2000) have found that men of differing personality types appear to behave similarly in terms of program completion and outcome. This led them to conclude that “one size appears to fit most” (White & Gondolf, 2000, p. 486). On the other hand, Saunders (1996) found that participants with antisocial personalities had lower recidivism rates in structured cognitive-behavioral groups, while men with dependent personalities showed reduced recidivism in psychodynamic groups with less structure.

Despite White and Gondolf’s (2000) findings, the promise of typologies has not yet been thoroughly tested. Most BIPs do not, at present, differentiate among the types of men who are admitted to their programs or offer differential programming tracks. Many communities have such limited resources that, at most, they offer very limited services to men in their community.

Many BIP facilitators would claim, however, that intervention is already differentiated or individualized, to the extent that group facilitators provide differential attention to men during and between BIP sessions.

Rough grouping of men by typologies may not be the preferred direction, in any case. Holtzworth-Munro and Meehan (2004) have argued that we shouldn’t be categorizing men into one type or another, but perhaps we should see these men as multidimensional, with variation among several factors. Eckhardt, Babcock, and Homack (2004) suggest that perhaps matching treatment to the level of motivation for change that a man expresses may better achieve the original goals of developing typologies.

Much less information is available on the differential impact of BIPs on men of color. There is a small but growing literature that focuses on different types of groups for men of color, particularly African American men. Williams (1994; Gondolf & Williams, 2001) has described three types of treatment for African American men who batter: (1) “color blind,” where differences in race or ethnicity don’t seem to matter; (2) “culturally specific,” where there is a critical mass of men of one race or ethnicity and attention to their community’s unique history is implicitly given; and (3) “culturally centered,” where the focus of the program design is on a particular racial or ethnic group that makes up most of the men in the group. In tests comparing these programs, it does not appear that any one type of program format is better able to achieve positive outcomes than another (see Buttell & Carney, 2005; Gondolf, 2007).

6. Men who participate in BIPs that are part of coordinated responses with the criminal justice system achieve better outcomes.

Last, an important finding of these studies is that BIPs that are embedded in a coordinated community intervention to identify, treat, and hold men accountable appear to provide the most positive outcomes in terms of reassault prevention.

This is a good example of how mesosystem interventions can play a major role in helping other, more direct interventions succeed. Specifically, Gondolf (2004) found that,

Under the pretrial referral, the men entered the program in an average of 2 1/2 weeks after arrest, as opposed to several months at the post-conviction systems, and they had to reappear in court periodically to confirm their program attendance. This system dramatically reduced no-shows (from 30% to 5%) and sustained a high completion rate of 70% despite the coerced attendance. (p. 619)

In short, men dropped out the least and achieved the best outcomes in systems in which (1) men were moved quickly into treatment, within two to two and a half weeks of arrest; (2) there was ongoing monitoring of men's compliance with mandates to treatment by the courts; and (3) the courts responded swiftly, with consequences for men who violated their mandates.

These findings argue strongly for mesosystem efforts involving close coordination between BIPs and court officers, particularly probation officers. In some locales, specific domestic violence probation units have been established to create this close liaison with BIPs.

Although close coordination is desirable, such efforts raise concerns about the type of information that BIP providers should supply to court officers or others, such as custody evaluators, guardians ad litem, and court-appointed special advocates. A man's behavior in a weekly BIP meeting may mask much more severe and dangerous behavior outside the walls of the social service agency. As a result, many BIP providers only feel comfortable providing basic information such as (a) attendance, (b) compliance with program rules, (c) new reports of violence, and (d) occasionally information on the man's past abusive behavior. Providing an estimate of the level of change men have achieved based on their in-group behavior is potentially dangerous and often inaccurate. It is only through long-term

follow-up with current and past partners that men's behavior can be assessed over time.

State Standards for Batterer Intervention

As discussed above, there has been concern about the effectiveness of BIPs. Concern about the rapid proliferation of programs has led to attempts to establish standards for their operation. The creation of these standards is most often initiated at the state level and is another example of a mesosystem strategy. A recent review determined that only six states—Arkansas, Connecticut, Mississippi, New York, South Dakota, and Wyoming—remain without some form of standards or regulations (Maiuro & Eberle, 2008). Standards have generally placed primacy on the safety of victims and attempted to set conditions for program accountability and coordination (Tolman, 2002). State standards vary a great deal. Some are mandatory and require the individual provider and/or the agency batterer intervention program to be certified by a state body that minimum standards have been met. Other states publish guidelines that are suggestive of best practices and voluntary (Maiuro & Eberle, 2008). Most include a mandate or suggestion for assessment procedures and program content, length, and format. To date, only one study has examined whether standards accomplish their intended goals. Bennett and Vincent (2002) examined the implementation of standards in Illinois. They used a variety of methods, including interviews with victim service staff, batterer program staff, judges, and other criminal justice staff; survey data from staff of victim services programs, batterer programs, and intervention programs; and surveys from participants of batterer intervention programs. According to reports by the batterer intervention programs, the standards influenced them to link to other community-based violence prevention efforts, particularly battered women agencies. Reports from battered women's advocates, on the other hand, also revealed that they believed the standards created a means to interact

with batterer programs and hold them accountable for their actions. This system coordination and accountability were among the primary goals of the standards in Illinois.

