



**national  
healthy marriage  
resource center**

## **January 2011 Webinar Transcript**

### **Distinguishing Among Different Types of Intimate Partner Violence: Implications for Healthy Marriage Programs**

Moderator: Rich Batten  
January 25, 2011

12:00 pm CT

Operator: Ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for standing by and welcome to the National Healthy Marriage Resource Center's January Web seminar. Today's meeting is being recorded.

At this time, I would like to turn things over to Mr. Rich Batten. Please go ahead, sir.

**Rich Batten:** Thank you and good afternoon and welcome to the National Healthy Marriage Resource Center's first webinar for 2011.

Today's webinar is titled Distinguishing Among Different Types of Intimate Partner Violence: Implications for Healthy Marriage Programs.

My name is Rich Batten and I'm the NHMRC Program Manager and will facilitate today's webinar.

Research has revealed variations in the types of violence that occurred between romantic partners and there's an emerging view that coercive controlling violence committed out of a desire for the perpetrator to control his or her partner should be distinguished from situational couple violence, where arguments or fights get out of control and sometimes become violent, and then violent resistance where one of the partners commits violence to protect her or his own safety.

Today's presenters will describe the research on different typologies associated with intimate partner violence and discuss how healthy marriage program staff can use this information to direct their screening processes and programming.

And we do have quite a distinguished group of experts today. We have Michael Johnson with us, Professor Emeritus of Sociology, Women's Studies and African and African American Studies at the Pennsylvania State University. We have Anne Menard, Director of the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence. And Diane Crosby, Healthy Couples Coordinator of the Elizabeth's New Life Center Marriage Works Program in Ohio.

We do have a few housekeeping items to go over before we begin. One, the webinar is being recorded. The recording and all presentation materials including the Q&A session from this webinar will be posted on the Healthy Marriage Info website within seven to nine business days following today's presentation.

With today's webinar technology you'll be able to submit questions during each presentation and Jill Scollan's going to describe that process to you now. Jill?

**Jillian Scollan:** Thanks a lot, Rich. Good afternoon everyone. I'd like to direct your attention to the demonstration slide that's displayed on your screen. You should find the question and answer pane designated by the letters Q&A located at the top left portion of your screen.

You can click on that portion of the menu bar to open the pane or you can open the pane and drag the pane off the menu bar to display it as a standalone box.

To ask a question this afternoon, type your question into the top box and then click the ask button. You'll automatically receive a reply thanking you for your question and letting you know that it has been forwarded to the facilitator.

The automatic reply frees you up to ask another question and we will be addressing the questions at the end of the presentation.

Thank you very much. I'll turn it back over to you, Rich.

**Rich Batten:** Thank you, Jill. Today's presentation will be a little different than the webinars we've done in the past as far as the questions. We will – Dr. Johnson will present and then Anne Menard will present and then after - and then Diane Crosby will present. And then after she has completed, Anne and Michael will entertain your questions for Diane based on her presentation and their previous presentations and so we'll have an interaction between the presenters.

And then for the last two minutes or so we'll receive, we'll address, the questions that come from you.

If by chance we have more questions than we're able to respond to during the webinar we will provide answers to those in the follow-up documentation.

So without further ado I would like to welcome Michael Johnson, our first presenter. As I mentioned earlier, Dr. Johnson is Professor Emeritus of Sociology, Women's Studies and African and African American Studies at the Pennsylvania State University and he'll kick things off by explaining his research on domestic violence typologies.

Dr. Johnson?

**Dr. Michael Johnson:** Thank you and good afternoon to everybody. We don't have a lot of time so I'm not going to be giving you a lot of numbers today but I wanted to start by pointing out that everything that I'm going to say is not just my opinion but it's backed by research.

It's backed by research that's been done by people, not only by me and my colleagues, but by other researchers as well using different measures and different samples.

So there's fairly broad support for the things that I'm going to say. I'm going to focus on my typology. I know we're talking about typologies in general but I'll focus on the typology that I use and that distinguishes among three major types of intimate partner violence; intimate terrorism, which is the violent coercive control that you're probably most familiar with from the power and control wheel. I should point out that that's a term that some people find it difficult to use in, for example, in court settings. They find it to be a little too - how do I put it - it's a word that people don't like to hear in court. So a term that's been used for that more recently in court settings is simply coercive controlling violence.

The second kind of violence is violent resistance and that's the violence that involves people who are resisting an intimate terrorist who's trying to control their lives. And the third type is situational couple violence which does not involve a general pattern of violent coercive control from either of the partners.

So I'm just going to talk briefly about each of them and I find I'm not able to advance my slides. Could somebody do that for me? Thank you.

The first type of intimate partner violence is intimate terrorism. It's defined by a pattern of violent coercive control. Now the patterns are not the same, it varies from case to case. Intimate terrorists use whatever control tactics work for them. So it varies also in terms of the level of violence. Some intimate terrorists may not need to use much violence in order to control their partner.

And the non-violent control tactics that they use will depend upon their particular situation. For example, in same-sex partnerships one could use a threat to "out" your partner. That wouldn't be a tactic that would be of any use in a heterosexual relationship. So there are variations on this but what defines it is a general pattern of the use of a variety of tactics to control your partner.

In heterosexual relationships where intimate terrorism is perpetrated, primarily but not exclusively by men, there are cases, documented cases, of women who are able to control their male partners using a combination of violent and non-violent coercive control tactics. But in heterosexual relationships it's very heavily dominated by men as perpetrators, women as targets of intimate terrorism.

This kind of intimate partner violence is frequent in agency samples as in the courts, in shelters and applications for protection from abuse orders in divorces and so on.

But it's very rare in survey research, and that's the source of the data that are cited over and over again, to argue that intimate partner violence is gender symmetric. It shows up as gender symmetric in surveys because there's little or no intimate terrorism in those surveys and it's the intimate terrorism that's heavily gendered.

There are two major sub-types of intimate terrorists that have been identified looking at personality and attitude dimensions by Amy Holtzsmith Monroe and her colleagues; the emotionally dependent and the antisocial. I'm not really going to talk about that in detail. They differ in terms of personality backgrounds but both types of male intimate terrorists share general misogynistic attitudes and general acceptance of violence.

This kind of intimate partner violence has a particularly high risk separation because separation is a time when the intimate terrorist's control is most threatened so there's often an escalation of the violence when the partner tries to get out of the relationship. And that's especially risky for the emotionally dependent sub-type whose personality is such that he is extremely emotionally dependent on his partner.

So we don't recommend couple education or counseling for this kind of intimate partner violence because of the risks involved.

So could we go to the next slide?

Violent resistance is violence that's enacted by the person who's being controlled or attempting, has an intimate terrorist partner who's trying to control her. In heterosexual relationships this is primarily women resisting male intimate terrorists.

Most victims - the research suggests that most victims do react with violence at some point but that's not always self-defense. That's why I've avoided the term here, self-defense, and called it violent resistance. Sometimes it's more a matter of retribution and other times it's simply sort of an instinctive reaction to violence that happens the first time the women is hit and without really much thought put into it at all.

And this kind of violence is frequent in agency samples so you often find in shelters that the women who come for help, who are experiencing intimate terrorism, have used some violence to resist that intimate terrorism themselves.

But in heterosexual relationships that violent resistance clearly increases the risk that they are clear on that. Most violent resisters desist when they find that fighting back doesn't help and may even make things worse and they turn to other tactics to mitigate the violence or to escape from the relationship.

