

Respect Research into the results of participation in domestic violence perpetrator programmes, 2008 - 2013

Contents (all hyperlinked)

1. [Overview of project](#)
2. [Respect](#)
3. [Background](#)
4. [Fundraising](#)
5. [Work with domestic violence perpetrators in the UK](#)
6. [Purposes of the research](#)
7. [Values for different stakeholders](#)
8. [Outcomes and milestones of the research](#)
9. [Influencing local and national policy and practice](#)
10. [Existing research](#)
11. [Building on existing research](#)
12. [Length of the research project](#)
13. [Partnership and collaboration between researchers and voluntary and community sector practitioners](#)
14. [REDAMOS database](#)
15. [Advisory group](#)
16. [Research team](#)
17. [Project monitoring and governance](#)
18. [Preventing conflict of interest](#)
19. [Ethics](#)
20. [Quality assurance](#)
21. [Dissemination strategy](#)
22. [Risk management](#)
23. [Tasks and activities](#)
24. [Activities, outputs, responsibilities and timetable, June 2008 – June 2013](#)
25. [Costs](#)
26. [Further information](#)

Appendices

1. [Considerations for research plan](#)
2. [Overview of research methodology](#)
3. [Bibliography](#)

This plan has been written by the Respect Research Manager in consultation with the current funders, members of the advisory group, the appointed research team and other Respect staff.

Thangam Debonnaire, Respect Research Manager, May 2009

1. Overview of the project

Respect, the UK national organisation of domestic violence perpetrator programmes, has designed a four year research project to fill a critical gap, to find out how and to what extent programmes improve women's and children's safety and reduce men's violence.

[Respect](#) is leading the project. The Respect Research Manager, appointed in June 2008, holds overall responsibility for the project.

The primary purpose of the research will be to examine the effects on women's safety from the participation of their partners in well established programmes. Secondary purposes are outlined in below in the section on [purposes of research](#).

An integral principle and practice running throughout the project and beyond is [partnership, collaboration and communication between practitioners, researchers](#) and policy makers. Respect Research Manager will be responsible for organising and supporting activities to support this process and the research team will recruit a PhD student under the Knowledge Transfer Partnership scheme to provide further support to this with the sites involved.

The key research questions are:

1. To what extent does men's participation in domestic violence perpetrator programmes affect the safety and welfare of women and children?
2. How does men's participation affect safety of women and children?
3. What increases the effectiveness of programmes?

2. Respect

Respect is the UK membership association for domestic violence perpetrator programmes and associated support services. Our key focus is on increasing safety the safety and well-being of victims by promoting, supporting, delivering and developing effective interventions with perpetrators.

Our services include:

- a) Support, resources and training for members;
- b) Managing accreditation of perpetrator programmes;
- c) Developing work with young people;
- d) Promoting knowledge of research about domestic violence and collaboration between researchers, practitioners and policy makers;
- e) Influencing public policy and providing a national voice on masculinity and violence against women;

- f) Running the Respect Phonenumber, an advice and referral line for perpetrators;
- g) Running the Men's Advice Line, a helpline for male victims and
- h) Running Dadspace.com, a virtual child contact centre.

Victims and perpetrators benefit from helplines. Children benefit from the general advice for fathers on the open site of dadspace.com and from the online virtual child contact centre part of dadspace.com. Practitioners benefit from policy work and research at national level to support service delivery at local level. Victims of domestic violence benefit from effective local services working to end their partner's violence against them and provide them with support.

Respect is a UK registered charity, number 1083968. Our website is www.respect.uk.net

3. Background to the research

[Perpetrator programmes](#) have been established to work with men who are using violence and controlling behaviour. They are situated both within community based organisations and within the criminal justice system.

Community based programmes are the subject of this research as they are mostly Respect members. They are usually run by voluntary organisations or from within statutory agencies like Children's Services or Health Trusts, or by local authority partnerships. The criminal justice based programmes are for offenders mandated to attend as part of a criminal sentence following a criminal conviction. They are run from within Probation Service and National Offender Management Service and will not be the subjects of this research.

This proposal has been developed through a process of consulting relevant researchers, policy makers and practitioners in the UK and the US. This includes consulting the researcher responsible for the only longitudinal multi site research on perpetrator programmes in the world.

The project started in June 2008 and will run until June 2012. The researchers were appointed in December 2008 and they are preparing for their pilot stage of the research at the moment.

Respect has overall responsibility for managing the project, by raising the funds, commissioning the researchers and overseeing their work. Respect is also partly responsible for ensuring that the process is as collaborative between researchers and practitioners as possible without compromising the integrity of the research elements. There are other elements of this project which include providing research and monitoring tools to programmes who are not one of the main sites and running seminars for practitioners, researchers and policy makers to discuss

specific aspects of the progress of the research and related research each year as well as taking part in other consultation including web based.

Respect retains overall responsibility for the project and for ensuring that it is rigorously carried out and fully completed. A new post, part time Research Manager, has been created for this purpose. The post holder has been in post for nearly one year.

As the project continues, the researchers' team will carry out the research, supported and monitored by the Respect Research Manager, to whom they are reporting quarterly against their work plan and financial targets. The Research Manager will continue to be responsible for implementing the database in programmes across the country, to provide the research team with baseline national data.

4. Fundraising

Respect has raised the cost of employing the Research Manager for two years from LankellyChase Foundation. Respect has further raised funds for the pilot phase of the research (LankellyChase Foundation and Northern Rock Foundation) and further conditional funding (Northern Rock Foundation) for the rest of the budget, which will be released when matching funding is secured. This means that approximately one third of the total amount of funds needed has already been secured at the time of preparing this project plan.

Further funds from LankellyChase Foundation and from Northern Rock Foundation may also be available.

Cafcass has committed providing an unconfirmed amount for the research at the time of writing (May 2009).

Researchers will apply to the Economic and Social Research Council for Phd studentships and other funding, including funding for a PhD Knowledge Transfer Partnership.

Respect is applying to Big Lottery Research Programme (May 2009) for funds.

5. Work with domestic violence perpetrators in the UK

Domestic violence perpetrator programmes were first developed in the UK in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Change, in Scotland, and DVIP, in West London, were amongst the first programmes. Each had a clearly developed curriculum, influenced in part by the programmes developed in the USA but developed specifically for their settings. Initially community based programmes delivered services for self referred and court referred men. In time, the court referrals became mandates, with consequences for non compliance. In recent years,

criminal court mandated men have been sent to programmes run within the criminal justice system usually by specifically trained probation officers.

The most common model of work with domestic violence perpetrators in the organised sense is in group work settings, with linked services for partners and ex-partners. Couples counsellors, individual counsellors, substance misuse workers and others also provide responses to perpetrators which may include couples or individual work.

Respect member services are mostly run in community based programmes working with perpetrators of domestic violence and their partners and ex-partners. The men and women may be referred by Children's Services, Cafcass (family courts), mental health or substance misuse services, couples counselling or by self referrals. The work of programmes includes the work with perpetrators in individual and group work, risk and case management and also includes the linked integrated support services for partners and ex-partners of perpetrators in contact with the organisation concerned, particularly those participating in groups. The specific integrated linked services for partners and ex-partners has been advocated by Respect as an essential component of the work and as something distinct from, though related to, other support services for victims of domestic violence.

In the UK there are around 38 third sector organisations registered with Respect and providing services for men who use violence towards female partners. A conservative estimate of the number of group programmes being delivered across both the probation service and the third sector is around 500 with around 5000 perpetrators of domestic violence attending these programmes and anyone time.

