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New Zealand’s family violence problem

• Family homicide rate per capita is more than twice Australia, Canada, UK\(^1\)
• From 2000 to 2010, NZ women reported the highest lifetime prevalence of physical violence amongst 14 developed countries\(^2\)
• 76 to 87 percent of intimate partner violence incidents may not be reported\(^3\)
• Per year, NZ police identify 30 000 people they believe are responsible for family violence offences\(^4\)

\(^{1,4}\)www.corrections.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/767646/TOPIC_SERIES_Family_violence.pdf

\(^2\)Family Violence Death Review Committee 4\(^{th}\) report (2014)

New Zealand’s family violence problem

• Economic costs of family violence estimated at $4.1 billion per annum minimum\(^1\)

• $1.4B spent on family violence and sexual violence
  • Most on core responses: police call outs, hospital admissions, prison
  • Includes 20M spent on victim recovery from sexual abuse (ACC etc.)
  • “Small proportion” to specialist services, most on child abuse and neglect\(^2\)

---


\(^2\) Report to Cabinet on progress of Ministerial Group on Family Violence and Sexual Violence, 2015
What we spend annually on family and sexual violence perpetrators (combined)

Figures in $M per annum

Family violence perpetrators

- Are people who abuse or behave violently toward a partner or former partner, child or older person in their household or the household of their intimate partner etc.
- Most often identified for violence against their intimate partner
Co-occurrence of IPV and Child Maltreatment

Family violence perpetrators

• Are people who abuse or behave violently toward a partner or former partner, child or older person in their household or the household of their intimate partner etc.

• Most often identified for violence against their intimate partner

• Often a child in household

• Substantial overlap between IPV and direct abuse of children

• Children in household/relationship => harm
What is a response?

• Any formal or informal reaction to family violence
• From
  • Friends, family, whānau, other community members
  • Social service, health agencies, GPs, schools etc.
  • Victim support services
  • Child support/protection services
  • Police, courts, probation officers, other corrections staff, lawyers
What is a response?
Toward coordinated community responses

• System thinking
What is a response?
Toward coordinated community responses

- System thinking
- Coordination between police, courts, programme providers, probation officers, victim services, child protection, addictions, housing etc.
- Communication between components
- Agreed and consistent services, responses, consequences for service users
- Built to be used by users!
  - People centred not problem-centred
  - Resists siloing, recognises fragmented and complexity of access experience for users
Bringing perpetrators back into our responses

“This Report turns the spotlight on perpetrators of family violence... until we adjust the lens and bring those who use violence and coercion more clearly into view – until we intervene at the source of the problem – the cycle of this violence will simply roll on. ... The aim of this Report, then, is to help to bring violent individuals out of this corner and under the scrutiny of a systemic response.”

(p.5; Centre for Innovative Justice, 2015. Opportunities for early intervention: Bringing perpetrators of family violence into view. Melbourne, Australia: RMIT).
Aims of perpetrator responses

- **Punitive**: harm, discomfort, inconvenience
- **Arrest, conviction, most sentences**
Aims of perpetrator responses

• Punitive

• Containing: making it harder to commit violence toward victim
  • Imprisonment, police safety orders, protection orders, GPS monitoring, curfews
Aims of perpetrator responses

• Punitive
• Containing

• **Rehabilitative**: support for making positive change
  • Non-violence programmes
  • Individual counselling
How punishment is theorised to work: Specific deterrence

Punishment for wrongdoing will discourage further wrongdoing

• Requires rationality and self-control

• Assumes that consequences are consistently negative whereas most crimes are only occasionally punished

• Most evidence is that it is ineffective in reducing criminal behaviour (e.g., effect of imprisonment on crime ≈ 0%; Cullen et al., 2011)
Deterrent responses

• Arrest
• Prosecution
• Punitive sentencing (“get tough”)
  • Curfews, electronic monitoring
  • Paying for own sentence
  • Longer prison sentence
• Monitoring?
Deterrent responses to family violence perpetration

Research on effects of arrest, prosecution, sentencing

• Most studies show no effect for formal processing when criminal history taken into account

• More “intrusive” sentencing may be more effective

• Suggests looking inside the sentence to see what works

• Formal actions may be important even if don’t reduce family violence
Supporting perpetrator accountability vs. “holding to account”

“. . . Family violence service systems can place restraints around the man’s violent and controlling behaviours. They can use incarceration, monitoring, supervision . . . to reduce risk . . .

