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This thesis evaluates the 3R Domestic Violence Program (3RDVP), a domestic violence perpetrator treatment program for men, to determine its effectiveness at reducing domestic violence crime as well as non-domestic violence crime.

The following theories were used: cognitive behavioral theory and socio-political theory, as well as the Social Change Model. There were five hypotheses for this thesis. Due to the small population size however, the fifth hypothesis was unable to be tested. In relation to hypotheses one, two, three, and four, the results did not fully support the hypotheses. While the results are mixed, it is suggested that the use of a cognitive behavioral-based treatment program is successful at teaching men how to recognize their anger triggers, and how to control their anger. Although the results in relation to cognitive behavioral theory varied, there was support for Angew’s general strain theory, Hirschi’s social bond theory, and the ‘aging out’ phenomenon.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Is the 3R Domestic Violence Program (3RDVP) effective at reducing domestic violence crime as well as non-domestic violence crime? This is an important question, because if the treatment program is found to be effective at reducing domestic violence (DV) crime, other areas throughout the United States would be more apt to adapt the 3RDVP as a successful domestic violence perpetrator treatment program. Also, if the program is found to be effective at reducing non-DV crime as well, perpetrator treatment programs for non-DV crime offenders, based off of the 3RDVP could be created. Implementing such a program could call for the creation of policies that allow judges to sentence non-DV crime perpetrators to such a program instead, or in addition to, another form of punishment. Also, having an effective treatment program will allow for perpetrators to receive the appropriate treatment that will successfully help them change their thinking patterns, thus reducing the likelihood that such individuals will commit crime again.

This introduction will provide background information in relation to domestic violence through the use of statistics, as well as provide information pertaining to the 3RDVP. In doing so, it will provide an understanding of what will be discussed throughout Chapter 2 (the literature review) as well as Chapter 3 (the methodological reasoning behind the thesis).

According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2005), females are more likely than males to become victims of intimate partner violence, as demonstrated in Figure A\(^1\). From 2001 to

\(^1\) Research has shown that females commit domestic violence against their intimate partners as often as men commit domestic violence against their intimate partners (Whitaker & Lutzker, 2009), although the abuse caused by men is more physically damaging than the abuse caused by women (Archer, 2000; Stuart, Moore, Gordon, Ramsey, & Kahler, 2006). Even though men cause more physical damage than women, women can still be physically abusive towards their intimate partners. While women are not as physically abusive as men, they tend to be more psychologically abusive. In abusing their intimate partners, women tend to throw objects and bite, attack their intimate partners while they are sleeping, deprive their intimate partners of sleep, attack the groin of their intimate partner, abuse alcohol, and use weapons when attacking their intimate partners (Cook, 2009). Unlike men, however,
2005, 21.5 percent of victims of non-fatal violent victimizations were females who were victimized by an intimate partner, while only 3.6 percent of males were victimized by an intimate partner. When it comes to homicide victims, from 1976 to 2005, 30.1 percent of homicide victims were females who were killed by an intimate partner, while only 5.3 percent of homicide victims were males who were killed by an intimate partner. Females as well as males who are separated from their intimate partners have a higher likelihood of being victimized by an intimate partner than if they were married, never married, or divorced. From 2001 to 2005, intimate partner victimization rates for males and females increased as the annual household income of the victim decreased. Although females had a victimization rate that was twice as high as the victimization rate of males, this statistic demonstrates how individuals of a lower socioeconomic status are more likely to be abused by an intimate partner (BJS, 2005).

Although the BJS (2005) data are at the national level, the statistics do not differ much at the state level. For example, in New York State in 2011, 44.0 percent of female homicide victims who were 16 years of age and older were murdered by their intimate partners. In 2011, police officers throughout the state responded to a total of 232,000 assaults perpetrated by intimate partners. Only 31,000 (or 13.4 percent) of those assaults occurred in New York City; the other 201,000 (or 86.6 percent) occurred throughout the rest of the state (New York State Office for the Prevention of Domestic Violence, 2012). Such statistics show that the rural areas of New York State are reporting more intimate partner assaults to law enforcement than New York City alone does.

female batterers tend to suffer from bipolar disorder (Hamel, 2005); they are not diagnosed with other mental disorders as often as male domestic violence perpetrators are.

2 Intimate partner(s) can be plural when referring to one domestic violence perpetrator. Serial perpetrators abuse more than one intimate partner throughout their lifetime, hence the potential plurality.
Figure 1. Victimization rate by gender and marital status. (BJS, 2005)

The 3RDVP, started in 2009, is currently run by the Allegany County Department of Probation in conjunction with the Allegany County Sheriff’s Department, both of Belmont, New York. The program participants, who have been convicted of a domestic violence crime, are required by the Allegany County Court or Child Protective Services (CPS) to attend this program. Those who are accepted into the program either have to successfully complete the program or serve another jail/prison sentence. The 3RDVP focuses on reducing participants’ anger levels, especially in relation to domestic violence incidents. This is done through the use of offender accountability and victim/community safety. The program coordinators work with the men to help them realize the consequences of their actions, allowing them to take responsibility for such actions. With the use of cognitive behavioral therapy as well as socio-political theory and the Social Change Model, the program works towards changing the participants’ thinking patterns so that they are less likely to become violent when they are
angered. The program lasts a minimum of 36 weeks and a maximum of 52 weeks, with new participants entering the program at the start of a new unit. Throughout the program, participants are required to prepare for each class by completing reading and homework assignments. On the 36th week of participation, the program participants are given the final; those who pass with a minimum of 70.0 percent are successfully discharged from the program, while those who score less than 70.0 percent remain in the program for the full 52 weeks, before they can take the final again. At the end of the 52 weeks, participants who do not pass the final with at least a 70.0 percent are unsuccessfully discharged from the program, causing them to face the consequences of not successfully completing the program (e.g., another jail or prison term, or the loss of parental rights).

In order to determine the effectiveness of the 3RDVP, agency data were collected from the Allegany County Department of Probation in Belmont, New York. Information such as the 3RDVP participants’ demographic characteristics (age, education level, employment status, socioeconomic status, marital status, number of prior arrests, and the seriousness of prior arrests), whether they successfully completed the program or failed out of the program, and how long it took them to successfully complete or fail out of the program were collected from this data. Primary data were collected from a telephone interview with eight of the program participants. The participants were asked questions relating to any offenses they committed after participating in the program which they were not arrested for. Such information provided data on the dark figure of crime. Background information relating to the processes by which the 3RDVP is meant to be implemented and actually is implemented was collected as well. Such background information allowed for the determination as to whether the program is being implemented in the ways in which it was intended to be implemented in.
Chapter 2 consists of a literature review which will discuss the literature on domestic violence treatment and cognitive behavioral therapy. Due to the fact that the 3R Domestic Violence Program, the program being evaluated, is a cognitive behavioral based program, it is important to understand the effectiveness of various forms of domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs, as well as how the programs are operated, thus providing an understanding as to which treatment programs are more effective at reducing domestic violence. Chapter 3 provides an explanation of the setting in which the 3RDVP is currently implemented as well as the operationalization of the program. In addition, an explanation of the proposed methodological analysis that were conducted in order to determine if the 3RDVP is effective at reducing domestic violence crime as well as crime in general, is provided. Chapter 4 provides the results of the analyses. A process evaluation of the performance of the 3RDVP in the classroom is provided along with descriptive statistics and a bivariate analysis of the data. Chapter 5 provides a discussion of the results in relation to the hypotheses, a discussion of the limitations of the study, and theoretical and policy implications of the study, while Chapter 6 provides a conclusion section.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter will review the literature on domestic violence treatment and cognitive behavioral therapy. It does so because the current study focuses on the effectiveness of the 3R Domestic Violence Program, which is a cognitive behavioral therapy based treatment program. It is therefore important to understand how various forms of domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs are operated, as well as their effectiveness. Comparing the effectiveness of various forms of domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs will allow for a better understanding of which types of programs are more effective at treating domestic violence perpetrators. To date, cognitive behavioral therapy based treatment programs for domestic violence perpetrators have been found to be the most effective forms of treatment programs for reducing the rate at which individuals are re-arrested for domestic violence offenses (Saunders, 2008). Although such programs have been found to be effective, the evaluation methods used have been found to be flawed (Saunders, 2008), thus calling into question whether such programs are actually effective.

In this literature review I will first provide background information on domestic violence (in terms of intimate partner violence) in the United States. Second, I will review different types of domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs, followed by a discussion of the different dimensions in which intervention programs can be classified. Third, I will explain cognitive behavioral therapy and how it relates to various domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs, and review examples of such programs as well as outline the current study. Lastly, I will provide information pertaining to the relationship between cognitive behavioral based treatment programs and the reduction of non-DV crime. Throughout the literature review, an
understanding of domestic violence as well as an understanding of domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs in relation to cognitive behavioral therapy and non-DV crime will guide the discussion.

**Understanding Domestic Violence**

There are several ways to define domestic violence. According to The United States Department of Justice (2011), domestic violence is defined as “a pattern of abusive behavior in any relationship that is used by one partner to gain or maintain power and control over another intimate partner” (para. 1). The Merriam-Webster (2013) online dictionary, defines domestic violence as “the inflicting of…injury by one family or household member on another” (para. 1). Davidson, Grisso, Garcia-Moreno, Garcia, King, and Marchant (2001), Jewell and Wormith (2010), and Plichta (2004) define domestic violence as “physical, sexual, and psychological abuse directed toward one partner in a romantic relationship by the other” (Jewell & Wormith, 2010, p. 1086). While domestic violence occurs in the home against intimate partners as well as children, intimate partner violence occurs in the home against intimate partners only (Max, Rice, Finkelstein, Bardwell, & Leadbetter, 2004). The Gay Men’s Domestic Violence Project on their website (GMDVP, 2010) defines domestic violence as “an intentional…and methodical pattern of abusive tactics used to gain power and to exert control over the partner in order to meet the abuser’s needs” (para. 3). There are seven elements to the GMDVP’s (2010) definition of domestic violence that are important in understanding intimate partner abuse. The elements include: a) intention; b) method; c) pattern; d) tactics; e) power; f) control; and g) needs (GMDVP, 2010).

The concept of *intention* means that the abuser purposely uses abusive tactics and that since their abuse is purposeful, they can chose to stop abusing their intimate partner at any time.
An abuser is methodical in abusing their intimate partner by gaining power and control through the use of abusive techniques, which they use systematically. Upon systematically using tactics to control their intimate partner, the abuser acquires a pattern of abusive behavior. Tactics are used by the abuser to be in command of their intimate partner by making all of the decisions in their relationship. Total power is reached when the abuser is able to completely control their intimate partner. Lastly, the abuser tends to focus on their emotional needs, physical needs, and sexual needs only. The abuser will be more violent and abusive towards their intimate partner when their needs are not met, and less violent and abusive when their needs are met (GMDVP, 2010), thus causing a cycle of abuse to occur.