Again, because this, just by definition, involves an intimate terrorist partner, we don't recommend couple education or counseling because of the increased risk if a person is asked to come into that setting and to talk about the violence that's going on in their relationship.

So let's go to the third, the next slide.

Situational couple violence is probably the most common kind of violence between intimate partners. It may not seem like the most common if you're working in a shelter setting because the people who come to you for help are often people who are involved with an intimate terrorist partner. Or in shelters you see the most severe and most dangerous kinds of situational couple violence.

It does not - situational couple violence does not involve a general pattern of coercive control. It involves conflicts that turn to arguments that escalate to violence.

So - and both men and women are involved in this and this kind of intimate partner violence is frequent in survey samples. That's why survey samples show gender symmetry; both men and women are roughly equally likely to use some violence in arguments that escalate to violence with their partners.

However, it's symmetric only in terms of perpetration. Men's violence is more likely to injure, more likely to frighten their partner. So there's not real gender symmetry it's just that both men and women do this but the men's violence is more dangerous on average than the women's violence.

There's huge variability in this kind of intimate partner violence. The research suggests that about 40% of the cases, there's only one incident and there's never violence again in the relationship.

Many couples have this experience at some point in their relationship that they blow up and there's some relatively minor violence. They're horrified by what's happened, they deal with it and it doesn't happen again. But it can involve chronic and severe, even homicidal violence. So the risks of situational couple violence should not be minimized.

There are - there's a whole class of situational couple violence that involves relatively high risk. So you wouldn't want to say whenever there's situational couple violence it's okay to do couple education or counseling with them.

You'd want to go on to look at other risk factors and screen for other risk factors like the severity of the violence or the recency of the violence, other things that are involved in various risk assessment instruments.

So that's the basic idea. There are three major kinds of intimate partner violence. They differ from each other in almost all respects and so we could now turn to research where I showed you number after number after number about how they differ from each other.

But I'm just going to show you a little bit of data from a study that I didn't do but that some British researchers did.

If we go onto the next slide I'll give you an idea of some of the things that differ between intimate terrorism and situational couple violence.

And this British study, if you look at the top circle, that shows their findings for intimate terrorism. The bottom circle shows their findings for situational couple violence.

You see that for intimate terrorism, 43% of the cases involve severe violence. In this particular study they define that as violence that required a visit to a physician; notice that that's only half the cases had there been severe violence.

So intimate terrorism is not necessarily severe violence but it's more likely to be severe than situational couple violence. You see down below that only 13% of the cases of situational couple violence involves severe violence but that 13% can't be ignored. It's a reminder that situational couple violence can be dangerous and, I'll say it again, even homicidal. So it can't be dismissed as unimportant violence.

Looking up above again in intimate terrorism what we often see in shelters is if he hit you once, he'll hit you again and it'll probably get worse. That's true for intimate terrorism. But notice, again, although a high percentage of the intimate terrorists have escalated the level of their violence. They don't all escalate the level of their violence. For some of them if they can control their partner without using violence, they may actually deescalate and use other tactics to maintain their control.

Once again, you look below at situational couple violence while you see that the vast majority do not escalate. In fact, the figure on the other side is that most deescalate; 20% do involve escalating violence.

Finally on mutuality in intimate terrorism, only 15% in this particular study were mutual, involved mutual violence. That's because of the pattern that I talked about earlier that in heterosexual relationships women who resist with violence desist because they find that it doesn't work for them.

When you look down below at situational couple violence you find a great deal of mutuality because this does not involve a pattern of coercive controlling violence. It involves arguments that escalate and when one partner slaps the other one their partner is likely to slap them back so you see a good deal of mutual violence.

I think I will go on to my next slide. I was going to watch and see how quickly I got through this and just talk briefly about screening. And I think the other speakers may talk more about it than that.

This is a simple line item scale that we use in our research to screen to define intimate terrorism and we use a cutoff. I would not recommend using a strict cutoff in the real world. In the world of survey research we can live with using a strict cutoff because making a mistake, nobody gets hurt. But in real context you'd want to use this as one piece of information that you use to decide whether or not you have high risk violence going on among your couples.

We use a cutoff of five or more, well, because our research shows that's a good cutoff as we look at other criteria. But what it does is to show you a pattern. It doesn't make any difference which five. If somebody's using five or more of these tactics they're engaged in a pattern of coercive control. And, of course, we define this as including violence as well. We use other measures to get at the violence.

Let's go to the next slide. Although I would screen for coercive controlling violence and I would not do couples work with any couples in which you see a pattern that suggests coercive controlling violence.

I would not say that when you don't find that pattern that you should feel free to go ahead and do couple work. I think you need to look at other risk factors because of what I pointed out in the research. Situational couple violence can be chronic, can involve increasing violence and can involve severe violence.

So for cases of situational couple violence you would want to look at other risk factors and this is one example of a screening instrument that's used by many people as Jacquelyn Campbell and her associates, dangerous estimate instrument. The reason I recommend using the coercive control measure to supplement this is that there are very few items in this assessment that get at coercive control. I've highlighted them, they're in pink on your screen; Numbers 13, 14 and 19 involve coercive control.

But I think it's important that we do a more thorough screening for coercive control so I recommend adding some supplementary items like the coercive control scale that we were just looking at.

Because even if there's a very low level of violence, in fact, I would say even if there's no violence, if you see a pattern of coercive control even without violence that you look carefully at that couple and ask yourself whether there's a risk that that coercive control would turn to violence if the controller threatened.

So that's a very quick, very brief summary of what the research shows. The important thing is that there are dramatic differences among these types and that they need to be dealt with differently in the context in which you're working with them.

Thank you.

**Rich Batten:** Thank you, Dr. Johnson.

Next we have Anne Menard, Director of the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence. Pivoting off of Dr. Johnson's presentation, Anne will discuss how marriage and relationship education programs can effectively use this information in their programming.

Anne?

**Anne Menard:** Thank you, Rich. So I'm the segue presenter between Mike and Diane and it's a pleasure to be here.

I want to start by acknowledging Michael for his work in this area. It really has helped to enhance our understanding of violence and abuse that occurs with intimate relationships and the implications of these different types of interventions that we design and implement. It's always a pleasure to co-present with him.

I want to begin by offering a statement of shared responsibility in the development of healthy marriage and responsible fatherhood initiatives. And that is that it's our shared responsibility 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.

So that is the frame that I bring to this discussion.

So I've been charged with exploring with you all, what are the implications of typologies, research and the ongoing critique and discussions that many of us are involved in.

There are several over, what I will call, kind of overarching implications that I want to talk about briefly before identifying some of the challenges that typologies raise for us.

The first of these overarching implications is that this research, Michael Johnson's and others, helps explain apparent contradictions among various data sources documenting intimate partner violence and it corresponds with on-the-ground experience of many practitioners. It reconciles what has historically appeared as conflicting research findings and their disconnect from actual practitioners experience. Again, including those of domestic violence advocates, law enforcement and other service providers.

Another overarching implication is that while there are many implementation challenges, there is a growing agreement that making distinctions is important particularly when making intervention decisions.

And I want to add a note on the use of the term domestic violence by domestic violence advocates. And it's linked to the typology discussion and the terms that are emerging from it.