However, this is not the same as holding the man accountable. Ultimately, accountability needs to be internalised by the perpetrator on a journey of change – he can be scaffolded and supported on this journey, but he cannot be made to be accountable.”

No to Violence Submission to the Royal Commission on Family Violence, Melbourne, 2015.
Web of accountability

• Formal and informal processes work together as a web around the perpetrator
• Shared understanding of family violence
• System actions hold perpetrator accountable
• Non-mandated services practice assertive outreach
• System supports victim/community in “drawing a line in the sand” and holding perpetrators to commitments they have made

- Joanie Smith, University of Melbourne;
- No To Violence;
- Centre for Innovation Justice
Web of accountability also means . . .

“. . .family violence service systems need to be accountable to each other, women, children . . .

. . . the current service system rarely engages men and does not have the capacity to provide men with a long-term strategy to stop the violence”

(p. 254, Vol III, Royal Commission in to Family Violence,
Melbourne, March, 2016)
Accountability: Five Kinds

1. Hold offenders accountable for the harm they have done to victims
2. Hold practitioners accountable to the safety and wellbeing of victims
3. Hold practitioners accountable to the due process of offenders
4. Hold practitioners accountable to others intervening in the system
5. Hold agencies accountable to other agencies

Source: Graham Barnes et al.
First, we need a system

“Our work to date has told us there is no purpose-built family violence . . . ‘system.’” (p.2)¹

“Although there are specialist programmes for sentenced perpetrators, there is no structured pathway for the management of other perpetrators. This contributes to the fragmented and inconsistent responses - considerable numbers of perpetrators are not engaged in any form of intervention” (p. 7)¹

¹Ministerial Group on Family Violence and Sexual Violence update on the progress of the work programme, 2016
“Currently, families are confronted with disconnected interventions resulting from piecemeal spending decisions made by agencies over time. These decisions have been made in an ad-hoc manner without a view to the overall system and without considering flow-on implications to other agencies or services.”

“Currently, families are confronted with disconnected interventions resulting from piecemeal spending decisions made by agencies over time. These decisions have been made in an ad-hoc manner without a view to the overall system and without considering flow-on implications to other agencies or services.”


Coordinated Community Response (CCR)
Developed and created by DAIP in collaboration with criminal and civil justice agencies, community members, advocates, and victims

- Written policies guiding each practitioner at each point of intervention that centralize victim safety and offender accountability and that coordinate an interagency intervention strategy.
- Protocols and procedures that link practitioners from different agencies and disciplines.
- An entity (preferably independent of the court) that tracks and monitors cases and assesses data.
- An interagency process that encourages practitioners to work together in a strategic manner to resolve problems.
- A process that allows for dialogue and problem-solving by focusing on systemic problems of an organization rather than on individual workers between criminal and civil justice agencies, community members and victims to close gaps and improve the community’s response to battering.
- A central role for advocates and victims in defining and evaluating the interagency intervention model.
- A commitment to support each other’s attempts to secure adequate resources to respond to these cases.

http://www.theduluthmodel.org/about/index.html
Integrated safety-oriented system responses

- Episode/crisis based
- Immediate priorities are victim/family safety and containment of perpetrator
- If response lasts long enough, some other issues may be addressed (e.g., health, housing, finances)
- Present initiative: Integrated Safety Response: Family Violence
Integrated safety-oriented system responses