There are several forms of intimate partner violence: emotional/psychological, verbal, physical, sexual, and financial abuse (Kurst-Swanger & Petcosky, 2003; Women’s Center & Shelter of Greater Pittsburgh, 2009). Emotional/psychological abuse occurs when an abuser repeatedly uses words or ignores their intimate partner in order to hurt, control, or demean them. Examples of such abuse include isolation and making threats. Similar to emotional/psychological abuse is verbal abuse: where the abuser’s tone of voice in conjunction with the words that he uses, hurt his intimate partner. Examples of verbal abuse include yelling or raising ones voice in a threatening manner, name-calling, and the use of profanity. Physical violence, which is referred to as battering (Kurst-Swanger & Petcosky, 2003), is defined as any threat of harm or forced physical action that causes an individual bodily harm or destroys property. Choking, punching, hitting, pushing, burning, medication deprivation, and entrapment are all examples of physical abuse. Entrapment, which is a form of false imprisonment, occurs when an individual holds another against their will (New York Law Enforcement Handbook, 2009). In a relationship in which intimate partner violence occurs, the abuser entraps their
intimate partner by not letting the intimate partner leave the house, thus holding their partner against their will.

Sexual abuse is any forced or coerced sexual act that is used to acquire power or control. Acts of sexual abuse are usually carried out through the use of threats of physical violence or the actual use of physical force (Kurst-Swanger & Petcosky, 2003), where the sexual act is performed for the perpetrator’s sexual gratification (American Academy of Child Adolescent Psychiatry, 2010; Fieldman & Crespi, 2002; Garner, 2004). Examples of sexually abusive acts in intimate partner relationships include any of the following activities, *inter alia* if they are forced: viewing pornography, fondling, rape, sodomy, oral intercourse, and sexual acts using a weapon (GMDVP, 2012; Halpérin, et al., 1996; Women’s Center & Shelter of Greater Pittsburgh, 2009). In intimate partner relationships, financial abuse occurs when the abuser misuses their intimate partner’s finances without their intimate partner’s consent. Taking control of and not allowing the intimate partner to make decisions about their own finances constitutes financial abuse as well (GMDVP, 2010).

Kurst-Swanger and Petcosky (2003) suggest three specific forms of abusive acts that are especially violent and harmful: stalking, parental kidnapping, and homicide. While the level of violence differs between forms of abuse and violent acts, each is still harmful in its own way. Stalking, a form of intimate partner violence, is defined as a process by which an individual watches and follows their prey (Grove, 1986). When performing the act of stalking, an individual can make threats, either written or verbally, and can also watch their victim without having contact with them. Parental kidnapping occurs when the abusive partner in the relationship takes the children, thus potentially interfering with custody rights. Doing so provides the abuser with control; they can use the power of having the children to control their
intimate partner (Kurst-Swanger & Petcosky, 2003). For example, in order to control an intimate partner, a woman can deny a husband access to his children until he tends to her demands.

Lastly, homicide occurs when the abusive partner murders their intimate partner. This is the most severe form of intimate partner violence (Kurst-Swanger & Petcosky, 2003).

**Domestic Violence Typologies**

In order to better understand the behavior of domestic violence perpetrators, a discussion of the types of abusers will be beneficial. Health professionals who specialize in working with domestic violence victims and perpetrators have created typologies based on their professional experience with such individuals. There are several different typologies of violence relationships, including typologies created by Johnston and Campbell (1993), Jacobsen and Gottman (1998), and Johnson (2006). Each of the typologies, which are shown in Table 1, are similar because each is based off of Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) who created the first typology, which consisted of three batterer subtypes: 1) family-only; 2) dysphoric/borderline; and 3) generally violent/antisocial.

Batterers in the family-only subtype are the least likely to participate in psychological and sexual abuse (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). These individuals participate in the least severe forms of intimate partner violence and tend, as the name suggests, to be violent only toward their family members. Thus, they are the least likely to be violent to individuals outside of their household, and rarely have a criminal history. It has been estimated that 50 percent of male batterers fit into the family-only subtype (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994).

Dysphoric/borderline batterers tend to participate in a higher level of intimate partner violence than family-only batterers; additionally, they participate in a more severe form of intimate partner violence. Although dysphoric/borderline batterers are usually only violent towards their
family members, they can be violent towards others outside of their family, causing them to have some run-ins with the law. Not only does violence toward individuals outside of their family cause them to get into potential trouble with the law, but they may also have problems with alcohol and substance abuse, which may also bring them into contact with the criminal justice system. Roughly 25 percent of male batterers constitute dysphoric/borderline batterers (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994).

The remaining 25 percent of male batterers, according to Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994), consists of batterers who are considered to be in the generally violent/antisocial subtype. Such individuals participate in the most severe form of intimate partner violence. They have a long history of criminal behavior and are violent both in the home as well as towards individuals outside of their household. Not only do these men tend to abuse alcohol and drugs, but they are also more likely to be psychopathic (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; Tweed & Dutton, 1998). Psychopathic individuals have been diagnosed with psychological disorders that relate to personality disorders (Hamel, 2005; Shorey, Febres, Brasfield, & Stuart, 2012); such disorders that are common among domestic violence perpetrators are discussed later in the literature review. Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) noted that batterers classified in the family-only subtype had the highest level of treatment success, while batterers classified in the generally violent/antisocial subtype had the lowest level of treatment success.
### Table 1

**Typologies in Relation to Violence Severity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) of Typologies</th>
<th>Least Severe</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Most Severe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994)</td>
<td>Family-only</td>
<td>Dysphoric/Borderline</td>
<td>Generally Violent/Antisocial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston and Campbell (1993)</td>
<td>Separation and Postdivorce Violence</td>
<td>Female-Initiated Violence</td>
<td>Ongoing or Episodic Male Battering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychotic and Paranoid Violence</td>
<td>Male-Controlled Interactive Violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobsen and Gottman (1998)</td>
<td>Bonnie and Clyde Couples</td>
<td>Pit Bulls</td>
<td>Cobras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Violent Resistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Typologies</td>
<td>Male-Dominated Nonviolent Control</td>
<td>Female Controlled Interactive Violence</td>
<td>Matriarchal Terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female-Dominated Nonviolent Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mutual Nonviolent Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The typologies created by Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994), family-only, dysphoric/borderline, and generally violent/antisocial, were used in a study conducted by Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, and Sugarman (1996) to measure the physical as well as the psychological attacks that occur on victims by their abusive intimate partners. In using the original program types, a scale known as the Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2) was
developed to measure which domestic violence perpetrators were more likely to be physically as well as psychologically abusive towards their intimate partners, and to measure sexual coercion and physical injury. Through this, a format was created to simplify and reduce the rate at which responses to the violence are provided to the perpetrators as well as the intimate partners (Straus et al., 1996). In using the original typologies, a system was created to provide more sufficient treatment and assistance to domestic violence perpetrators and their intimate partners whom they have abused.

**Johnston and Campbell (1993).** Johnston and Campbell (1993) classified violent relationships into five categories: 1) ongoing or episodic male battering; 2) female-initiated violence; 3) male-controlled initiated violence; 4) separation and postdivorce violence; and 5) psychotic and paranoid reactions. The first category, ongoing or episodic male battering, the male physically abuses his intimate partner frequently as well as severely. Men in this category tend to stalk their victims, causing their victims to be extremely fearful of them, depressed, and submissive. The frequency of the abuse tends to increase when the men fear that their intimate partners are going to leave them. Female-initiated violence is virtually the opposite of ongoing or episodic male battering. In this category, although the men physically abuse their intimate partners, the frequency as well as the severity of the abuse are not as great as that of ongoing or episodic male battering relationships. With female-initiated violence, the women are not fearful of their abusers, and it is the men who are depressed. These men tend to abuse their intimate partners because they are frustrated from their inability to successfully communicate with them (Hamel, 2005; Johnston & Campbell, 1993).

With male-controlled interactive violence, the violence occurs between both individuals in the relationship. Usually, the violence occurs as a result of a disagreement between the
couple, escalating from verbal insults and provocation to physical altercation. In this category, neither individual is afraid of the other. Although the abuse escalates, it is usually the man who dominates the dispute (Hamel 2005; Johnston & Campbell, 1993). The fourth category, separation and postdivorce violence, occurs between a couple who has separated from one another or divorced one another. In such relationships, the abuse did not start until after the separation/divorce occurred. The abuse is not perpetrated by only one gender, but by whichever individual feels as though they have been “discarded.” Usually the frequency of abuse is low, and the perpetrator feels guilt and shame for the abusive actions that they participated in. The last category, psychotic and paranoid reactions, occurs when the separation between the couple causes one of the individuals to have a psychotic break. Due to the psychotic break and accompanying paranoia, the individual who has such an episode believes that they have to attack their intimate partner before their intimate partner can attack them (Hamel, 2005; Johnston & Campbell, 1993).

Jacobsen and Gottman (1998). Jacobsen and Gottman (1998) classified violent relationships into three categories: 1) Pit Bulls; 2) Cobras; and 3) Bonnie and Clyde couples. Pit Bulls are analogous to the dysphoric/borderline types that are described by Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994). These men are exceedingly violent in the household but appear to be nice, well-functioning individuals when in a public setting. Such men become increasingly violent when their intimate partner does not meet their emotional needs, meaning that they are emotionally dependant on their intimate partner. Cobras, unlike Pit Bulls, do not depend on their intimate partners to fulfill their emotional needs; they are unable to love and be intimate with their intimate partners. This subtype of abusers is considered to be generally violent/antisocial, causing them to be more violent than Pit Bulls. Due to being more violent, Cobras are more
likely to kill their intimate partners than Pit Bulls. The third subtype, Bonnie and Clyde couples, includes couples who participate in tandem abuse towards one another. This means that not only is the man abusive, but his intimate partner is as well. Both individuals tend to participate in not only physical abuse, but verbal and emotional abuse towards one another as well (Hamel, 2005; Jacobsen & Gottman, 1998).

**Johnson (2006).** Johnson (2006) classified violent relationships into four categories: 1) mutual violent control; 2) intimate terrorism; 3) violent resistance; and 4) common couple violence. The first category, mutual violent control, consists of a relationship in which both individuals are violent and controlling towards one another; this is similar to the Bonnie and Clyde couples’ category from Jacobsen and Gottman (1998) as described above. Intimate terrorism occurs when one of the individuals in the relationship is violent and controlling toward their intimate partner. The violent individual tends to be manipulative and they severely physically abuse their intimate partner. Such individuals can have traits of either the Pit Bull or Cobra category (Hamel, 2005; Johnson, 2006).

The third category, violent resistance, consists of a relationship in which one individual is violent, while the other individual is violent and controlling. It is thought that the individual that is only violent is violent as a defense mechanism towards their violent and controlling partner. The last category, common couple violence, consists of individuals in a relationship, which are violent towards one another, but are not controlling. Individuals in this category physically abuse one another at a lower rate than individuals in other categories (Hamel, 2005; Johnson, 2006).