Practice knowledge has been developing in this work for over thirty years, since the first programmes for violent men were established in the USA and for about twenty years in the UK. In the USA various states have developed service standards, with varying levels of assessment and implementation to enforce these. In the UK, Respect has developed a system of accreditation with clear national service standards for programmes and the integrated support services for partners and ex-partners of programme participants. Accreditation includes desk review, case file checking, observation of group work and interviews with staff and others, against the 105 requirements of the service standards. The system is designed to allow for maximum flexibility of delivery format and professional approach, within clear boundaries to provide minimum level of safety for victims and maximum possible chance of change for perpetrators.

The accreditation standard was built on the best available information from practice and research at the time (the standard was published in 2008 after a three year process). Policy makers, practitioners, commissioning agencies and other funders are starting to make use of the accreditation system to support the work with perpetrators. However, reasonable questions arise for all of these stakeholders and for Respect itself about the basis for various requirements

within the service standards and about the overall assumptions that programmes do in fact contribute to victim safety. For example, the standard recommends a minimum programme length, caution about the use of couples counselling as an immediate response to domestic violence, the critical importance of working with children's services, use of risk management tools. Some of these have clear evidential basis, some are required by law or policy and some are in need of further clear investigation.

6. Purposes of the research

The primary purpose of the research is to investigate the effects of well established perpetrator programmes on the safety of women whose partners and ex-partners are participating in the programmes. The secondary purposes will be to find out:

1. Who participates in perpetrator programmes?
2. What helps men to make sustained changes to their abusive behaviour?
3. Why do men drop out and how can they be kept engaged?
4. When are men succeeding in making lasting change even when they don't complete a programme? Who else is involved with them?
5. What are the effects of programme participation on the children connected to the men participating in the programme?

The findings of the research will have major implications for third sector organisation providing these services and those who commission them. If the results were positive it would bring about an increase in funds for this work and improve engagement with fathers who are using abusive behaviour towards their partners.

7. Value for different stakeholders

This research will provide rigorous data which will directly inform decisions about practice, policy and funding of perpetrator programmes in the UK. It will also have implications for other responses to domestic violence.

The key stakeholders who will benefit directly and indirectly from this research include:

- Women experiencing domestic violence whose partners and ex-partners are participating in programmes: programmes will be more effective for improving their safety if they are evidence based;
- Men using domestic violence and who want to stop: programmes will be more effective at helping them change if they are evidence based;

- Practitioners delivering group work and other services with and for perpetrators of domestic violence and their partners and ex-partners: they will have evidence of how and why programme participants do and do not change, which will directly inform and improve their practice;
- Policy makers, funders and commissioners of perpetrator programmes: the evidence will help them to be better able to guide and support the development of effective coordinated responses to domestic violence;
- Primary health care providers;
- Relate: as a key referring agency to Respect member organisations, Relate will be better able to provide information to its clients about perpetrator programme effectiveness and to be able to provide more appropriate and safer services as a result;
- Family Courts and the CAFCASS: as users and key referring agencies they can have more confidence in the services of perpetrator programmes and in the reports provided by such programmes to them about the risk presented by individual perpetrators if the work of such programmes is informed by rigorous research;
- Safeguarding Children's Boards and others involved in child protection: they can have increased confidence in programmes which have been rigorously tested for effectiveness in protecting children or informed by such research;
- Criminal justice based perpetrator programmes: the lessons learnt in this research will also be directly relevant for these programmes;
- Government departments such as the Home Office and the Ministry of Justice: as key funders and policy makers, the research will help them to make informed evidence based decisions about national directions in responses to domestic violence;
- Researchers: the methodologies developed and the findings identified by this research will help all those engaged in research on domestic violence.

8. Outcomes, measures of success and key milestones

Outcome 1 By 30th June 2012

Funders, policy makers, practitioners and commissioners of services have clear information about the extent to which women and children are safer as a result of men's participation in Respect accredited programmes based in the community and statutory sectors.

Measures of success for outcome 1

The researchers will have written interim reports and then a final report from the research which will describe and analyse rigorously collected data from men and women involved in perpetrator programmes compared with data from men and women where the men are not involved in perpetrator programmes. We will have carried out dissemination and publicity activities as per our project plan.

Policy makers in DCSF, Home Office and Department of Health, practitioners in 90% community based programmes will have information, and other relevant funders will know about the findings, which we will test through measuring participation in seminars, knowledge demonstrated in individual meetings with policy makers and take up of information in other formats.

Milestones for outcome 1

1. The researchers will have provided annual interim reports which will be scrutinised by the independent advisory group in October 09, November 10 and November 11.
2. The researchers will have published 3 academic papers on the research findings (by June 2013)
3. The final report will be completed and available for publication (June 2012)

Outcome 2 30th June 2012

Funders, service managers, commissioning agencies and policy makers will be able to make informed decisions about management, funding and operation of programmes because they will know who is approaching, being referred to, being assessed for, starting and completing domestic violence perpetrator programmes in the community in the UK. This will include significant amounts of demographic data and information about the levels of past violence used and current risk posed by these men aggregated and analysed nationally, something which is not currently available and is greatly needed.

Measures of success for outcome 2

We will have data provided locally by a wide range of community based programmes and analysed nationally via the [Respect REDAMOS database](#). The researchers will have analysed in detail data from the research sites and from other programmes using REDAMOS and drawn well supported conclusions about programme use, which will be scrutinised by the advisory group. We will have discussed the implications of this information and have publicised it in our magazine and on our website. Service managers, commissioning agencies and others as needed will have received a briefing paper from Respect on the implications of research findings on service use for management and funding of programmes.

Milestones for outcome 2

1. The REDAMOS database will be checked by the research team for research compliance, required fields and compatibility with recognised data analysis software (July 2009)
2. The researchers will have completed the pilot phase and will have as a result clear identification of criteria for programme success, clear identification of methodology; well tested research tools; tested control group methods; tested recruitment of research subjects by April 2010
3. Data from the REDAMOS database and from the interviews with men and women will have been extracted and analysed by the research team (March 2011)

Outcome 3 by June 2013

Respect, practitioners, funders and commissioners of services will have available to use clear information about the factors which increase the effectiveness of perpetrator programmes to inform improvements to practice in programmes, revisions to the national service standards set by Respect and the commissioning and funding arrangements required for delivering the safest long term outcomes for women and children.

Measures of success for outcome 3

The research report will describe identifiable factors which increase effectiveness. Respect Service standards and accreditation process will have been amended to reflect these. Respect will have produced practice guidance for practitioners on the implications of the research findings and Commissioning guidance to reflect the resource requirements this produces. Respect will have negotiated with key commissioning agencies to agree these documents as national policy.

Milestones for outcome 3

1. The research team will have written 3 briefing papers on: 1. What is success? 2. Who attends perpetrator programmes? 3. Guidance for interviewing perpetrators (by June 2010)
2. Respect Research Manager will have written briefing papers for practitioners and policy makers and new Commissioning Guidance for funders promoting the key findings from the research (briefing papers by December 2012, Commissioning Guidance by June 2013)

3. There will have been a conference to launch the research findings and seminars to discuss these with practitioners, policy makers, funders and other stakeholders (October 2012)

All tasks listed in this project plan are listed against activities necessary to fulfil them in [section 22, tasks and activities](#).

Activities identified as necessary to fulfil tasks are listed against the staff responsible for them and the outputs expected are presented in date order in [section 23, activities, responsibilities and outputs](#).