• One type or part of coordinated response
• Episode/crisis based
• Immediate priorities are victim/family safety and containment of perpetrator
• Referral to perpetrator programme is small part of system
• If response lasts long enough, some other issues may be addressed (e.g., health, housing, finances)
• Present initiative: Integrated Safety Response: Family Violence
• Difficult to implement fully, maintain integrity
• Difficult to investigate effectiveness
NGO integration of perpetrator and victim/child services

• Recognises that victims and perpetrators often will have ongoing contact
• May enhance communication between workers
• May provide a more accurate picture of perpetrator risk, change
• May facilitate victim decision making around “line in the sand”
• May facilitate family reintegration if that is goal of victim/family
What about integrating perpetrator responses to support desistance?
Offender desistance

• Process not outcome
• Zigzagging
• Requires internal changes alongside stopping the behaviour
• May struggle at stressful times not to return to old habits
• If the difficulties with “going straight” outweigh incentives, may return to old behaviour
Desistance in family violence perpetrators

The Glenn Inquiry, Roguski & Gregory, 2014

Barriers

• Normalisation of violence
• Masculine identity
• Alcohol and drug use
• Social support for violence
• Experiences of alienation from mental health providers
• Mistrust of help from people who “haven’t been there”
• Mandating to programmes
• Lack of post-programme support
Desistance in family violence perpetrators
*The Glenn Inquiry, Roguski & Gregory, 2014*

What helped?

- Understanding desistance is a journey
- Informal mentoring in community
- Hearing and sharing in group with similar others
- Emotional recognition of impact of behaviour on family
- Moderating alcohol/drug use
- Developing deep personal resolve
How can we help?
Providing more and better practical and social support for longer after a specific episode

- More rapid referral to services
- Emergency housing so victim can stay in family home if want
- Longer monitoring which may enhance compliance
- Developing prosocial support network around perpetrator (system-level reviews)
- Brokering/navigation/multimodal service provision
- Case management for protection orders
- Repeating programmes
- Going on to other generic counselling services/personal development/parenting etc
- Peer supports, buddies, sponsors (AA)
- More support to “grass roots” movements (It’s not OK, E Tu Whānau, Pasefika Proud)
- More information on why most people never attend a programme, why some drop out
Containing perpetrators in the community
What works?

Aim is to restrict (discourage) access to victims through use of legislation and technology
  • Protection orders
  • Police safety orders
  • Electronic monitoring
Protection Orders

• Can be granted without perpetrator using physical violence: more inclusive definition of violence (Domestic Violence Act 1995)

• Limited research internationally

• Breaches common, but victims may still report benefits (safer, less violence)

• NZ study showed no effect on perpetrator behaviour, inconsistent responding to breaches, perpetrators continuing psychological violence (Robertson et al., 2007).
Police safety orders

• Since 2010 police can immediately order alleged perpetrator to leave residence, refrain from victim contact for up to 5 days
• For use when insufficient evidence for an arrest

Very little research in NZ

Mossman, King, Wehipeihana (2014) found low rates of reported breaches, alleged perpetrator less angry, improved behaviour
Electronic monitoring

• Limited until now in restricting people to home
• No long term effect on arrest (Erez et al., 2012) but victims positive
• Newer systems will allow mobile notification of proximity etc.
• No NZ research with family violence?
Programmes for perpetrators
Programmes for perpetrators

• Origins in 1970s feminist action to criminalise and reduce IPV
• Early versions based on challenging patriarchal beliefs through group education: ‘psychoeducation’ => consciousness raising
• Cognitive-behavioural programmes developed in parallel: challenging thinking or “cognitive errors” that support use of violence
• Modal programme = group-based discussion, some teaching, some emotional processing
New Zealand non-violence programmes (NVPs)

• Three main approaches today
  • Kaupapa Māori
  • “Mainstream” non-violence programmes
  • Department of Corrections family violence programmes
Kaupapa Māori interventions