Standards have been controversial in themselves, with critiques noting it is premature to prescribe or proscribe intervention modalities that have not been supported empirically. Although some states have been quite restrictive in this regard, Maiuro and Eberle (2008) note a trend toward an acceptance of multicomponent interventions. As a result, several states (e.g., Michigan, Oregon, and Texas) have adopted standards that explicitly allow innovation that might be otherwise deterred by overly restrictive standards.

Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Interventions

Batterer interventions programs, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, have often been conceived as part of a larger coordinated community response to violence. As such, other relevant systems, such as law enforcement, prosecution, and probation, have been engaged as part of a multi-pronged effort to end or reduce intimate partner violence. These coordinated interventions are also a good example of how coordination among exosystems that do not directly involve an individual can exert a powerful impact on that individual. The role of law enforcement and criminal justice systems is covered more completely in Chapter 14 of this book.

Fathering After Intimate Partner Violence

One new development in batterer intervention is a focus on men as fathers (Bancroft & Silverman, 2002; Edleson & Williams, 2007). These efforts can be considered indicated prevention because they identify fathers after violence has occurred, but also as selective prevention because they

attempt to ameliorate the negative impact of exposure to intimate partner violence on children before they may develop their own aggressive behavior. The focus on fatherhood might also be important in motivating men to end their abuse of their partners (Arian & Davis, 2007; Donovan & Vlasis, 2005). Perel and Peled (2008) note that models of intervention with men who batter as fathers can be distinguished by the extent to which they see the issue of fathering as an end in itself or as an entry point into other potential areas of change, such as the violent behavior. However, these needn't be mutually exclusive.

There are several examples of emerging programs specifically designed for training men who batter to parent without violence, yet most of these have been established only in the last decade or so. These programs can be classified into two types: (1) parenting programs that are supplementary sessions within existing batterer intervention programs, and (2) separate curricula that are offered to men once they have completed a traditional batterer intervention group curriculum.

One of the best-documented programs is the *Caring Dads* program (Scott, Francis, Crooks, & Kelly, 2006). *Caring Dads* uses a range of approaches, including motivational interviewing, psycho-education, cognitive-behavioral techniques, confrontation, and "shame work." The program seeks to address four goals: (1) engaging men to examine their fathering by developing trust and motivation; (2) increasing awareness and application of child-centered fathering; (3) increasing awareness of, and responsibility for, abusive and neglectful fathering and intimate partner violence; and (4) rebuilding children's trust in the men's fathering and planning for the future.

A preliminary evaluation of the *Caring Dads* program compared pre- to post-intervention measures for 23 participants (Scott & Crooks, 2007). Using self-reports on the Parenting Stress Index, fathers' hostility, denigration, and rejection of the child all decreased significantly, as did angry arousal to child and family situations

(Abidin, 1995). There was a low attrition rate for participants (34 of 42 completed). Self-reported partner abuse decreased, but not significantly, leaving in question the program's contribution to violence prevention.

Another well-described and widely disseminated program is the *Fathering After Violence* program, developed by the Family Violence Prevention Fund (Areean & Davis, 2007). This curriculum is designed to be incorporated into existing batterer intervention programs and is based on exercises that (1) create empathy for children's experience of intimate partner violence; (2) identify behaviors that constitute positive modeling by fathers for their children and support the mother's parenting; and (3) increase understanding of fathers' roles in the process of repairing a damaged relationship with their children (see <http://www.endabuse.org>).

Fleck-Henderson (2004) conducted an initial evaluation of the *Fathering After Violence* curriculum. Data were gathered from approximately 60 participants in three programs in the Boston area. Staff and participants' self-reports provided some support that the curriculum was engaging and readily integrated into the batterer intervention program. The exercises appeared to result in improvements in the three goals noted above. Although attempts to contact partners were not very successful, the majority of those reached (about half) did report positively on the participants' behavior toward their children and were positive about the program. The limitations of this evaluation suggest caution in drawing conclusions about the impact of this curriculum.

Selective Prevention Strategies

Strategies receiving the most attention are those indicated efforts covered above that focus on men who have already committed violence. A number of other efforts have, however, been developed to engage men whose circumstances may put them in a group that shows higher risks

of committing intimate partner violence, for example, men who have experienced or witnessed abuse in their families of origin, unemployed men, and those with a criminal history. Others who may be at greater risk are adolescent fathers and expectant or new fathers. In this section, we focus on selective prevention strategies targeted to at-risk individuals, primarily fathers.

One of the best-known programs for at-risk fathers is the Baltimore-based *Responsible Fatherhood Program* (BRFP; Center for Urban Families, 2009). Participants in this program are primarily noncustodial fathers. Most are unemployed, have not graduated high school, and may have been involved in the criminal justice system and/or used illegal drugs. The program assists these low-income fathers with seeking employment, providing child support, taking steps to reduce recidivism, developing skills for effective parenting, and maintaining healthy relationships. Although these fathers clearly are experiencing multiple stressors and show a number of factors that might predict a high possibility of intimate partner violence, they do not specifically participate in the Baltimore program because of current intimate partner violence or child abuse. However, BRFP actively works to identify violence if it has occurred and motivate men to seek help for their abusive behavior when identified. They have established a cooperative relationship with a batterer intervention program at House of Ruth to provide cross-training and service referrals.