**Clinical typologies.** Through clinical experience, five other categories defining violent relationships have been created (Hamel, 2005): 1) female controlled interactive violence; 2)
male-dominated nonviolent control; 3) matriarchal terrorism; 4) female-dominated nonviolent control; and 5) mutual nonviolent control. The first category, female controlled interactive violence, occurs in relationships when the female is the dominating individual due to the male being physically weakened by sickness and/or old age. In male-dominated nonviolent control relationships, the likelihood of the men physically abusing their intimate partners is low due to the fact that they severely emotionally abuse their intimate partners instead (Hamel, 2005). The third category, matriarchal terrorism, is seminal to Johnson’s (2006) intimate terrorism category. The difference between matriarchal terrorism and intimate terrorism is that in Johnson’s (2006) category of intimate terrorism, only three percent of the terrorists were female; in matriarchal terrorism however, a higher percentage (25.0 percent – 35.0 percent) of the terrorists are female (Hamel, 2005).

The fourth category, female-dominated nonviolent control is the same as the second category, male-dominated nonviolent control, except that the female is emotionally abusive to her intimate partner instead of the male being emotionally abusive toward his intimate partner. In a mutually nonviolent control relationship (the finale category), both individuals in the relationship emotionally abuse one another. In this type of relationship, the likelihood that the individuals will physically abuse each other is extremely low, while the frequency of emotional abuse as well as the use of control tactics is high (Hamel, 2005).

Correlates of Domestic Violence

According to Edleson and Tolman (1992) and Mears (2003), there are several individual characteristics that separate battering men from non-battering men. Such characteristics include: behavioral deficits, depression, hostility, sex roles and attitudes, and alcohol and substance abuse. Each of the characteristics can be interrelated to one another. For example, (a) men who
lack the capacity to express themselves appropriately due to behavioral deficits tend to be depressed and hostile, and (b) depressed batterers become hostile in order to show their masculinity. Also, men with psychological issues who also abuse alcohol or drugs tend to abuse their intimate partners more often than men who have only psychological issues or alcohol and substance abuse problems but do not occur in tandem (Edleson & Tolman, 1992; Hamberger & Hastings, 1991). Further, a study conducted by Shorey, Febres, Brasfield, and Stuart (2012) examined the prevalence of mental health disorders among 308 males convicted of at least one domestic violence offense. The results found that male domestic violence perpetrators were extremely likely to be diagnosed with a mental health disorder. Shorey and colleagues (2012) discovered that of this sample, 19.9 percent met the cutoff score for depression, 26.2 percent met the cutoff score for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), 15.2 percent met the cutoff score for panic disorder, 27.6 percent met the cutoff score for social phobia, and 19.5 percent met the cutoff score of generalized anxiety disorder. For alcohol use disorders, the study found that 39.1 percent of the sample met the cutoff score while 21.5 percent met the cutoff score for drug use disorders (Shorey et al., 2012).

Men with behavioral deficits have been found to have difficulty in expressing their desires in a socially acceptable manner, yet they are able to properly protect their rights (constitutional) and territory (Maiuro, Cahn, & Vitaliano, 1986). This suggests that men who are not able to express their desires may be more likely to become batterers than men who are able to express their desires. Not only do behavioral deficits present themselves when men are unable to express their desires, but several batterers have behavioral deficits in the form of psychological disorders as well. Such psychological disorders that have been found to be prominent among male domestic violence batterers include: intermittent explosive disorder, impulse control
disorder, attention-deficit disorder, bipolar disorder, borderline personality disorder, and antisocial personality disorder, as well as other personality disorders (Hamel, 2005). Batterers who are classified as family-only batterers are extremely unlikely to be diagnosed with a personality disorder, whereas batterers who are classified as generally violent/antisocial batterers, or Cobras, are extremely likely to be diagnosed with at least one personality disorder (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994).

Intermittent explosive disorder is characterized by “discrete episodes of failure to resist aggressive impulses resulting in serious assaults or destruction of property” (American Psychiatric Association, 1994, p. 609). Individuals are diagnosed with intermittent explosive disorder only after all other mental disorders that could cause episodes of violence have been ruled out. A violent episode might potentially arouse the individual, and tends to cause relief at the completion of the episode. Later on, the individual will usually feel guilty and shameful of the violent acts that he committed during such episode (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). Impulse-control disorder, not otherwise specified, consists of impulse control disorders which do not meet the criteria for any other specific impulse-control disorders (American Psychiatric Association, 1994; Hamel, 2005). Individuals who are violent towards others could be diagnosed with such disorder. Batterers classified as generally violent/antisocial batterers, or Cobras, are more likely to be diagnosed with intermittent explosive disorder or impulse-control disorder than batterers classified in other domestic violence typologies. An alternative approach to impulse-control disorder is attention-deficit disorder. Individuals diagnosed with attention-deficit disorder tend to be more aggressive than individuals who do not have such diagnosis (Hamel, 2005). Those diagnosed with attention-deficit disorder are usually more hyperactive and impulsive than individuals who are not diagnosed with the disorder. A high level of
impulsivity leads to aggressiveness (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). Being naturally aggressive increases the likelihood that the individual will become a batterer themselves.

Individuals diagnosed with bipolar disorder can be diagnosed with bipolar I disorder or bipolar II disorder. Those diagnosed with bipolar I disorder experience a course of one or more manic episodes – experiencing an unusually outgoing, elevated, or irritable mood for at least one week – or mixed episodes – experiencing a manic episode as well as a major depressive episode – daily, as well as a major depressive episode – experiencing a lack of interest in all activities or being depressed for a period of at least two weeks (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). Along with experiencing manic episodes and major depressive episodes, the individual experiences moods that rapidly alternate between sadness, irritability, and ecstasy. In order to be diagnosed with bipolar II disorder instead of bipolar I disorder, the individual must not have a manic episode or a mixed episode. Bipolar II disorder occurs when an individual has at least one major depressive disorder along with one or more hypomanic episodes. A hypomanic episode occurs when an individual has an unusually outgoing, elevated, or irritable mood that lasts for a period of at least four days (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). A majority of female domestic violence perpetrators have been found to suffer from bipolar disorder, while men are not typically diagnosed with such disorder (Hamel, 2005). This supports that fact that women who commit domestic violence tend to be depressed, thus becoming hostile due to their lack of ability to express themselves appropriately.

There are two main types of personality disorders which domestic violence perpetrators tend to be diagnosed with: borderline personality disorder and antisocial personality disorder. Twenty five percent of male domestic violence perpetrators (Hamel, 2005; Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994) and the most severe batterers (Dutton, 1998; Hamel, 2005) are diagnosed with
borderline personality disorder. Individuals diagnosed with this disorder lack stability in their relationships with others, have instability of their self-image, and are impulsive. Such individuals try to avoid abandonment and become angered and aggressive when they believe that there is a chance that they will be abandoned (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). Men who abuse their intimate partners, who are diagnosed with borderline personality disorder, are more likely to become violent towards their intimate partners in a reaction to their intimate partners’ actions (Ross & Babcock, 2009). Batterers classified as dysphoric/borderline batterers, Pit Bulls, and batterers that fit into the separation and postdivorce violence category, stand a higher likelihood of having a diagnosis of borderline personality disorder. Individuals diagnosed with antisocial personality disorder are highly controlling and severely violent towards others; they are deceitful and manipulate those around them. Cobras and generally violent/antisocial batterers tend to show aspects of the disorder even if they are not diagnosed with it (Hamel, 2005). Antisocial personality disorder is characterized by a pattern in which the individual has no disregard for the rights of others, thus causing them to violate others’ rights. Such individuals obtain this pattern at a young age and throughout adulthood they fail to conform to societal norms (American Psychiatric Association, 1994), causing them to be deviant by breaking laws. Male batterers who are diagnosed with antisocial personality disorder not only react to their intimate partners’ actions with violence, but they initiate violence proactively as well (Ross & Babcock, 2009).

Two other personality disorders that have been found in male domestic violence batterers include narcissistic personality disorder and histrionic personality disorder (Hamel, 2005). Individuals who are diagnosed with narcissistic personality disorder have a grandiose sense of self, need to have others admire them, and lack empathy. When they are not admired or are
insulted, such individuals can become violent towards others. Individuals who are diagnosed with histrionic personality disorder constantly seek attention from others to fulfill their emotional needs. When their emotions are not met, or their demands to be the center of attention are ignored, they can become violent towards others (American Psychiatric Association, 1994).

Although females who are abused by their intimate partners are more likely to suffer from depression than their abusive partners (Chuang, Cattoi, McCall-Hosenfeld, Camacho, Dyer, & Weisman, 2012), male domestic violence perpetrators can suffer from depression as well. According to Hamberger and Hastings (1986) and Edleson and Tolman (1992), depression arises from thinking their intimate partner will abandon them which causes fear, thus causing a violent reaction towards their intimate partner. Batterers classified as dysphoric/borderline batterers, Pit Bulls, and batterers that fit into the separation and postdivorce violence category, tend to suffer from depression. Along with depression leading to hostility, according to Maiuro and colleagues (1986), men who batter are angrier and more hostile than men who do not batter. Batterers who anticipate certain consequences to occur or are aroused by anger are likely to become hostile towards their intimate partners (Dutton, 2001). The higher the anger level, the higher the hostility and violence levels will be. Such hostile men are likely to be diagnosed with antisocial personality disorder. Cobras and generally violent/antisocial batterers tend to be the most hostile towards their intimate partners.

In relation to depression and hostility, alcohol and drug abuse have been found to be highly associated with some subtypes of male domestic violence perpetrators (Shorey et al., 2012; Stuart et al., 2006), with higher rates of abuse occurring while the perpetrators are under the influence. Alcohol consumption can cause depression as well as violent behaviors which can lead to abusive tendencies, while a perpetrator who is addicted to drugs who is unable to obtain
their next fix can have violence as a withdrawal symptom (Edleson & Tolman, 1992). Dysphoric/borderline batterers as well as generally violent/antisocial batterers are at the highest risk of abusing alcohol and/or drugs.

Men who believe that they are not living up to their gender roles are more likely to abuse their intimate partners than men who are comfortable with the level at which they are performing their gender roles (Maiuro et al., 1986). Intimate partner abuse is more likely to occur when a man believes that he is supposed to be the dominant individual in the relationship while his intimate partner is to be the subordinate individual in the relationship. When societal norms and values support such belief, the victimization that is occurring is enforced by society, thus making it difficult for the men to believe that their abusive behaviors are not only hurtful to their victims but wrong as well (Edleson & Tolman, 1992). Batterers who fall into the dysphoric/borderline category or the generally violent/antisocial category are likely to hold such beliefs.

Not only are there psychological correlates of domestic violence, but there are general correlates as well. Such characteristics include age, race, education level, socioeconomic status, employment status, marital status, number of children in the home, number of prior arrests, and the seriousness of prior arrests (Antonaccio, Tittle, Botchkovar, & Kranidiotis, 2010; Elliot, 2004; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Lodge, 1947; Sampson & Laub, 1993; Sutherland, Cressey, & Luckenbill, 1992). A majority of researchers agree that gender and age are the main correlates of criminal behavior (Antonaccio et al., 2010; Elliott, 1994; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Sampson & Laub, 1993; Sutherland, Cressey, & Luckenbill, 1992). For males, marital status has a large impact on criminal behavior; males who are not married are more likely to commit criminal acts than males who are married (Antonaccio et al., 2010). Race as well as education are considered to be positive correlates of criminal behavior as well. While past research by
Black (1971), who discovered that out of 176 arrests, Whites constituted 69.9 percent of the arrests, more current research, as demonstrated by Donohue and Levitt (2001), has found that an individual who is considered to be of a race other than White, is expected to be more likely to be arrested for crimes.