9. Influencing local and national policy and practice

Research will answer critical question for policy makers and practitioners locally and nationally about programme effects through rigorous research methods.

Outputs for this will include the following Respect documents:

1. Revised national service standards for practitioners (2014)
2. Practice guidance for practitioners on the implications of the research (2013) Commissioning guidance using research findings (2013)
3. Revisions proposed to national policy on programmes (2013)
4. Revisions to existing commissioning frameworks with DCSF (2013-14).

Other outputs include:

Publicity targetting policy makers and practitioners following the final report
Specifically targetted communication with specific individual national policy makers and policy groups

The research significantly improves knowledge of promoting well-being, psychological and physical health of survivors of domestic violence and their personal independence, reducing their isolation and improving their family relationships, by measuring the impact of specialist services for their violent partners/ex-partners and linked support for them and providing clear information about how safety can be promoted and violence reduced through programme work.

10. Existing research

There has been little research into the outcomes of participation in perpetrator programmes in the world. Each of the rigorous relevant research projects has provided lessons for this proposed piece of work to build on and also has gaps or limits which this project would remedy.

The most significant, rigorous and long term research of perpetrator programmes was that carried out in the United States, led by Edward Gondolf over a total of 7 years (Gondolf, 2003). This research examined the effects of four well established programmes on the safety of over 800 women whose partners and ex-partners participated in group work and other services provided by those programmes. This research confirmed that well established programmes, situated within a co-ordinated inter agency community response to domestic violence, significantly improve the safety of the majority of women whose partners and ex-partners participate. The men who participated in the programmes were almost all mandated by the courts and the programmes had very little or no integrated specific services for partners and ex-partners (these integrated services for partners and ex-partners are feature of UK service provision).

Specialist domestic violence prevention programmes for men using violence towards their female partners have been working in the UK for around 18 years. During this period there have been two independent pieces of research of programme effectiveness.

The first research was of two services in Scotland both working with court mandated referrals (Dobash et al, 2000). This research found that:

- A minority (33%) of men who completed the programmes, as part of a criminal sentence, committed further acts of violence on their partner during the 18 month period after programme participation;
- The majority (75%) of men who received other types of sentences but did not participate in programmes did commit further acts of violence during the same time period.

The sample was limited to men who were convicted and sent to the programmes as an alternative to custody. This selection was not random and did not produce a matching control group. The services evaluated were not running parallel services for the partners and ex-partners of the men, the current UK model, which means that the significance of this aspect of a perpetrator programme service could not be evaluated.

The research of the Domestic Violence Intervention Project in London did include an examination of the integrated support service working with partners and ex-partners of men on the programme. It was also the only research so far with a sample of non court mandated clients. It did not have a large sample size to be statistically significant and there was no control group. The researchers found evidence that the combination of the domestic violence prevention programme

for men and the integrated support service for women had a significant effect upon the safety of women and children and that the majority of men competing the programme stopped using physical violence and other abusive behaviours (Burton et al, 1998).

11. Building on existing research

The proposed research will fill in some of the gaps in knowledge not covered by the other major research projects carried out so far. It will also aim to remedy some of the other limitations of these projects. Respect staff have consulted the researchers involved in all three of the major research projects outlined above. This has helped us to identify the following limitations in past research:

- Small sample sizes and significant attrition of the original sample size over the length of time taken in the follow up period; the researcher leading the US research has identified that a four year follow up period is not necessary to measure sustained change and that a shorter follow up period will identify almost all the men likely to continue using violence after participating in a programme;
- Limited data sources about change in behaviour; many researchers have relied on the participant's views and on psychometrics; the researchers involved in the work described above have found, through careful examination, that the most reliable information on changes in behaviour comes from the men's partners and ex-partners;
- Much research has been both limited and retrospective, relying on memory of past experience rather than tracking experiences over time; the research projects described above have developed methods of carrying out such tracking which can be built on and developed in this proposed research;
- Most research has concentrated on criminal justice programmes, and have had no measure of the effect on children's safety;
- New services are often the subject of research and are frequently experiencing teething problems and working with inexperienced staff; this means that the programmes change significantly during research and it thus becomes difficult to determine which effects are due to programme participation;
- Control groups have proved to be difficult to establish on both ethical and practical grounds

This design of this research will seek to address all of the above problems. The recent development of a national accreditation system for services working in this field provides the framework and information to judge which services should be evaluated.

This research will address the above problems in the following ways:

- There will be a sample size of c. 600 men in total from at least 2 sites, providing a large enough sample to carry out rigorous data analysis which can take into account a range of variables such as age, marital status, children, etc; this data will be scrutinised by the [advisory group](#), particularly the researchers on it, to test out validity and power analysis;
- The research project will maintain frequent contact with the partners;
- The researchers will focus on gathering hard evidence of observed actual behaviour change;
- The research will focus on non court mandated clients;
- The impact of this intervention on outcomes from children will be part of the research;
- This will be a prospective, not retrospective, piece of research examining and tracking the safety of women from the point their partner or ex-partner first makes contact with the programmes, whether they then participate in the programme or not;
- All the services participating in the research will have been assessed as meeting the Respect accreditation standard; services will be regularly audited against the standard throughout the research to ensure that the quality of service provision is maintained
- There will be a control group that is ethical, possible and relevant in order to be able to draw meaningful conclusions from the comparison, this will be tested during the pilot phase.

12. Length of research

The entire project lasts up to five years, starting in June 2008 with the employment of a part time Research Manager at Respect, to coordinate the process overall and to ensure the collaborative and communication processes.

The research process will last for up to four years in total, starting with the pilot year in April 2009 and with a target completion date of end of 2012, with the possibility of using the first quarter of 2013 if necessary.

This will allow sufficient time to gather data from women for up to one year following the end of their partner or ex-partner's participation in or contact with a programme and to allow for sufficient time for preparation, data gathering and analysis. The figure of a year for following up the women's safety has been carefully considered in the light of the findings of other relevant research. The only [other similar research](#) carried out anywhere in the world (Gondolf, 2003) found very little difference between the results at one year after programme participation and at four years. The lessons from this and other existing research can be built on and developed during the proposed multi site research.

13. Partnership between researchers, voluntary and community sector practitioners and policy makers

The earlier research with DVIP in London in the 1990s was initiated by practitioners, who sought out rigorous answers to key questions about programme effects. The programme research was not sufficient to provide definitive answers but it did provide strong indicators about programme effects and the routes by which men changed. This research was monitored by an advisory group with representation of practitioners, policy makers, potential funders and other researchers. Discussions between practitioners and researchers and the very processes of research influenced practice and helped to inform the implications drawn out of the research. For example, the researchers found, through use of a research technique of proactive contact with the women whose partners were on the programme, that proactive contact was not only welcome but often vital to support women's safety. This turned the prevailing thinking and practice within women's services on its head and continues to influence work. The requirement to make proactive contact with women and to carry out joint case work between men's and women's workers has been built into the Respect accreditation standard.

Respect has developed a tradition of linking research and practice, researchers with practitioners and trying to improve communication and collaboration. A series of research seminars for an invited group of practitioners, researchers, funders and policy makers has taken place on a series of specific topics, including research on programme effects, work with black and other ethnic minority clients, work with lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered clients and on collaborative research. Respect hosts a research think-tank, a smaller group of researchers and Respect staff working on research implications and the research agenda in the UK. This will continue to be a fundamental part of this project. The Respect Research Manager post has now provided a way for this to be developed

Improved partnership between VS and research community will be demonstrated through the existence at end of Year 1 of research criteria and tools which have been jointly developed by practitioners and researchers in partnership in the pilot phase and participation by 50% of Respect member programmes in at least one element of the project, either attending a seminar, using the database, being one of the pilot or full research sites or contributing to an e-discussion on the website.