Another program that targets at-risk fathers is the *Con Los Padres* program affiliated with the National Latino Fatherhood and Family Institute (NLFFI) of Bienvenidos Family Services (Carillo & Tello, 2007; NLFFI, 2003). Through 20 weekly classes, the program helps young and expectant fathers aged 16 to 25 to develop positive relationships with their children. Case management services are available for young fathers who need additional support to develop appropriate interaction with their children. The program screens for intimate partner violence and other forms of family and community violence and runs a more

structured program that attempts to address existing aggression. This culturally specific program is based on the principles of *un hombre noble*—a noble man. Un hombre noble is a man who keeps his word as the foundation of respectful relationship with his children and others in his life. As the NLFFI curriculum describes,

Through the process of sitting in a circle with other men who collectively reflect on the reality of their gifts and their baggage, men begin to acknowledge and accept that aggression and violence are not acceptable and realize they cause irreparable damage to themselves and others. (NLFFI, 2003, p. 43)

These programs in Maryland and California highlight the need for prevention efforts to be culturally specific. This specificity may increase the probability of successfully engaging men. Cultural specificity may also increase the effectiveness of intervention by delivering messages that are more readily received by participants, but comparative studies are needed to confirm whether these hypotheses are correct.

A number of selective prevention strategies have also been implemented in youth settings, primarily schools. The *Youth Relationship Program* is a selective prevention program aimed at high school students with a history of child maltreatment, witnessing abuse, or other trauma in their families of origin (Wolfe et al., 1996). The program is described at length in Chapter 17. Another school-based example of selective prevention is the *Mentor Training Program* conducted by the Men Stopping Violence program in Atlanta (Douglas et al., 2008). This program trains college students to mentor high school boys at risk of dropping out of high school and who are having disciplinary problems. Mentors work to promote healthy definitions of masculinity among youth, to promote the prevention of intimate partner violence.

Given the strength of childhood exposure to violence as a predictor for future perpetration (Ehrensaft, Cohen, Brown, Smailes, Chen, &

Johnson, 2003; Whitefield, Anda, Dube, & Felitti, 2003), selective prevention efforts might be effectively targeted for this group in settings besides schools. For example, prevention efforts aimed at men with such histories might be particularly relevant when their partners are pregnant. This is a time when men might come into contact with the health system (e.g., at ultrasound or during labor and delivery) and when their concern for their ability to parent and partner might be particularly salient. Given this intersection of access and openness to prevention efforts, screening for traumatic childhood experiences might be effective in identifying men who could benefit from education and support to prevent their abusing their partners or children. Of course, this transition time might also be an ideal time for universal prevention efforts, a topic to which we now turn our focus.

Universal Prevention Efforts

Universal prevention strategies move beyond intervention with men who have committed violence (indicated) or those at risk of committing it (selective) to address all men and boys. A key advantage to this strategy is the large number of individuals who can be reached. Applied across a population, even an intervention that generates modest effects can have a widespread impact. Universal prevention programs often involve changing social norms, behaviors, and policies that directly and indirectly contribute to intimate partner violence, and, as such, universal prevention is intrinsically part of a broad-based, long-term agenda. From the ecological framework, one would be focusing on macrosystem interventions when addressing the underlying norms of a society.

Universal prevention programs can include both education and media programs. Universal programs aimed at shifting beliefs and attitudes about violence and building communication and conflict resolution skills are one approach to preventing the onset of intimate partner violence.

Several studies demonstrate the efficacy of school-based programs to prevent dating violence (e.g., Jaffe, Sudermann, Reitzel, & Killip, 1992; Weisz & Black, 2001; Wolfe, Crooks, Lee, McIntyre-Smith, & Jaffe, 2003). Several longitudinal studies found that early conduct disorder and the use of generalized violence predict dating violence perpetration, suggesting that prevention and intervention in the area of conduct problems can also prevent dating violence (Brendgen, Vitaro, Tremblay, & Lavoie, 2001; Capaldi & Owen, 2001; Ehrensaft et. al., 2003; Lavoie, Hebert, Tremblay, Vitaro, Vezina, & McDuff, 2002; Magdol, Moffitt, Caspi, & Silva, 1998).

There is little research on programs to prevent intimate partner violence outside of school settings. One study of a community-based communication and conflict management skills program offered to couples planning to marry found that up to four years after program completion, participants reported better communication and less physical violence in their relationships when compared to a control group, but by the five-year follow-up, the only lasting effect was in the area of men's use of communication skills (Markman, Renick, Floyd, Stanley, & Clements, 1993).

Encouraging Positive Messages

A number of promising community-based efforts in the United States to prevent intimate partner violence have been discussed in the literature (see, e.g., Bowen, Gwiasda, & Brown, 2004; Graffunder, Noonan, Cox, & Wheaton, 2004; Mitchell-Clarke & Autry, 2004). For example, the Institute for Community Peace has worked closely with local communities in the U.S. to develop multipronged violence prevention efforts that are locally defined and designed. Each community with which they worked developed a broad coalition of community stakeholders to address violence in their communities, conducted a needs and an assets assessment, and then implemented a plan that included continuous evaluation. In Australia, the state government of Victoria supports a state-wide

media awards program aimed at influencing community attitudes to intimate partner violence by encouraging journalistic quality in the reporting and characterization of family violence (Donovan & Vlasis, 2005).