Domestic violence has historically been described by domestic violence advocates as a pattern of abusive behaviors that adults and adolescents used against an intimate partner. And characterized by one partner's need to control the other and use of a range of tactics to do so. So what Michael now terms intimate terrorism and coercive controlling violence is pretty close to that definition.

The domestic violence community has worked long and hard over the last 30 years to, first of all, name the problem, something that really had not emerged into public discourse, and help the public understand and accept the dynamics of domestic violence this definition reflects, and take appropriate action.

But increasingly the domestic violence community is hearing from practitioners and victim survivors that not all violence between intimate partners fits this definition particularly as early interventions have been put into place and public awareness has grown.

For example, some women refer to domestic violence programs for services and support do not feel that there's a pattern to the abuse that their partner is - or that their partner is trying to control them.

They describe a different set of interpersonal dynamics that, while problematic, fall outside the definition of domestic violence.

But at this point I think it's also important to acknowledge that the language is still evolving and most domestic violence programs still refer to domestic violence but you can generally assume that the definition that they have of that term is pretty close to what Michael has presented here as intimate terrorism or coercive controlling violence.

But clearly any report and other over arching implication is that clearly any report of domestic violence must be taken seriously and explored further although the most appropriate responses are still being developed.

I'm doing a lot of moving parts here.

What are some of the challenges that this new understanding and critique of typologies raises for both healthy marriage and responsible fatherhood programs?

The first is that screening for intimate partner violence remains difficult and there is no agreement yet about easily administered tools or culturally sensitive read flags. Although we have some clues and Michael provided some and Diane will talk about how they approach us in their program.

There are no clear cut white lines between the different types and, again, I think Mike underscored that as well.

Mike suggested in his last slide some of the questions that have been designed to identify controlling

behaviors which is an important marker of intimate terrorism. And Diane, as I said, will be talking about her program's approach in a minute but it is important to understand that developing appropriately refined tools is still a work in progress.

A second challenge that we have is that research on intimate partner violence typologies has been both misunderstood and misused to imply that situational couple violence is not a significant concern.

For example, couples involved in situational couple violence may be told that it's not dangerous or less dangerous and that may be a very inappropriate message to give them. Batterers arrested for domestic violence and the attorneys representing them may attempt to characterize their acts of intimate terrorism as situational couple violence or just a one-time angry outburst to reduce that batter's culpability.

Intimate partner violence typologies have also been criticized because they can sometimes be used to "normalize," and I say that in quotes, situational couple violence or make erroneous generalizations such as men and women are equally violent, as Mike addressed in his presentation as well.

A belief that all intimate partner violence is gender symmetrical can lead to, and has in some situations, led to unwarranted arrests and mutual protection orders or custody or visitation of (wards) that are dangerous for children and their victimized parents.

Finally, typologies can be misused to perpetuate racial and class stereotypes. I think the bottom line here is that all use of violence or abuse in intimate relationships is problematic and should be taken seriously. I've said that, I'm going to say it a couple of more times in my presentation. Mike said that and I bet Diane is going to say that as well. So that's really an important message we want to leave with you.

Related to the last challenge is one that the domestic violence advocates community is still working to understand and carefully critiquing the typology literature and it's implications in the range of settings in which it is being applied including criminal and civil courts where criminal charges and custody of children is at issue. So that's a different - that's a setting where these kinds of decisions are very important, healthy marriage and responsible fatherhood programs where participation in programs and service referrals need to be determined. So this information is being used to make those types of decisions and in child welfare settings where a range of child protection and welfare issues are being decided.

So these are all particular settings in which these typology discussions and critiques are occurring with different implications, with different spheres on the part of practitioners and different specific challenges.

Another implication is that although there are shared misgivings among some domestic violence advocates and healthy marriage and responsible fatherhood practitioners about screening out and response to any disclosure of domestic violence, there's also a related concern that many healthy marriage and responsible fatherhood programs may not have the capacity or tools to conduct the necessary assessments or respond appropriately without considerable program enhancement staff training and community partnerships.

So again, in many ways we have new knowledge. We have an appreciation of its significance and interest and willingness to apply it in different settings including healthy marriage and responsible fatherhood settings; but still lots of work to do in its application and various settings.

I think the good news is that we know what we don't know or what we still need to learn more about. And, again, Diane Crosby will be describing to us how her Marriage Works program move forward in addressing some of these challenges.

As we segue to Diane's presentation I want to suggest that we embrace multiple goals in our screening and assessment for intimate partner violence. It's not just to make a narrow determination; it's really an opportunity to do a number of different things.

The first is to really begin the process of trust building and engagement which will help in our screening and assessment as I think you'll understand more clearly after Diane's presentation.

It will help us having a broad view of the screening and assessment process as an opportunity to help us determine who was at risk and make decisions about participation.

It can also help - is an opportunity to help make informed referrals to community resources that will be most helpful to the individuals and couples that we're working with.

It's an opportunity to communicate that we care about safety of all family members and it also is an opportunity to communicate that violence in any form, and I would add violence and abuse in any form, is not part of healthy relationships. So those are all important goals that we should be bringing into the screening and assessment process regardless of the setting that we're in.

Clearly there are issues affecting response to disclosure to intimate partner violence. And, as you listen to Diane's presentation, there are also important - these are also important to keep in mind.

The extent to which the staff or volunteers who are engaged in screening are responding to disclosures understand the different types of intimate partner violence and appropriate interventions, that, obviously, has implications for staff training and supervision.

The timing of disclosure is at intake. Is it from someone who's already participating in the program? And also whether you're working with an individual or a couple that's disclosing and the different options that those provide you particularly in a healthy relationship program.

The availability and capacity of alternative services for an individual or couple who is screened out because of intimate partner violence issues and concerns, and we know that that varies from community to community and is changing as we speak as a number of states are seriously considering cutting funding for domestic violence programs. So this issue of availability of alternative services is a real one.

Organizational capacity to address different levels of violence and abuse among providers, among facilitators, related to the kinds of community partners that you have and particularly your domestic violence partner.

I would also point related to this discussion to an interesting discussion in the “Making Distinctions Among Different Types of Intimate Partner Violence: A Preliminary Guide”. That was the name of the guide was Making Distinctions. It was produced by the National Healthy Marriage Resource Center in April of 2010, which looks at all of these issues.

But what I’m pointing to now is that the guide asserts that a critical element affecting how the individual marriage and relationship education program can best address violence and abuse issues is how well relevant staff get to know individual program participants and develop a relationship with them, what Scott Stanley calls the “Personal Acquaintance Dimension”. And he goes on to say that some marriage and relationship education program staff can get to know their participants quite well over several weeks or months of contact. These programs thus have a variety of opportunities for directly asking about and otherwise being alert to evidence that intimate partner violence may be a problem for a particular individual or couple and get them appropriate help.

However, other programs that have only fleeting personal contact with participants at workshops or during one time, day long or weekend events will have fewer such opportunities for personal intimate partner violence assessment. And instead need to focus on providing general information about intimate partner violence and related services in the course of the program.

Similarly, programs that conduct public communications or Internet-based marriage education activities or relationship education activities never have face-to-face contact with their audience, though they have a responsibility to educate them about healthy and unhealthy relationships as well.

So that’s another dimension. Again, I think Diane’s going to pick up on that and talk about how important observation is, as well as using surveys and questions to get a sense of what’s going on with the individuals and couples you’re working with.