Outputs: Evidence of improved dissemination of VS led research:

- annual reports and seminars for key stakeholders on research progress and findings in 2010, 2011 and 2012;
- amendments to Respect service standards drawn from findings in 2014
- Respect briefings for practitioners on implications from research for practice by December 2012

- Respect briefings for relevant government departments to recommend changes to national policy in 2013-14.

The research is commissioned by a VCS umbrella organisation for 40 local VCS organisations; includes a purpose built tool combining local case management with monitoring and analysis of outputs and outcomes, developed by and for practitioners in collaboration with researchers; pilot phase includes practitioner consultation. Two posts will be created to improve VCS knowledge of using research. Evidence of achievement will be: participation by at least 50% of Respect member organisations in one aspect of the project; 20% Respect members use the database for their own research.

14. REDAMOS Respect case management and outcome database for programmes

This has been one of the early achievements of this project. The Respect Research Manager has led a team of practitioners, researchers and IT specialists and developed skills in technical areas herself in order to create a purpose built, low cost, web-based, accessible yet secure database for programmes to use. This provides for the programmes the tools to carry out and record client work including gathering initial information, carrying out assessments, recording group work and individual work, recording liaison with other agencies. It was piloted and tested in three sites in London during 2008 and is now being installed in other programmes across the country.

REDAMOS also contains a purposely designed outcome assessment tool for programmes that are not part of the full research process to use to assess the impact of their services on victims whose partners have taken part in some or all of a programme for perpetrators. This tool was designed with the experienced research team Dr Russell and Dr Rebecca Dobash, authors of numerous books and publications about domestic violence and the lead researchers for the 1998 research on programmes in Scotland (Changing Violent Men, Dobash et al, 1998). The tool is available now on the Respect website for downloading as well as in the REDAMOS online database.

The Respect Research Manager is providing training and assistance for member programmes free of charge to use the database and the outcome collection system.

15. Advisory group

Research design, data gathering and analysis will all be affected by the detail of practice and the developments in responses to domestic violence. Other similar

research has benefited from the guidance of an advisory group of key individuals who will be able to provide clear and immediate information about such developments as well as providing insights into the meaning of the data gathered. Researchers and practitioners consulted during the preparation of this proposal have confirmed that this is an essential feature of an effective and rigorous long term research of domestic violence interventions.

It is also important to ensure that the research is accountable to and pays due respect to the experiences and needs of survivors of domestic violence. Respect will ensuring that there are suitable representatives of organisations working with survivors included in the advisory group helps to support this accountability.

The research will therefore be guided by an advisory group made up of key academics, policy makers and practitioners. This group will meet regularly throughout the research. As well as providing guidance and scrutiny to the research process, the group can help to ensure that the project is influencing social policy and practice from the outset.

The advisory group has been recruited and was first fully convened in April 2009. Before that, a sub group of the advisory group, including the chair, Mary MacLeod, CEO of the National Family and Parenting Institute, to recruit the researchers.

Other members include:

Professor Edward Gondolf, Mid Atlantic Addiction Research and Training Institute, University of Indiana, USA

Professor Geoff Garnett, Imperial College, London

Dr Ravi Thiara, University of Warwick

Nicola Harwin, Women's Aid Federation of England

Dr John Archer, University of Central Lancashire

Dr Lorraine Radford, NSPCC

Elizabeth Hall, Children and Families Court Advice and Support Service

Dr Oliver Williams, Center for Domestic Violence in African American Communities, Minneapolis, USA

Jo Todd, Respect

Scottish Women's Aid

Susan Ash, LankellyChase Foundation

Cullagh Warnock, Northern Rock Foundation

16. The research team

A sub group from the advisory group, chaired by Mary Macleod, convened in Autumn 2008 to recruit the research team. After a rigorous process of interviewing and assessment, the following research team was appointed:

Professor Liz Kelly, Roddick Chair in Violence Against Women and Director of the Child and Woman Abuse Studies Unit at London Metropolitan University.
Dr Nicole Westmarland, Lecturer in Criminal Justice, Durham University

Professor Charlotte Watts and Dr Cathy Zimmerman, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine

Professor Kelly will be the Research Director or Principal Investigator for the research team. Dr Westmarland will be the deputy director for the team. Dr Watts and Dr Zimmerman will be used as consultants on specific elements of the process.

Research assistants and Phd students will also be recruited during the process to carry out some of the data collection and other activities.

One of the key features of this will be the recruitment, if the application to the Economic and Social Research Council is successful, of a Knowledge Transfer Partnership PhD, whose role will be to support the transfer and use of knowledge between practitioners and researchers.

17. Project monitoring and governance

In order to ensure that the project is monitored efficiently and that there is adequate governance, particularly in the light of the complex safety and ethical factors presented by this research, the following will be adhered to:

1. The Respect Research Manager will report to all funders according to their requirements, referring to and using or including reports from researchers when necessary.
2. Professor Kelly, directing the researcher team, will report quarterly to the Respect Research Manager against agreed budget and timetable targets. She will also report to every meeting of the independent advisory group.
3. Professor Kelly will monitor the progress of the research team against their work tasks as listed in their research plan and in the overall project plan.
4. Respect Research Manager will be monitored by the Respect CEO and Executive Committee against her tasks listed in the project plan, which will be monitored separately as her work plan.
5. The Respect Research Manager will contact the programme sites at least quarterly by phone to ask about the process from their point of view and will visit each one in person each year of the project.
6. The independent advisory group will monitor and review progress at each meeting.
7. Finance will be monitored by the Respect Research Manager and the Respect finance officer, with quarterly reviews of spending and income.

8. The research director will be required to provide financial reports to the Research Manager quarterly before funding is released for the next quarter.
9. There is representation of the practitioners, policy makers and funders on the independent advisory group monitoring and guiding the research.
10. Respect has held the first of a series of research seminars for practitioners which will continue throughout the research process to provide additional monitoring and guidance and advice about how to do this systematically in ways which are supportive to practitioners without compromising the integrity of the research. There will be a seminar near the end of the research process looking at the implications of the draft research report and monitoring this against the original purposes for practitioners.
11. Commissioning and funding agencies will be provided with regular briefings on the progress of the project either by their presence on the advisory group or through seminars and briefings which will be provided regularly and at key moments.

18. Preventing conflict of interest

There was potential for a conflict of interest if Respect had been researching internally the outcomes of its own member programmes. For this reason, Respect commissioned an independent advisory group of skilled individuals to carry out oversight and governance of the process and to recruit an independent research team. The following factors will help to prevent conflict of interest arising or if it arises, becoming a problem:

1. None of the research team is involved with or connected to domestic violence perpetrator programmes other than through research. If they develop a personal or professional connection beyond a research one during the life of the project they will declare this immediately to the chair of the independent advisory group.
2. The advisory group has individuals from a range of disciplines and backgrounds and is chaired by a highly experienced individual from an organisation which has an interest in but is not connected in any way to perpetrator programmes.
3. The advisory group contains researchers from different disciplines and backgrounds as well as policy makers and representatives of women's support services and they have already begun scrutinising the plans and work of the researchers.
4. Respect has only one representative on the advisory group and she will abstain from any decisions which have a conflict of interest with her position as Respect CEO.
5. The final decision on conflicts of interest within the advisory group and research will rest with the chair of the advisory group.