Another approach is to engage key people in boys' microsystems to educate them in respectful, nonviolent ways of relating to women and girls. For example, *Coaching Boys Into Men* is a national prevention campaign developed by the Family Violence Prevention Fund. It uses public service announcements and other ads to promote the idea that men should communicate to boys that intimate partner violence is unacceptable. A related program is the *Coaching Boys Into Men* leadership program for sports coaches, which attempts to encourage athletic coaches (many of whom are fathers themselves) to have conversations with their team members to promote respect for women and girls and erode support for violence as a defining characteristic of masculinity. The program distributes a "playbook" that provides a curriculum for presenting this information and finding teachable moments to promote these ideas. There is also a more structured weekly curriculum available and a newly developed *Coaches' Training Kit*. Coaches are encouraged to be involved in community outreach and other change efforts as well. Via a Web site, coaches have access to program materials and tips from fellow coaches on how to implement the program. These efforts have not yet been evaluated.

Involving Men as Allies

Globally, institutions and organizations working on intimate partner violence have begun to involve men as key allies in this effort. This marks a shift from focusing on men primarily as perpetrators and embodies a hope that men can be effective partners in prevention efforts. This recognition is exemplified by the U.N. Secretary-General's (2006) in-depth study on ending violence against women, which states, "There is also

a need to engage men more effectively in the work on preventing and eliminating such violence, and to tackle stereotypes and attitudes that perpetuate male violence against women” (p. 2).

Efforts to engage men as allies can presumably help to reduce the risk of abuse by men who participate; it can also change the culture that might support other men’s behavior. A number of authors have argued that male involvement in campaigns to end intimate partner violence can help to undermine beliefs, attitudes, and power relationships that support violence and transform the culture to support constructions of masculinity that lead to respectful and nonviolent relationships with women (Crooks, Goodall, Baker & Hughes, 2006; Flood, 2005). Berkowitz (2004) has categorized the goals of efforts to engage men into three categories: (1) prevention of men’s violence; (2) men’s intervention to prevent the violence of other men; and (3) addressing root causes of violence, such as gender socialization. Below we give some examples of strategies to achieve each of these goals. In practice, efforts often address more than one goal.

Numerous factors may have previously deterred men’s involvement as allies. Garin (2000) reported on a poll of over 1,000 men on barriers to engagement in antiviolence work. Among the reasons endorsed by more than 10% of the men were that no one had asked them to get involved; they did not have time; they did not know how to help; they perceived that they had been vilified and were seen as part of the problem, rather than approached as an important part of the solution; and that intimate partner violence is a private matter and they were uncomfortable getting involved.

Despite these barriers, a recent national telephone survey of 1,020 men, commissioned by the Family Violence Prevention Fund (Hart Research Associates, Inc., 2007), found that men may be more ready to take action than the earlier Garin (2000) poll indicated. Many of the men surveyed (73%) reported that they believed they can personally make a difference in ending sexual and domestic violence, and a majority of

those with children said they already are talking to their sons about the importance of healthy, violence-free relationships. A majority of the men surveyed also said they would make the time for and would be willing to do the following: Donate an old wireless phone to programs that assist victims/prevent violence, sign a pledge to promote respect for women and girls and end violence, sign a petition or contact elected officials to urge strengthening laws, and purchase an item or product that raises awareness and funds or make donations. These survey findings point to the promise of universal prevention efforts to build upon men’s current beliefs and increase the number of men who believe that violence is a problem and that they can do something about it.

Most relevant in this list for active involvement is the willingness to sign a pledge. Pledge-based campaigns have been one of the most prominent and successfully disseminated strategies for involving men as allies. Most notable in this regard is the White Ribbon Campaign (WRC). WRC began in Canada in 1991, two years after the Montréal massacre in which a gunman who said he was angry at women killed 14 students and wounded 13 others. Men across Canada were urged to wear white ribbons to commemorate this event.

Using the Berkowitz (2004) framework described above, WRC efforts seek not only to decrease men’s willingness to engage in abusive behavior, but also to increase their willingness to challenge other men whose behavior is abusive (e.g., telling a friend who has committed abuse that his behavior is unacceptable and helping him get assistance) or whose behavior contributes to or condones violence against women (e.g., confronting a sexist joke). Currently, the WRC is a worldwide campaign in 47 countries (Carolo, 2009). In the UN report mentioned above, the WRC was named as an example of a successful strategy for involving men.

Like WRC, The Family Violence Prevention Fund’s Founding Fathers campaign is aimed at recruiting men who explicitly denounce violence

against women and children and promote a culture that respects women. Its activities include publishing an annual full-page ad on Father's Day in the *New York Times* demonstrating men's concern about the issue of partner violence and soliciting additional participation by other men. An international registry of men who have supported the campaign is maintained. Participants are encouraged to take the campaign into their workplaces, with brochures, cards, and other materials that can be distributed to raise awareness and engage others in joining the campaign.

As part of these new efforts, there appears to be an endorsement of the need for and advisability of broader coalitions. Two key areas for coalition building are other violence prevention fields (e.g., child abuse, community violence) and related social and health issues (e.g., HIV, poverty; Prevention Institute, 2007).

Globally, there has been a strong overlap between efforts to address the spread of HIV and campaigns to involve men in reducing gender violence. Most notably, a recent international meeting was held by MenEngage, a Swedish-funded global alliance of UN agencies and non-governmental organizations from around the world, including sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, the Caribbean, North America, Asia, and Europe. Established in 2004, the goal of MenEngage is to connect men and boys in work to achieve gender equality—including challenging the structural barriers to that goal—to promote health and reduce violence at the global level. The alliance is an attempt to “scale up” local efforts to achieve progress in transforming gender inequality.