And just a final word, again, I said I was going to repeat this: any disclosure or indication of abuse and violence in intimate relationships must be taken seriously and explored further.

And I think particularly in this time where we’re still learning the specific applications or learning more about how to - culturally and programmatically sensitive ways - implement this research on typologies. We need to err on the side of safety because most appropriate responses to disclosures are still being developed.

So with that I’m going to close and look forward to Diane’s presentation.

**Rich Batten:** Great, thanks Anne.

Diane Crosby is the Healthy Couples Coordinator for Elizabeth's New Life Center Marriage Works Ohio program based out of Dayton, Ohio. She'll discuss her program's approach to domestic violence and describe a pilot program they initiated. After Diane's presentation, I then will invite Dr. Johnson and Anne to interact with Diane on the work that she is doing.

Diane?

**Diane Crosby:** Good afternoon and I am very happy to be involved in this and think that from the perspective as I've been preparing for this, this is a unique opportunity and thank you very much for the opportunity to be here with you.

As I've been preparing, one of the most important things that I think that from my perspective is going to be kind of a description of what our partnership looks like and what programs and services Marriage Works Ohio provides because that also changes the dynamic of what I do.

So first of all, the partnership really began in the very, very beginning stages before classes even took place. The organization and Marriage Works Ohio created a partnership with the family violence prevention center in Greene County here in Ohio and there began a process where there were conversations about, "what do you think?", and "what do you think?" And as they started looking at protocols and procedures, that partnership became something that was a really solid working relationship between both organizations in a way that they learned from each other.

And that's been - I could give you two hours of what this partnership has been for a learning process for both sides of the partnership. However, we don't have that kind of time and that's not really what we're here to talk about.

But it is important to understand from the perspective of what was created in the beginning of this partnership, is very different than what I will be talking about as I go through this process.

In fact, they created some resources and some tools and it wasn't until they started utilizing those tools that they realized the need that really was there.

Once that was realized, this, that I'm going to be talking about, has grown and adapted and that has been a learning process as we still learn from each other and we still are growing and still are adapting.

In fact, in this organization, they created a full-time position based on the need that emerged from those very beginning tools that were put into place.

Once the full-time position, and that's what I do now as the healthy couples coordinator, I'm in that role, I'm a domestic violence liaison, really as a resource for Marriage Works to address all things concerning domestic violence or intimate partner violence depending on if we're talking about legal terms or we're talking about behaviors.

Now, in this position Marriage Works has a very large program size. It really evolves over six counties and it is immense in terms of some of the numbers of participants in those kinds of things that we see.

We offer services that are individual education where really it's a couple mentoring, going through curriculum, with another couple in kind of a two-on-two setting.

We also have the Marriage and Relationship Educations, its different kinds of lengths and duration or a number of hours in a night, but it's something that's ongoing.

And then there's also one-day workshops, and that might be an enrichment process. And the curriculum varies from each one of those so it is a little bit different. In every part of the process there are different things that we have done to implement some screening and some intervention opportunities.

The one thing that I want to reiterate, I guess, there has been thought as I talk about this process, well it's great that there's a full-time position that this has been created because it's such a large program. And I would really offer that even if it's a small program serving smaller numbers.

The importance of this partnership has been so tremendous in my mind that that partnership is really the important piece that needs to take place regardless of the size.

We know that there are no boundaries in our society that would limit the domestic violence or intimate partner violence that would be walking in the door for relationship education.

And as we have found in our experience, sometimes they will come to you specifically for that reason and unless you're asking, you don't know that it's there.

So I would just offer to seek a partnership and it may be something along the lines of what we did in the very beginning, and not "we" because I wasn't here then, but in the very beginning stages where you're putting some things into place but as a bare minimum. And I would encourage go a step further. Find someone that you can have to help you with all of these processes.

That's something that I've learned from the facilitators along the way and now that I am a resource for them, a lot of times they'll come to me and they have enough training and enough knowledge that they recognize something's a little off and "this is something for Diane to take care of".

So there again, once that resource is created you'll realize far more the accessibility and how much you will use it.

So it kind of goes both ways in that and I know that I come from a state that was very rural in my past and at the very least every state has a coalition of some kind that exists and there is at least something at the state level in part of the government aspect that looks into this.

If you don't know who to connect with sometimes those people will. So seek that out. Get a name and a number of somebody that will share your interest of concern for the safety of victims while you do marriage and relationship education, and that is there.

Okay, so the first thing that I want to talk about is our levels, as I try to say. We have several filters that are in place and they are offered at different levels. The very first thing, for every type of surface that Marriage Works offers, there's a court record review where we have the availability here to check public records online and some of the admin staff will then pull those records. I will do all of the follow-up and contact someone and ask a series of questions and really trying to determine if that person is appropriate for relationship education.

A lot of times it's not a question of "is there domestic violence", it's really an indication of here it is and there aren't a whole lot of questions that need to follow.

A couple of lessons learned or some things just to point out in that process, I'm looking for behaviors. Not necessarily if they were convicted of a crime, sometimes just a charge of a crime will be an indicator for me to say, okay, there's somebody here that we need to talk to and we need to look at this.

There are also different crimes classes - all right, let me advance my....Jill, will you advance - thank you.

We complete this record review at the time of registration. And it's important that we get this background, first of all, before they get into a situation where they feel like we've wasted their time or they feel like they're really being turned away after they've already engaged in something and have developed more hope and those things.

So we try to do this at the time of registration and it really is a first layer. Our policy that we've created is that if there's any conviction for domestic violence it goes back for ten years. And in that ten-year timeframe they said it doesn't necessarily matter if it's a conviction. Sometimes it looks a little bit different if there are multiple charges over a period of time and they've always been dismissed because then that also tells me that there is a partner involved who may be, or likely, is manipulated into dropping those charges.

I'm going to bring up that document, the first one that says Ohio Revised Code. This might be difficult to read and I realize the font is really small from here. But the important thing to understand is that we collaborated in the very beginning and came up with a list of things. These are different crimes classes and yet the behavior that relates to domestic violence, in particular the course of controlling dynamics, they can come in several different places in all kinds of different crimes. So we developed a list of things that may come into play.

I am the one that looks at all of this. I have background in understanding what these crimes are and what the process is and several other things so it's a little bit helpful for me to try to determine what's appropriate and what's not.

So on here is a list of what we've determined really are those crime classes that may warrant a little bit more attention. In particular, I want to point out homicide and assault. We have had people who have registered for

classes who have been convicted of homicide in the past. If we didn't ask we really wouldn't know that and that's something that we, for the safety, need to understand and know just for the propensity of violence even if it wasn't their intimate partner.

Kidnapping and extortion we have as possible. Sex offenses, Tier 2 and Tier 3 - we changed this policy after the Adam Walsh Act came out. Ohio was very proactive in putting that into place in the State of Ohio. And in that process some things changed. In particular, somebody who is now classified as a registered sex offender, if they fall under Tier 1, even at Tier 1 most often I would find something that they wouldn't be appropriate.

However, there are some occasions where it's not necessarily that - save for the Adam Walsh Act where they have the Romeo and Juliet clause where somebody may have been under a certain age at the time that they were together. And although that is a crime in Ohio, it's not in other jurisdictions. And so there's a little bit of room for that and we're adjusting and adapting appropriately.

Going through the other list, the other one is the offenses against the family down at the bottom, 2919.

