

Final Report: Section B

Overall Effectiveness of the Enhanced Domestic Abuse Intervention Project

Background

A coordinated community response involves police, prosecutors, probation officers, battered women's advocates, counselors and judges in developing and implementing policies and procedures that improve interagency coordination and lead to more uniform responses to domestic violence cases. Components of a coordinated community response include: pro-arrest or mandatory arrest policies, follow-up support and advocacy for victims, aggressive and prompt prosecution, active monitoring of offender compliance with probation conditions, court mandated participation in batterer rehabilitation programs, and monitoring of the system-wide response to domestic violence cases. Civil remedies have been strengthened by removing barriers to obtaining orders of protection, improving their enforcement, and requiring participation in batterer rehabilitation programs. Specific policies and practices vary depending upon state legislation, the structure of the court system, and the characteristics of local agencies.

The Enhanced Domestic Abuse Intervention Project sought to improve the coordinated community response already in place in the Duluth community by working with each of the agencies involved to improve information exchange and the response to high risk cases. This section of the report will examine the overall effects of the Enhanced Domestic Abuse Intervention Project. Part One examines recidivism based upon a review of criminal justice records. Part Two examines abuse, women's safety, women's well-being and community intervention based upon victim interviews. Part Three focuses on a discussion of the overall findings.

Part One: Recidivism

Hypothesis and Research Question

Hypothesis 3a The Enhanced Domestic Intervention Project (EDAIP) when compared to the Domestic Abuse Intervention Project (DAIP) will have lower rates of recidivism by offenders.

Research Question. To what extent were the program enhancements implemented by community agencies?

Method

Population and Sample

The population studied were male domestic violence offenders who entered the DAIP Men's Nonviolence Program. The sample included all men who volunteered or were court ordered to attend the program during 1994, 1996, 1997 and the first six months of 1998. Offenders from 1994 provided pre-intervention data and served as a baseline for later comparisons.

Tables 1 and 2 summarize the demographic data available on male offenders and female victims for each year of the study. Only data on race and age were available from agency

databases. Data on age and race were examined to determine whether or not comparison groups were similar in terms of demographics using Chi-Square and t-test procedures. For purposes of analysis, race categories were collapsed into two categories; “white” and “person of color” because of the small numbers in some categories.

Offenders from 1994 were not significantly different in terms of race and age from 1996, 1997 or 1998 offenders. The p values of t-tests for age were: .07 (94-96), .51 (94-97) and .09 (94-98). The p values of Chi-Square procedures for race were: .19 (94-96), .66 (94-97), .07 (94-98).

Victims from 1994 were not significantly different in terms of race and age from 1996 and 1998 victims. They were not significantly different in terms of age when compared to 1997 women, but there were significantly more women of color among 1997 victims. The p values for age were: .11 (94-96), .21 (94-97) and .11 (94-98). The p values for race were: .08 (94-96), .03 (94-97), .11 (94-98).

Table 1

Demographic Data on Male Domestic Violence Offenders

Variable	Year			
	1994 (n=261)	1996 (n=217)	1997 (n=220)	1998 (n=100)
Age				
Under 21	13 (5%)	6 (3%)	9 (4%)	7 (7%)
21-30	116 (44%)	81 (37%)	93 (42%)	31 (31%)
31-40	82 (31%)	85 (39%)	75 (34%)	38 (38%)
41-50	35 (13%)	33 (15%)	38 (17%)	21 (21%)
Over 50	11 (4%)	12 (6%)	5 (2%)	2 (2%)
Unknown	4 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
Race				
American Indian	32 (12%)	35 (16%)	32 (15%)	17 (17%)
Asian American	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (2%)
African American	16 (6%)	15 (7%)	14 (6%)	8 (8%)
Hispanic	0 (0%)	3 (1%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)
White	209 (80%)	159 (73%)	172 (78%)	71 (71%)
Other	3 (1%)	5 (2%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)

Table 2Demographic Data on Female Domestic Violence Victims

Variable	Year			
	1994 (n=261)	1996 (n=217)	1997 (n=220)	1998 (n=100)
Age				
Under 21	24 (9%)	20 (9%)	22 (10%)	7 (7%)
21-30	117 (45%)	75 (35%)	82 (37%)	36 (36%)
31-40	62 (24%)	77 (36%)	59 (27%)	30 (30%)
41-50	23 (9%)	30 (14%)	33 (15%)	13 (13%)
Over 50	10 (4%)	4 (2%)	6 (3%)	2 (2%)
Unknown	25 (10%)	11 (5%)	18 (8%)	12 (12%)
Race				
American Indian	23 (9%)	25 (12%)	33 (15%)	12 (12%)
Asian American	1 (0%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	3 (3%)
African American	4 (2%)	7 (3%)	5 (2%)	2 (2%)
Hispanic	0 (0%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
White	227 (87%)	181 (83%)	175 (80%)	82 (82%)
Other	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
Unknown	6 (2%)	0 (0%)	6 (3%)	1 (1%)

Design

A non-equivalent comparison group design was used to compare a pre-intervention period (1994) to a pilot year (1996) and two intervention periods (1997 and 1998). In addition, repeated follow-up measurements were taken for each comparison group. Statistical procedures were used to determine whether or not other demographic and programmatic variables had an impact on recidivism.

The comparison groups included the following:

*1994 male offenders were compared to 1996 male offenders

*1994 male offenders were compared to 1997 male offenders

*1994 male offenders were compared to offenders from the first 6 months of 1998

Operational Definitions and Data Collection

DAIP. The DAIP coordinated the intervention of battered women's advocates, police,

prosecutors, probation officers, judges and rehabilitation services. Policies and procedures were developed to hold batterers accountable for their behavior and enhance the safety of victims. The DAIP monitored cases as they moved through the criminal justice system and to insure that policies and procedures were followed and that individual cases were responded to effectively. A mandatory arrest policy, prosecution and sentencing guidelines, and an educational curriculum for men who batter are a few of the noted accomplishments of the DAIP. The DAIP served as the 1994 baseline group.

EDAIP. The Enhanced Domestic Abuse Intervention Project expanded the coordinated community response with the use of risk assessment tools, a probation sentencing matrix and a computerized monitoring system called the Domestic Abuse Information Network (DAIN). The police conduct dangerousness suspect assessments and include this information in their police reports. Women's advocates collect risk assessment information that is forwarded to probation officers conducting presentence investigations. Probation officers collected more in-depth information to supplement pre-sentence investigations for domestic violence-related offenses. Some of the information used to complete this investigation was drawn from the "Arrest Follow-up Assessment" completed by on-call advocates and the risk assessment information available in the police report. After completing the pre-sentence investigation, probation officers categorized offenders and make sentencing recommendations using the "Sentencing Recommendation Matrix". Offenders assessed to be more dangerous were recommended for longer sentences. EDAIP also includes an alternative rehabilitation component for male offenders which will be addressed in Hypothesis 4 of this report. EDAIP was partially implemented during the pilot year (1996) and more fully implemented during the two intervention years of 1997 and 1998. (See Appendix for assessment tools and the sentencing matrix).

Project implementation. Throughout the project, data were collected to monitor the implementation of the Enhanced Domestic Abuse Intervention Project. The percent of cases that were assessed for dangerousness by the police and advocates from the Women's Coalition each year was determined. In addition, the percent of cases in which the sentencing matrix was utilized and the categorization of offenders was documented.

Recidivism rates. Recidivism rates were determined by collecting data from criminal justice data bases for St. Louis County and the Minnesota Bureau of Criminal Apprehension. For 1994, 1996 and 1997 male offenders, data were collected 6, 12 and 18 months after intake. Because of time constraints, 6 and 12 month follow-up data were available for men who entered the program during the first six months of 1998 only. Three levels of recidivism were identified, with each level requiring a greater level of documentation. Men were identified as recidivists when at the time of follow-up they fell into one or more of the following categories:

1. Investigated for a domestic violence related incident, but not charged.
2. Charged with a domestic violence related offense or been a respondent in an OFP hearing, but not convicted or had an OFP awarded.
3. Convicted of an offense related to another domestic violence related incident or been the respondent where an Order for Protection (OFP) was awarded.

Control variables. The following variables were included in the statistical analysis: age of victim and offender, race of victim and offender, whether or not they were court mandated to attend the program, whether or not they completed the men's program, number of sessions attended, and batterer categorization by probation officers and by Men's Nonviolence Program staff .