19. Ethics

The ethics of researching domestic violence perpetrator programmes have been rehearsed at length in the literature, with the most frequent discussions pertaining to requiring men to take part as a condition of acceptance on the programme and the ethics of asking women to be the measure of their partner's success. Whilst there are important philosophical issues involved here, all parties have possibilities to consent – or not – to participation. In our experience many discussions of ethics in social research underestimate the extent to which people take part from altruistic motives – they are interested in 'making things better' for others.

That said, the researchers will have no levers with which to ensure continued engagement of men who drop out or of female partners. The monetary compensation and activity events are attempts to motivate women to stay with the evaluation, but for many this will not be a priority in their lives. The researchers will use as much encouragement as they can and make it as easy and enjoyable as possible for them to continue participation, but will not use any form of pressure.

As with their practice in previous studies, if the researchers have concerns for the safety female partners and/or their children who are not in regular contact with the support service they will strongly encourage them to make contact. Where these concerns are serious we will develop a speedy mechanism for discussing this in the team, and where deemed necessary will pass on concerns to the support service, in order that they can prioritise pro-actively contacting the woman concerned.

Since all support services have a pro-active practice this will blend into existing routines. In initial contact with the partner, the researchers will make clear the boundaries of confidentiality and gain signed consent forms. The researchers will use the same consent forms with the perpetrators, and again it will be important to explain the limits of confidentiality (in terms of safeguarding children and threats to harm others). They will agree a shared child protection protocol for the research team with the selected programmes and advisory board before data collection begins.

All data will be anonymised at source or, if this is not possible, at the point of transcription. Anonymised data will be held on the London Metropolitan and Durham University drives, which are secure systems, backed up regularly and password protected.

All of the research team's research adheres to the Statement of Ethical Practice for the British Sociological Association, and the World Health Organisation guidelines for conducting research on intimate partner violence. In line with previous practice, support will also be put in place for all researchers working on the project.

20. Quality assurance

1. The advisory group will scrutinise the work of the researchers against the original purposes for the research and against more detailed plans.
2. The research director will report quarterly to the Respect Research Manager.
3. The Respect Research Manager will report quarterly to funders in writing and when necessary by phone.
4. The research team will provide a full written interim report annually which will be scrutinised by the advisory group.
5. The Respect Research Manager will have her work scrutinised and supervised by the Respect CEO and by the Respect Executive Committee.
6. The research team will be supervised by Professor Kelly and Dr Westmarland.
7. The universities are scrutinised by the Research Assessment Exercise, which is conducted jointly by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), the Scottish Funding Council (SFC), the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales (HEFCW) and the Department for Employment and Learning, Northern Ireland (DEL).
8. Periodic quality checks on the qualitative data will be conducted by Professor Liz Kelly. Data entry will be checked on the quantitative data through a dip sample conducted by Dr Nicole Westmarland.
9. Data will be anonymised at source or, if that is not possible, then at transcription. All data will be stored securely on University drives.

21. Dissemination strategy

Aims

1. To ensure that the findings of the research are well known to practitioners, policy makers, the academic research community, commissioning agencies and other key stakeholders
2. To ensure that the interim findings are made available in useful ways to key stakeholders and that they have opportunities to discuss the implications of these in seminars and in electronic consultation
3. To promote the use of the findings in changes to policy, practice and funding arrangements as necessary and possible

There will be a number of points during the period of the research where dissemination of findings can take place. The initial findings related to the demographics, levels and type of violence, types of relationships, numbers of children and agency contact will provide data which of interest to practitioners, researchers and policy makers. These should be available towards the end of year one, later in the process there will be interim findings which will give some indications as to whether services are being effective and if so, who with.

Interim findings would be available in year 3 and the final report coming shortly after the end of the research.

Dissemination tasks

1. Information will be provided to key stakeholders throughout the research project to ensure they are informed of emerging lessons.
2. The findings from the research, including lessons from the data collection methods and from the analysis of data, will be made available.
3. Key stakeholders will be informed in succinct and appropriate ways of the key messages from the research for their specific needs.

Dissemination activities

1. The research team will publish briefing papers during 2010 (task 1)
2. The research team will provide interim reports annually from which key information will be published (task 1)
3. The Research Manager will publish briefing papers for practitioners on the evidence from research about programmes in July 2009 (task 1)
4. The Research Manager will hold research seminars for practitioners, policy makers, researchers and funders to discuss interim findings and the progress of the research annually (task 1)
5. There will be a final research conference to publish the findings of the research and identify implications for policy, practice and funding (task 2)
6. The research team will write a full research report (task 2)
7. The Research Manager will write briefing papers for practitioners, policy makers and other stakeholders after the completion of the final report, in September 2012 (task 3)
8. Respect staff will arrange meetings to brief key policy makers in late 2012 and 2013 (task 3)
9. The Research Manager will host an interactive section of the Respect website for practitioners, policy makers and other researchers to comment on the process, provide insights into the findings, make suggestions, ask questions etc. (tasks 1 and 3)
10. The research team will publish papers in 3 academic journals. (task 2)
11. The research team will make presentations at academic conferences including the 2011 World Congress of Criminology conference. (task 2)

Dissemination outputs

1. 90% of Respect members have briefing papers on the key findings by 2013
2. 75% of Respect members can identify key findings from research by 2013
3. 50% of Respect members have amended publicity materials or fundraising or contracting arrangements or practice as a result of lessons from research, by 2014

4. Key staff in stakeholder agencies are aware of main findings, including CAADA, Women's Aid, CPS, and NOMS, by 2013
5. 50% of Respect members have taken part in some part of research process (by June 2012)
6. Meetings or other activities with key policy makers set up by June 2013
7. Practitioners in the research sites gave positive feedback about the process by June 2013
8. Respect accreditation standard has been amended with the implications from the research incorporated by April 2014
9. Directors of Children's Services and Cafcass services in all areas where there is currently a Respect member are aware of the Commissioning Guidance developed as a result of the research findings

Monitoring dissemination (Respect Research Manager)

1. Electronic survey (via email link) for Respect members in late 2012 to identify impact against targets above.
2. Individual telephone interviews with key stakeholders in late 2012 to identify impact against targets above.
3. Review of seminar take up, use of interactive e-consultation and other events during the process, by June 2014
4. Individual telephone interviews with practitioners in the research sites in October 2010 and in October 2012
5. E-survey via email link with directors of Children's Services in areas where there are Respect programmes, by June 2014
6. Review of outputs listed, by June 2014

22. Risk management

A separate risk management plan has been prepared for this project and is available on request.

23. Summary of tasks linked to activities

This section provides a list of all the tasks identified throughout the document, which are needed in order to ensure specified outcomes and other aims, and lists the activities needed to fulfil these tasks. The next section provides a list in date order of all the activities, listing who is responsible for carrying these out and the outputs expected, in date order.