In relation to education as a correlate, the less educated the individual is, the more likely the individual is to commit criminal acts (Lodge, 1947). Lodge (1947) also determined that individuals who have a record of previous criminal behavior are more likely to continue participating in criminal behavior; the more previous crimes committed as well as the more serious the crimes, the higher the likelihood the individual would commit criminal behaviors again. Research has also found that the likelihood of abuse occurring in a family setting increases when the family is of a low socioeconomic status and the parents were less educated (Whipple & Webster-Stratton, 1991), causing stress to increase among adults as the number of children increases (Misri, Kendrick, Oberlander, Norris, Tomfohr, Zhang, & Grunau, 2010). The higher the stress level of the parents, the more likely violence is to occur (Moore, Probst, Tompkins, Cuffe, & Martin, 2007).

When it comes to socioeconomic status however, researchers are unable to agree as to whether or not such a variable is a correlate of criminal behavior. While some research has determined that socioeconomic status is a correlate of criminal behavior (Braithwaite, 1981; Lodge, 1947; Thornberry & Farworth, 1982), others have determined that it is not a strong correlate (Dunaway, Cullen, Burton, & Evans, 2000; Tittle, Vellemez, & Smith, 1978; Wright, Caspi, Miech, & Silva, 1999). Although research on socioeconomic status as a correlate of criminal behavior is controversial, the variable of socioeconomic status will be controlled for in this study due to the fact that some research has determined that it is a correlate of criminal
behavior. In relation to socioeconomic status, employment status will be measured in order to determine if the level of socioeconomic status resulted from a lack of employment or a low paying job.

**Warning signs.** Given the domestic violence typologies, other researchers have created warning signs that individuals can look for to determine if their intimate partners have a risk of becoming abusive. Oldham, Clarking, Appelbaum, Carr, Kernberg, Lotterman, and Hass (1985) created the borderline personality organization (BPO) to gain a better understanding of what type(s) of men are likely to participate in domestic violence acts. Through the use of surveys, the BPO is able to categorize men into different violence typologies. Although there is no one abusive personality type, with the use of the BPO, a list of abusive personality warning signs was created. Such warning signs include: jealousy, controlling behavior, quick involvement, unrealistic expectations, isolation, blame-shifting for problems, blame-shifting for feelings, hypersensitivity, cruelty to children, “playful” use of force in sex, rigid gender roles, verbal abuse, “Dr. Jeckyll and Mr. Hyde” (Hamberger & Hastings, 1991), alcohol and/or substance abuse, a history of battering or sexual violence, a negative attitude towards women, threatening violence, breaking and/or striking objects, and the use of any force during an argument (Hidden Hurt, 2012; National Center on Domestic and Sexual Violence, 2012). The list of warning signs suggests that if an intimate partner is jealous, becomes angered easily, is physical during an argument, and tries to control and/or isolate you, then there is a higher likelihood that they are an abusive individual.

Another tool, the Domestic Violence Screening Instrument-Revised (DVSI-R), assesses the risk of the individual who is being evaluated of being abusive again (Williams, 2011; Williams & Grant, 2006). The DVSI-R includes eleven items, seven of which address the
individual’s behavioral history, while the other four items are weapons use, substance use, employment status, and the presence of children during violent episodes. The results of the assessment are provided to a Family Relations Counselor, who uses the results to provide a recommendation to the judge as to what type of treatment would best suite the individual (Williams, 2011). The items that are evaluated during the assessment relate to the warning signs described previously. Individuals who are aggressive or have a history of violent behavior are likely to abuse their intimate partners.

**Program Types**

By understanding the typologies of domestic violence perpetrators, treatment programs can be created and implemented to prevent future abuse. For example, family-only batterers are the batterers who are least likely to be violent towards individuals who are outside of the household, thus, family therapy or couples treatment could potentially provide the best treatment option for such perpetrators. Domestic violence perpetrators who are extremely violent, such as generally violent/antisocial batterers or Cobras, need to be placed into a treatment program that focuses on teaching the men how to control their anger as well as steer them away from their violent behavioral tendencies (e.g., cognitive behavioral therapy based treatment programs, such as the one being evaluated in this thesis). With such knowledge, domestic violence perpetrators can obtain the best form of treatment.

There are several different types of domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs. The most common treatment program is men’s groups, followed by individual counseling as the second most common treatment program (Edleson & Tolman, 1992). With men’s groups, through interaction with other domestic violence perpetrators, group members are able to learn from one another’s mistakes, as well as learn how to change. This provides a positive influence
for the perpetrators, providing them with a social support system that encourages them and helps them succeed. With this support system, perpetrators learn how to take responsibility for their actions, develop empathy for others, learn how to confront others in an acceptable and non-violent manner, recognize their own personal socialization and how it affects their relationships, and how to solve their problems without using violence. In interacting with other group members, social support is provided to each program participant, allowing for change based on the group’s modeling and feedback to occur. Perpetrators in group programs also experience how to handle confrontation in a non-violent manner by being confronted by group members as well as being able to confront members of the group themselves (Edleson & Tolman, 1992).

Individual counseling treatment programs are similar to men’s groups when it comes to learning ways in which to manage anger and stress and the domestic violence educational information that is provided to the program participants. Usually, the same material is covered in men’s groups that are covered in individual counseling. Individual counseling, however, allows for domestic violence perpetrators to have individual counseling sessions, thus providing the perpetrator with more personal, one-on-one attention (Edleson & Tolman, 1992). Along with scheduled meetings, the perpetrators also have the opportunity to drop in and see their counselor during times when the counselor is doing paperwork and does not have meetings with others. Such opportunity provides the perpetrator with more assistance. Although individual counseling has its advantages, it has a few disadvantages as well. Through the use of individual counseling sessions, the perpetrator loses the social environmental knowledge and experience gained through group sessions. The perpetrator also lacks the social support that is given by the other group members. Not interacting with other group members also causes the perpetrator to lose out on changing based on the group’s modeling as well as the group’s feedback, and it causes the
perpetrator to lose out on being confronted by group members as well as confronting group members themselves (Edleson & Tolman, 1992).

A national survey reported that over 95.0 percent of domestic violence perpetrators who have been convicted of a domestic violence offense participate in some form of domestic violence perpetrator treatment program (Price & Rosenbaum, 2007 as cited in Saunders, 2008). While just fewer than 50.0 percent of convicted domestic violence perpetrators participating in individual treatment programs, only 5.0 percent of the perpetrator treatment programs offer individual treatment. When it comes to couples treatment, only 13.0 percent of perpetrator treatment programs offer this as an option. Indeed, less than 20.0 percent of the men who participate in treatment programs that offer couples treatment are offered couples counseling (Saunders, 2008). This means that most of the treatment programs offered to domestic violence perpetrators are men’s only groups, and that a low percentage of perpetrators are offered to attend couples counseling with their intimate partners. A high percentage of perpetrators being offered men’s only group treatment and a low percentage being offered to attend couples counseling, suggests that treatment programs do not focus on having the perpetrators and their intimate partners work through their issues as a couple; rather, the men work on their individual issues themselves instead of working on issues that they have with their intimate partners. Therefore, it appears that the majority of the programs have men recognize and work through their own personal issues.

3 Couples treatment works with the abuser and his intimate partner against whom he committed the abusive act(s). Working together with a therapist, men work towards decreasing their anger levels, while women work towards becoming less fearful of their intimate partners (Stith, Rosen, & McCollum, 2002). Couples treatment consists of feminist-based theories integrated with family therapy models. The treatment program focuses on gender-specific treatment for both partners, thus providing treatment to both the perpetrator and the victim. Not only are the partners treated for gender-specific factors, but they are treated together by discussing issues which they bring as a couple to their therapy sessions (Stith, Rosen, & McCollum, 2004).
**Intervention Dimensions**

According to Saunders (2008), domestic violence perpetrator treatment interventions can be placed into six basic categories. These categories include: 1) skills training; 2) cognitive approaches; 3) sex role resocialization; 4) methods to build awareness; 5) family systems theory; and 6) trauma-based approaches. The first four categories (skills training, cognitive approaches, sex role resocialization, and methods to build awareness) are usually combined together into one program, while family systems theory and trauma-based approaches tend to be used individually (Caesar & Hamberger, 1989; Ganley, 1989; Geffner & Rosenbaum, 2001; Gondolf, 2004; Saunders 2008; Rosenbaum & Liesring, 2001).

*Skills training* is founded on social learning theory (Bandura, 1986). Through the use of role modeling by the program coordinator as well as practicing one’s behaviors throughout the program in a positive way the perpetrators will learn new skills through observation and practice (Saunders, 2008). These new skills, which include, *inter alia*, active listening, emotional expression, assertiveness, and negotiation and compromise, will replace the perpetrators’ negative behavior with positive behavior; this behavior is then reinforced, thus allowing them to expand their relationships with others (Murphy & Eckhardt, 2005). In order to teach these new skills to the perpetrators, there are five basic steps that the program coordinator uses throughout the skills training process. First, the perpetrators are provided with information about the skills that they will be learning. Second, perpetrators work to improve the positive ways in which they think and behave. Next, the program coordinator provides situations in which the perpetrators can use such skills, and has them act out the skills through the use of “role-playing exercises” (Murphy & Eckhardt, 2005, p. 179). Lastly, the program coordinator explains to the perpetrators
how they can use each of their newly acquired skills in everyday situations, instead of just when interacting with their intimate partners (Murphy & Eckhardt, 2005).

Since some theories postulate that abusive men believe that they should have dominance over women (Hamel, 2005), *sex role resocialization* allows domestic violence perpetrators to think about how gender exclusive roles have negative consequences. For example, men are able to learn how male dominance is associated with a “rigid socialization” (Saunders, 2008, p. 157), and that such socialization creates inequality for the female gender. In observing the negative consequences of gender inequality, the men are able to understand how gender equality benefits society. In gaining such understanding, the men are able to work towards changing their beliefs about women, thus causing them to begin to treat women as their equals. Treating women as equals prevents the men from engaging in abusive behavior towards their intimate partners because they no longer believe that women are to be subordinate to them (Saunders, 2008).