Data Analysis

The percent of men who had recidivated during each year of the study was determined by identifying whether or not they fell into one or more of the recidivism categories of investigated, charged and convicted. Men who had recidivated one or more times were identified as recidivists. The number of men identified as recidivists during 1994 were compared to the number of men who recidivated in 1996 and 1997 using Chi-Square tests to determine statistical significance. Comparisons were also made of the numbers of men who fell into each level of recidivism. For example, the number of 1994 men who had one or more incident of being investigated, but not charged of domestic violence, were compared to the number of 1996, 1997 and 1998 men who fell into this category.

A Chi-Square, Fisher's Exact test or t-test was used to determine if control variables were different for offenders who recidivated and those who did not. Spearman correlation procedures were used to examine the relationship between recidivism and batterer categories assigned by probation officers and DAIP Men's Non-Violence Program staff. Forward stepwise logistic procedures were then used to determine which set of control variables, if any, discriminated between offenders who recidivated and those who did not.

Results

Project Implementation

During the course of the project, the enhanced interventions were not always consistently implemented. The police did not document that they had completed danger assessments in a majority of domestic abuse incidents in which they intervened. The police may have conducted the danger assessment in more cases, but they did not indicate having done so in their reports. Women's advocates conducted danger assessments during most on-call visits to women after police contacts and when assisting women in completing orders for protection until 1998 when programmatic shifts led to a decline in documentation. The data indicate that probation officers used the sentencing recommendation matrix with more than half the offenders referred to the Men's Nonviolence Program. Data on the implementation of the danger assessment and sentencing matrix are summarized in Tables 3, 4 and 5.

Table 3

Implementation of Danger Assessment by Duluth Police

	1996	1997	1998
No. of Incidents	443	494	422
Assessment completed	146 (33%)	180 (36%)	161 (38%)

Table 4Implementation of Danger Assessment by Women's Coalition

	1996	1997	1998
<i>On-Call Visits</i>			
No. of Visits	300	387	359
Assessments completed	299 (99%)	352 (91%)	330 (92%)
<i>OFP Contacts</i>			
No. of Cases	190	219	168
Assessments completed	190 (100%)	197 (90%)	82 (49%)

Table 5Implementation of Sentencing Matrix by Probation Officers

Offenders	1996	1997	1998
Sentenced to Men's Program	n/a	130	103
Used Sentencing Matrix	n/a	75 (58%)	53 (51%)

The "Domestic Violence-Related Misdemeanor Sentencing Recommendation Matrix" used probation officers has four categories with "one" being an offender who has no history of battering and "four" being an offender who poses a high risk of serious harm to victims. The intake staff of the Men's Non-Violence Program also used a matrix to categorize men similar in design to that used by probation officers. (See Appendix for Matrices). Unlike with the sentencing matrix, the categories were assigned for evaluation purposes only and were not linked to intervention. The intake staff assigned categories to 95% of the men seen in 1997 and 100% of the men seen during the first six months of 1998. Categories were assigned to all men entering, not only those entering through the criminal justice system. See Table 6 for probation officer (P.O.) ratings and intake staff ratings (Program).

Table 6Battering Categories Assigned to Offenders

Category	1997		1998	
	P.O.	Program	P.O.	Program
1- No battering history	14 (18.7%)	10 (4.8%)	7 (20.6%)	7 (7%)
2- Low level/ not escalating	31 (41.3%)	72 (34.6%)	17 (50%)	38 (38%)
3- Clear pattern/ likely to escalate	26 (34.7%)	108 (51.9%)	10 (29.41)	38 (38%)
4- High risk of serious harm	4 (5.3%)	18 (8.6%)	0	17 (17%)

Table 7 summarizes attendance and referral data from the Men's Non-Violence Program. During 1994 and 1996, men were required to complete 27 class sessions. During 1997 and 1998, this number was increased to 33 sessions. It is apparent from the data below that some men completed the program without having attended the required number of sessions. With the exception of 1996, a majority of men entering the program did not complete it. Men from 1994 and 1996 had a longer period in which to complete the program, which may partially account for their higher completion rate. Attendance data were collected until September of 1999. Some men drop out of the program, but eventually return and complete the program after further court action. Approximately 20% of the men attend as volunteers.

Table 7Men's Non-Violence Program Data

Variable	1994 (n=261)	1996 (n=217)	1997 (n=220)	1998 (n=100)
Classes attended (mean)	14.3	18.3	16.2	18.7
Completed Program	118 (45%)	113 (52%)	85 (39%)	34 (34%)
Classes attended by completers (mean)	22.7	32.2 29.5	31.3	
Referral Source				
Civil Court	57 (22%)	28 (13%)	37 (17%)	21 (21%)
Criminal Court	125 (48%)	124 (57%)	130 (59%)	53 (53%)
Both	29 (11%)	17 (8%)	4 (2%)	0 (0%)
Volunteer	50 (19%)	48 (22%)	49 (22%)	26 (26%)

Recidivism

Recidivism Rates. Tables 8, 9 and 10 summarize the data on recidivism rates for each year of the study. As indicated earlier, an offender was identified as a recidivist if he fit into one or more of the recidivism categories (investigated, charged, convicted). Recidivism rates for 1994 men were higher than for men from 1996, 1997 and 1998. These differences were statistically significant for six and twelve month follow-ups for 1997 and 1998 offenders. The 1998 recidivism rates may be incomplete because of data entry delays in criminal justice data bases. Additional police contacts which would have labeled a 1998 offender as a “recidivist” would have been entered promptly, but complete data on OFP’s and the final disposition of cases may not have been available for some cases. Lower recidivism rates for 1998 offenders may be partially accounted for by incomplete data, particularly for those who did not have additional police contact, but did have another OFP.

Table 8

Comparison of 1994 and 1996 Recidivism Rates

Follow-up	1994	1996	Chi Sq	Prob (1-tail)
Six Months	36%	31%	1.16	0.14
Twelve Months	46%	41%	0.98	0.16
Eighteen Months	51%	46%	1.31	0.13

Table 9

Comparison of 1994 and 1997 Recidivism Rates

Follow-up	1994	1997	Chi Sq.	Prob. (1-tail)
Six Months	36%	28%	3.34	0.04*
Twelve Months	46%	39%	2.63	0.05*
Eighteen Months	51%	44%	2.51	0.06

*significant at the .05 level or above

Table 10Comparison of 1994 and 1998 Recidivism Rates

Follow-up	1994	1998	Chi Sq.	Prob. (1-tail)
Six Months	36%	20%	8.58	0.00*
Twelve Months	46%	33%	4.99	0.02*

*significant at the .05 level or above

Levels of Recidivism. Although there was not a directional hypothesis made regarding the recidivism levels, it was decided that it would be useful to further explore the data by more closely examining the three levels (i.e. investigated, charged or convicted) at the 18 month follow-up period for 1994, 1996 and 1997 offenders. Twelve month data only were examined for the offenders from the first six months of 1998. Offenders from 1996 were significantly more likely than 1994 offenders to be charged with another criminal offense (5%- 1994, 12%- 1996). However, offenders from 1996 were not more likely to be convicted of another offense. See Table 11.

Table 11Comparison of 1994 and 1996 Recidivism Levels at 18 month Follow-up

Level	1994	1996	Chi Sq.	Prob. (2 -tail)
Investigated	29%	24%	4.31	0.64
Charged	8%	15%	10.64	0.01*
OFP	3%	2%	2.17	0.34
Criminal	5%	12%	11.68	0.01*
Convicted	37%	31%	11.40	0.12
OFP	21%	23%	5.03	0.17
Criminal	25%	16%	9.06	0.11

*significant at the .05 level or above

Offenders from 1997 were significantly more likely than 1994 offenders to be charged with another criminal offense. There were no significant differences in terms of the numbers convicted of criminal offenses. Significantly fewer offenders from 1997 had additional OFP's awarded against them (21%-1994, 8%- 1997). See Table 12.

