



National Healthy Marriage Resource Center Webinar

January Webinar: Distinguishing among Different Types Intimate Partner Violence: Implications for Healthy Marriage Programs

January 25, 2011 ❖ 1:00 pm-2:30pm (EST)

Presenters:

Michael Johnson, Professor Emeritus of Sociology, Women's Studies, and African and African American Studies at The Pennsylvania State University

Anne Menard, Director of the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence

Diane Crosby, Healthy Couples Coordinator, Elizabeth's New Life Center Marriage Works program



How to ask a question:

Microsoft Office Live Meeting - livemeeting.com

Attendees (1) Voice & Video **Q&A** Meeting Feedback

Type your question here. Ask X Q

No questions have been answered yet.

Fit to Page

1. Click on the word "Q&A"
2. Type your question in the top box
3. Click on the word "Ask" to submit your question

Intimate Terrorism

Violent Coercive Control

Violent Resistance

Resisting the Intimate Terrorist

Situational Couple Violence

Situationally-provoked Violence

Intimate Terrorism

Violent Coercive Control

- ◆ Control tactics vary from case to case
- ◆ Primarily but not exclusively men
- ◆ Frequent in agency samples, rare in surveys
- ◆ Two major subtypes identified for men
 - ◆ Emotionally dependent and Antisocial
- ◆ High risk at separation, especially for emotionally dependent subtype
- ◆ Couple education or counseling dangerous

Violent Resistance

Resisting the Intimate Terrorist

- ◆ Most victims do react with violence at some point—not always self-defense
- ◆ Primarily but not exclusively women
- ◆ Frequent in agency samples, rare in surveys
- ◆ Violent resistance increases risk
- ◆ Most violent resisters turn to other tactics to mitigate the violence or escape
- ◆ Couple education or counseling dangerous

Situational Couple Violence

Situationally-provoked Violence

- ◆ Conflicts turn to arguments that escalate
- ◆ Both men and women do this
 - ◆ Men's violence more likely to injure and frighten
- ◆ Frequent in survey samples
- ◆ Huge variability
 - ◆ 40% involve only one incident
 - ◆ Can involve chronic and severe violence
- ◆ Couple education or counseling possible if there are no other risk factors

British data
Mixed sample

Intimate Terrorism

43% severe

78% escalated

15% mutual

General Motive: To control the relationship

Situational Couple Violence

13% severe

20% escalated

87% mutual

Situational Motive: To win, get attention, get even, etc

Coercive Control Scale

(Need information about both partners)

Thinking about your husband [yourself], would you say he [you]...

- ◆ is jealous or possessive?
- ◆ tries to provoke arguments?
- ◆ tries to limit your contact with family and friends?
- ◆ insists on knowing who you are with at all times?
- ◆ calls you names or puts you down in front of others?
- ◆ makes you feel inadequate?
- ◆ shouts or swears at you?
- ◆ frightens you?
- ◆ prevents you from knowing about or having access to the family income even when you ask?

*These are items from the 1995 National Violence Against Women Survey (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). They were adapted from the Canadian Violence Against Women Survey (Holly Johnson, 1996).

Michael P. Johnson, Ph.D. <http://www.personal.psu.edu/mpj/>

Danger Assessment

1. Has the physical violence increased in severity or frequency over the past year?
2. Does he own a gun?
3. Have you left him after living together during the past year?
4. Is he unemployed?
5. Has he ever used a weapon against you or threatened you with a lethal weapon?
6. Does he threaten to kill you?
7. Has he avoided being arrested for domestic violence?
8. Do you have a child that is not his?
9. Has he ever forced you to have sex when you did not wish to do so?
10. Does he ever try to choke you?
11. Does he use illegal drugs?
12. Is he an alcoholic or problem drinker?
13. Does he control most or all of your daily activities?
14. Is he violently and constantly jealous of you?
15. Have you ever been beaten by him while you were pregnant?
16. Has he ever threatened or tried to commit suicide?
17. Does he threaten to harm your children?
18. Do you believe he is capable of killing you?
19. Does he follow or spy on you, leave threatening notes or messages, destroy your property, or call you when you don't want him to?
20. Have you ever threatened or tried to commit suicide?