Protection orders; even if it's not a conviction of anything criminal, a protection order is something that will alert me that I want to have a conversation. So I wanted to provide this just as an example. I think every jurisdiction has different laws. Every jurisdiction has different things and it's just really a thought process that needs to be collaborated in understanding what you want. Involve law enforcement if you need to. Involve other parts of the system and if you have a partner that's related to a domestic violence program, they would likely know who those people are and what you could come up with.

Okay, to go back to the slides.

Okay, one lesson that we learned in this process is that it's important to follow-up with the person who registered. So we implemented a procedure because, as I was doing follow-up and I want to talk to somebody who has a criminal conviction, I found myself on occasion on the phone with somebody who had no idea that they had been registered for a class by their partner and yet here's a stranger calling wanting to know about their criminal background which is public information but still not very comfortable for them.

So we implemented a process where I will follow-up with a person who registered whether it's the offender or the partner. And most often I will refer out. If it's a partner of somebody who has been convicted of domestic violence in particular it's very important to also come up with a plan.

If their partner knows that they've been registered for this class we need to talk about, "How are you going to tell your partner and what would you expect their reactions are going to be? Would it be easier for you if I make that phone call and explain that to them?" - those kinds of things and it's a process that really needs to take place for the safety of that person.

And that person would know far better than I do what their partner's response may be or what they could

anticipate. So it's a process where we come up with a plan.

I have had occasions where I have needed to follow-up even after, okay, if somebody decides that they want to do that. For safety reasons, it's just something that you have to think about and put into place when you do this kind of a thing.

For the most part a non-offending partner can attend alone. And it really is an opportunity for them to hear some things that may be appropriate for them. And other times it may not and that's something that we just have to think about and everybody's different and every case is different.

There are some times, and I'll talk about this a little bit further in the second layer that I'm going to discuss, but it's not always appropriate for the non-offending partner to attend because there are some times when that's not appropriate and I'll talk about that a little bit more. But, for the most part I would offer that the non-offending partner to attend alone.

Now, there are some rare exceptions where something has come up and where something has been charged. It may not necessarily be something that I would be interested in as being a possible, what we call, "exclusion". Now, please understand, I use that term exclusion. That's how we identify what we're talking about in-house. I would never say that to somebody I was on the phone with.

So I have had an occasion where two years prior somebody had come home. They had some PTSD kind of things that were coming out. Their partner happened to be there. That person was in treatment. They had several other things and there had been a significant amount of time.

At the time I had excluded and then kept in contact with that partner a little bit. I gave her some referrals and resources within the VA in connection with the things that her husband was also receiving services for.

Another one is – this is an exception that I made within the last six months, it's really a situation where - it was a gentleman that I had talked to. He had a conviction for domestic violence. I'm sorry, he was charged with domestic violence and a conviction for a lesser crime that was about...I believe it was - anyway, it was a lesser crime not conviction for domestic violence.

As I was talking to him and asking him to explain to me what had happened, it was a different situation where I could identify his partner was likely the aggressor and he was reacting to that.

So as it would be defined as a violent resistance situation. As a child he was abused by his father who was also abusive. He grew up in that kind of a relationship. As a result then, as an adult in a partnership, he has a reaction that he didn't know he had until his partner put a pillow over his face while he was sleeping and he work up swinging. In fact, he connected at some point.

Now, it's not that simple. I don't want to - because of time I'm scanning through these very quickly. But this

was a long conversation that I had had with him with several referrals, several processes. He was not with his partner that this had occurred with. He was now with a different partner and he had a lot of the right motive. He was capable of introspect. He really was interested in learning about himself and what he could do differently.

So that was one where in the last six months I made an exception and allowed him into a class that I could still monitor. And I'll talk a little bit more about that a little bit later.

Some examples of some need for intervention: We have had cases where, of course, people will lie to us and/or we have had cases where somebody has been charged with a crime and it's outside of our jurisdiction and we aren't aware of it, whatever that is.

It seems to be a population where it will come up. If you screen out at the least you are also raising awareness and so in those times when that has happened we have had people that have come to us and fortunately I'm sorry that that had happened to them but while in class there is a level of violence that comes in and these aren't minor.

We had one woman who came to us. There had been an incident that happened the weekend prior. He had not only hit her several times and caused significant injuries, he also tried to pour bleach down her throat.

And as I went back and looked at some of the screening tools that we had in place, of course, none of those patterns had been identified to us. But at the very least they knew that we were approachable to provide additional intervention.

And in that case, you know, it became imperative that we got other people involved and take care of that kind of, as we call in the field, a warm handoff.

Another lesson that we learned in this process is about other people who may decide that we are an option to treat or provide intervention for domestic violence. In fact, I have had courts where someone has been convicted of domestic violence, had sent them us. And so I was the one that would engage with that person who is making those referrals, probation officer, court, several different times it's come in. And, quite frankly, understanding comes from knowing and if we weren't asking we would have never known.

And rather than get upset at this court who is referring those people, we came to an understanding about safety and what that means and it also became a great situation where I built a partnership with that person and agreed they would talk to me if they wanted to refer somebody to Marriage Works for services. And not only that, if I was going to have a class in that area again then I would call them with all of the details needed to do the court record review for me and they would do that.

Of this part of this first layer of a filter, I have an exclusion rate, again, that's a different term that we use but it's 1% of the registrants. Now, that looks like a small number but it is not small in comparison to the things that we have found that are very, very important.

And what we have for participants and what we have for registrants are two different things. When all is said and done, there have been over 800 people that have not come into this program through this process.

And some of these are pretty egregious. Some of the follow-up that I've done, I have gone into the mode, right, where I really have safety concerns and am on a different level of providing advocacy that is just really dire and having that understanding and knowing what those people are coming for.

We have also a process where people call in for a registration and they may not even register but just based on the questions that they ask or their interests then they would be referred to me and I would be completing that kind of follow-up. So even without the record check there are different layers that come into place.

Okay, let's go to the next slide. And I know that I'm getting into time a little bit here so I'm going to go a little bit more quickly through some of this and explain the situations and the process.

This is what I would call the second filter is the relationship stressor assessment. And basically what I do is go to each first session of the class. If it's a one-day workshop, of course, that's only one day, I don't attend. But we do have the court record review in that process.

For all other services, if it's a classroom setting or if it's an individual education there is an intake process where, in fact, they have extended that classroom setting by one session in order to complete all of the paperwork and to attend to the screening for domestic violence or intimate partner violence.

Now, once we get to this place I'm really talking to a different audience. It's a different population and making that realization is, I think, important because it changed a little bit what I would say and how I would interact with them.

I will separate the participants. They do not sit with their partner while they do this. And I do the exact same thing for both the female group as well as the male group.

Now, if there's an exchange or any kind of interaction I will also - that became something that I will follow-up on immediately if there's any kind of interaction even if it's a hug and a kiss because I don't know what was whispered in the ear at that particular point in time.

And I just want to follow-up and check in. Once we get them separate I have a PowerPoint video that we show and then I talk a little bit about what those dynamics are. And very quickly, a couple of things to point out, I talk about why we do this. And what I say is that we know that if there's an imbalance of control in the relationship then sometimes this process can be more harmful than helpful and that my goal is to make sure that we have the right kinds of services in place, if there's something additional that I can get for them for resources or information then that's what I want to do.