Using *methods to build awareness*, domestic violence perpetrators are taught ways in which they can become aware of the control tactics that they themselves used when they would abuse their intimate partner(s). In understanding the types of control tactics that they themselves use, as well as how and when they use them, the men are able to take responsibility for controlling their intimate partner(s). With this understanding, the men are able to work towards being empathetic: feeling sympathetic and compassionate towards those whom they abused. Methods to build awareness also introduce the men to an extended definition of domestic violence. This extended definition of abuse focuses on different forms of control, such as “isolation, demeaning language, control of finances, and other means of control” (Saunders, 2008, p. 157).
Family systems approaches have been greatly criticized due to the fact that such approaches tend to place blame on the victim for the abuse that occurred. This type of approach can be used in male groups only, thus limiting the approach to domestic violence perpetrators who are attending treatment sessions with their intimate partners. Such domestic violence perpetrators are limited in their access to family systems approaches because their intimate partners cannot attend the treatment sessions. In deciding to participate in treatment with their intimate partners, the perpetrators made the decision to not attend a treatment approach that does not allow their intimate partners to join them. Family systems approaches analyze “family dynamics and communication patterns” (Saunders, 2008, p. 157), thus allowing the perpetrators to obtain new skills and viewpoints on their abuse tendencies. Instead of showing the men how they engage in a cycle of interactions that lead to abuse, this approach shows the men how they and their intimate partners engage in a cycle of interactions that leads to abuse, thus causing the perpetrator to believe that he as well as his victim are responsible for the actions of abuse instead of the blame being placed only on the perpetrator (Saunders, 2008). With this, the perpetrator does not take responsibility for his actions, making it more difficult for him to recognize how his own actions are hurtful.

Trauma-based approaches rely on the belief that male domestic violence perpetrators need to confront their past childhood experiences in order to be able to empathize with others (Saunders, 2008). It is believed that during childhood, these men encountered parental violence and were potentially physically abused by their parents as well. Due to this, the men are unable to be compassionate towards others, thus causing them to become the abusive ones, not realizing the harm they are causing their intimate partners (Saunders, 2008).
According to *cognitive approaches*, it is believed that abusive behaviors are the result of negative emotions that are caused by defective ways of thinking. In order to change the defective ways in which the perpetrators are thinking, cognitive approaches reform the way the perpetrators think. In doing so, the perpetrators are able to deal with painful emotions that are the root cause of their anger. Once the perpetrators are able to recognize what has caused their anger, they are able to deal with emotions that they have been suppressing (since potentially childhood), thus allowing them to change their beliefs, attitudes, and values, which they developed at a young age (Murphy & Eckhardt, 2005; Saunders, 2008).

**Cognitive Behavioral Therapy**

Most domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs are based on cognitive behavioral theory (Saunders, 2008). In addition, while not all domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs focus solely on cognitive behavioral theory (as mentioned later in the literature review); many of them still incorporate aspects drawn from cognitive behavioral theory. Research by Saunders (2008) shows how cognitive behavioral theory based treatment programs are effective at “…changing attitudes about gender roles [and] reducing anger directed at the partner” (p. 160). In fact, cognitive behavioral approaches seem to be the most used form of treatment as well as the most effective form of treatment for domestic violence perpetrators (Gondolf, 2004; Saunders, 2008). Any therapeutic or treatment approaches that are based on cognitive behavioral theory are referred to as cognitive behavioral therapy approaches.

Cognitive behavioral therapy, first articulated by Meichenbaum (Meichenbaum, Shaughnessy, & Haight, 2003), is used to treat a variety of psychiatric and behavioral disorders. These treatment programs allow the individual to talk about and recognize how they think about themselves as well as about the world and other individuals. It also allows the individual to talk
about and recognize how their own actions affect their thoughts and feelings (Whitfield & Davidson, 2007). By recognizing how they as individuals perceive themselves as well as others and the world around them, they are able to recognize how their own actions affect their thoughts and feelings, as well as how such actions are affected by their thoughts and feelings. In recognizing these aspects, individuals are able to work towards changing their views as well as their cognitive processes. Essentially, cognitive behavioral therapy teaches individuals to identify how their thoughts, behaviors, and feelings, both emotions and physical sensations, interact and affect one another (Simmons & Griffiths, 2009).

Such treatment programs have been applied to several disorders including depression, bipolar disorder, phobias and panic, generalized anxiety disorder, obsessive-compulsive disorder, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), anorexia nervosa, bulimia nervosa, hallucinations and delusions, and borderline personality disorder (Whitfield & Davidson, 2007). From this list there are several different disorders in which domestic violence perpetrators are likely to suffer from, as previously discussed in the literature review. Such disorders may include depression, bipolar disorder, post-traumatic stress disorder, and borderline personality disorder. The focus of this section of the literature review will be on cognitive behavioral therapy as applied to domestic violence perpetrators.

Cognitive behavioral based treatment programs in relation to domestic violence focus on the violent behavior of the perpetrator. With this focus, the positives and negatives of violence are shown to the perpetrators. The perpetrators are taught new skills as well as anger management techniques which help them become aware of when they are becoming violent and how to calm down. This awareness provides the perpetrators the opportunity to alter their behaviors so they are not violent towards their intimate partners (Babcock, Green, & Robie,
In recognizing how they themselves become violent, the perpetrators can learn how to stay away from such triggers as best as they can. When they are unable to avoid such triggers, they can use the skills and calming techniques that they were taught throughout their treatment program, thus allowing them to keep from abusing their intimate partners.

To illustrate the application of cognitive behavioral therapy in relation to domestic violence treatment, I briefly review two such programs: the Emerge program and the Duluth model. The Emerge program is a cognitive behavioral therapy program that helps not only the perpetrator but the victim as well (Adams & Cayouette, 2002). The Duluth model is another type of domestic violence perpetrator treatment program. This type of program is a partial social cognitive based treatment program, mixed with a community approach, and a feminist psychoeducational approach (Babcock, Green, & Robie, 2002). Understanding how a perpetrator treatment program based on cognitive behavioral therapy and programs based not on a cognitive behavioral therapy approach will help to demonstrate the results of each of the types of approaches as well as the effectiveness of each type of treatment program approach.

**Emerge Program.** The Emerge program is a Massachusetts Certified Batterer Intervention Program. This means that the program, which was created in Massachusetts, has been certified by the state, thus providing state certification to the program. The purpose of the program is to educate domestic violence perpetrators as well as domestic violence victims on what domestic violence is and how it can be recognized and treated. The program itself is divided into two stages, with a total of 40 sessions. The first stage consists of eight group sessions in which the program coordinator provides the perpetrators with an educational group model. With the use of this model, the perpetrators are exposed to eight topics that relate to domestic violence. During each group session, the group members discuss with the group what
occurred during the past week, and how they used what they have learned in the group sessions to keep from becoming violent towards their intimate partners. At the end of the eight weeks, the program coordinators discuss whether each perpetrator has learned how their actions have harmed others; if they have not shown an understanding of this they are dismissed from the program while those who do show such understanding proceed to stage two of the program. Those who are dismissed who participated voluntarily receive no consequences for being dismissed from the program, while those who are dismissed who were mandated to participate in the program are remanded back to jail to serve out another sentence (Adams & Cayouette, 2002; Emerge, 2013).

Stage two consists of 32 group sessions. During these sessions the group members interact more with one another. They discuss in detail what is occurring in their relationships, especially their relationships with their intimate partners. Along with group discussions, each group member completes various activities including a history of their past relationships with family members and intimate partners, and a self-evaluation in which each individual assesses the progress they have made throughout the program. Group members give each other feedback, thus allowing them to enhance their knowledge of their own abusive behaviors. Each individual also creates and sets goals that they work towards throughout the duration of the second stage of the program. At the end of their 40th session, the group members are successfully discharged from the program as long as they completed all of the required activities (Adams & Cayouette, 2002; Emerge, 2013).

Although there is no research on the effectiveness of the Emerge program, the program is believed to be effective due to the amount of resources it provides the victims. In fact, the Emerge founders recognize that they cannot change domestic violence victims and perpetrators,
and that they can only provide information to assist such individuals in a manner which does not provide further harm to the victims. Furthermore, the founders are committed to providing a helpful program, thus, based on the knowledge of how to promote internal motivation among domestic violence perpetrators, the program will continuously change as new information on domestic violence is provided (Adams & Cayouette, 2002).

**The Duluth Model.** The Duluth model, which was created in Duluth, Minnesota (Pence & Paymar, 1993), is a community approach to ending domestic violence. This model is an interaction between the community and the criminal justice system, allowing the community to keep domestic violence victims safe. In doing so, the blame is placed on the perpetrator, while providing the perpetrator with court-mandated educational batterers programs, in which domestic violence victims are able to share their stories of survival (Domestic Violence Intervention Programs, 2011). The main goal of the Duluth model is to get the perpetrators to stop using the “Power and Control Wheel” and use the “Equality Wheel” instead. The “Power and Control Wheel” consists of physical and sexual violent actions. Such actions include using intimidation, emotional abuse, children, male privilege, economic abuse, and coercion and threats, and minimizing, denying, and blaming. Such actions are taught from childhood experiences and allow the male to dominate his intimate partner. The “Equality Wheel” consists of non-violent actions that allow the abusers to treat their intimate partners as equals. Such actions include negotiation and fairness, non-threatening behavior, respect, trust and support, honesty and accountability, responsible parenting, shared responsibility, and economic partnership (Pence & Paymar, 1993). The “Power and Control Wheel” consists of the violent behaviors such as intimidation, isolation, and emotional and economic abuse, while the “Equality Wheel” includes behaviors that cause the perpetrator to treat their intimate partner as their equal. The Duluth
model incorporates a feministic psychoeducational approach, as well as a social cognitive approach (Babcock, Green, & Robie, 2002).

When it comes to the Duluth model, the previous evaluations conducted on it have been found to produce insufficient results. Due to this, a questionnaire was created by the Duluth model program coordinators to properly evaluate the effectiveness of the Duluth model (Pence & Paymar, 1993). Currently, an evaluation of the questionnaire has not been done. Although the effectiveness of the Duluth model has not been evaluated, many believe that it is an effective program (Saunders, 2008). This is due to the fact that the Duluth model is an interaction between the community and the criminal justice system to not only keep domestic violence victims safe, but to provide domestic violence perpetrators with educational treatment programs. Through the use of such treatment programs, domestic violence survivors are able to tell their stories to the perpetrators thus allowing the perpetrators to see how they are responsible for the abuse that occurred, not their victims (Pence & Paymar, 1993). Similar multi-pronged approaches and collaboration between the criminal justice system and community service provided for other crimes have been found to be successful (Klofas, Hipple, & McGarrell, 2010).

**Socio-Political Theory**

Socio-political theory works towards obtaining knowledge of political phenomena with the use of sociological understanding (Lune, 2012). Sociological understanding “…encompass[es] the wide variety of theoretical and associated methodological approaches with which sociologists attempt to describe and explain social phenomena,” while political phenomena “…encompass[es] the wide variety of topics that sociologists investigate, including social and cultural bases of power and authority” (Lune, 2012, para. 1). This interdisciplinary field was created so the “interrelations and interactions between the socio-cultural life-world and
the political sphere, between social and political arenas, institutions and agency” could be studied (Spohn, 2010, pp. 49-50). Governments, public laws, political institutions, and political behavior are examined under socio-political theory from a sociological as well as a political viewpoint.