• A variety of developing frameworks and theories drawn from Te Aō Māori (e.g., Mauri ora; Dobbs & Eruera, 2014)
• Decolonisation/Colonisation awareness
• Restoring and strengthening whānau and communities
• Issues of maintaining autonomy over intervention and accountability to government
• Need for more documentation (of models) and research
“Mainstream” NGO NVPs

- Developed and modified over many years in communication with each other
- “Psychoeducational”, single gender, gender-based/cognitive-behavioural
- Mostly group-based, 6 to 18 in size
- Sessions begin with check in, used to update risk management information
- Perpetrators and facilitators work together through series of topics (e.g., respect, trust, accountability, partnership)
- Most 16 to 20 weeks of 2-3 hours per week
- Now mostly “rolling entry” format
- Referrals mainly from Protection Orders, Courts, self-referrals
Department of Corrections Family Violence Programme

• Implemented since 1 July 2016
• For offenders on community sentences, low to medium risk of reimprisonment ($\text{RoC} \times \text{RoI} < .05$)
• Influenced by medium-intensity programme suite
• Individual and group
• Currently no requirement for victim contact
• Offender case managed by Probation Officer while on sentence
Why groups?

- Preferred for all types of offender interventions
- More efficient
- Allows for modelling, sharing, practicing interpersonal skills
- Individual sessions more suitable for some
Do perpetrator programmes work?

• What do we mean by “work?”
  • Recidivism (re-arrest, reconviction, victim and perpetrator reports of reabuse etc.)
Do perpetrator programmes work?

• What do we mean by “work?”

• How can we tell?

• We need rigorous designs to confidently identify
  • Whether taking part in a programme has different outcomes to not doing it
  • Which parts of a response are more effective than others
To identify whether a programme is better than no programme

- Preferred evaluation design compares programme attendees with non-attendees who are otherwise identical: compares outcomes
  - Hypothetically, best is randomised controlled trial, but very difficult to implement
  - Next most preferred is quasi-experimental design: attendees and non-attendees matched to be as similar as possible
  - Third, use of statistical techniques to control for differences, isolate “what works”
Do perpetrator programmes work?

- International research mostly evaluated CBT/gender-based programmes
- Some randomised controlled trials, most quasi-experimental
- Outcomes used are re-arrest, reconviction, victim and perpetrator reports of abusive behaviour
- Results consistent with “no effect” from programme attendance
So programmes don’t work?

Researchers have held back from this conclusion because

- Very difficult environment for rigorous research
- Poor methodology common
- Difficult to find equivalent comparison group
- Low(ish) rates of reabuse/recidivism in comparison groups
- Lack of good risk assessment tools: how at risk was participant if nothing changed?
Are we asking the right questions?
What counts as evidence of effectiveness?

Project Mirabal (Kelly & Westmarland, 2015) used 6 measures of success:

1. Improved relationship, respect, effective communication
2. Expanded “space for action” for victims, restoring voice, choices, wellbeing
3. Safety, freedom from abusive behaviour for victims/children
4. Safe, positive, shared parenting
5. Awareness of self and others
6. Safer healthier lives for children, feel heard, cared about
Project Mirabal: Comparison of perpetrator behaviour at baseline and 12 months

Figure 1. Respectful communication (% yes)

- [If separated] DVP respects whether and how I want to be in contact with him: 35% at baseline, 53% at Month 12.
- DVP supports the decisions or choices that I make: 54% at baseline, 70% at Month 12.
- DVP acts in a considerate manner towards me: 66% at baseline, 64% at Month 12.
- DVP listens to what I have to say: 48% at baseline, 63% at Month 12.
- DVP negotiates during disagreements: 34% at baseline, 64% at Month 12.
Project Mirabal: Comparison of perpetrator behaviour at baseline and 12 months

- Kelly & Westmarland, 2015
Project Mirabal: Comparison of perpetrator behaviour at baseline and 12 months