I started telling them, in part of this verbal process, that I follow-up on - I'm going to introduce the tool here in

just a little bit – but I tell them that I follow-up on that tool both randomly and specifically so that I didn't want any assumption to be made about what a partner may have put on their piece of paper if there's a phone call that comes in from me. That was a lesson learned that is really geared towards safety.

I want to - the last thing that we do at this process is we have a resource pamphlet. It has information about a side-by-side look at – these are coercive controls, dynamics and this is what it looks like in a healthy relationship. And then in addition to that for all of the area that we serve there are references for domestic violence programs as well as national numbers. So that if somebody finds themselves in that situation, then they have at least those resources in hand.

And then I introduce the, what I call, the relationship stressor assessment if we can pull up that document.

Okay, again, this is difficult to read and there's so much that I could talk about in just this tool that we could be here for quite some time. So a couple of things that are helpful, lessons learned, this is just a tool. Understanding how to use this tool is the most important part of this process.

It's important for me to have their first and last name as well as their partner's name. And then if I need to know where I'm at and what I'm doing. So that information at the top is really kind of administrative.

Question Number 1: What do you hope to gain from attending this service? That question is open-ended but it is incredibly insightful because when I do follow-up I want to know, and I will ask that again in that general of a term, if somebody is focused on their partner and they're really using this as a tool to manipulate then they would say something like, "she doesn't listen to me and so maybe if she will hear it from somebody else she would understand what she needs to do."

Or something along those lines that would indicate to me that we have a manipulation tactic going on. It's also helpful for me to understand maybe what areas they want growth and these are all in a healthy way.

Sometimes the box that I have checked is "other". If you give somebody an opportunity to just fill in they will do exactly that and I'll have things like "no more hitting" or something to that affect.

Some of the other questions down there after that really talk about mental health or alcohol or drug kinds of issues that come into play that are helpful for me to understand and know about as I do some of rest of this follow-up.

And then at the bottom, we have several different kinds of behaviors that really are indicative of abuse or violence. And some of this as you, as we, have talked about before, it's really about course of control and identifying what's not healthy and what's not going to work.

Now we have the two columns. One is for somebody to identify their behavior and the other column is for them to identify what their partner does. And then the scale from zero to ten; the categories: verbal and mental

abuse, emotional abuse, monitoring, financial, destruction of property, pet abuse, spiritual, sexual abuse, verbal violence and physical violence.

Now, again, this is just a tool. So somebody can go through here and circle whatever it is. Its intensity, it's subjective which gives me an idea of what they are experiencing from their perspective.

So if I see a ten on here that's scribbled and marked four or five times over, that tells me there's something here even if it's the only category marked. There's still something here that I need to do some follow-up on.

Other than that, I look for a pattern where somebody would identify their behaviors on a higher mark than they would identify their partner. It's not uncommon for me to see both sides to be marked in a somewhat mirror ways. If there's one category where there's something more than I do, then that tells me something and I want to follow-up with that.

Now, the other thing is regardless of the number that they mark, I am looking for a pattern. If there is a two or three, two or three, through all of these then I'm going to pay attention to that and I will do follow-up.

If there's anything above a five, I'm likely going to do follow-up. As we get to the bottom of the page where we start talking about sexual abuse, verbal violence or physical violence, I'm going to be doing some follow-up. It's subjective again and it depends on the context.

So although this is a tool that might point me in the direction where I might need to do more follow-up, the context really comes from the conversation and that's what I'm trying to vet out.

It's not necessarily just about the behaviors either. It's really more a process of trying to understand the thinking pattern and does that go along with manipulation and coercion or those things that would be abusive? Sometimes I get some results that really indicate an area where there's some conflict, not necessarily abuse. And knowing those differences are sometimes very subtle.

For example, let's say on destruction of property, a frequent question I would ask is, okay, "what was destroyed?" There's a complete difference between "it was my wedding pictures" or "it was a cell phone". And let's say it was a cell phone. I would ask, is it common for your partner to throw their cell phone out the window when they are emotionally charged about something? That'll help me understand if their partner is the target of that kind of behavior or if it's something there in general; either way it usually isn't healthy and that's the important thing.

I will ask verbal violence. We used to have verbal violence and physical violence in the same category. For me, it was a matter of understanding if those threats were successful - if making the threat was successful and being able to control their partners. And that was really the same to me as actually grabbing or threatening somebody.

We have since separated those because one thing that I learned recently is that sometimes a perpetrator

would be willing to say, yes I commit verbal violence but they would absolutely not be willing to say that they've committed physical violence. So to separate those out helps me to better understand the information and what is there.

A couple of things that's also important to understand, as I do this follow-up, I am approachable regardless of gender and regardless of victim or perpetrator behavior.

Now the reason that I say that is really about objectivity. Every phone call is different. Every phone call has different dynamics and different context even if the behavior is the same. And I am most interested in the thinking patterns. So that's the kind of information that I'm looking for, the kind of situations that may come up.

Let me go back to this slide.

Okay. Once I have a couple of those dynamics in place, they're sometimes from the very beginning, I will usually know where this conversation is going to go or where it's likely going to go.

I have thought about implementing other tools and flow charts and other things that might be helpful to understand this process. However, this really needs to be a fluid conversation where whatever those things are that are identified is something that I can talk about with each of them separately and individually for whatever those situations are with them.

There have been times where somebody may indicate that they are one thing and then when I actually get them on the phone, it is completely different. So being approachable and being fluid is really kind of a context that we have to understand.

Now there's are a couple of things knowing from my training and what I bring with me. Victims will often present themselves as being I'm the harmed one...I'm sorry, I said that backwards. The victims will often be taking the blame. They'll be apologizing, "I got him into trouble" or they'll really fall into that category of if "I just loved him enough".

If they understood that I cared about them, then they wouldn't do this and it's kind of excusing the behavior or it's a co-dependent kind of thing that I might pick up on.

Perpetrators will often present as being the injured one. They're the wounded one. They've been so harmed by their partner and it almost has been flipped-flopped. A perpetrator will likely justify their actions with their emotions or they will blame their partner for the way that they feel.

So I'm really looking for a process of – How does that work with this couple and what is that dynamic? Who is likely the one that is wanting to control and who is likely the one who is responding to those dynamics of control? Are they capable of introspect? Does this person have the right motive for wanting to attend? Do they objectify their partner where they really may not know them, but they have in their mind this perfect partner and

they're trying to fit their partner into that mold? Those are some of the things that will help me identify.

Now, I also then respond to whatever that conversation is. So my referrals would be along the lines of whatever those needs that come up. I have a wide resource list. It may be drugs and alcohol, it may be individual counseling for trauma; it could be a wide variety of different things.

And I try really hard to develop a plan for them that will not send them in a wild goose chase or just send them away with no resource whatsoever. That's not my goal.

Okay, talking about one time or situational couple violence, it's not uncommon. Well I wouldn't say that. Occasionally I will get a comment at the bottom of the relationship stressor assessment that says, oh the remarks in J, which is the physical violence, "it only happened one time and it was a really long time ago". But then if I look at all of the other things that might be indicators of those control dynamics, I very rarely find an occasion where that really applies.

What I oftentimes find is that it only happened once and it was a long time ago but, and sometimes it's a big but, "I have learned then not to ever do that again" or "I'm not going to cross his wishes". Or it just really means that the control dynamics have a greater impact. So I have to be very, very conscious of that and understand the whole picture. It's not about broken bones and bruises. It's not about anger. It really is about that dynamic of coercive control.