These efforts to organize men to end gender violence are quite broad. As noted in the declaration from MenEngage's recent global symposium, the gender equality concerns include intimate partner violence and numerous other domains, for example, violence against children, violence amongst men, the global political economy, sexual diversities and sexual rights, men's and boys' gender-related vulnerabilities, sexual exploitation, sexual and reproductive health and

rights, HIV and AIDS, and environmental concerns (MenEngage, 2009). As these efforts continue, it is clear that the work focused on men who batter is an important, but a relatively small, part of the developing global effort to address men's violence toward women. This broader focus—envisioned perhaps in the early days of the battered women's movement and consistent with the profeminist principles of many of the male allies who began work with batterers—is only now becoming a robust and identifiable global movement. There is not yet much data on these efforts, but we look forward to future contributions to inform the opportunities and challenges of this compelling work.

Finally, we want to draw attention to an intersection of indicated and universal prevention taking place in programs for men who batter. One good example is the Men Stopping Violence program in Atlanta (Douglas et al., 2008). Men involved in the Men Stopping Violence's batterer intervention program are required to bring men from their own microsystems (e.g., workplace, peer group, or family) to witness some of the work they are doing in the program. These community witnesses may then promote sustained change of men participating in the program, as they become aware of the participants' commitment to change and can be sources of accountability and support in their microsystems. The inclusion of these men from the community, however, also provides the witnesses with opportunities to examine their own behavior and to potentially engage in further actions to end intimate partner violence.

The Men Stopping Violence program also provides an example of a program that works on many ecological and prevention levels simultaneously. In addition to their BIP work, and the Mentors in Training Program described above in the selective prevention section, Men Stopping Violence engages in a number of other programs (Douglas et al., 2008). For example, their Community Restoration Program began as a follow-up program for men who had completed Men Stopping Violence's 24-week BIP, but

evolved into a way for those men to participate in community projects, outreach, and advocacy as a form of restorative justice (see Chapter 14 for more on restorative justice). Given their focus on both supporting men in maintaining nonabusive behavior and in community change, the program can be considered both indicated prevention and universal prevention and helps to create exosystem change. Another form of indicated prevention is Men Stopping Violence's parenting classes for fathers, to help correct the damage their battering has caused in their families and to teach them skills for positive parenting without abuse. Men Stopping Violence's focus on fathers also extends to a universal prevention program, Because We Have Daughters. This program provides fathers and their daughters with an opportunity to engage in fun activities and discussions that help fathers be a positive influence in their daughters' lives, heighten awareness of the culture of violence their daughters are growing up in, and engage men in helping to create change in their own lives and in the community.

Conclusion

As the discussion of the work of Men Stopping Violence exemplifies, the work of ending men's violence against women is a task that must be completed at multiple levels of the human ecology and across a continuum of prevention efforts. Although we have attempted in this chapter to classify such strategies as primarily at one level or another, in practice, such efforts are likely to span multiple categories. We have found ourselves inspired and energized by the proliferation of efforts to involve men in greatly varying efforts to end men's violence, both as targets of change and allies of change. At this point in our development as a field, we can find hope in the promise of the innovative practices being developed around the world. We look forward to more of these efforts, as well as additional research that reveals where our future efforts will be most effective and our resources best spent.

References

- Abidin, R. R. (1995). *Parenting Stress Index: Professional manual* (3rd ed.). Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
- Arean, J. D., & Davis, L. (2007). Working with fathers in batterer intervention programs: Lessons from the Fathering After Violence Initiative. In J. L. Edleson & O. J. Williams (Eds.), *Parenting by men who batter* (pp. 118–130). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Babcock, J. C., Green, C. E. & Robie, C. (2004). Does batterers' treatment work? A meta-analytic review of domestic violence treatment. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 23, 1023–1053.
- Bancroft, L., & Silverman, J. G. (2002). *The batterer as parent: Addressing the impact of domestic violence on family dynamics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bennett, L. W., & Vincent, N. (2002). Standards for batterer programs: A formative evaluation of the Illinois protocol. In R. A. Geffner & A. Rosenbaum (Eds.), *Domestic violence offenders: Current interventions, research, and implications for policies and standards* (pp. 181–197). New York: Hayworth.
- Bennett, L., & Williams, O. (2001). *Controversies and recent studies of batterer intervention program effectiveness*. Harrisburg, PA: VAWnet. Retrieved March 18, 2010, from <http://www.vawnet.org>
- Berkowitz, A. D. (2004, October). Working with men to prevent violence against women: An overview (Part 1). *National Resource Center on Domestic Violence, VAWNet Applied Research Forum*, 1–7.
- Bowen, L. K, Gwiasda, V., & Brown, M. (2004). Engaging community residents to prevent violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(3), 356–366.
- Brendgen, M., Vitaro, R., Tremblay, R. E., & Lavoie, F. (2001). Reactive and proactive aggression: Predictions to physical violence in different contexts and moderating effects of parental monitoring and caregiving behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 29(4), 293–304.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist*, 32, 523–531.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives. *Developmental Psychology*, 22, 723–742.