Table 12Comparison of 1994 and 1997 Recidivism Levels at 18 month follow-up

Level	1994	1997	Chi Sq.	Prob. (2-tail)
Investigated	29%	23%	5.86	0.56
Charged	8%	11%	4.06	0.13
OFP	3%	0%	3.62	0.06
Criminal	5%	11%	7.28	0.03*
Convicted	37%	25%	16.17	0.01*
OFP	21%	8%	14.63	0.00*
Criminal	25%	21%	4.66	0.46

*significant at the .05 level or above

Offenders from 1998 were significantly less likely to be charged and convicted of additional offenses than were 1994 offenders. When this was broken down in terms of criminal offenses and OFP's, they were convicted of significantly fewer criminal offenses only. As noted earlier, the 1998 data is likely incomplete in terms of the final disposition of cases so it is likely that the conviction rate would have been higher, if more time had elapsed. The data is considered most reliable at the level of investigation where no significant differences were found. See Table 13.

Table 13Comparison of 1994 and 1998 Recidivism Levels at 12 month follow-up

Level	1994	1998	Chi Sq	Prob
Investigated	29%	17%	11.10	0.09
Charged	8%	6%	6.37	0.04*
OFP	3%	0%	2.74	0.10
Criminal	5%	6%	4.76	0.09
Convicted	37%	17%	16.32	0.01*
OFP	21%	6%	10.7	0.00*
Criminal	25%	13%	7.48	0.11

*significant at .05 level or above

Many of the men recidivated during the first six months after intake. In examining the data more closely, we found that between 11 to 18 percent of the men (18% -1994, 15%-1996, 16%-1997 and 11%- 1998) recidivated within the first six months, but did not do so later. The possibility that the partners of some of these men may have sought an OFP after the point of intake as a protective measure, but not necessarily because of renewed violence was also explored. We found that most of the recidivism was not because of OFP's; 11% of the 1994 men, 7% of the 1996 men, 4% of the 1997 men and 4% of the 1998 men were a respondent in an OFP hearing during the first six months, but had no other record of recidivism.

Control Variables

Factor by factor analysis found that most of the demographic variables were not significantly related to recidivism at any of the follow-up periods. The one exception was the race of the victim. Offenders whose victims were white women were less likely to recidivate at 12 ($p=.01$) and 18 ($p=.04$) month follow-up periods.

Variables relating to the offender's involvement with the Men's Nonviolence Program were more likely to be related to recidivism than demographic variables. Men who were court mandated to the program were significantly more likely to have recidivated at 6 ($p=.00$), 12 ($p=.00$) and 18 ($p=.00$) month follow-up periods. Men who did not complete the program were also more likely to recidivate at 6 ($p=.02$), 12 ($p=.00$) and 18 ($p=.00$) month follow-up periods. At the twelve month follow-up period, men who attended fewer group sessions were more likely to recidivate ($p=.03$). This difference approached significance at 6 ($p=.06$) and 18 ($p=.06$) month follow-up periods .

The lower the batterer category assigned by probation officers, the less likely the offender was to have recidivated at 6 ($p=.01$), 12 ($p=.02$) and 18 (.02) month follow-up periods. At the eighteen month follow-up period, 10 of the 28 category "1" offenders (36%) recidivated, 23 of the 51 category "2" offenders (45%) recidivated, 28 of the 44 category "3" offenders (64%) recidivated and 2 of the 2 category "4" offenders (100%) had recidivated.

Batterer categories assigned by intake staff of the Men's Nonviolence Program were only significantly related to recidivism at the 12 month follow-up period ($p=.05$). At the twelve month follow-up period, 7 of the 17 category "1" offenders (41%) had recidivated, 34 of the 110 category "2" offenders (31%) had recidivated, 53 of the 146 category "3" offenders (36%) had recidivated and 20 of the 35 category "4" offenders (57%) had recidivated.

Forward logistic procedures including control variables and 1994-96 as an independent variable at the 18 month follow-up resulted in two variables remaining in the final model . See Table 14. Having been court mandated and not having completed groups were significantly related to recidivism. Using this model, recidivism could be predicted accurately in 46% of cases, while no recidivism could be predicted accurately in 78% of the cases. Overall recidivism could be accurately predicted in 62% of the cases based upon this model. The Chi-Square for the model was 27.39 with 2 degrees of freedom, which was significant at the .00 level. Variables not predicting recidivism were: age of the victim, age of the offender, race of the offender, race of the victim, number of group sessions attended and the year. Older women were more likely to have had partners that recidivated at 6 months and women of color were more likely to have had partners that recidivated at 12 months, but these variables were no longer significant at 18 months.

Table 14Logistic Regression: Control Variables and 94-96 Recidivism at 18 months

Variables	Recidivism at 18 months		
	Beta	Standard Error	Prob.*
Court Mandated	-1.11	.26	.00
Program Completion	-.88	.22	.00

* Two tail significance

Forward logistic procedures including control variables and 1994-97 as an independent variable at the 18 month follow-up resulted in four variables remaining in the final model.(See Table 15). Women of color, having been court mandated, not having completed groups and attending the program in 1994 were significantly related to recidivism. Using this model, recidivism could be predicted accurately in 56% of cases, while no recidivism could be predicted accurately in 66% of the cases. Overall recidivism could be accurately predicted in 61% of the cases based upon this model. The Chi-Square for the model was 27.64 with 4 degrees of freedom, which was significant at the .00 level. Variables not predicting recidivism were: age of the victim, age of the offender, race of the offender and number of group sessions attended. The same four variables were significantly related to recidivism at 6 and 12 month follow-up periods.

Table 15Logistic Regression: Control Variables and 94-97 Recidivism at 18 months

Variables	Recidivism at 18 months		
	Beta	Standard Error	Prob*
Victim Race	.59	.29	.04
Court Mandated	-.94	.26	.00
Program Completion	-.88	.21	.00
1994-97	-.43	.20	.02

* Two tail significance with the exception of “1994-97” reported as one tail

Forward logistic procedures including control variables and 1994-98 as an independent variable at the 12 month follow-up resulted in four variables remaining in the final model.(See Table 16). Women of color, having been court mandated, not having completed groups and attending the program in 1994 were significantly related to recidivism. Using this model, recidivism could be predicted accurately in 50% of cases, while no recidivism could be predicted accurately in 78% of the cases. Overall recidivism could be accurately predicted in 66% of the cases based upon this model. The Chi-Square for the model was 25.70 with 3 degrees of freedom, which was significant at the .00 level. Variables not predicting recidivism were: age of the victim, age of the offender, race of the offender and number of group sessions attended. The model was slightly different for 6 months recidivism with court mandated not being included in the model. Eighteen month follow-up data was not examined for 1998 because it was not yet complete.

Table 16

Logistic Regression: Control Variables and 94-98 Recidivism at 12 months

Variables	Recidivism at 12 months		
	Beta	Standard Error	Prob.*
Court Mandated	-.73	.30	.02
Program Completion	-1.09	.25	.00
1994-98	-.68	.26	.01

* Two tail significance with the exception of “1994-98” reported as one tail

Discussion

Conclusions

The data provide support for the hypothesis that EDAIP offenders would have lower rates of recidivism when compared to DAIP offenders. EDAIP offenders did not have significantly lower recidivism rates when compared to 1996 (pilot year), but the rates were significantly lower when compared to the intervention years of 1997 and 1998 at six and twelve month follow-up periods. Significant differences were not found when 1994 and 1997 were compared at the 18 month follow-up, although the results were in the expected direction and approached statistical significance (p=.06).

Further analysis of the various levels of recidivism found that 1994 offenders were less likely to be charged with criminal offenses when compared to 1996 and 1997 men, but were not more likely to be convicted. These 1994 offenders were more likely to have had another OFP obtained against them when compared to 1997 offenders. They were more likely to be charged and convicted when compared to 1998 men.

Further data to support the hypothesis is provided from the logistic regression which controlled for demographic and programmatic variables when examining the differences between 1994 and later years of the study. This data found that having entered the program in 1997 and 1998 was significantly related to lower rates of recidivism when compared to the baseline year of 1994. This was not found to be the case when 1994 offenders were compared to the 1996 offenders (pilot year). Logistic regression procedures found three additional variables that were significantly related to offenders not having recidivated during most years of the study: the victim being a white woman, the offender having volunteered to attend the Men's Nonviolence Program, and the offender having completed the program. Other demographic variables were not found to be significantly related to recidivism, nor was the actual number of group sessions attended. Findings from a factor by factor analysis found the same three variables to be significant with the addition of higher attendance rates being associated with recidivism at the 12 month follow-up only.