When applied to domestic violence, socio-political theory “states that domestic violence is a controlling behavior in which there is an imbalance of power between the abuser and the victim and that society plays a role in upholding [such] beliefs” (Mahoney, 2011, p. 2). Due to this, society helps to uphold the beliefs that domestic violence abusers have about their intimate partners, thus causing it to be difficult for the men to change their beliefs about their intimate partners because society does not support them doing so. Currently, there are no research studies relating to socio-political theory in relation to domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs. An example of a domestic violence perpetrator treatment program that uses socio-political theory is the 3R Domestic Violence Program.

**The Social Change Model**

The Social Change Model, as shown in Figure B, was created to build up individuals’ leadership skills through social responsibility as well as the change for the common good (Dugan, 2006; Higher Education Research Institute; 1996). Through the use of the seven core values of the Social Change Model, which interact at the individual, group, and societal levels, leadership is developed. The seven core values, which interact to form the eight collective values of change, are: 1) consciousness of self; 2) congruence; 3) commitment; 4) collaboration; 5) common purpose; 6) controversy with civility; and 7) citizenship (Dugan, 2006; Higher Education Research Institute, 1996).
The consciousness of self is defined as being aware of one’s attitudes, emotions, beliefs, and values, which cause an individual to act. Congruence occurs when an individual not only feels and thinks towards others, but also behaves in relation to the honesty and consistency of others. In fact, such actions comply with the individual’s own beliefs. The third core value, commitment, is defined as psychic energy which individuals are motivated by. Such energy drives an individual’s collective effort and is directed towards group activity more than individual activity. Collaboration occurs when individuals work with others to achieve a common goal. In working as a group, individuals are able to form trust with one another, thus improving their individual leadership abilities. In working with a group, individuals share the same goals and values, thus such individuals work together for a common purpose. With a
common purpose, individuals are able to work together to analyze and solve issues. The sixth core value, controversy with civility, recognizes that individuals within a group will have viewpoints that differ from one another and that the individuals can work out their differences in a civilized manner. Lastly, citizenship occurs when an individual within the group becomes connected with society based on the leadership abilities which they have learned (Dugan, 2006; Higher Education Research Institute, 1996). Currently, there is no research that incorporates the Social Change Model into a domestic violence perpetrator treatment program. An example of a domestic violence perpetrator treatment program that incorporates the Social Change Model is the 3R Domestic Violence Program.

Research on Program Effectiveness

While evaluations of cognitive behavioral therapy based treatment programs have found positive effects in reducing as well as stopping assaults on intimate partners and reducing anger (Edleson & Grusznski, 1989; Gondolf, 1997), depression (Saunders & Hanusa, 1986), and sex role beliefs (DeMaris & Jackson, 1989; Saunders, 2008), such treatment programs have not been found to significantly reduce emotional/psychological abuse (Caesar & Hamberger, 1989; Kelso & Personette, 1985). This is perhaps in part due to the flaws in the research designs of the evaluations. Flaws of such evaluations include bias in the victim’s responses, the use of methods that were not cognitive behavioral methods, and using comparison groups that contained individuals who did not complete the treatment programs (Caesar & Hamberger, 1989). For example, with the use of self-assessments, substantive as well as systematic flaws occur (Dunning, Heath, & Suls, 2004). Victims who evaluate the program(s) which they participated in for treatment are likely to provide flawed responses due to how they view their own changes throughout the treatment process, hence a flawed self-assessment.
The length of the program also affects the effectiveness of the program. For example, research conducted by Gordon and Moriarty (2003) and Saunders (2008) have shown how a program is more effective the longer that it is. The results of their research show how the more program sessions a domestic violence perpetrator attends, the less likely he is to be rearrested. Attending more sessions allows the perpetrators to gain a better understanding of their thought process as well as learn more skills that allow them to keep from becoming aggressive and violent towards their intimate partners. Perpetrator motivation is also important in determining the effectiveness of domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs. Without motivation, the perpetrator has no desire to learn from their mistakes, change their way of thinking, or change their behaviors (Maguire, Morgan, & Reiner, 2007; Palmstierna, Haugan, Jarwson, Rasmussen, & Nøttestad, 2012). If a perpetrator is not motivated, his chances of allowing the program to help him decreases, thus causing the program to be ineffective.

Research (Gordon & Moriarty, 2003) has shown that no matter what form of treatment program the perpetrator attends; those who complete the program are less likely to be rearrested compared to those who do not complete the program. In fact, the more sessions attended, the lower the rearrest rate (Gordon & Moriarty, 2003). A study completed by Saunders (2008) supported Gordon and Moriarty’s (2003) findings that individuals who completed the treatment program had lower recidivism rates than individuals who did not complete the program. This means that the more sessions a perpetrator attends, the less likely the perpetrator is to be rearrested. After all, it is the perpetrator’s motivation that ultimately determines if the perpetrator will be successful in their treatment program as well as after attending the program. For example, if the perpetrator is motivated to receive help and work towards changing their way of thinking so that they do not commit a crime again (Maguire, Morgan, & Reiner, 2007), the
perpetrator is more likely to successfully complete the treatment program and less likely to recidivate.

Due to having several various domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs, it begs the question as to whether one type of program is more effective at reducing domestic violence crime than other treatment programs. All in all, it is uncertain as to whether or not one form of domestic violence perpetrator treatment program is more effective than another at reducing domestic violence. As for cognitive behavioral therapy approaches, evaluations conducted on the effectiveness of reducing domestic violence crime have been found to be inconclusive due to flawed evaluation approaches (i.e., flawed self-assessments) (La Taillade, Epstein, & Werlinich, 2006). Although research by Saunders (2008) and Gordon and Moriarty (2003) found cognitive behavioral therapy treatment programs to increase in effectiveness with an increase in program length, their methods of obtaining data could have been flawed due to bias victim responses or the use of self-assessments.

**Court mandated versus voluntary treatment.** Although the majority of domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs are court mandated, some programs are voluntary. There has been much debate as to whether or not court mandated domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs are more or less effective than voluntary domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs (Palmstierna et al., 2012). A study conducted by Palmstierna and colleagues (2012) found that males who were voluntarily seeking treatment for their domestic violence behaviors successfully completed the treatment program as long as they began the program soon after arrest; those who waited for at least four months to start the program were less successful. This study demonstrates how voluntary treatment programs are effective as long as the perpetrators begin the program shortly after being arrested, whereas programs are ineffective if
the perpetrators have to wait to begin the program after being arrested. Men who volunteer to participate in such programs might be willing to change at the time they are arrested, but few months after the arrest, the men might have less motivation to change their behaviors, due to not being arrested in the months leading up to the time they begin the program. Due to this, it is believed that court mandated treatment programs are more effective because the perpetrators have to participate in the programs no matter how long after they have been arrested they begin the program.

**Cognitive Behavioral Therapy and Non-Domestic Violence Crime**

If domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs are effective at reducing the anger levels of the perpetrators as well as changing their thinking patterns, such a decrease in anger should cause the perpetrators to not only commit less domestic violence crime, but less non-DV crime as well. Due to this, if perpetrators are less likely to become angered, their chances of becoming violent decreases. Also, in changing thinking patterns, individuals are less likely to react without thinking.

Evaluations have shown that community based programs that incorporate the criminal justice system, when applied to other crimes, reduce such crimes (Klofas, Hipple, & McGarrell, 2010). However, research has not been conducted to determine whether or not domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs that incorporate a community systems approach with the criminal justice system, is effective at reducing domestic violence crime as well as non-DV crime. Research has determined that while cognitive behavioral therapy based treatment programs in relation to family therapy have been found to reduce aggression among domestic violence perpetrators (La Taillade, Epstein, & Werlinich, 2006), research has not been conducted as to whether or not cognitive behavioral therapy based domestic violence perpetrator treatment
programs are effective at reducing non-DV crime as well as domestic violence crime. Although research has not been conducted on the effectiveness of domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs at reducing non-DV crime, other cognitive behavioral programs have found a relationship between the program and reductions in non-DV crime.

A study conducted by Marques, Day, Nelson, and West (1994) determined the effectiveness of a cognitive behavioral treatment program for sex offenders. The researchers concluded that sex offenders who participated in the treatment program were less likely to commit other violent crimes (non-sexual crimes), than sex offenders in the control group (Marques et al., 1994). This study demonstrates how the sex offender cognitive behavioral treatment program reduced the likelihood that the program participants would reoffend for both sex offenses as well as other violent crimes. This is important because a study conducted by Weinrott and Saylor (1991) demonstrates how individuals convicted of sexual offenses were more likely to commit other crimes than they were to commit sex crimes. For example, the study’s sample consisted of 99 sexual offenders who were surveyed. Through the use of self report surveys, the researchers discovered that the 99 study participants committed a total of 19,518 non-sexual offenses over the course of a year. This study demonstrates how high the amount of non-DV crimes committed by specific crime individuals (i.e., sex offenders) is, compared to those individuals committing specific crimes which they were convicted of. For example, the study conducted by Weinrott and Saylor (1991) demonstrates how convicted sex offenders are more likely to commit a non-DV crime than they are to commit a sexual crime, even though they specialize in sexual crimes.

Piquero, Oster, Mazerolle, Brame, and Dean (1999) determined that individuals who committed specific crimes, such as domestic violence or sexual offenses, started off by
committing non-DV crimes. Due to this, specialized criminals start off as generalized criminals who work their way towards committing more specialized crimes (Blumstein, Cohen, Das, & Moitra, 1988). With criminals starting as generalized, the cognitive behavioral treatment programs are able to work with the program participants to determine how they obtained such beliefs and thinking patterns, thus working towards reducing the behaviors that caused the individual to become a generalized criminal. Since domestic violence perpetrators are specialized criminals, the cognitive behavioral treatment programs should be able to work towards changing the perpetrators’ thinking patterns; thus, they are less likely to commit another domestic violence crime, as well as a non-DV crime. As demonstrated by the study conducted by Marques and colleagues (1994), since a sex offender cognitive behavioral treatment program was able to reduce the likelihood that the program participants would commit sex offenses as well as other violent crimes, then the 3R Domestic Violence Program should also be found to reduce the likelihood that its program participants will commit another domestic violence crime as well as non-DV crime.

The Current Study

Although no single domestic violence perpetrator treatment program has been found to be effective at reducing domestic violence to a significant degree (Diefenbeck, 2003), the research remains mixed (Babcock, Green, & Robie, 2002; Gondolf, 2004; Saunders, 2008). The 3R Domestic Violence Program (3RDVP) has the potential to not only effectively reduce the recidivism rate at which its participants commit domestic violence crimes, but it may also reduce the recidivism rate at which its participants commit crime in general. As discussed previously in the literature review, if such domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs reduce the perpetrators’ thinking patterns, why would it not reduce the rate at which domestic violence
crime is committed as well as the rate at which non-DV crime is committed by such perpetrators? To my knowledge, no such research on the effects of domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs on general offending behavior exists. If it is found that the 3RDVP reduces the recidivism rate at which its participants commit non-DV crimes, a treatment program for those who commit non-DV crime as a whole could be created based off of the 3RDVP. Implementing such a program could call for the creation of policies that allow judges to sentence non-DV crime perpetrators to such a program instead of to another form of punishment.