- Brygger, M. P., & Edleson, J. L. (1987). The Domestic Abuse Project: A multi-systems intervention in woman battering. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 2, 324–336.
- Buttall, F. P., & Carney, M. M. (2005). Do batterer intervention programs serve African American and Caucasian batterers equally well? An investigation of a 26-week program. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 15, 19–28.
- Capaldi, D. M., & Owen, L. D. (2001). Physical aggression in a community sample of at-risk young couples: Gender comparisons for high frequency, injury, and fear. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 15(3), 425–440.
- Carillo, R., & Tello, J. (2007). Fathers in recovery. In J. L. Edleson & O. J. Williams (Eds.), *Parenting by men who batter: New directions for assessment and intervention* (pp. 131–136). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Carlson, B. E. (1984). Causes and maintenance of domestic violence: An ecological analysis. *Social Service Review*, 58, 569–587.
- Carolo, H. (2009). *Taking stock of 18 years of activism: White ribbon around the world*. Retrieved March 18, 2010, from http://www.menengage.org/symposium2009_present.asp#1
- 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.
- Center for Urban Families. (2009). *Baltimore Responsible Father Project*. Retrieved December 9, 2009, from <http://www.cfuf.org/BRFP>
- Chamberlain, L. (2008, March). *A prevention primer for domestic violence: Terminology, tools, and the public health approach*. Harrisburg, PA: VAWnet. Retrieved March 18, 2010, from <http://www.vawnet.org>
- Crooks, C. V., Goodall, G. R., Baker, L. B., & Hughes, R. (2006). Preventing violence against women: Engaging the fathers of today and tomorrow. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 13, 82–93.
- Davidson, T. (1977). Wifebeating: A recurring phenomenon throughout history. In M. Roy (Ed.), *Battered women* (pp. 2–23). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. (1978). Wives: The appropriate victims of marital violence. *Victimology: An International Journal*, 2, 426–442.
- Domestic Violence Task Force. (1988). *The Denver domestic violence manual*. Denver, CO: City of Denver.
- Donovan, R., & Vlais, R. (2005). *VicHealth review of communication components of social marketing. Public education campaigns focusing on violence against women*. Melbourne: Victorian Health Promotion Foundation.
- Douglas, U., Bathrick, D., & Perry, P. A. (2008). Deconstructing male violence against women: The Men Stopping Violence community accountability model. *Violence Against Women*, 14, 247–261.
- 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.
- Dutton, D. G. (1985). An ecologically nested theory of male violence toward intimates. *International Journal of Women's Studies*, 8, 404–413.
- Dutton, D. G. (1988). *The domestic assault of women*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Dutton, D. G., & Corvo, K. (2006). Transforming a flawed policy: A call to revive psychology and science in domestic violence research and practice. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 11, 457–483.
- Easton, C., Swan, S., & Sinha, R. (2000). Motivation to change substance use among offenders of domestic violence. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 19, 1–5.
- Eckhardt, C. I., Babcock, J., & Homack, S. (2004). Partner assaultive men and the stages and processes of change. *Journal of Family Violence*, 19, 81–93.
- Edleson, J. L. (1991). Social workers' intervention in woman abuse: 1907–1945. *Social Service Review*, 65, 304–313.
- Edleson, J. L., & Tolman, R. M. (1992). *Intervention for men who batter: An ecological approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Edleson, J. L., & Williams, O. J. (2007). Introduction: Involving men who batter in their children's lives. In J. L. Edleson & O. J. Williams (Eds.), *Parenting by men who batter* (pp. 3–18). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ehrensaft, M. K., Cohen, P., Brown, J., Smailes, E., Chen, H., & Johnson, J. G. (2003). Intergenerational transmission of partner violence: A 20-year prospective study. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 71, 741–753.

- Feder, L., & Wilson, D. B. (2005). A meta-analytic review of court-mandated batterer intervention programs: Can courts affect abusers' behavior? *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1, 239–262.
- Fleck-Henderson, A. (2004). Application of theoretical frameworks for domestic violence. In F. Danis & L. Lockhart (Eds.), *Breaking the silence in social work education: Domestic violence modules for foundation courses* (pp. 9–13). Washington, DC: CSWE.
- Flood, M. (2005). Men's collective struggles for gender justice: The case of anti-violence activism. In M. Kimmel, J. Hearn, & R. W. Connell (Eds.), *The handbook of studies on men and masculinities* (pp. 458–466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Garin, G. D. (2000). *Report #5702c*. Washington, DC: Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc.
- Gondolf, E. W. (2002). *Batterer intervention systems: Issues, outcomes, and recommendations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gondolf, E. W. (2004). Evaluating batterer counseling programs. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 9, 605–631.
- Gondolf, E. W. (2007). Culturally focused batterer counseling for African American men. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 6, 341–366.
- Gondolf, E. W., & Williams, O. J. (2001). Culturally focused batterer counseling for African American men. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 2(4), 283–295.
- Goolkasian, G. A. (1986). *Confronting domestic violence: A guide for criminal justice agencies*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Gordon, L. (1988). *Heroes of their own lives—the politics and history of family violence*. New York: Viking Penguin.
- Graffunder, C. M., Noonan, R. K., Cox, P., & Wheaton, J. (2004). Through a public health lens. Preventing violence against women: An Update from the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Journal of Women's Health*, 13(1), 5–14.
- Hamby, S. (2009). The gender debate about intimate partner violence: Solutions and dead ends. *Psychological Trauma*, 1, 24–34.
- Hart Research Associates, Inc. (2007). *Father's day poll*. Retrieved December 11, 2009, from <http://www.endabuse.org>
- Heise, L. L. (1998). Violence against women: An integrated, ecological framework. *Violence Against Women*, 4, 262–290.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Meehan, J. C. (2004). Typologies of men who are maritally violent: Scientific and clinical implications. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19, 1369–1389.
- Jaffe, P., Sudermann, M., Reitzel, D., & Killip, S. M. (1992). An evaluation of a secondary school primary prevention program on violence in relationships. *Violence and Victims*, 7, 129–146.
- Killoran, M. M. (1984). The management of tension: A case study of Chatelaine Magazine, 1939–1980. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 15, 407–426.
- Labriola, M., Rempel, M., & Davis, R. C. (2005). *Testing the effectiveness of batterer programs and judicial monitoring. Final report to the National Institute of Justice*. Retrieved December 7, 2009, from <http://www.courtinnovation.org/>
- Lavoie, F., Hebert, M., Tremblay, R., Vitaro, F., Vezina, L., & McDuff, P. (2002). History of family dysfunction and perpetration of dating violence by adolescent boys: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 30(5), 365–383.
- Magdol, L., Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., & Silva, P. A. (1998). Developmental antecedents of partner abuse: A prospective-longitudinal study. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 107, 375–389.
- Maiuro, R. D., & Eberle, J. A. (2008). State standards for domestic violence perpetrator treatment: Current status, trends, and recommendations. *Violence and Victims*, 23(2), 133–155.
- Markman, H. J., Renick, M. J., Floyd, F. J., Stanley, S. M., & Clements, M. (1993). Preventing marital distress through communication and conflict management training: A four and five year follow-up. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 62(1), 70–77.
- MenEngage. (2009). *The Rio de Janeiro MenEngage declaration: Global symposium on engaging men and boys on achieving gender equality*. Retrieved December 9, 2009, from http://menengage.org/symposium2009_rio.asp
- Miller, W. R., & Rollnick, S. (2002). *Motivational interviewing* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford.
- Miller, W. R. & Wilbourne, P. L. (2002). Mesa Grande: A methodological analysis of clinical trials of treatments for alcohol use disorders. *Addiction*, 97, 265–277.
- Mills, L. G. (2003). *Insult to injury: Rethinking our response to intimate abuse*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Mitchell-Clark, K., & Autry, A. (2004). *Preventing family violence: Lessons from the community engagement initiative*. San Francisco: Family Violence Prevention Fund.