There was evidence to support the use of the batterer categorization matrix by probation officers to predict recidivism. Factor by factor comparisons of the batterer categories assigned by probation officers were found to be significantly related to recidivism. Men assigned lower categories, indicating that violence was not escalating violence, did have lower rates of recidivism at all follow-up periods. The categories assigned by the intake staff of the Men's Nonviolence Program were only significantly related to recidivism at the 12 month follow-up period.

The program implementation data suggest that EDAIP was implemented inconsistently. The police in particular did not document that they had utilized new procedures in a majority of cases, and probation officers did so in a little more than half the cases. The Women's Coalition was most consistent in following through and documenting the use of risk assessment procedures.

Limitations

This study is limited because it does not have an experimental design. While the comparison groups appeared to be relatively similar, they may have differed in some respects that were not anticipated by the researchers. Variables other than the intervention (EDAIP) may have influenced the outcomes. Data were collected from a number of criminal justice databases and checked for accuracy. Delays in data entry by the criminal justice system may have resulted in the 1998 recidivism data being incomplete. Additional police contacts which would have labeled a 1998 offender as a "recidivist" would have been entered promptly, but complete data on OFP's and the final disposition of cases may not have been available for some cases. Lower recidivism rates for 1998 offenders may be partially accounted for by incomplete data, particularly for those who did not have additional police contact, but did have another OFP.

Part Two: Abuse, Women's Safety and Women's Well Being

Hypotheses and Research Question

- Hypothesis 3b. The Enhanced Domestic Intervention Project (EDAIP) will have lower rates of physical and psychological abuse reported by victims when compared to the Domestic Abuse Intervention Project (DAIP).
- Hypothesis 3c. The Enhanced Domestic Intervention Project (EDAIP) will have higher ratings of women's safety when compared to the Domestic Abuse Intervention Project (DAIP).
- Hypothesis 3d. The Enhanced Domestic Intervention Project (EDAIP) will have higher ratings of women's well being when compared to the Domestic Abuse Intervention Project (DAIP).
- Research question. Did battered women report that the intervention provided by community agencies was helpful, harmful or had no impact for different years of the study?

Method

Population and Sample

The population studied were the female victims of male domestic violence offenders who entered the DAIP Men's Nonviolence Program during 1994, 1996 and 1997. The sample included all women during these years who agreed to be interviewed eighteen months after the offender's intake appointment.

Unfortunately, we were unsuccessful in contacting many of the women for interviews. This was primarily due to being unable to locate them. Of the 261 women from 1994, 85% could not be located, 3% declined to be interviewed and 11% were actually interviewed. Of the 217 women that we attempted to contact in 1996, 74% could not be located, 10% declined to be interviewed and 16% were interviewed. Of the 220 women from 1997, 76% could not be located for the interview, 11% declined to be interviewed and 13% were actually interviewed. Table 17 summarizes the descriptive data available for victims from each year.

Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square tests were done to compare the victim's age categories between 1994, 1996, and 1997. There were no statistically significant differences at the .05 level between either a) 1994 and 1996 or b) 1994 and 1997. In respect to income distribution, there were considerable differences between 1994 and 1997 in the proportion of victim's with annual incomes of less than \$10,000 (i.e., 26% in 1994 compared with only 7% in 1997). However, when these differences were evaluated through a Chi-Square test, they were not statistically significant at the .05 level. There also appeared to be large differences between 1994 and 1997 in the proportion of victims who were either part-time or full-time employed (i.e., 51% versus 74%). These again proved to not be statistically significant at the .05 level. Finally, the apparent differences between 1994 and 1997 in the victims' parental status (i.e., having children or not) were not statistically significant at the .05 level.

Data on age and race were available from DAIN (Domestic Abuse Intervention Network) for most of the women in the study population. For each year of the study, women who were interviewed were compared to those who were not on these variables to determine how similar the relatively small sample was to the study population.

Data were available for 236 of the 261 victims from 1994. Women who were interviewed were significantly older than those who were not ($t=-2.59$, $p=.01$). The mean age for those interviewed was 34.5, compared to 29.5 for those who were not. Race was collapsed into two categories of “white women” and “woman of color”. There were no significant difference found between 1994 women who were interviewed and those that were not (Fisher’s exact P-Value= .99). For 1996, data on race and age were available for 206 of the 217 women. There were no significant differences between interviewed women and women who were not on age ($t= -.41$, $p= .68$) or race (chi-square= .57, $p=.45$). Data were available for 214 of the 217 domestic violence victims from 1997. Women who were interviewed were not significantly different in terms of race (chi-square= .90, $p= .90$) or age ($t= -1.33$, $p= .18$) from those who were not interviewed.

Table 17Demographic Data from Victim Interviews

Variable	Year		
	1994 (n=28)	1996 (n=34)	1997 (n=28)
Race			
American Indian	3 (11%)	3 (9%)	4 (14%)
African American	0	0	1 (4%)
White	25 (89%)	30 (88%)	23 (82%)
Asian American	0	0	0 (0%)
Hispanic/ Latina	0	1 (3%)	0
Age at time of interview			
18-25	7 (26%)	7 (21%)	6 (21%)
26-35	10 (37%)	14 (41%)	12 (43%)
36-49	9 (33%)	12 (35%)	8 (29%)
50-65	1 (4%)	1 (3%)	2 (7%)
Over 65	0	0	0
Income at time of incident			
Less than \$10,000	7 (26%)	11 (33%)	2 (7%)
\$10,001 to \$20,000	8 (30%)	6 (18%)	9 (32%)
\$20,001 to \$30,000	6 (22%)	5 (15%)	6 (21%)
\$30,001 to \$40,000	2 (7%)	6 (18%)	7 (25%)
\$40,001 to \$50,000	2 (7%)	3 (9%)	2 (7%)
More than \$50,000	2 (7%)	2 (6%)	2 (7%)
Employed at time of incident			
Full-time	14 (52%)	15 (44%)	12 (43%)
Part-time	4 (15%)	7 (21%)	6 (21%)
Not at all	9 (33%)	12 (35%)	10 (36%)
Employed at time of interview			
Full-time	12 (44%)	14 (41%)	14 (52%)
Part-time	2 (7%)	8 (24%)	6 (22%)
Not at all	13 (48%)	12 (35%)	7 (26%)
Has children			
Yes	19 (68%)	26 (77%)	23 (82%)
No	9 (32%)	8 (23%)	5 (18%)

Design

A non-equivalent comparison group design was used to compare a pre-intervention period (1994) to a pilot year (1996) and a post-intervention period (1997). Statistical procedures were used to determine whether or not other demographic and programmatic variables had an impact on abusive behavior, safety and well-being.

The comparison groups included the following:

- *1994 female victims were compared to 1996 female victims
- *1994 female victims were compared to 1997 female victims

Operational Definitions and Data Collection

Part one of this section of the report describes the Domestic Abusive Intervention Project (pre-intervention period) and the Enhanced Domestic Abuse Intervention Project (post-intervention). Data were collected to monitor the implementation of the project and the results are discussed in the previous section.

Women were initially contacted by mail to request their participation in the study eighteen months after the offender's intake appointment with the Men's Nonviolence Program. Women were asked to either return a signed consent form indicating their willingness to be interviewed or to return a form indicating that they did not wish to be contacted for an interview. A trained interviewer contacted the women and in most cases interviewed her by phone. If women did not respond, they received a second mailing. Follow-up phone calls were attempted when women did not respond to either of the first two inquiries.

The Survivor's Experiences Questionnaire used in the interviews is located in the Appendix. This in-depth interview took approximately one hour to complete. Areas covered in the interview included experiences with domestic violence services, offender risk factors, current and previous abuse on the part of the offender, and the women's current status in terms of their safety and well-being. Three main outcome variables were examined in this part of this study and are operationally defined below.