The purpose of this research is to determine the effectiveness of the 3R Domestic Violence Program at reducing the recidivism of program participants for both domestic violence crime and non-DV crime. Among those who successfully completed the program or were unsuccessfully discharged, the study will determine how many of them recidivated. For those who did recidivate, this study will also measure the amount of time that transpired from program completion to recidivism. The number of participants who committed a domestic violence crime or a non-DV crime after participating in the program will be determined as well as how long after participating in the program the crime(s) were committed, and the number of crimes, both domestic violence and general, were committed. The following hypotheses will be tested:

H₁: Completion of the 3RDVP reduces an offender’s likelihood of engaging in domestic violence again.

H₂: Those who fail the program will commit another domestic violence crime sooner compared to those who completed the program, yet recidivated.

H₃: Completion of the 3RDVP reduces an offender’s likelihood of engaging in non-domestic violence crime.
$H_4$: Those who fail the program will commit another non-domestic violence crime sooner compared to those who completed the program, yet recidivated.

$H_5$: The longer the participant remains in the program, the lower the number of crimes the participant will commit after participating in the program.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH DESIGN

In order to obtain an understanding of the effectiveness of the 3RDVP, I provide an overview of the prevalence of domestic violence throughout the United States, the state of New York, and Allegany County. After knowledge of the research setting is obtained, the program being evaluated will be explained in detail as well. In order to understand how the 3RDVP relates as well as differs from other domestic violence programs, the program itself needs to be explained in detail so a picture can be painted as to the functionality and purpose of the program. With this understanding the proposed evaluation will then be explained. This process will be explained in detail, thus demonstrating why specific variables were used, how data were collected and analyzed, and how the effectiveness of the program at reducing domestic violence crime and crime in general was evaluated.

The Setting

Allegany County

Allegany County is located in the southwestern part of New York State, along the Pennsylvania border. According to the 2010 United States Census, Allegany County has a population of about 49,000 with a female population of 49.5 percent (United States Census Bureau, 2012b). Around 97.0 percent of the population is White with English as the primary language. The county consists of 29 towns, ten villages, and four hamlets (United States Census Bureau, 2012b).

County-wide, 89.7 percent of the population aged 25 years and older have a high school degree, while 17.4 percent have a Bachelors degree or higher. There are roughly 26,300 housing units and 19,000 households in the county, with 83.0 percent of the population living in the
household for over a year. The average housing cost is $66,800 while the average household income is $20,000, with 2.32 persons per household. Sixteen point six percent of the county’s population is below the poverty level (United States Census Bureau, 2012b), while the county’s unemployment rate is 7.6 percent (Department of Labor, 2010).

According to the 2012 United States Census, New York State has a population of approximately 19,570,000, with 51.5 percent of the population being female (United States Census Bureau, 2012a). Seventy one point two percent of the state’s population is White and 17.5 percent of the population is Black, with 29.5 percent of the total population speaking a language other than English at home. State-wide, 84.6 percent of the total population aged 25 years and older have a high school degree, while 32.5 percent have a Bachelors degree or higher (United States Census Bureau, 2012a). In 2011, there were roughly 8,119,400 housing units in New York State and from 2007 to 2011, there were approximately 7,215,700 households throughout the state. From 2007 to 2011, the average housing cost was $301,000, while the average household income during that timeframe was $56,951, with an average of 2.50 persons per household. Fourteen point five percent of the state’s population is below the poverty level (United States Census Bureau, 2012a), while the state’s unemployment rate is 7.6 percent (New York State Department of Labor, 2013).

In 2012, the United States’ population as a whole was approximately 313,914,000, with 50.8 percent of the population being female. Seventy seven point nine percent of the population is White, with a Black population of 13.1 percent. Of the total United States population, 20.3 percent of individuals speak a language other than English at home (United States Census Bureau, 2012a). Country-wide, of persons aged 25 years and older, 85.4 percent have a high school degree and 28.2 percent have a Bachelors degree or higher. In the United States in 2011,
there were approximately 132,312,400 housing units, and roughly 114,761,400 households from 2007 to 2011. From 2007 to 2011, the average housing cost in the United States was $186,200, with an average household income of 52,762. During this timeframe, there was an average of 2.60 persons per household throughout the country (United States Census Bureau, 2012a). Fourteen point three percent of the population was below the poverty level from 2007 to 2011 (United States Census Bureau, 2012a), while the country’s unemployment rate is 7.6 percent (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013).

In comparing Allegany County, New York to New York State and the United States, it can be seen that Allegany County is significantly smaller than New York State and the United States. In fact, the population of Allegany County (approximately 49,000) makes up 0.25 percent of New York State’s population and 0.016 percent of the country’s population. Although Allegany County has a significantly smaller population than New York State and the United States, the three do no vary much in relation to the female population percentage; they are all roughly around 50.0 percent, differing by a maximum interval of 2.0 percent (49.5 percent to 51.5 percent). While New York State and the United States have a significant Black population, the population of Allegany County is significantly White (97.0 percent), thus causing for the county to be less racially diverse than the state and the country. There is a higher percentage of the population of persons aged 25 years and older in Allegany County who have their high school degree (89.7 percent) compared to the state (84.6 percent) and the country (85.4 percent). Although Allegany County has a higher percentage of individuals compared to the state and the country, whom have their high school degree, the country has a lower percentage of individuals (14.4 percent) who have their Bachelors degree or higher.
The number of housing units in Allegany County (26,300) make up 0.32 percent of New York State’s housing units and 0.02 percent of the country’s housing units. Not only does Allegany County comprise a small portion of the state’s and the country’s housing units, but the county also comprises a small portion of their households as well, constituting 0.26 percent of the state’s households and 0.017 percent of the country’s households. The average housing cost in Allegany County is $66,800, which is 4.5 times smaller than the average housing cost in New York State, and 2.8 times smaller than the average housing cost in the United States. With the average housing cost in Allegany County being significantly lower than the state and the country, the average household income for the county is significantly lower as well. The average household income for Allegany County is $20,000 which is 2.8 times smaller than the average household income for the state and 2.6 times smaller than the average household income for the country. Due to this, Allegany County is a less expensive area compared to New York State and the United States. While individuals in Allegany County have a lower average household income than the average in New York State and the United States, the percentage of individuals in the county that are below the poverty level (16.6 percent) is only slightly higher than the state (14.5 percent) and the country’s (14.3 percent) percentages, with an equal unemployment rate of 7.6 percent. While Allegany County is a less expensive area compared to New York State and the United States, it is not a significantly poorer area due to having a comparable population percentage below the poverty line and an equal unemployment rate.

From 2007-2009, in Allegany County, New York, 673 Domestic Incident Reports (DIRs) were filed, the Integrated Domestic Violence (IDV) Court had 100 active cases, and there were 780 calls made to the Allegany County Domestic Violence Hotline (Mahoney, 2011). This means that an average of 224.3 DIRs were filed per year, with an average of 33.3 active IDV
Court cases per year, and the Domestic Violence Hotline in Allegany County received an average of 260 calls per year. In fact, in New York State alone, 220,179 Orders of Protection were issued in 2009, which increased 6.0 percent from the number of Orders of Protection issued in 2007 (Mahoney, 2011).

According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s (FBI) Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) and National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS), in Allegany County in 2011, 895 index crimes were committed, 831 of which were property crimes, and 64 were violent crimes, with four violent crimes committed using a firearm (New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services, 2011). In 2011, 82,045 domestic violence incidents were reported to law enforcement throughout New York State. Just over 35.0 percent (28,911) of the reported incidents occurred in New York City alone, while just fewer than 65.0 percent (53,134) of the reported incidents occurred throughout the rest of the state. Out of the 53,134 reported incidents that occurred throughout the rest of the state, less than 1.0 percent of such incidents (43) occurred in Allegany County (New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services, 2011). This means that 0.08 percent of the domestic violence incidents that occurred throughout New York State occurred in Allegany County.

In 2011, approximately 1,203,564 violent crimes occurred nationwide (United States Department of Justice Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2011). Of the 1,203,564 violent crimes reported nationally, under 0.005 percent of such incidents (64) occurred in Allegany County. In relation to domestic violence, approximately 2.1 million individuals nationwide reported being victims of domestic abuse, annually (National Institute of Justice, 2007). Of the 2.1 million domestic violence cases reported annually, 3.9 percent occurred in New York State, and less than 0.002 percent of the incidents (43) occurred in Allegany County.
In accordance with the population of Allegany County, 1.31 violent crimes occur per 1,000 individuals, and 0.88 domestic violence crimes occur per 1,000 individuals. For every 1,000 individuals in New York State, 4.23 domestic violence crimes occur. In the United States, 3.83 violent crimes occur per 1,000 individuals and 6.68 domestic violence crimes occur per 1,000 individuals. According to these statistics, New York State has 2.45 domestic violence crimes per 1,000 individuals less than the United States, and Allegany County has 2.92 domestic violence crimes per 1,000 individuals less than New York State and 5.37 domestic violence crimes per 1,000 individuals less than the United States. This means that domestic violence occurs at a lower rate in Allegany County than it does in New York State as well as the country as a whole.

The 3R Domestic Violence Program

The 3RDVP is currently run by the Allegany County Department of Probation in Belmont, New York, in conjunction with the Allegany County Sheriff’s Department in Belmont, New York. 3RDVP works with male individuals who have been convicted of domestic violence charges in order to lower their chances of committing another domestic violence crime. These participants are required by the Allegany County Court or Child Protective Services (CPS) to attend this program. Males who have been charged with a domestic violence crime are referred by the Allegany County Court to participate in the program (Mahoney, 2011). Program participation is a sanction that is given to such individuals. Usually these individuals are referred to the 3RDVP after they have served a jail or prison sentence as punishment for committing the domestic violence act. Males, who are perceived by CPS to be violent in nature, or potentially violent, are referred to the 3RDVP as a way to work towards getting their children back. As explained later in this section, individuals who are referred to the program have to be accepted
into the program by the program coordinators; those who are not accepted to the program are required to participate in other treatment programs, instead. Those who are accepted to the program either have to successfully complete the program or serve another jail/prison sentence. Failure to complete the program, a decision ultimately made by the program coordinators, can result in the loss of visitation rights to their children, or another incarceration term of jail or prison.

Before referring men to the 3RDVP, a disposition must be in place. The disposition is to be completed by the individual who is referring the potential 3RDVP participant: this can be a judge, probation officer, parole officer, or a CPS case worker. Information such as arrest reports, Orders of Protection, Domestic Incident Reports, Pre-Sentence Investigations (PSIs), fact findings, and petitions, are included with the disposition. Such information allows the program coordinators to efficiently and accurately evaluate the referred individual to determine if the 3RDVP will be the best treatment program for the individual. After the individual has been referred or ordered to participate in the program, the individual has five business days to contact the Allegany County Probation Department and set up a date and time to meet with one of the program coordinators for an evaluation (Mahoney, 2011).