Perpetrators learning and applying NVP content
- Expanded understanding of violence
- Recognition of own cognition/emotion
- Understanding/using new tools
- Applying learning elsewhere (e.g., work)

Figure 3. Physical and sexual violence (% yes)

- Made you do something sexual that you did not want to do
- Used a weapon against you
- Threatened to kill you or someone close to you
- Tried to strangle, choke, drown, or smother you
- Punched, kicked, burnt, or beaten you
- Slapped you, pushed you, or thrown something at you
- Punched or kicked walls or furniture, slammed doors, smashed things or stamped around

- Kelly & Westmarland, 2015
Project Mirabal: Comparison of perpetrator behaviour at baseline and 12 months

Figure 4. Harassment and other abusive acts (% yes)

- Did things that scared or intimidated you: 41% at 12 months, 90% at baseline
- Belittled or humiliated you in front of other people: 27% at 12 months, 69% at baseline
- Insulted you or made you feel bad about yourself: 48% at 12 months, 91% at baseline
- Deliberately interfered with or damaged your property: 9% at 12 months, 64% at baseline
- Followed you or waited outside your home or workplace: 7% at 12 months, 34% at baseline
- Harassed you using letters, emails, texts or phone calls: 28% at 12 months, 68% at baseline

- Kelly & Westmarland, 2015
Project Mirabal: Comparison of victim safety perceptions at baseline and 12 months

Figure 5. How safe do you feel? (%)

- Baseline
- 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Perception</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>12 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not safe at all</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little unsafe</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat safe</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very safe</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Kelly & Westmarland, 2015
Project Mirabal: Comparison of perpetrator behaviour at baseline and 12 months

Figure 6. Fathering (% yes)

- DVP asks the children to report on what I am doing and where I have been: Month 12 - 31, Baseline - 36
- DVP attempts to get the children to ‘take his side’ in disagreements between us: Month 12 - 21, Baseline - 45
- DVP criticises me as a mother either to the children or in front of them: Month 12 - 32, Baseline - 57
- DVP blames me for the children’s behaviour: Month 12 - 42, Baseline - 57
- I worry about leaving the children alone with DVP: Month 12 - 49, Baseline - 49

- Kelly & Westmarland, 2015
Project Mirabal: Comparison of perpetrator behaviour at baseline and 12 months

- Kelly & Westmarland, 2015
Project Mirabal: Comparison of child behaviour at baseline and 12 months

Figure 9. Safer, healthier childhoods (% - yes)

- Do any of your children get aggressive when frustrated
  - Month 12: 57
  - Baseline: 64

- Do any of your children have problems making and maintaining friendships
  - Month 12: 26
  - Baseline: 22

- In new situations do any of your children easily lose confidence
  - Month 12: 34
  - Baseline: 40

- Are any of your children nervous or clingy
  - Month 12: 54
  - Baseline: 54

- Do any of your children have problems sleeping
  - Month 12: 29
  - Baseline: 35

- Do any of your children appear anxious, or often worried
  - Month 12: 44
  - Baseline: 58

- Do any of your children worry about your safety
  - Month 12: 37
  - Baseline: 64

- Are any of your children frightened of DVP
  - Month 12: 35
  - Baseline: 54

- Kelly & Westmarland, 2015
Are we asking the right questions?

• What counts as evidence of effectiveness?
• Why evaluate “the programme” without the rest of the response?
Gondolf and colleagues (1999) “naturalistic comparative design” compared 4 sites with gender-based cognitive-behavioural programmes in their systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
<th>Dallas</th>
<th>Houston</th>
<th>Denver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court referral</td>
<td>Pretrial with court review</td>
<td>Postconviction</td>
<td>Postconviction</td>
<td>Postconviction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program duration</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional services</td>
<td>Referral</td>
<td>Assessment and referral</td>
<td>Assessment and referral</td>
<td>Evaluation and in-house substance abuse treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women’s and children’s groups</td>
<td>Women’s contact</td>
<td>Women’s groups</td>
<td>Individual mental health counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women’s casework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of multi-site evaluation into whether longer programmes are more effective (Gondolf et al., 1999)

No differences in re-assault over 4 years across the sites (~49%)

=> longer programme did not lead to better outcomes¹

Results of multi-site evaluation (Gondolf et al., 1999)

Why no difference?