Abusive Behavior. The frequency of abusive behavior as reported by victims was determined by using the Abusive Behavior Inventory (Shepard & Campbell, 1992) located in Part VII of the Survivor's Experiences Questionnaire (see Appendix). Four items were modified from the original inventory based upon a validity study of the instrument (Shepard & Campbell, 1992) and feedback from the evaluation team and program staff. Respondents were asked to rate retrospectively the frequency of physical and psychological abusive behavior during the three month period prior to the incident and their frequency during the most recent three months (approximately 16 to 18 months after the incident) on a scale from 1 to 5 (1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Occasionally, 4=Frequently, 5=Very Frequently). The Abusive Behavior Inventory (ABI) has physical and psychological abuse subscales which were examined separately for each respondent. Frequency ratings for each subscale item were summed and divided by the total number of subscale items to obtain subscale scores for physical and psychological abuse.

The ABI has 17 psychological abuse items and 13 physical abuse items. Originally there were 20 psychological abuse items, but three of the items correlated more highly with the physical abuse

subscale- these items had to do with threatening physical violence or being violent toward objects.

The psychological abuse items are: called you names and/or criticized you, tried to keep you from doing something you wanted to do, screamed at you, ended a discussion with you and made the decision himself, put down your family and friends, accused you of paying too much attention to someone or something else, gave you angry stares or looks, bossed you around, said things to scare you, checked up on you, used the children to threaten you, drove recklessly when you were in the car, refused to do housework or child care, put you down in front of others, stopped or tried to stop you from going to work or school, became upset because dinner, housework, or laundry was not ready when he wanted it, made you do something humiliating or degrading. The physical abuse items are: pressured you to have sex when you didn't want to, threatened to hit or throw something at you, slapped/hit or punched you, pushed/grabbed or shoved you, pressured you to have sex in a way that didn't like or want to, threw/ hit/ kicked or smashed something, physically forced you to have sex, threatened you with a knife/ gun or other weapon, kicked or bit you, threw you around, choked or strangled you, used a knife/ gun or other weapon.

Women's Safety. Safety was measured using item #159 on the Survivors' Experiences Questionnaire (see Appendix). Women were asked: "How safe do you feel now—is it worse, better, or the same?"

Women's Well-being. Well being was determined by the percent of women who rated themselves as "worse", "better", or "same" on items relating to their freedom to make decisions, how they feel emotionally, how they feel about their economic situation, how they feel physically, how they feel about social relationships, how they feel about their spiritual life, and how they feel about their relationship with their children (items #148- 156) on the Survivor's Experiences Questionnaire (see Appendix). A total well-being score was calculated for each woman by adding the number of items that received a "better" rating.

Control variables. The following variables were included in the statistical analysis: age of victim and offender, race of victim and offender, whether or not they were court mandated to attend the program, whether or not they completed of the program, number of sessions attended, and batterer categorization by probation officers and by Men's Nonviolence Program staff .

Community Intervention. The interviews with victims asked them about their experiences with different aspects of community intervention (ie., the police, the criminal court, the probation process, the process of applying for an OFP, the OFP hearing, having the OFP in effect, the women's shelter, and the Men's Nonviolence Program.) Women were asked to rate each intervention as either "harmful", "helpful" or having "no impact" (see Survivor's Experiences Questionnaire).

Data Analysis

Frequency of Abusive Behavior. Means were calculated for each item of the Abusive Behavior Inventory and physical and psychological subscale scores were determined as described above. T-tests were conducted comparing mean scores before intervention with mean scores after intervention for each year of the study. A change score was calculated for each woman by subtracting the scores before intervention from the scores after intervention. The mean change scores for each year of the project were compared to the baseline scores from the 1994 group. Analysis of Covariance tests were conducted to assess whether there were statistically significant differences in post-intervention scores between years (i.e., 1994 & 1996 and 1994 & 1997), controlling for differences in pre-intervention scores.

Women’s Safety. Safety ratings for each year of the study were summarized and compared using Chi-Square procedures.

Women’s Well-being. Women’s ratings of individual items were compared for each year of the study using Chi-Square procedures. Total well-being scores were also calculated and t-tests were conducted to compare 1994 scores with 1996 and 1997 scores. Comparisons were made including all women, but excluding items related to parenting/ children and also, by including all items, but excluding women who did not have children.

Community Intervention. Women’s responses were examined qualitatively for common themes and patterns. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the ratings of “helpful”, “harmful” or “no impact”.

Control variables. A Chi-Square, Fisher’s Exact test or t-test was used to determine if control variables were related to abusive behavior, women’s safety and women’s well-being. Spearman correlation procedures were used to examine the relationship between batterer categories assigned by probation officers and DAIP Men’s Non-Violence Program staff and women’s safety. In order to examine the relationship between the categories and well-being and abusive behavior the categories were collapsed into two (i.e., 1 & 2; 3 & 4) and t-tests were conducted. Forward stepwise logistic procedures were then used to determine which set of control variables, if any, discriminated between women who reported feeling safer and those that did not. Forward stepwise multiple regression procedures were used to examine control variables in relation to abusive behavior and women’s well being.

Results

Abusive Behavior

For all three years, significant reductions in the frequency of physical and psychological abuse were reported when a three month period before intervention was compared to a three month period after intervention (Tables 18, 19 and 20).

Table 18

Comparison of 1994 Abusive Behavior Inventory Mean Scores Before and After Intervention (n=27)

Variable	Before	After	t	Prob
Psychological Abuse	3.25	1.69	7.86	.00*
Physical Abuse	2.38	1.29	6.02	.00*
Total Score	5.62	2.97	7.44	.00*

* significant at the .01 level

Table 19

Comparison of 1996 Abusive Behavior Inventory Mean Scores Before and After Intervention (n=34)

Variable	Before	After	t	Prob
Psychological Abuse	3.01	1.82	6.59	.00*
Physical Abuse	2.36	1.27	7.08	.00*
Total Score	5.38	3.10	7.29	.00*

* significant at the .01 level

Table 20

Comparison of 1997 Abusive Behavior Inventory Mean Scores Before and After Intervention

Variable	Before	After	t	Prob
Psychological Abuse	3.29	1.72	7.69	.00*
Physical Abuse	2.18	1.36	5.31	.00*
Total Score	5.47	3.08	7.37	.00*

* significant at the .01 level

Table 21 compares 1994, 1996, and 1997 mean change scores. There were similar decreases in reported frequency of psychological and physical abuse for all three years. No statistically significant differences between 1994 and subsequent years were found for any of the abuse scores.

Table 21

Comparison of 1994, 1996 and 1997 Abusive Behavior Mean Change Scores

Variable	<u>1994</u> (n=27)	<u>1996</u> (n=34)	<u>1997</u> (n=28)
Psychological Abuse	-1.56	-1.19	-1.57
Physical Abuse	-1.09	-1.09	-.83
Total Score	-2.65	-2.28	-2.39

Analysis of Covariance tests were conducted to assess whether there were statistically significant differences in post-intervention scores between years (i.e., 1994 & 1996 and 1994 & 1997), controlling for differences in pre-intervention scores. In both comparisons (between 1994 & 1996 and between 1994 & 1997), the main effect for “year” was *not* statistically significant in respect to psychological abuse, physical abuse or the combined psychological and physical abuse score. See Tables below.

Table 22

ANCOVA Analysis Of Differences in Post-intervention Psychological Abuse Scores between 1994 and 1996, Controlling for the Effect of Differences in Pre-intervention Scores

Variable	df	F	Prob
Pre-Intervention Score	32	1.463	.158
Year (1994 versus 1996)	1	.142	.709
Error	27	N/A	N/A

Table 23

ANCOVA Analysis of Differences in Post-Intervention Physical Abuse Scores between 1994 and 1996, Controlling for the Effect of Differences in Pre-Intervention Scores

Variable	df	F	Prob
Pre-Intervention Score	31	2.604	.006
Year (1994 versus 1996)	1	.461	.503
Error	21	N/A	N/A

Table 24

ANCOVA Analysis of Differences in Post-Intervention Composite Psychological and Physical Abuse Scores between 1994 and 1996, Controlling for the Effect of Differences in Pre-intervention scores

Variable	df	F	Prob
Pre-Intervention Score	56	8.613	.050
Year (1994 versus 1996)	1	2.168	.237
Error	3	N/A	N/A

Table 25

ANCOVA Analysis of Differences in Post-Intervention Psychological Abuse Scores between 1994 and 1997, Controlling for the Effect of Differences in Pre-Intervention Scores

Variable	df	F	Prob
Pre-Intervention Score	31	2.401	.030
Year (1994 versus 1997)	1	.299	.592
Error	16	N/A	N/A