Task	Activities
Advisory group and researchers recruited	Recruit chair Recruit recruitment sub group Carry out tender process Recruit researchers and issue contract
Raise sufficient funds	Raise funds for pilot Revised fundraising materials including this project plan Identify suitable funders Make application to Big Lottery, ESRC and other funders
Develop, implement, revise and use REDAMOS database	Develop test database Pilot in one Respect project Amend and revise Implement in 3 other projects Run training Implement in all full research sites Implement in 6 other projects Review and revise Carry out data extraction and analysis, ensuring data is clean
Develop rigorous and suitable research tools	Carry out research review Consult practitioners and service users in pilot sites about "what is success" and evidence Draft research tools (interviews, protocols etc) Test research tools in pilot sites Revise and agree final versions of tools
Carry out data collection with men and women in programme sites and control group	Using agreed protocols and interview schedules, carry out sufficient interviews with men and women to be able to supply rigorous data, currently estimated to be 600 men and their partners, ex-partners and new partners Carry out second follow up interviews with partners, ex-partners and new partners of men on programmes and in control group

Task	Activities
Carry out data analysis and write reports	Code data ongoing during data collection Analyse data Provide interim reports annually to advisory group Advisory group scrutinise reports Advisory group and researchers agree when sufficient data has been collected or devise strategies for increasing data collection Carry out final data analysis Draft final report Discuss draft with advisory group and amend as necessary Final report completed
Carry out communication, collaboration and dissemination activities throughout the life of the project	Prepare briefing papers for practitioners on research findings to date Carry out annual seminars for practitioners Establish and maintain electronic interactive notice boards for practitioners and researchers and others to communicate about and discuss research Publish academic papers Present research findings at least one academic conference Provide briefing papers on programme success and interviewing perpetrators Promote interim findings in relevant periodicals for practitioners Carry out final conference and seminar with publicity about report Provide briefing papers for key stakeholders Carry out other dissemination activities as needed
Review processes	Evaluate practitioners' experiences of participating in research Monitor practitioners' involvement in research project activities Evaluate impact of research findings on key stakeholders and their practice and decision making

24. Timetable of activities and outputs with key responsibilities

This has been prepared in consultation with the research team and is available on request.

25. Costs

The cost of the project has been established as a result of wide and detailed consultation with relevant researchers and practitioners on the costs of the process of research and the management of the project overall.

This total includes the funds Respect will need to commission and oversee the project, the costs of the advisory group, the compensation for research participants, the employment of the Research Manager as well as the funds the research team will need to design, carry out and manage the research.

Further information about costs is provided in the full budget which is available on request.

26. Further information

For further information about the proposal contact Thangam Debonnaire, Research Manager, Respect thangam.debonnaire@respect.uk.net

Appendix 1

Outline of key elements of the research

Number and choice of sites

There will be 2 - 4 perpetrator programme sites included in the research. These will be UK based, community based (non probation) programmes that have passed or are close to passing the rigorous process of Respect accreditation. This will help to ensure programme integrity and provide a framework for maintaining this throughout the process, through the assessment and spot check system Respect uses to establish whether or not a programme is conforming to the high standards of the Respect Service Standard.

The number of sites was established following consultation with relevant researchers from the UK and the US. If there are several sites from different cities there will be more demographic and other variables to be taken into account. This would mean a larger number of men from each site would be needed in order to make the findings statistically useful.

The choice of sites will be influenced by several factors including:

1. The need to provide sufficient numbers of men to participate within the proposed time scale. Smaller, less well-established programmes are unlikely to have sufficient numbers of participants to provide useful data;
2. The need to avoid comparing programmes which are too different or are still developing, as this would produce other variables to take into account and again mean greater numbers of men to produce statistically useful data. This multi site research should be about testing the effectiveness of the Respect accredited services, with established providers.

Data gathering

The methods of data gathering and other aspects of the research process will be determined by the researchers appointed. They will be guided by an advisory group (see section 12 below) and by Respect.

It is likely that the process will include establishing embedded workers working for the research project within the programme and control sites to support the data gathering stage. This will allow for close and immediate contact with men and women. This will help to ensure maximum possible numbers recruited and the required amount of contact throughout the data gathering process. It will also provide a source of support and assistance to the organisations participating in the research and maintain their commitment to the process.

Data from men and from women

Data about use or experience of, abusive behaviour will be gathered from men and from women at the start of programme contact. From then on, the main source of data about safety and abuse is likely to be from the women. This will cover their actual safety, incidents of abuse and controlling behaviour, feelings of safety and other factors. Women will be interviewed every six months and the research team will need to make contact with them in between interviews to maintain the links.

Men will initially be interviewed about their abusive behaviour. From then on they will mainly be interviewed about their responses to and feelings about the programmes. This will help to provide data for analysing why and how men change, a secondary purpose of the research.

Programme integrity monitoring

The research will require consistent programme integrity over the period of the men's participation in the programmes otherwise there will be variables arising from changes in programme delivery. The research team will therefore need to ensure that programme delivery is monitored.

Choosing well established programmes which have passed the Respect accreditation system will help to ensure treatment monitoring. Respect will ensure that the participating sites will be subject to spot checks on all or part of their service delivery during the research process.

The research team will also be able to make use of the fact that accredited organisations will be recording each group work session with men.

The will also be able to make use of the Respect REDAMOS database. This web-based secure database includes demographic information about men and their partners/ex-partners, risk assessment and management tools, details of contact with all of these individuals, records of programme participation, details of children and outcome data collected from women. Again, this will help to support programme monitoring.

"Intention to treat" model

The research will gather data from men and from women from the point where there is an intention on the part of the man using violence to engage with a programme and continue from that point, regardless of whether or not he does engage. This provides the researchers with useful data about programme drop out and the effects of this on women's safety.

Considerations for control groups

Using a control group of men who have stopped contact with the programme before or during the programme and comparing the behaviour of these men with that of programme completers may mean the researchers are comparing the outcomes for two entirely different groups of men. By creating another control group with women whose partners did not have the option of engaging with a programme, the possibilities for comparison become greater. The sample will be large enough and drawn from a city with roughly similar demographic factors. In this way the number of variables will be reduced. This will help to draw meaningful comparisons between the safety of women whose partners/exes had attended a programme and those who had not.

It is anticipated that this group of women will be recruited through their contact with a well established women's support service which has passed the Women's Aid system of accreditation for domestic and sexual violence services. This is to ensure that the women in the sample group have available the same or similar options for support and protection to those in contact with perpetrator programmes. This is both for ethical reasons and to ensure meaningful comparison of data.

The city for this control group will be one with a demographic profile as close to that of the sites of the perpetrator programmes as possible, in order to reduce the number of variables.

Children

Children's experiences are a key element to the work and will be explored in the research. In the current UK context this has a particular significance in the light of policy developments such as Every Child Matters and the developing use of the Common Assessment Framework. Additionally, many local Safeguarding Children's Boards (SCBs) are developing procedures for social workers to respond to the needs of children affected by domestic violence and will be required by these to engage with perpetrators and make effective referrals.

The implementation of the Children and Adoption Act 2006 in December 2008 has provided the family courts with the option of require fathers who have used domestic violence to attend a perpetrator programme as a "contact activity" before deciding whether or not to grant a child contact order. The outcome of this research could have significant influence of the family court's use of this provision. Local authority child protection work is increasingly the major source of referrals to domestic violence perpetrator programmes. They are likely to become a significant source of funds as they commission programmes or contract places on groups and will want to see evidence of programme effect on children.