Gondolf (2004) speculated:

• Those who will change do so in 3 months. Those who need a longer response drop out.

• “Compensating effect of system components”

  e.g., the pre-trial programme received men within 20 days of arrest, court monitored attendance, 70% completed.
Correctional psychology’s approach to changing criminal behaviour
Deterrent responses to family violence perpetration

Research on effects of arrest, prosecution, sentencing

• Most studies show no effect for more official processing when criminal history taken into account

• More “intrusive” sentencing may be more effective

• Suggests looking inside the sentence to see what works

• Arrest etc. are important even if on their own they don’t reduce family violence
Correctional psychology’s approach to changing criminal behaviour

• Pioneers in importance of analysing what goes on “inside the box”
• Canadian school (Andrews, Bonta, Gendreau, Wormith et al.) used this realisation to extract “what works” principles

⇒ Risk Need Responsivity Model (Andrews and Bonta, 1990-2016)
   An umbrella framework that guides diverse forms of response
Inside the box

INGREDIENTS
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Another example: parole supervision

• *Increases* reconviction if surveillance-oriented, unsupportive
• *Increases* reconviction if Probation Officer is authoritarian
• *Decreases* reconviction if it focuses on needs, includes rehabilitation
• *Decreases* reconviction if Probation Officer is authoritative, caring, trustworthy
Applying Effective Corrections Principles (RNR) to Partner Abuse Interventions

Lynn A. Stewart, PhD
Jillian Flight, MA
Correctional Service of Canada

Claire Slavin-Stewart
McMaster University, Canada

Integrating the Principles of Effective Intervention into Batterer Intervention Programming: The Case for Moving Toward More Evidence-Based Programming

Dana L. Radatz and Emily M. Wright
“We can have a feminist approach, but still apply RNR principles and we believe that programs need the capacity, not to have a different type of program, but to overlay what they are already doing ... with a capacity to be able to have an individualised tailored approach and to address some of these other issues, but that doesn’t necessarily mean abandoning a gender-based approach to the work. They can act together in a really comprehensive, integrated approach”

_Australian Royal Commission into Family Violence, Vol. III. Report and recommendations., p. 259
Transcript of Rodney Vlais, 24 July 2015, 1463 [28]–1464 [6]._
RNR model (14 principles; Andrews and Bonta, 1990-2016)

Three core principles have been adopted by Ministerial Group:

**Risk principle**

- Estimated risk of reconviction determines level of service
- Higher risk offenders need more service to change
- Low risk offenders should be released from the system before they are damaged
RNR model (Andrews and Bonta, 1990-2016)

Risk principle
Need principle

• Services and interventions work on changeable risk factors for crime (those linked by research to recidivism)

• Central Eight
  • Big four: history of antisocial behaviour, antisocial personality pattern, antisocial cognition, antisocial peers
  • Moderate four: Family/marital circumstances, school/work performance, leisure/recreation, substance abuse
RNR model  (Andrews and Bonta, 1990-2016)

Risk principle

Need principle

Responsivity principle

• General: cognitive, behavioural, social learning approaches to influencing offenders, building prosocial skills, work best

• Specific: programmes need to take account of individual characteristics in order to maximise engagement with programme and change
Applying the RNR model/what works with offenders to family violence perpetrator programmes

• FV perpetrator programmes developed in isolation to criminal/correctional programmes

• Many FV perpetrators commit other types of offences, risk factors may overlap

• Does RNR have something to offer?
Applying the RNR model/what works with offenders to family violence perpetrator programmes