Table 26

ANCOVA Analysis of Differences in Post-intervention Physical Abuse Scores between 1994 and 1997, Controlling for the Effect of Differences in Pre-intervention Scores

Variable	df	F	Prob
Pre-Intervention Score	31	2.615	.011
Year (1994 versus 1997)	1	.026	.873
Error	22	N/A	N/A

Table 27

ANCOVA Analyses of Differences in Post-Intervention Composite Psychological and Physical Abuse scores between 1994 and 1997, Controlling for the Effect of Differences in Pre-Intervention Scores

Variable	df	F	Prob
Pre-Intervention Score	51	1.813	.000
Year (1994 versus 1997)	0*	---	---
Error	2	N/A	N/A

*Type III Sum of Square = .001

Control variables. Factor by factor analysis found that the demographic variables (ie., victim age and race, offender age and race) were not significantly related to abusive behavior change scores. The number of sessions attended and program categorizations were also not significantly related to abusive behavior change scores. Women reported significantly greater reductions in physical abuse for those offenders who had completed the program when compared to than those who had not ($p=.04$). There were no significant differences for program completion and psychological abuse

change scores and total abuse scores. Women reported greater reductions in physical abuse (p=.01), psychological abuse (p=.01) and total abuse (p=.00) when the offender had been court mandated to attend the program.

The court mandated variable predicted psychological abuse, physical abuse and the total abuse change scores when forward stepwise multiple regression procedures included the 1994-96 as an independent variable. The significant equation for the psychological abuse change scores was [F(1,59)= 8.74, p=.004], with a R square of .13. The significant regression equation for physical abuse change scores was [F(1,59)=8.24, p=.006], with a R square of .12. The significant regression equation for the total abuse change scores was [F(1,59)= 9.98, p=.002], with a R square of .13. Women whose partners were court mandated to attend the program reported greater reductions in physical, psychological and total abuse. Variables not included in the model were victim age, victim race, offender race, offender age, attendance, completion of groups and the year the offender had been in the program (either 1994 or 1996). Table 28 summarizes these findings.

Table 28

Stepwise Multiple Regression: Control Variables and 94-96 Abuse Change Scores

Psychological Abuse	Beta	Standard Error	Significance of t score
Court Mandated	.36	.30	.00*
Physical Abuse			
Court Mandated	.35	.26	.00*
Total Abuse			
Court Mandated	.38	.52	.00*

*significant at the .05 level or above.

No variables predicted psychological abuse change scores and total abuse change scores when 1994-97 was examined. A significant regression equation was found for 1994-97 physical abuse change scores with one variable in the equation [F(1,53)= 6.05, p=.00] and a R square of .09. Women whose partners completed the program reported greater reductions in physical abuse. Table 29 summarizes these findings. Variables not included in the models were victim age, offender age, victim race, offender race, attendance, court mandated, and the year the offender had been in the program (either 1994 or 1997).

Table 29Stepwise Multiple Regression: Control Variables and 94-97 Abuse Change Scores

Variable	Physical Abuse		
	Beta	Standard Error	Significance of t score
Completed Program	-.32	.23	.02*

* significant at the .05 level or above

Women's Safety

Eighteen months after the offender's intake appointment, women were asked: "How safe do you feel now—is it worse, better, or the same?" Eighteen (72%) of the 1994 women reported that their safety was better, while 5 (20%) considered it the same and 2 (8%) reported that it was worse. Twenty-six (79%) of the 1996 women reported that their safety was better, while 5 (15%) considered it the same and 2 (6%) reported that it was worse. Twenty-two (82%) of the 1997 women reported their safety was better, 2 (7%) said it was the same and 3 (11%) said it was worse. For purposes of chi-square analysis, the categories of "same" and "worse" were collapsed into one category of "not better". More women in 1996 and 1997 reported that they felt their safety was "better" when compared to 1994 women, but differences were not statistically significant. When the Chi-Square, Fisher's Exact Test was run, no significant relationship between the two variables was found for either 1994 and 1996 (Exact Significance, one-sided =.384) or 1994 and 1997 (Exact Significance, one-sided =.315). See Table 30.

Table 30Frequency Distributions of Women's 1994, 1996, and 1997 safety ratings

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>
Better	18 (72%)	26 (79%)	22 (82%)
Not Better	7 (28%)	7 (21%)	5 (19%)

Control variables. Factor by factor variables found that none of the demographic or program related variables studied were significantly related to women's ratings of their safety. No variables remained in the final model for any of the abuse variables when forward stepwise logistic regression procedures included control variables and 1994-96 or 1994-97 as independent variables and safety as the dependent variable.

Women's Well-being

Women were asked a series of questions to assess their well-being at the eighteen month follow-up interview. They were asked how they felt about various areas of their life compared to in the past. The only area in which a majority of women did not report feeling better was in terms of their "economic situation". While 54% of the 1997 women did feel "better" about their economic situation, only 50% of the 1996 women and 41% of the 1994 women did. Table 31 summarizes these findings.

Table 31

Comparison of Women's Well-being Ratings in 1994, 1996, and 1997

Variable	<u>1994</u>		<u>1996</u>		<u>1997</u>	
Freedom to make decisions	85%	(23/4)	85%	(29/5)	96%	(27/1)
Emotionally	74%	(20/7)	68%	(23/11)	86%	(24/4)
Economic situation	41%	(11/16)	50%	(17/17)	54%	(15/13)
Physically	67%	(18/9)	77%	(26/8)	82%	(23/5)
Social relationships	82%	(22/5)	71%	(24/10)	79%	(22/6)
Spiritual life	82%	(22/5)	65%	(22/12)	82%	(23/5)
How children are doing	76%	(16/5)	78%	(21/6)	83%	(19/4)
Relationship with children	86%	(18/3)	70%	(19/8)	91%	(21/2)
Parenting skills	80%	(16/4)	78%	(21/6)	87%	(20/3)

*Percent of "better" ratings followed by frequency breakdown of "better" and "not better" responses.

There were no significant differences in terms of reported well-being when 1994 women were compared to women from 1996 and 1997. For purposes of analysis, the categories of "same" and "worse" were collapsed into one category of "not better". Tables 32 and 33 summarize these findings.

Table 32

Test of Differences in “Better” versus “Not Better” Ratings in 1994 and 1996

Variable	<u>1994</u>		<u>1996</u>		<u>Fisher’s Exact Sig. (1-Sided)</u>
	better	not better	better	not better	
Freedom to make decisions	23	4	29	5	.633
Emotionally	20	7	23	1	.398
Economic situation	11	16	17	17	.322
Physically	18	9	26	8	.287
Social relationships	22	5	24	10	.249
Spiritual life	22	5	22	12	.122
How children are doing	16	5	21	6	.582
Relationship with children	18	3	19	8	.183
Parenting skills	16	4	21	6	.574

Table 33

Test of Differences in “Better” versus “Not Better” Ratings in 1994 and 1997

Variable	<u>1994</u>		<u>1997</u>		<u>Fisher’s Exact Sig. (1-Sided)</u>
	better	not better	better	not better	
Freedom to make decisions	23	4	27	1	.164
Emotionally	20	7	24	4	.230
Economic situation	11	16	15	13	.248
Physically	18	9	23	5	.157
Social relationships	22	5	22	6	.527
Spiritual life	22	5	23	5	.611
How children are doing	16	5	19	4	.438
Relationship with children	18	3	21	2	.455
Parenting skills	16	4	20	3	.418

As noted previously, a total well-being score was determined for each women by adding the number of items that received a “better” rating. Two overall well-being scores were determined; one that included items relating to children and one that did not. This was done because not all women had children and, therefore, could not respond to all the items.

There were a total of nine well-being items and on average women from 1994, 1996 and 1997 reported that seven of these were better than they had been prior to intervention. Neither the differences between 1994 and 1996, nor those between 1994 and 1997 were statistically significant: $t(46)=.430$, $p=.334$ (1-tail) for 1994/1996; and $t(42)=.512$, $p=.306$ (1-tail) for

1994/1997. See Table 34.