Appendix 2

Overview of research methodology, extracted from the research plan written by the research team

Overall approach and rationale

Our research proposal is for a multi-method design that builds upon the previous two 'generations' of perpetrator research. Our 'third generation' design uses a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods to understand better the process of intervention implementation and to assess the potential range of impacts on programme participants and their partners. As detailed below, we propose a programme of research that will include interviews with programme workers, analysis of client databases, an analysis of the dynamics of participant involvement in the programme, and follow-up research with clients and their partners/ex-partners using several new analytic tools to measure success. We also integrate children's safety across the entire research design. All participants (except for those in comparison group) will be recruited through Respect accredited perpetrator programmes and associated women's support services. We intend to introduce a degree of randomisation into our selection of participants, but the exact details of that are dependent on the predicted level of participation (to be explored during the pilot phase).

The core of the study will be to prospectively track a sample of 600 men who have entered programmes through their female partners. These will be compared with 200 women whose male partners have not been on a programme (i.e. a quasi-experimental approach). There are two rolling time periods to this research. The first, that we call the programme phase, will be conducted while men are on the programme, when both men and partners will be interviewed. The second, follow up phase, will be conducted over the 12 months following exit from/completion of the programme, when researchers will maintain contact only with the partners.

In our design we have attempted not only to overcome some of the traditional pitfalls in relation to data collection but also to concentrate heavily on data analysis. Drawing on nearly two decades of literature and our past experience in this field we propose supplementing mainstream forms of analysis (descriptive statistics, significance testing and thematic analysis) with two more innovative techniques – critical incident analysis and survival analysis (described below).

The pilot phase

We are currently near the beginning of the pilot phase. In this phase we are conducting semi-structured interviews with men on programmes, the female partners, programme workers and policy makers. The aim of these interviews is to pilot some of the tools that will be used in the main study but also to look at 'what success means' from the perspectives of the different interview groups. From this, the first briefing paper will be published in November 2009. From this, we envisage moving around six 'indicators of success' forward into the main study. All Respect accredited programmes have been invited to participate in the research and the intervention sites are due to be named in June.

Expert interviews with programme workers

A minimum of eight programme workers will be interviewed on two occasions. On the first occasion (during the pilot phase) semi-structured, qualitative interviews will focus on ensuring that our research tools with men on programmes and their partners will ask the right questions and give us a sense of how practitioners understand success. The second interview will explore their experiential knowledge and how they work on issues of motivation and engagement for those who work with men, and safety planning with those who work with women. It is also important to be aware of any issues within projects that might impact on programme integrity or any part of the research. Rather than address these issues in interviews, we will maintain an ongoing dialogue and relationship with programme workers and explore and record these issues as they arise. Our experience has taught us that workers prefer not to have to repeat things they have already told researchers simply because it is the time of 'the interview'.

The programme phase

Interviews with men

We will conduct focus groups and individual interviews with men on programmes on two occasions. Individual interviews (a minimum of twelve) will also have been conducted with men on programmes during the pilot phase in terms of what 'success' means to them. The first set of focus groups will be when men have newly entered a programme; the second will be close to completion. We expect to conduct these as the programmes are running (by arranging to meet them before or after). As it is necessary to be able to contact the men who leave programmes before completion we will ask their permission to have email and mobile numbers so that we can contact them directly for a one to one interview if necessary. We intend to explore in more depth than any previous research the perceptions of perpetrators and partners on how they understand 'success' and what enables, limits and prevents it. We will also ask what they have learnt from the programme in terms of relationships with partners and children and the challenges of trying to implement this in their everyday interactions, including as a parent, and their current support/social networks; their assessment of the programme and its impact on their self concept. An additional set of questions will be added for men who leave before programme completion exploring the reasons for exit and the extent to which they sustained change, and if so what and/or who has supported this.

In designing our data collection tools, we will contact principal investigators of similar studies to request access to their instruments (which we will of course acknowledge any use/adaptation of). To facilitate trans-Atlantic working and sharing of research instruments, Prof. Gondolf (director of a similar US study) has accepted an invitation to be Honorary Professor at Durham University for the four year duration of the project. We will ask men to describe how they last responded to an event described by us (this is necessary for the Critical Incident Analysis) in the individual interviews, as well as further developing themes that emerge from the focus groups.

We are also exploring the possibility of tracking men through criminal justice (police report) data, both to have the dual outcome measurement, and to enable comparison of arrest rates. However, this is dependent on establishing a matched criminal justice sample of men who have not been on the programme.

Interviews with partners/ex-partners of the men

Recruiting and retaining partners/ex-partners is a more difficult task, especially since it is likely that some will separate during the programme, and may want to 'move on'. Our

experience is that women are often more motivated to participate in research when they understand why their views are important and how it will be of benefit to others. We will, therefore, cast our invitations in this way, and work with the women's support services to find the most effective ways of working in partnership to create the greatest participation. Creating commitment to the research among the workers in women's services will be a critical part of the project development. We would hope to demonstrate that our approach will offer opportunities for participation and reflection which the majority of partners will find beneficial. The payment (vouchers) for participation is another enhancement, and we suggest that it is given following completion of the research. We envisage doing a proportion of these interviews face to face, but where women are happy to do so, as many as possible will be done over the phone. The numbers involved (i.e. repeated contacts of 600 women) make this the most efficient approach. This will require programmes obtaining consent for passing on safe phone contact numbers and safe contact times to the research team.

We will also interview women in the pilot phase about what success means to them and then in the programme phase about their hopes and fears about programme participation for themselves, their partner and children; description of a recent event described by us (see critical incident analysis below); what they consider the most challenging issues are for the perpetrator, themselves and their children; parenting issues for themselves and their partner; the extent to which they have taken up offers of support from the women's service and any other formal support they are accessing; measurements of well-being and space for action and the extent and depth of their informal networks.

The follow up phase

The follow up interviews with partners will take place at regular intervals (either monthly or bi-monthly) post completion/exit from the programme. They will be undertaken predominantly over the phone, and will focus on measuring any subsequent abuse and/or controlling behaviour towards the partner and/or the children, repeated critical incident analysis (see below), take up, and assessment of, support services, the repeat measures on well-being and space for action and the extent and depth of informal networks.

We are also proposing that – building on the child care example in the literature (Goldman and Dumont, 2001) – that we offer activity groups for partners – possibly face painting or craft session for children, aromatherapy or Indian head massage for women – as an incentive to attend. This would enable us to interview those who attend in more depth than will possible over the phone, and do a focus group/individual interview as part of the session to explore key questions. We would involve the women's support workers fully in these groups and hope that they will be more than 'just about gathering data'. Rather, we hope they will be relaxing and empowering for all involved and make being involved in the research a pleasure rather than a chore.

The comparison group

We have had almost a full year's discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of having a comparison group (we have completely ruled out the possibility of a control groups because the safety and ethical implications outweigh the benefits). Our debates have led us to the conclusion that the most appropriate comparison group will be another women's support project that offers similar support to the women's support project linked to the men's programmes. The data collected for the survival analysis will then tell us what, if any, the added benefits are of 'adding' a men's programme to a women's support project. As with the intervention sites, we intend to introduce some form of randomisation in participant selection if possible. Attempts will be made to control for all

confounding variables, including type and level of support accepted. These discussions will take place when the intervention and comparison groups are selected and named.

Critical incident analysis

We intend to use Critical Incident Analysis (CIA) to analyse part of the interviews (the remaining interview data will be analysed thematically). While the lack – or presence – of violence and threat are important, they are limited measures of change. These limitations also make them more open to criticism with respect to accuracy – both in terms of recall and honesty. CIA provides a way to explore the same type of events over time, told as a story in the words of the participant, enabling identification of changes in behaviour, perceptions and understandings.