• Risk principle predicts
  • That current programmes should only be effective with low risk perpetrators, high risk attendees should be unaffected by attendance
  • That mixing level of risk in a group will be harmful, especially for low risk attendees

• Implementation challenges
  • No publicly available risk assessment validation studies in NZ
  • Usually only a choice of one or two interventions, similar intensity (low in RNR terms)
Applying the RNR model/what works with offenders to family violence perpetrator programmes

- Applying the need principle
  - No recognised need assessment
  - How well do programmes match perpetrator needs?
  - How much can programmes (+ other referrals) be tailored to need?
  - Which of the Central Eight apply to family violence?
Applying the RNR model/what works with offenders to family violence perpetrator programmes

• Applying the need principle

• Applying the Responsivity principle
  • How much do current programme methods influence/generate change in thinking, attitudes, skills, behaviour?
  • How easily can we work with/around major responsivity issues such as resistance, personality disorders, other mental health issues etc.
Conclusions of considering FV perpetrator programmes against RNR principles

• FV perpetrators vary in levels of risk, the change targets that underpin that risk and perpetrator capabilities for change

• RNR conceptual framework may help identify and improve responses, especially to higher risk cases, recognise heterogeneity in more useful ways?

• RNR argues for funding and structure of intervention (programme or whole system) to be based on risk, need and responsiveness,

• Instead, current system is based on referral source
Some cautions in applying RNR/ what works to family violence perpetrator responses

Harming one’s family is a crime and “crime is crime”

BUT
## Some cautions in applying RNR/ what works to family violence perpetrator responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RNR developed with convicted offenders, mainly in correctional systems</th>
<th>What about FV perpetrators with no convictions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No reconviction = success, proxy for reoffending</td>
<td>Bar too low. Need all violence to stop. Need positive qualities/behaviour to fill the vacuum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misunderstood, implemented narrowly, badly, and mainly with individuals</td>
<td>Need to retain current strengths while considering what RNR offers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validated needs may be too narrow, further investigation needed</td>
<td>e.g., depression? parenting? More emphasis needed on conceptions of masculinity (entitlement to power, rigid gender roles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to have favoured programme over system evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

• New Zealand has a notable family violence problem
• Insufficient investment
• No coherent system, many piecemeal initiatives
• Myriad reports on “state of things”
Conclusions:
What do we need next for perpetrators?

• Foundational knowledge to inform system provision
  • Characteristics relevant to service provision and behavioural change
  • Current experiences with the system
  • Who are self-referrals

• Workforce development
  • Perpetrator human service work is highly skilled work
  • Improved training, remuneration, career paths for staff
  • Supported professional development
Conclusions:
What do we need next for perpetrators?

• System and service development
  • Develop perpetrator response system as part of wider web-like system
  • Human service responses delivered based on person not referral source, funding for self-referrals
  • Built from user perspective
Conclusions: Where to start?

- Cross-government work programme underway
  - Piloting ISR:FV
  - Risk assessment and management framework
  - Workforce development project
  - Consolidating functional leadership in the primary prevention and perpetrator services areas
Conclusions: Where to start?

• Cross-government work programme underway
• For perpetrator services step 1 is simplifying funding and funding all referrals
• Without evidence though, we should be cautious about reducing diversity of NVPs
• More “by Māori for Māori” development, documentation, evaluation of Kaupapa Māori responses
• Resource service providers for case management/kaitiaki for high needs perpetrators
Conclusions

• Thoughtfulness, caution in integration between FV perpetrator provisions and RNR
• Research and evaluation framework built into new initiatives
• Evidence-based practice (it’s a process, not an outcome)
Changing the culture

• New Zealand society is “permissively violent”

• More investment in prevention and community education
  • Direct effects on current perpetrators
  • Model on drinking-driving / road safety campaigns
Finally

• We need to invest in better, more integrated, more effective perpetrator response systems without taking away from needs of victims and families for more and better responses
• Better responses to perpetrators will benefit us all
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