- National Latino Fatherhood and Family Institute. (2003). *Fatherhood lessons*. Retrieved December 9, 2009, from <http://www.nlffi.org>
- Pence, E. L. (1983). The Duluth Domestic Abuse Intervention Project. *Hamline Law Review*, 6, 247–275.
- Pence, E., & Paymar, M. (1993). *Education groups for men who batter: The Duluth model*. New York: Springer.
- Pence, E. L., & Shepard, M. F. (1999). An introduction: Developing a coordinated community response. In M. F. Shepard & E. L. Pence (Eds.), *Coordinating community responses to domestic violence: Lessons from Duluth and beyond* (pp. 3–23). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Perel, G., & Peled, E. (2008). The fathering of violent men: Constriction and yearning. *Violence Against Women*, 14(4), 457–482.
- Pleck, E. H. (1987). *Domestic tyranny: The making of social policy against family violence from colonial times to present*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Prevention Institute. (2007). *Poised for prevention. Advancing promising approaches to primary prevention of intimate partner violence*. Retrieved December 9, 2009, from <http://www.prevention-institute.org>
- Roffman, R. A., Edleson, J. L., Neighbors, C., Mbilinyi, L., & Walker, D. D. (2008). The men's domestic abuse check-up: A protocol for reaching the non-adjudicated and untreated man who batters and abuses substances. *Violence Against Women*, 14, 589–605.
- Saunders, D. G. (1996). Feminist-cognitive-behavioral and process-psychodynamic treatments for men who batter: Interaction of abuser traits and treatment models. *Violence and Victims*, 11, 393–414.
- Saunders, D. G. (2008). Group interventions for men who batter: A summary of program descriptions and research. *Violence & Victims*, 23, 156–172.
- Scott, K. L., & Crooks, C. V. (2007). Preliminary evaluation of an intervention program for maltreating fathers. *Brief Treatment and Crisis Intervention*, 7, 224–238.
- Scott, K., Francis, K., Crooks, C., & Kelly, T. (2006). *Caring dads: Helping fathers value their children*. Victoria, BC: Trafford.
- Sherman, L. W., & Berk, R. A. (1984). The specific deterrent effects of arrest for domestic assault. *American Sociological Review*, 49, 261–272.
- Sherman, L. W., & Cohn, E. G. (1990). The effects of research on legal policy in the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment. In D. J. Besharov (Ed.), *Family violence: Research and public policy issues* (pp. 205–227). Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.
- Smedslund, G., Dalsbø, T. K., Steiro, A., Winsvold, A., & Clench-Aas, J. (2009). Cognitive behavioural therapy for men who abuse their female partner (Review). *The Cochrane Library*, 3, 1–36.
- Soler, E., & Martin, S. (1983). *Domestic violence is a crime*. San Francisco: Family Violence Project.
- Stanko, E. A. (2006). Theorizing about violence: Observations from the Economic and Social Research Council's Violence Research Program. *Violence Against Women*, 12, 543–555.
- Thurman v. City of Torrington, 595 F. Supp. 1521 (D. Conn. 1984).
- Tolman, R. M. (2002). An ecological analysis of batterer intervention program standards. In R. A. Geffner & A. Rosenbaum (Eds.), *Domestic violence offenders: Current interventions, research, and implications for policies and standards* (pp. 221–234). Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Press.
- U.N. Secretary-General. (2006). *From words to action: In-depth study on all forms of violence against women: Study of the Secretary-General*. Retrieved December 9, 2009, from <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/vaw/v-sg-study.htm>
- Weisz, A., & Black, B. (2001). Sexual assault and dating violence prevention with urban youth: Assessing effectiveness. *Social Work Research*, 25(2), 89–102.
- White, R. J., & Gondolf, E. W. (2000). Implications of personality profiles for batterer treatment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 15, 467–488.
- Whitefield, C. L., Anda, R. F., Dube, S. R., & Felitti, V. J. (2003). Violent childhood experiences and the risk of intimate partner violence in adults: Assessment in a large health maintenance organization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18(2), 166–185.
- Williams, O. J. (1994). Group work with African American men who batter: Toward more ethnically sensitive practice. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 25, 91–103.
- Wolfe, D. A., Crooks, C. V., Lee, V., McIntyre-Smith, A., & Jaffe, P. G. (2003). A meta-analysis of the effects of children's exposure to domestic violence: The need for a developmental framework. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 6, 171–187.
- Wolfe, D. A., Wekerle, C., Gough, R., Reitzel-Jaffe, D., Crasley, C., Pittman, A. L., et al. (1996). *The youth relationships manual: A group approach with adolescents for the prevention of woman abuse and the promotion of healthy relationships*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Personal Reflection