And I really don't buy very often that it's only happened one time. A few occasions maybe, not likely. Even if I think, okay, maybe it only happened one time. I won't let them into a setting or a classroom unless I can further monitor that situation. No ifs, ands or buts, which brings me to our next slide.

Okay, in July of this past year, in 2010, I decided that I really thought we were at a place where maybe we could address this a little bit more closely. As I've been working with the facilitators who had questions or misunderstandings as we're going through this dialogue and creating this partnership, there's a lot of things that we've learned from each other. And I would oftentimes hear, "why can't we do something for them? Why can't we just try?"

And over and over I would say because it's not a safe intervention. This is not domestic violence intervention or Batters Reeducation program. And that's really where these people need to be.

In July, in response to – Is there something we can do for this population? I realize there was a difference in what had happened prior to my coming on as a full-time partner where the relationship stressor assessment had been utilized since there was no scale. That's something that recently occurred and I liked the results, tremendously liked the results, because I can see the patterns.

Prior to that there were several different versions of that tool and if there was anything marked in any one of those categories, it was a follow-up process. Really less about the context of what that meant to them and

more about this isn't a good service for you.

So in response to that understanding, I thought, okay, maybe we have a population here that we could effectively serve. And so I offered an additional class that I invited people. I did some additional screenings, some additional contact with people I had talked to in the past who had domestic violence convictions.

And then I engaged in a process where I was trying to, again, screen domestic violence with different criterion. So the criterion that we established is that they must have completed some kind of intervention. Initially, we were pretty strong firm on it had to have been a certain week of Batters Reeducation and very specific that it could not be anger management. And I don't want to get into that a whole lot but there are some differences.

These people had to complete their probation and they had to be violence-free for over a year with no active abuse and all of the other things that I talked about just a minute ago; capable of introspect, willing to learn for themselves, not looking for manipulation or a tool to manipulate their partner with this process.

So we offered that class. I had 12 people that registered. We had seven couples that came for that, although I had already done that screening process upfront. We had that many people that - we had seven couples (14 people) that attended.

By the second session we had lost all but three so we went from 12 to seven to three couples. And I had a longstanding theory that that screening process may have something to do with people that don't come in. Then my observation really was that I had more of a desire to serve that population than the population themselves wanted to get those services.

In the end it was weighted very heavily after somebody got in to more a one or - a conversation at a slower pace than over the course of eight weeks. It was harder for those dynamics to be hidden. And, again, the course of control dynamics were presenting.

So my recommendation at the end of that is I would not offer a couples class with somebody at all in any level who has a domestic violence history, at any level.

I have since decided that if there is an occasion where I think somebody may fit into a category of violence resistance or something to that affect, then I may offer them to take the healthy couples class in a regular setting with everybody there. And I've only offered that one time in the last six months and with the gentleman who had a pillow put over his face.

In fact, he had chosen another partner that had some of the same dynamics which sometimes happens without intervention and in the end they did not complete the class. I don't believe they are together as a couple any longer either so...

I want to wrap up right there. I really hope - I know that I've gone long. I feel like there's two hours worth of

information that I'm trying really hard to get into this short amount of time. But it's important stuff that might be really helpful to understand.

**Rich Batten:** It very much so is. And we want to thank you, Diane. And I want to - we've taken your questions and because of the time we do have remaining, I do anticipate that some of your questions will not be answered during the webinar but we will follow-up with answers in a hard copy that will be posted on the website.

I want to quickly go to Michael and Anne to see if they have any additional comments, questions for Diane and her process.

**Dr. Michael Johnson:** Well given the time left, I want to seed almost all my time to everybody else. But I'll simply point out how thorough and flexible the screening is that Diane described and that's exactly what I would recommend that you try to devote the resources that are necessary to involve that kind of depth of assessment and flexibility in your screening process.

And with that, I'll turn it over to Anne I presume and anybody else who wants to get in.

**Rich Batten:** Anne, do you have any follow-up or questions for Diane and her presentation?

**Anne Menard:** Why don't I take myself off mute and then you might be able to hear me.

**Rich Batten:** There you go.

**Anne Menard:** I apologize. I just have one question. I know that there's some great questions from the participants and I want to get to those but I was curious Diane, how individuals and couples have responded when they find out that there will be a court review?

Is that something that you tell them at the point of intake and, again, what is the typical response and how do you respond to that, those, responses?

**Diane Crosby:** That does come up whenever somebody does a registration. They explain that that is the process and that that is something they will do. They also ask for a date of birth and in order to get that information it's good to have an explanation even if people don't want it.

As - what we have found is that people often will disclose then that I have a domestic violence or I have this conviction or I have that conviction.

**Anne Menard:** Okay.

**Diane Crosby:** Something that we've learned in this process though is the people who are taking those notes and doing the registration will capture those notes for me and let me know in advance what that conversation looked like.

Oftentimes they will minimize whatever happened or they will dismiss that it wasn't really what it was supposed to be but those are all things that I will follow-up on and it, again, depends on the context.

Anne Menard: Just the other comment that I would have, I think it's real important that, and you described this and probably didn't have as much time as you wanted, that you take time to sort out dual-arrest or mutual orders or violent resistance or self-defense on the part of victims so that we certainly know a lot of perpetrators who are engaging in controlling behaviors are very skilled at getting their partners in trouble and blamed for their own behaviors.

So we too frequently see victims with charges, domestic violence charges, against them which they often plead to because they're anxious to get home to their kids.

And so there's a whole problem there with who ends up being charged and then the implications in something like this. I think a very important part of what you described as your process was really sorting those things out, understanding a context and the implications for the fact that they reached out to a healthy marriage program.

I'm sure that criminal record checks will be daunting to some of the other participants and that's why I'm also glad that it's not the only thing you rely on and that there's also both the stressor assessment and observation and you weight those just as heavily as you do the criminal checks and I would agree with that as well.

And Rich I know, there's great questions from the participants so why don't we turn it back to you.

**Rich Batten:** Okay. And let me access some of those. Let's go to a question for Mike. It was basically on - the participant asked a question about the goal of "to win" being attributed to perpetrators of situational violence rather than intimate terrorism. And they talk about a competitive world view as often a common element among deviant perpetrators and they're not sure if there's a difference between "winning" and attempting to control.

Is there a distinction there?

I think he may be on mute.

**Rich Batten:** Anne, do you want to step in on that since you just spoke?

**Anne Menard:** No, I think Mike is probably just trying to un-mute his line. You may want to do star 6 again Mike.

Mike, we're still not hearing you. Are you back?

**Dr. Michael Johnson:** Oh my gosh, the mute thing again. I'm sorry.

**Anne Menard:** There you are. You're back.

**Dr. Michael Johnson:** The distinction is between a situational motive and the general motive to control. There may even be a control motive in situational couple violence but there's no evidence of a general pattern of an attempt to control your partner.

**Rich Batten:** Okay. Another just clarifying question - you made the comment that this is frequent in samples but rare in surveys, so a number of people didn't quite follow that.

**Dr. Michael Johnson:** I see. In agency samples, it's frequent in agency samples. So research that is done in shelters, it's done with police statistics, it's done in the courts, they're done in hospitals. You see large amounts of intimate terrorism.