Table 34

Comparison of Well-being Scores on Items 1-9 (Excluding those Respondents without Children)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Mean</u>
1994 (n=21)	6.90
1996 (n=27)	6.59
1997 (n=23)	7.22

There were six well-being items when those relating to children were eliminated. On average, women in 1994 and 1996 reported that four areas were better after intervention, while this was the case for five areas for 1997 women. Neither the differences between 1994 and 1996, nor those between 1994 and 1997 were statistically significant: $t(59) = .324$, $p = .374$ (one-tail) for 1994/1996; and $t(53) = 1.17$, $p = .125$ (one-tail) for 1994/1997. Table 33 summarizes these findings.

Table 35

Comparison of Well-being Scores by Year on Items 1-6 (excluding children's well-being questions)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Mean</u>
1994 (n=27)	4.30
1996 (n=34)	4.15
1997 (n=28)	4.79

Control variables. Factor by factor analysis found that the demographic variables (ie., victim age and race, offender age and race) were not significantly related to well-being scores. Having attended more group sessions was related to higher well-being scores when the child related items were excluded ($p = .01$), as was having the offender court mandated ($p = .01$). Batterer categorizations and program completion were not found to be significantly related to well-being.

The court mandated variable predicted well-being (items relating to children/ parenting excluded) when forward stepwise multiple regression procedures included the 1994-96 as an independent variable. See Table 36. The significant equation for the well being scores was $[F(1,59) = 7.34, p = .009]$, with a R square of .11. Women whose partners were court mandated to attend the program reported greater well-being than those who were not. Variables not included in this model were age of victim, age of offender, race of victim, race of offender, attendance, completed groups, and the year the offender had been in the program (1994 or 1996). No variables predicted well-being scores including all the items (excluding women without children) for either 1996 or 1997. No variables predicted well-being scores for 1997 scores using the shortened list.

Table 36Stepwise Multiple Regression: Control Variables and 94-96 Well-Being Scores

Variable	Beta Error	Standard	Significance of t score
Court Mandated	-0.33	-2.71	.01

* significant at the .05 level or above

Experiences with Community Intervention

Table 37 summarizes women’s ratings of helpfulness across the different years of the study. It should be noted that some women did not use all forms of intervention. For example, some women did not have contact with the criminal justice system while others only had involvement with the OFP process. From examining the descriptive data, there did not appear to be differences across the years of the study. Similar themes emerged from the qualitative data for each year of the study. Women found most aspects of the intervention provided to be helpful to them, particularly the police intervention, having an OFP and receiving support from the Women’s Coalition. Some women reported continuing to experience violence and that the system did not always follow through with enforcing consequences. The Men’s Nonviolence Program was considered by the women to be the least helpful form of intervention. Table 35 summarizes the descriptive data, while qualitative comments are included below.

Police. Sixty-five percent of the women reported that the police intervention was helpful. Many of the women found police assistance was helpful because the offender was removed and/or arrested. Some women responded that the police intervention was helpful because of the support or assistance that was offered to them. Illustrative comments include the following: “they believed me” (1994), “quick to respond/ informative”(1996) and “helpful because they took me to the shelter”(1997). Twelve percent of the women reported that police intervention was harmful mainly commenting that it increased the offender’s anger. Several women felt the police were not responsive. These comments included; “they treated me like the perpetrator and treated him indifferently” (1994), “very neglectful of evidence” (1996), and “cops wouldn’t do much” (1997). Twenty-three percent of the women thought the intervention had no impact. Their comments included; “he just left when they came”(1994), “didn’t phase him”(1994), “made it emotionally worse”(1996), “they didn’t help because they weren’t supportive” (1996), “no help-they kind of ignored me”(1997), “they treated it like a joke because they had been there a lot”.

Table 37Women's Ratings of Community Intervention

Police				
	Helpful	Harmful	Both	No Impact
1994	8 (67%)	1 (8%)	0	3 (25%)
1996	11 (65%)	2 (12%)	0	4 (23%)
1997	9 (64%)	2 (14%)	0	3 (21%)
Total	28 (65%)	5 (12%)	0	10 (23%)

Criminal Court/ Judge				
	Helpful	Harmful	Both	No Impact
1994	9 (75%)	0 (0%)	0	3 (25%)
1996	9 (53%)	2 (12%)	0	6 (35%)
1997	5 (42%)	3 (25%)	0	4 (33%)
Total	23 (56%)	5 (12%)	0	13 (32%)

Probation Process				
	Helpful	Harmful	Both	No Impact
1994	8 (67%)	0	0	4 (33%)
1996	7 (44%)	0	0	9 (56%)
1997	6 (60%)	1 (10%)	0	3 (30%)
Total	21 (55%)	1 (3%)	0	16 (42%)

Table 37 (cont.)

Process of Applying for OFP				
	Helpful	Harmful	Both	No Impact
1994	9 (82%)	1 (9%)	0	1 (9%)
1996	11 (84%)	1 (8%)	0	1 (8%)
1997	10 (77%)	0	3 (8%)	0
Total	30 (81%)	2 (5%)	3 (8%)	2 (5%)

OFP Hearing				
	Helpful	Harmful	Both	No Impact
1994	7 (64%)	0	0	4 (36%)
1996	10 (77%)	1 (8%)	0	2 (15%)
1997	11 (85%)	2 (15%)	0	0
Total	28 (76%)	3 (8%)	0	6 (16%)

Having the OFP				
	Helpful	Harmful	Both	No Impact
1994	10 (91%)	0	0	1 (9%)
1996	11 (85%)	0	2 (15%)	0
1997	9 (75%)	1 (8%)	0	2 (17%)
Total	30 (83%)	1 (3%)	2 (5%)	3 (8%)

Table 37 (cont.)

Women's Shelter/Coalition				
	Helpful	Harmful	Both	No Impact
1994	13 (87%)	0	0	2 (13%)
1996	12 (71%)	1 (6%)	0	4 (23%)
1997	11 (73%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	2 (13%)
Total	36 (77%)	2 (4%)	1 (2%)	8 (17%)

Men's Nonviolence Program				
	Helpful	Harmful	Both	No Impact
1994	14 (50%)	3 (11%)	0	11 (39%)
1996	14 (42%)	2 (6%)	0	17 (52%)
1997	11 (44%)	3 (12%)	1 (4%)	10 (40%)
Total	39 (45%)	8 (9%)	1 (1%)	38 (44%)

Criminal Court/Judge. A majority of the women (56%) reported that the “judge or court” was helpful. It is apparent in Table 37 that women reported that the criminal court/judge was less helpful in later years of the study. For example, 75% of the women rated the criminal court as helpful in 1994, but only 42% of the women reported this in 1997. It should be noted that the numbers of women broken down by year are quite small. Several women reported that the court was helpful because the judge “ordered classes”. Two women from 1994 reported that the judge helped the offender to recognize that his abusive behavior was not acceptable (ie., “made him believe he couldn’t do that”). Twelve percent of the women reported that the court or judge was harmful. One woman stated that it was “harmful because they didn’t follow through with the restrictions” (1996). A woman from 1997 reported that “he became more mentally abusive.” Thirty-two percent of the women reported that the judge or court made no impact. Most of these women commented that the offender did not change. “When someone is so enraged, they don’t care what some judge says” (1994). “He was defiant and wasn’t going to conform anyway”(1996).

Probation Process. Fifty-five percent of the women thought the probation process was helpful. Reasons given for why it was helpful was that the offender was not allowed to drink and that he

was “kept in line”. Some women experienced positive changes in their partner; “no violence” (1994), “he quit drinking and fighting” (1994), “it scared him” (1996), he learned he was wrong” (1996), “it was helpful because it curtailed the physical abuse”(1997). Only one woman thought the probation process was harmful because “it was a joke because he just became worse.” Forty-percent of the women thought the probation process had no impact. Comments included; “there were no consequences for wrong doing”, “not strict”, “he didn’t feel he had a problem and the probation officer at the time didn’t either.”

Order for Protection. Women were asked about the process of applying for an OFP, and having the OFP in effect (See Table 35). Eighty-one percent of the women thought the process of applying for an OFP was helpful. In general, women did not distinguish between the process of applying for the OFP and actually having it in effect in their comments. Many women said they felt safer. “If he got out of hand, police were called and the OFP got them faster” (1994). “He respected the OFP and didn’t want to go to jail” (1994). “It helped keep him away so I could heal mentally.” Eight percent of the women felt that the process of applying for an OFP was harmful. One woman said she was “harassed terribly” after he had received a copy of her written statement. Several women thought the process was helpful and harmful. For example, they said “helpful for the documentation, but it made him angry” and “it was helpful by providing some protection, but he knew how to get me.” Three percent of the women reported no impact. Comments included, “I felt like I didn’t get a say”, “he never had to do what they said he would”. One woman dropped pursuing the OFP because of threats from the offender.