Campbell, J. C., Webster, D. W., & Glass, N. (2009). The Danger Assessment: Validation of a lethality risk assessment instrument for intimate partner femicide. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*(4), 653-674.

Michael P. Johnson, Ph.D. <http://www.personal.psu.edu/mpj/>

Marriage Works! Ohio Family Violence Prevention Center of Greene County, OH

DO NO HARM, domestic violence screening process

- Court Record Review (registration)
- Relationship Stressor Assessment (participation intake)
- Healthy Couples Pilot Class

Court Record Review

- Completed at the time of registration, 10 years
 - Sex crimes (II and III), domestic violence, predetermined list
- Follow-up with person who registered, refer out (safety)
 - Non offending partner can attend alone
 - RARE exceptions
 - aggressor, combat related, not intimate partner AND capable of introspect, motives/goals, self awareness
 - Examples of identified need for intervention
 - 'voluntary' case plans, court referrals
- Exclusion rate about 1% all registrants



Microsoft
Word Document

Relationship Stressor Assessment

- Attend 1st session of each class
 - Separate participants, not with partner, watch for behaviors
- Show video, verbal, resource pamphlet
 - Approachable regardless of gender or victim/perpetrator self identification
- Complete RSA, scale
 - Follow-up phone call (safety)
 - Looking for patterns, control dynamics (about 30%)
 - Victim presentations, perpetrator presentations
- Exclusion rates, data trends (25%)
 - DO NO HARM, error on the side of caution



Microsoft
Word Document

Healthy Couples Class

- Pilot, extended services to previously excluded for domestic violence convictions
- Criterion:
 - Must have completed intervention, probation
 - Violence free for over a year, no active abuse
- Observations
- Recommendations

**Distinguishing among
Different Types of
Intimate Partner Violence:**

***Implications for
Healthy Marriage and
Responsible Fatherhood Programs***

1/25/2011

Anne Menard

**National Resource Center on
Domestic Violence**

Our shared responsibility in the development of HM and RF Initiatives

To design and implement programs
that do not exacerbate
the risks faced by domestic violence
victims and survivors,
but instead
enhance their safety and
support their choices and options.

Implications of Typologies Research and Discussion

- This typology research -- Michael Johnson's and others -- helps explain apparent contradictions among various data sources documenting intimate partner violence and corresponds with on-the-ground experience of many practitioners.
- While there are many implementation challenges, there is growing agreement that making distinctions is important, particularly when making intervention decisions.

Implications of Typologies Research and Discussion

Any report of domestic violence must be taken seriously and explored further, although the most appropriate responses are still being developed.

Implications of Typologies Research and Discussion

Challenges

- Screening for intimate partner violence remains difficult and there is no agreement yet about easily administered tools or culturally-sensitive “red flags”. No clear cut “bright lines” exist between the different types.
- The research on IPV typologies has been both misunderstood and misused to imply that situational couple violence (SVC) is not a significant concern.

Implications of Typologies Research and Discussion

Challenges

- The domestic violence advocacy community is still working to understand and carefully critiquing the typology literature and its implications in the range of settings in which it is being applied -- criminal and civil courts, HM and RF, child welfare settings, and others.

Implications of Typologies Research and Discussion

Challenges

- There are shared misgivings among some domestic violence advocates and HM/RF practitioners about “screening out” in response to *any* disclosure of intimate partner violence.
- However, there is a related concern that many HM or RF programs may not have the capacity or tools to conduct the necessary assessment or respond appropriately without considerable program enhancements, staff training and community partnerships.

What are the goals of screening and assessment?

Recommend that we embrace multiple goals:

- begin process of trust building and engagement
- help determine who is at risk to make decisions about participation
- help make informed referrals to community resources
- communicate that we care about safety of all family members
- communicate that violence -- in any form -- is not a part of healthy relationships

Issues affecting response to disclosures

- Understanding of different types of intimate partner violence, and appropriate interventions
- Timing of disclosure (at intake, already a participant) and whether working with individual or couple
- Availability and capacity of alternative services for an individual or a couple who is “screened out”
- Organizational capacity to address different levels of violence and abuse - providers, facilitators, community partners, dv partners
- Others?

Final word...

Any disclosure or indication of abuse and violence in intimate relationships must be taken seriously and explored further - err on the side of safety! -- although the most appropriate responses to disclosures are still being developed.