In survey research, the intimate terrorists and their victims refuse to participate so they don't show up in the survey at all. So the survey research really only gives you information about situational couple violence.

**Rich Batten:** Okay. Here's a question for Anne. This person is wondering if you could talk more how to access the availability and capacity of alternative services for an individual or a couple that is screened out from prospective or erring on the side of safety. Are there suggestions? Is it sometimes safer to not screen participants out if there isn't a good alternative available? Or what threshold of violence disclosure should lead to a screen-out? And I think Diane or Anne could respond to that.

**Anne Menard:** Right. I'll start and Mike might have something to say about this as well. And I think here's where there's an important distinction between responsible fatherhood programs and healthy marriage and relationship programs.

I think we're not - I'm certainly not suggesting that fatherhood programs where you have fathers walking in to the door looking for help around jobs or substance abuse or criminal history or, just more generally, wanting to re-connect with their kids.

But I think the goal for fatherhood programs is to really to increase their capacity to address violence along with the other issues that may be interfering with the father's ability to play the kind of role that we want them to play within their families. But the concern arises for healthy marriage and relationship programs that focus on couples.

I think a lot of folks were surprised and some of us were not as surprised at the level of interest in couples dealing with issues of domestic violence who reach out to healthy marriage and relationship programs.

And, again, what we've learned then in the erring on the side of safety and screening out for domestic violence is that screening out is not without its own implications and I think that's what we're struggling with now.

So I think the first thing to do is too really - for programs to really do an honest appraisal of the program's capacity to address violence and abuse issues. And, again, there's a range of capacity programs. There

are some healthy marriage and relationship programs that I'm aware of that have a very clinical component and are connected to very expert professionals who, in fact, have higher levels of capacity to deal with more complex array of issues and others are really not designed in that way.

I think the other thing that I would encourage folks to do is to really look at the way that they're programs are describing themselves in the community and make sure that you're engaging in truth in advertising.

If you're getting couples with very serious relationship problems that your program is really not designed, was never designed, to address and there may be - you may be describing your program to the community in ways that, again, create that disconnect. So you're then participating in the process of encouraging people to reach out to your program and then refusing them entry. So those are two things that I think all programs should be paying attention to.

In terms of assessing for the availability of services, what I'm really talking about is that you really do have a good handle on what's available in your community for domestic violence victims and survivors for perpetrators of domestic violence. That can be from the domestic violence community, from your mental health community, other social services that - and that you're also aware if they are not local services, they're not local hotlines or yours was recently been de-funded because of state funding woes, that you're aware of the national domestic violence hotline and other resources where at minimally people can go and have someone safe to talk to and explore what's going to be helpful to them.

If there really are no alternatives in your community that you can refer someone to that when you're saying our program really isn't designed to address the issues that you're bringing to us. You obviously want to do that in a very sensitive way. But if there really are no alternatives, then I would encourage you to explore whether it's possible, as Diane described, and I think as many of your programs already do, to explore whether the individual who's disclosed being a victim can participate and get what they can. The connections with other people, information about healthy verses unhealthy relationships, that might be helpful to them in their current relationship and in future relationships without the kinds of dangers and concerns that we have with couples who face (work).

Some folks may only be able to participate with a safety plan that you help them develop or more ideally that your local domestic violence programs help them develop.

But, I think the point here that we've learned from understanding the implications of screening out is that we don't want to leave individuals or victims hanging. We need to make sure that they have resources.

Ideally, they'll be referred to programs that are more appropriate in their community and that can address the concerns that they have.

**Rich Batten:** Thank you. We have a couple of questions about the background checks. Diane, do people know that as they register or inquire about this program that they will be going through a background check?

And then how do you access that? Is that through social security numbers, date of birth, names, city? Tell us a little bit more about that briefly.

**Diane Crosby:** The court record review is really a process of having someone's name and date of birth. And in Ohio, ideally not always true but ideally, all of those court records for convictions of a crime are available online from each of those courts.

And so ideally you can just go onto the website, put in the name and date of birth and then it will search and bring up anything with that match. So it's fairly easy to get.

I would offer that that is public information not that we're paying for it in any way or that we're asking for social security numbers. As people are registering, they are told that there is a court record review, that it's public records and that in order to do that they need their name and date of birth.

And I would offer that in some jurisdictions, I've not had the capability of doing that online, and as long - and I can call the court itself and give them an idea of what I would like or what I'm hoping for. I have faxed them a list of the names and dates of birth and they will give me back any positive hits if I've not had the online capability.

**Rich Batten:** Okay. We're going to wrap this up but we do - I mean, we have a number of responsible fatherhood programs on the line too. Do you often see, or not often, but how do you handle when you see the woman in the role of a perpetrator? Is that something that is - do you handle that in a different way? How do you effectively handle that, I guess?

**Diane Crosby:** I just - I will let Anne weigh in on this from her perspective. I have found myself on the phone with a perpetrator and a victim regardless of gender. I am approachable regardless of gender and it's not like I'm having a conversation with somebody trying to find a label for them to stick on their forehead. The process is really - "What are your needs? Are you somebody that tends to use violence? Does this makes sense to you?"

If this hits home - and sometimes I will talk with them about why that may have occurred and I will get them appropriate information for them to learn more about it and resources; typically a Batterers Reeducation Program, Batterers Intervention Program, whatever that may be.

If I have somebody on the other end - it really is regardless of gender. Most often it turns out to be men who will be a perpetrator, female who won't but I have had both and I've had the extremes of both.

Another thing that I typically will refer is the work of Ellen Pense or Lundy Bancroft. Either one of those is really understanding a perpetrator and the thinking patterns that go into place with the use of violence and the manipulation and the control.

And sometimes it's a matter of just getting them more information so they can learn about it themselves, because I don't know if they're going to go to that step and more than one referral is always better in my opinion.

Anne, I'll let you weigh on that.

**Anne Menard:** No, that's okay. I know we're - I know we're bumping against the end time so I think you said it well Diane.

Thanks.

**Rich Batten:** Thank you. Let's - we do have a couple of polling questions. We're going to give those too and if you could quickly respond.

"Do you feel you have a better understanding of different types of intimate partner violence?" Go ahead and vote. That'll help us do a quick evaluation of our webinar today.

Okay, let's move on to the next polling question, how about, "I have a better understanding how to screen for intimate partner violence in my healthy marriage initiative program or responsible fatherhood program".

Okay. We have two more.

"I have better understanding of what to do if a case of intimate partner violence is identified among my healthy marriage initiative participants."

And then our last polling question – "I have a better understanding of my programs ability to include as participants, couples active engage in intimate partner violence".

As you're taking that last polling question, I will note that all of the PowerPoint's, the questions, questions that we didn't get to live as well as the handouts will be available on our website at [healthymarriageinfo.org](http://healthymarriageinfo.org).

I do know there were a couple of requests for Diane, say job description or information about that so let's see if we can get information about that for some of the programs you're looking to help craft or have somebody do similar type work in their programming with funding available.

And I would draw your attention to a new tip sheet posted on our website today distinguishing among types of intimate partner violence. What - and this could mean for MRE practioners that's currently listed. If you can go to the home page it's listed under features and that's a tip sheet which also has a link to the more fuller document that Anne referred to.

Well I want to thank all of our presenters today and all of you who participated in today's webinar and hope you have a great afternoon.

Thanks for participating.

END