First developed by psychologist Michael Flanagan (1954), CIA has since been widely used in professional practice (especially of health and education professionals), the private and security sectors. One definition of a critical incident, from the health sector, has clear relevance to domestic violence.

A critical incident is an event that has the potential for causing social trauma and undermining social trust, creating fear that may have impact on community life and even on the practice of democracy. (Critical Incident Analysis group, University of Virginia Health System, <http://www.healthsystem.virginia.edu/Internet/ciag>)

We have found few studies that use CIA in the longitudinal way we are proposing, and none that have used it in relation to domestic violence. Participants are asked to describe an incident (e.g. the last time their partner did something they didn't agree with): where and when it happened; what actually happened – who did and said what; what they were thinking and feeling at the time and just after the incident. This can be used with perpetrators and partners, albeit that we would need to frame the incidents slightly differently. We envisage four 'incidents' which we would use at the beginning and end of the programme phase with men and women. Its advantages are that we will collect accounts from participants in their own words and the data will be far richer than much gathered to date. This is the closest it is possible to get to observable behaviour and the focus on specific incidents may overcome some of the noted concerns for men to simply rehearse what they have heard in programme sessions. It also means we will have additional ways of measuring reduction, not only cessation, of violence over time.

Survival analysis

The data collected during the follow up phase will be quantified as far as possible and survival analysis will be conducted (alongside other more traditional statistical tests). We are not aware of any UK domestic violence perpetrator study that has used survival analysis, and only a few have used it in the USA.

Survival analysis is a technique often used in medical research. It measures the amount of time taken until the occurrence of a pre-defined event - in medical research the 'event' is generally defined as 'death'. For the purposes of this research, however, several key events would be considered – these are dependent on the key 'indicators of success' that are developed from the pilot phase. We will be able to develop, with the expertise of LSHTM, sophisticated statistical modelling, capable of dealing simultaneously with a large number of variables, and exploring what may predictors associated with the occurrence and timing of key events. In particular, we are interested in exploring what

may be individual level factors (such as age, route of referral into programme etc) and programme specific variables (for example, established/recent, consequence management or not, length of time in the programme) to see if we can identify any factors that account for higher and lower retention rates, and whether these correlate with outcomes. It will also be possible to undertake analysis for sub-types of perpetrators, and to control for variables such as age and ethnicity. We would also hope to have sufficiently large and complete data sets to include variables on the timing of further incidents and the frequency and type of re-offence.

Client database

The fact that Respect has recently developed a bespoke database for use by accredited programmes presents considerable opportunity for maximising its potentials for the research. It is possible that some of the indicators of success can be measured across all accredited programmes and not just the case tracking sample of 600. The current role of the research team consists of contributing to the development of the database to ensure key fields are included. We are having a research team away day in July 2009 to consider which of the database variables are likely to be stable enough to be included in the main study. Analysis of this data will also play the central role in answering ‘who participates in domestic violence perpetrator programmes’ (a further briefing note will be published on this topic).

Appendix 3

Bibliography

Appendix 1: Bibliography

Austin JB and Dankwort J (1999) Standards for batterer programs: A review and analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, **14**, 152-168

Babcock, J.C., Green, C.E., and Robie, C. (2004) Does batterer treatment work? A meta-analytical review of domestic violence treatment outcome research. *Clinical Psychology Review*, **23**, pp 1023 – 1053.

Burton, S., Regan, L., & Kelly, L., (1998) *Supporting Women and Challenging Men Lessons from the Domestic Violence Intervention Project*. Bristol: Policy Press

Davis, R., Taylor, B., and Maxwell, C. (1998) *Does batterer treatment reduce violence? A randomized experiment in Brooklyn*. Final report to the National Institute of Justice. Washington, DC.

Debonnaire, T with Debonnaire, E and Walton, K (2005) An evaluation of programmes working with domestic violence perpetrators in Ireland. Dublin: DJELR.
<http://www.justice.ie/en/JELR/Evaluation.pdf/Files/Evaluation.pdf> (PDF, 1.3 MB)

Dobash, R. E., Dobash, R. P., Cavanagh, K., & Lewis, R., (2000) *Changing Violent Men*. California, US: Sage Publications

Dunford, F. (2000b). The San Diego Navy Experiment: An assessment of interventions for men who assault their wives. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, **68**, 468–476.

Gondolf, E (2002) *Batterer Intervention Systems: Issues, Outcomes and Recommendations*. California: Sage.

Gondolf, E. (2007). Theoretical and research support for the Duluth Model: A reply to Dutton and Corvo. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, **12**(6), 644-657.

Mullender, A. and Burton, L. (2001) Dealing with perpetrators; pp 59 - 94 in *What Works in Reducing Domestic Violence? A comprehensive guide for professionals* London, UK: Whiting and Birch Ltd

O'Leary, K. D., Heyman, R. E., & Neidig, P. H. (1999). Treatment of wife abuse: A comparison of gender specific and conjoint approaches. *Behavior Therapy*, **30**, 475-505. Heyman R and Schlee K (2003) Stopping wife abuse through physical aggression couples treatment. *Journal of Aggression Maltreatment and Trauma*, vol 7, 2.

Pence E and Paymar M. (2003) Creating a process of change for men who batter, an education curriculum. Domestic Abuse Intervention Project, Duluth Minnesota. www.duluth.model.org

Radford, L., Gill, A. (2006) Losing the Plot? Researching Community Safety Partnership Work against Domestic Violence, *Howard Journal of Criminal*, Vol. 45, No. 4, pp. 369-387.

Radford, L., Blacklock, N. & Iwi, K. (2006) Domestic Abuse Risk Assessment and Safety Planning in Child Protection – Assessing Perpetrators. In **Humphreys, C. &**

Stanley, N. (eds) *Domestic Violence and Child Protection. Directions for Good Practice.* London: Jessica Kingsley

Respect (2004) *Statement of Principles and Minimum Standards of Practice.* London: Respect.
http://www.respect.uk.net/data/files/old_site/Respect%20Statement%20of%20Principles%20and%20Minimum%20Standards%20of%20Practice%202004.pdf

Respect (2008) *The Respect Accreditation Standard.* London: Respect.
http://www.respect.uk.net/data/files/old_site/Standard%20030608A4%20FINAL%20WITH%20GUIDANCE.pdf

Saunders D (2000) Feminist, cognitive and behavioural group interventions for men who batter. Invited chapter in Wexler, D. *Domestic Violence 2000, Group Leaders Manual* pp 21 – 31

Saunders, D.G, and Hamill, R.M (2003) *Violence Against Women: Synthesis of Research on Offender Interventions.* Washington, National Institute of Justice.
<http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/201222.pdf>

Shephard, M.F. and Pence, E.L. (1999) An Introduction: Developing a Coordinated Community Response, in **Shepard, M.F. and Pence, E.L.** (eds.) (1999) *Coordinating Community Responses to Domestic Violence: Lessons from Duluth and Beyond.* California: Sage.

Shepard, M. F., & Pence, E. L. (Eds.). (1999) *Coordinating Community Responses to Domestic Violence: Lessons from Duluth and Beyond* Sage Publications

Wilson, M. (2004) *Perpetrator programmes for Male Domestic Violence Offenders: What do we know about effectiveness?* Edinburgh: Criminal Justice Social Work Development Centre for Scotland.

Links (alphabetical)

CHANGE programme www.changeweb.org.uk/change_mens_programme.htm
Domestic Violence Intervention Project (DVIP) www.dvip.org
RESPECT www.respect.uk.net/