Eighty-three percent of the women reported that having the OFP in effect was helpful for reasons, such as, feeling safer, greater police protection, keeping the offender away and changing the offender’s behavior. Again, some women found it both helpful and harmful (eg., “it was helpful at the time, but he didn’t terminate contact because he wasn’t really threatened”). Fourteen percent of the women reported that the OFP had no impact. “He didn’t care about a piece of paper.”

OFP Hearing. Most women (76%) found the OFP hearing to be helpful. The reasons were primarily that the OFP was awarded and that it provided protection. Other comments were that it “helped protect children”(1997) , “I felt more powerful”(1996), “reaffirmation of my stronger self-esteem ”(1996), “the judge believed and supported me ”(1997), “the judge was on my side”(1997) and “it was helpful because I was allowed to choose the options concerning my child”(1997). Overall, 8% thought the hearing was harmful. Women made comments, such as, “worse thing I ever went through”(1994), “emotionally hurtful” (1994), “it was harmful because it made him mad” (1997). Several respondents thought that the hearing had no impact.

Women’s Shelter /Coalition. Women who used the services provided by the Women’s Coalition, including court advocacy and shelter, found the services helpful (77%). They commented that the services offered support, legal assistance and help with developing a plan. “It was helpful because I found strength and support in others” (1997). “Another affirmation that he was wrong” (1996). “They took pictures and went through the OFP process with me.” (1994). One woman reported that the shelter contact was harmful saying, “The legal department was helpful, but the shelter stay was to controlling and disempowering.” Seventeen percent reported that the services had no impact. “He didn’t abide by the rules (1997). “I didn’t feel threatened” (1996).

Men’s NonViolence Program. Only 45% of the women reported that the men’s program was helpful. Many of the women commented that the program was helpful when their partner had been willing to change. “It was helpful because he was willing to change” (1997). “He brought home information about verbal abuse and intimidation and looked at it “ (1994). Nine percent of the

women reported that the program was harmful. A few women indicated that this was because their partner continued to be abusive. One woman commented that “it was harmful because he listened to others in the group and felt he could get away with it” (1996). One woman indicated that the offender’s involvement with the program was both helpful and harmful because it “taught him to calm down and not get crazy, but he became cocky and knew everything” (1997). Forty-four percent of the women reported that the program had no impact. “It didn’t do anything for him. He was still violent. He didn’t attend on a regular basis. No one seemed to care” (1994). Several women indicated that their partner or former partner was unwilling to change. Several indicated that the lack of change was due to their partner’s continued drinking. “He drank through it. There were no restrictions on drinking alcohol. He still drank and beat me” (1996).

Discussion

Conclusion

Abusive Behavior. The hypothesis that the Enhanced Domestic Intervention Project (EDAIP) would have lower rates of physical and psychological abuse reported by victims when compared to the Domestic Abuse Intervention Project (DAIP) was not supported by the results of the study. There were significant decreases in abuse reported by women for all years of the study, but these reductions were not lower for the baseline year (1994) when compared to other years of the study.

Variables relating to the offender’s program participation were found to be useful in predicting abuse, while demographic variables were not. Having been court mandated was significantly related to greater reductions in psychological, physical and total abuse scores when regression procedures were used (94-96 only) and in factor by factor analysis. Having completed the men’s program was significantly related to greater reductions in physical abuse when regression procedures were used (94-97 only) and in factor by factor analysis.

Women’s Safety. The study results did not support the hypothesis that the Enhanced Domestic Intervention Project (EDAIP) will have higher ratings of women’s safety when compared to the Domestic Abuse Intervention Project (DAIP). A majority of women reported that their safety was better at follow-up during all years of the study and there were no significant differences when the baseline year (1994) was compared to the other years of the study. No demographic or program variables were related to women’s safety ratings.

Women’s Well-Being. The results did not support the hypothesis that the Enhanced Domestic Intervention Project (EDAIP) would have higher ratings of women’s well being when compared to the Domestic Abuse Intervention Project (DAIP). Women reported improved well-being in different aspects of their lives, but did not report greater improvement for the EDAIP years. In a factor by factor analysis greater well-being was related to two variables; the offender having been court mandated to attend and the offender having attended a greater number of sessions. Regression analysis found that only one variable predicted well-being. Women whose partners were court mandated reported greater well-being at follow-up when 1994-96 comparisons were made.

Community intervention. A majority of the women found community intervention more helpful than harmful. They found police intervention, obtaining an OFP and services from the Women’s Coalition as being the most helpful. The Men’s Nonviolence Program was viewed as the least helpful intervention. Some women reported that the system did not always follow through with

enforcing consequences for offenders who continued to be violent.

Limitations

This study is limited because it does not have an experimental design. While the comparison groups appeared to be relatively similar, they may have differed in some respects that were not anticipated by the researchers. Variables other than the intervention (EDAIP) may have influenced the outcomes. A major limitation of the study is that so few women were located for interviews. A small percentage of the women during each year of the study were interviewed, greatly limiting the generalizability of the findings. Women who were located for interviews may have had very different circumstances than those who were not.

Another limitation relates to the reliability and validity of outcome measures. The measures of safety and well-being have content and face validity, but no information is available on reliability and on construct and criterion validity. One study provides evidence of the reliability and validity for the measure of abusive behaviors (Shepard & Campbell, 1992).

Part Three: Discussion of Overall Findings (Part One and Part Two)

There is evidence to suggest that there were improvements in recidivism rates after EDAIP was initiated, but this was not the case for victim reports of abusive behavior, safety and well-being. Recidivism rates reflect offenses that come to the attention of the justice system and cannot reflect the full extent of abusive behavior experienced by women who are being battered. The project may have reduced the number of incidences of violence that are likely to come to the attention of the criminal justice system, but not improved the daily lives of battered women.

It appears that factors related to the offenders participation in the Men's Nonviolence Program influenced recidivism, abusive behavior and well-being. In general, offenders who completed the program and attended more sessions had better outcomes than those who did not. Whether or not the man was court mandated was the variable most consistently present in regression analyses as the best predictor of program outcomes when the impact of other variables was controlled for. Men who volunteered for the program had lower recidivism rates, but their partner or former partners reported less improvement in their abusive behavior and had lower well-being scores. This finding suggests that volunteers may be less likely to come to the attention of the criminal justice system. However, the data from the women's interviews suggests that their behavior does not improve as much as those that are mandated by the courts. Further study of this issue is needed. It may be that court mandated offenders demonstrate serious forms of violence that are more likely to come to the attention of the criminal justice system. Their partners or former partners may experience greater relief when intervention occurs, but still experience more overall violence than do the partners/former partners of volunteers.

In general, demographic variables did not appear to be related to program outcomes. The one exception was that offenders whose victims were white were less likely to recidivate when 1994-97 recidivism rates were examined. The reasons for this are unclear and may be influenced by variables not included in this study.

There was some evidence to support the use of the battering categories as a guide for decision making in the intervention process. Men who were assigned higher categories were more likely to be recidivists.

Recidivism rates were high throughout the years of the study. By the 18 month follow-up, 44 to 51 percent of the men had been identified as recidivists. These rates may reflect the fact that the Duluth community may be more likely to identify reoffenders because of an aggressive response to domestic violence. A majority of the men in the study did not complete the Men's Nonviolence Program. Given that program completion is related to improved program outcomes, it is important that processes be put into place to improve the completion rate. It is unclear from this study why this variable results in improved outcomes. It may be that completion of the program is an indicator that the offender is being held accountable for his behavior, that he is benefiting from participation and/or is more willing to change.

As noted earlier, there were many limitations to the study design. The interventions were not consistently implemented and may have had a greater impact if they had been. Interviews with women about the response of the system did not detect that they experienced difference in the response of the system. They did suggest that many women reported being helped, while others called for greater accountability from the system. While the differences in outcomes between EDAIP and DAIP are not clear, the data from the women's interviews indicate that women report less abusive behavior and greater safety and well-being after intervention has taken place.