Edward Gondolf



My partner at the time had just come home from a meeting on women's issues. She was noticeably disturbed by the violence against women exposed there and by the recall it prompted of abuse she had experienced in her past. What she introduced to me at that moment opened a door in my mind and soul and eventually a new path in my academic and research work. I ended up supervising social work students at a women's center my partner helped start and volunteering at a recently formed program for men who abused their partners. I vividly remember one particular training session at the men's program. A panel of women told their experiences of being abused, raped, and beaten by men. They then departed the room, and the circle of remaining men were left to sort out our reactions, feelings, and

defensiveness to what we had heard. It quickly became clear that we were all complicit in some way, all echoing conflicting views of women, all exposing how far reaching were the issues. We left motivated to do something about it—that included my helping to facilitate what were initially "voluntary" groups for abusive men.

I was soon to shift my research focus as a community psychologist from social impact assessments and community conflict to so-called "batterer programs." We were faced with hard questions about whether our efforts were effective in reducing men's violence against women—or causing more problems. What might we do to make the groups more effective? The questions launched me on a series of visits to other early programs across the country and later to start a few follow-up studies of men in our own groups. Programs rapidly expanded in response to the emerging arrest policies for domestic violence calls, and so did questions about the effectiveness and utility of such programs with court-referred men. Currently, amidst the movement toward "evidence-based practice," program evaluation is even more essential for the justification and funding of programs and interventions of all sorts. There is also an increasing emphasis on the psychological impetus for men's violence that has brought confusion to the field (as well as some fresh insights) and some diversion from the initial attention to the sociological and gendered roots of violence against women.

For more than 20 years, I've been working full time on research, mostly about batterer intervention. Probably our biggest contribution has been an eight-year study of batterer intervention in four large cities. It not only demonstrated the contribution of batterer programs in improving women's safety and well-being, but also reinforced the importance of approaching intervention from a systems perspective. A program's links to the courts, women's services, and other community treatments make a difference. These findings have been particularly important amidst a handful of narrowly focused experimental evaluations that suggest batterer programs are not particularly effective. Our subsequent studies have also exposed the need for risk management of a subgroup of unresponsive and particularly dangerous men and the importance of a coordinated community response to achieving this. Stopping violence goes well beyond the boundaries of a weekly group for a select group of men.

At times, doing research in this area is like being a policy "lawyer." I'm working, like many others, to bring forth compelling and acceptable evidence to the court of academic and policy decision makers. It seems an increasingly important role, given the increase in different perspectives, pet theories, and competing agendas. I also continue to be challenged by the basic questions about human nature implicit in this work: Are we, especially men, inherently violent? Can we change for the better? How are peace, love, and justice achieved in our personal and collective lives? More than one academic discipline, or handful

of research studies, is needed to answer these questions. Certainly, we need to be thinking about these sorts of questions more deeply, broadly, and persistently. I'd like to think that the research in the field is helping us do that.

Chapter Authors



Richard M. Tolman, LMSW, Ph.D., is a Professor at the University of Michigan School of Social Work. He began his work in batterer intervention programs in 1980 at the Male Awareness Project in Anchorage, Alaska. His research focuses on interventions designed to change violent and abusive behavior and the impact of violence on the physical, psychological, and economic well-being of victims. His current projects include research on the impact of and prevention of abuse during pregnancy and involvement of men as allies to end violence against women. He is currently co-Director of the Global Research Program on Mobilizing Men for Violence Prevention, a collaborative project between the University of Michigan and the University of Minnesota.



Jeffrey L. Edleson is a Professor in the University of Minnesota School of Social Work and Director of the Minnesota Center Against Violence and Abuse (<http://www.mincava.umn.edu>). He is one of the world's leading authorities on children exposed to domestic violence and has published more than 100 articles and 10 books on domestic violence, group work, and program evaluation. He has recently coedited (with Oliver J. Williams) the book *Parenting by Men Who Batter: New Directions in Assessment and Intervention* (Oxford University Press, 2007) and (with Claire Renzetti) the multi-volume *Encyclopedia of Interpersonal Violence* (Sage, 2008).