The 3RDVP was started in 2009. Since its start, a total of 84 participants have completed or failed out of the program, with an average of 21 participants per year. It focuses on reducing participants’ anger levels, especially in relation to domestic violence incidents, through offender accountability and victim/community safety. Because of this, the 3RDVP can be situated within the restorative justice paradigm (Zehr, 2002). Tony Marshall defined restorative justice as “a process whereby all the parties with a stake in a particular offense come together to resolve collectively how to deal with the aftermath of the offense and its implications for the future”
Under restorative justice, the offender comes face-to-face with his victim, and/or the victim’s family members. When such individuals meet with one another, the victim and their family members are able to ask the offender questions as to why they committed the crime, and the offender is able to apologize and show remorse for his actions. The main focus of restorative justice is for the victim and the victim’s family to obtain closure as well as for the offender to take responsibility for his actions, become remorseful, and apologize for what he has done (Presser, 2003; Shapland et al., 2006; Stubbs, 2007; Zehr, 1990).

In relation to restorative justice, the 3RDVP works with male domestic violence offenders to get them to gradually begin to realize the consequences of their actions as well as obtain an understanding that women are to be treated as equals to men (Mahoney, 2011). Once they are able to realize the consequences that their actions have caused, as well as understand that they should treat women as they themselves want to be treated, the men begin to empathize for those whom they have harmed. Becoming empathetic allows the men to begin to show remorse. In showing remorse, the men can explain to their victims why they harmed them as well as apologize for what they have done. Healing can then begin between the offender and his victim, especially if they are still in an intimate relationship with each other.

As outlined in the program literature, in developing the 3RDVP, two theories were used: cognitive behavioral theory (CBT) and socio-political theory (SPT). Cognitive behavioral theory, as discussed in the review of literature above, is based on the notion that behavior can be altered by modifying the way in which we react to certain situations (Simmons & Griffiths, 2009; Whitfield & Davidson, 2007). By changing the way we as individuals process events, we can learn how to respond to specific circumstances appropriately by learning healthier ways to think. In learning healthier ways to think, perpetrators are able to change their thinking patterns,
which is the goal of the cognitive behavioral aspect of the 3RDVP. Socio-political theory as it applies to domestic violence, “states that domestic violence is a controlling behavior in which there is an imbalance of power between the abuser and the victim and that society plays a role in upholding these beliefs” (Mahoney, 2011, p. 2). Along with the use of these two theories, the program also utilizes the Social Change Model. Through this model, participants are taught new skills, and learn new ways to adjust thinking patterns and beliefs that result in violent behavior (Mahoney, 2011). In learning ways to adjust thinking patterns and beliefs that result in violent behavior, program participants learn how to alter their behavior so they not only do not perpetrate violence against their intimate partner, but so that they do not perpetrate violence against anyone else, thus resulting in a program where the goals include not only having participants not commit domestic violence crime, but crime in general.

Two groups of 12 participants are run at a time. Each group meets every Tuesday at the Allegany County Jail in Belmont, New York, and each session lasts 90 minutes. Individuals participate in the program for at least 36 weeks and no more than 52 weeks. At 36 weeks, individuals can take a test; if they pass the test they are successfully discharged from the program and if they do not pass the test they remain in the program for the full 52 weeks, at which point they can take the test again (Mahoney, 2011). Allowing the program participants to take the test at their 36th week of participation allows the participants who have changed their way of thinking, learned how to control their anger, and realized that they alone are at fault for their actions, to be discharged early from the program. It is viewed that if they pass the test then they have obtained a maximum amount of knowledge from the program, and that continuing with the program would not only cost them extra money but would keep a space from freeing up, thus causing someone who needs to participate in the program to have to wait. Due to this, the
participation is rolling, causing participants who have been in the program for 12 weeks, for example, to be in a group with participants who have been in the program for 18 weeks.

Upon the start of a new unit, program participants may start the program. Due to this, individuals who start the program at the first unit can be in a group with participants who started the program at the start of the third unit, several weeks later. The program consists of 12 units, with each unit consisting of three parts; thus there are 36 subunits incorporated into the program (R. K. Bitting, personal communication, April 9, 2013). Each week (each subunit) the program participants are given reading and homework material. The reading material consists of information that will be covered in the proceeding class, and the homework material consists of short answer, multiple choice, definitions, journaling, and reflection of behavior, vis-à-vis the topic that is to be discussed (R. K. Bitting, personal communication, April 9, 2013). Three months into the program, participants begin presenting projects that reflect what they have learned about their past violent behavior.

After 36 weeks in the program, participants are offered to take a final. The final contains information that has been covered during the 36 weeks of classes the participants have been attending. Questions on the final consist of fill-in-the-blank questions, multiple choice questions, true/false questions, and short answer questions (R. K. Bitting, personal communication, April 9, 2013). If the participant receives a minimum score of 70.0 percent, they have passed the final and are successfully discharged from the program. Those who fail the final remain in the program for the full 52 weeks.

Upon completion of the 52nd week, the participants are given the final again. Obtaining a score of less than 70.0 percent on the second final will result in an unsuccessful discharge from the program. Receiving an unsuccessful discharge from the program results in the program.
directors notifying the county court judge, or whoever mandated/referred the individual to the program, of the unsuccessful dismissal. Upon receiving this information, the CPS case worker could determine that the individual is an unfit parent, causing him to lose his parental rights, while the judge could then sentence the discharged individual to a jail or prison term. The sentence that the individual receives depends on the length of time he was in the program as well as the type and severity of the crime(s) he was charged with that caused him to be mandated/referred to participate in the 3RDVP. When an individual successfully completes the program, they are given an exit interview. The exit interview consists of questions that pertain to the individual’s opinion and experience of the program. Upon completion of the exit interview, the individual is given a certificate of completion (Mahoney, 2011). Although the individuals have completed the program, their charges and/or convictions are not deleted from their record. It is, however, added to their file that they successfully completed the 3RDVP.

The program participants pay all program costs themselves; what they pay each week is based on a sliding scale which is determined by the participant’s income. After referral, but before being admitted into the program, each referred individual goes through a two hour evaluation (Mahoney, 2011). The purpose of the evaluation (as stated above) is to determine which individuals would be benefited by participating in the 3RDVP. For example, the evaluation helps to determine whether the 3RDVP would be the best treatment program for the individual to participate in or if the individual would benefit more from participating in another form of treatment. The evaluation is completed by a licensed psychologist and consists of “…a clinical interview, family/social history and relationship history” (Mahoney, 2011, p. 4). An assessment is completed based on the Domestic Violence Inventory (DVI), which is a validated tool used by domestic violence programs throughout the United States (Professional Online Test...
Solutions, 2004). After completing the evaluation, the program directors determine who will be permitted access into the program.

With the Domestic Violence Inventory, potential problems that could affect the successfulness of a domestic violence offender through his treatment process are identified. Identification of such problems allows the offender to receive help that focuses on reducing such problems, thus making the offender more successful throughout his treatment process. The DVI is correlated at the $p < 0.001$ significance level with other domestic violence tests, and has a reliability coefficient standard of 0.80. It takes about 30 minutes to complete, has 155 items, and consists of six measures: 1) Truthfulness Scale; 2) Violence (Lethality) Scale; 3) Control Scale; 4) Alcohol Scale; 5) Drugs Scale; and 6) Stress Coping Abilities Scale (Professional Online Test Solutions, 2004).

The Truthfulness Scale measures whether the individual told the truth when completing the test. With this, this scale identifies individuals who are considered to be guarded or defensive by attempting to act good by lying on the test. The Violence (Lethality) Scale determines which individuals are dangerous not only to themselves but to others as well. The higher the individual scores on this scale, the more violent the individual is, thus causing the individual to be more likely to harm themselves or others around them. The third scale of the DVI is the Control Scale. This scale measures the need that the individual has to control others. Such behaviors of control can range from normal, which is considered to be mild, to pathological, which is considered to be severe (Professional Online Test Solutions, 2004). The more pathological the behavior, the harder it will be for the individual to respond to treatment because they will be more likely to resist giving up such control. The Alcohol Scale measures the individual’s alcohol use as well as the level of abuse severity, while the Drug Scale, which is
similar to the Alcohol Scale, measures the use and abuse of drugs instead of alcohol use and abuse. The Stress Coping Abilities Scale, which is the last DVI scale, measures the individual’s ability to cope with stress. Not only does the individual’s ability to cope with stress decrease when his score increases, but as the individual’s score increases the likelihood that the individual has a mental illness increases as well (Professional Online Test Solutions, 2004).

**Methodology**

This study explores the impact that the 3RDVP has on its program participants in relation to the rate at which the participants commit crime after participating in the program. The research questions are important because they imply that a domestic violence based treatment program not only reduces the amount of domestic violence crimes that are perpetrated by the program’s participants, but it reduces the amount of non-DV crimes that are perpetrated as well. In order to explore the research questions, data from agency records were collected from the Allegany County Probation Department’s records as well as the Allegany County Court House’s records and the Allegany County Sheriff’s Department’s records. Primary data were collected from the 3RDVP participants through the use of telephone interviews. Background information on the program were collected as well to determine if the 3RDVP is being implemented in the way in which it is supposed to be implemented. Therefore, the unit of analysis for this study is the individual, since the criminal behavior of individuals is being analyzed.

This section will discuss in detail the methods by which data were collected to determine whether the hypotheses are supported or rejected. A synopsis of the sources of data will then be provided as well as a description of how such data were collected and analyzed. An explanation of why the population was used instead of a sample from the population will be given as well as
a discussion of the study’s variables. The hypotheses are provided here again as reference. The following hypotheses guide the current study:

H₁: Completion of the 3RDVP reduces an offender’s likelihood of engaging in domestic violence again.

H₂: Those who fail the program will commit another domestic violence crime sooner compared to those who completed the program, yet recidivated.

H₃: Completion of the 3RDVP reduces an offender’s likelihood of engaging in non-domestic violence crime.

H₄: Those who fail the program will commit another non-domestic violence crime sooner compared to those who completed the program, yet recidivated.

H₅: The longer the participant remains in the program, the lower the number of crimes the participant will commit after participating in the program.

**Data Sources**

The researcher had been permitted access to the Allegany County Probation Department’s records, the Allegany County Court House’s records, and the Allegany County Sheriff’s Department’s records, of individuals who have completed as well as have dropped out of the program, individuals who were referred to the program but not accepted into the program, and their arrest records. Data were collected on which participants successfully completed the program, which participants failed out of the program, how long it took participants to successfully complete the program, and how long it took participants to fail out of the program. Evaluations were compared between those who were accepted to the program and those who were not accepted to the program to obtain a general understanding of the characteristics of the individuals accepted into the program versus those who were not accepted into the program.
This painted a picture of the types of domestic violence perpetrators who are more likely to be admitted into the 3RDVP. This is important because it provides an understanding of what types of domestic violence perpetrators are accepted into the program, as well as whether or not such individuals are likely to be successful in such a program.

Data were also collected on if and how long participants took to commit a domestic violence offense as well as a non-DV crime offense. Through the use of telephone interviews, the researcher collected data from the population participants to determine if they have committed any form of crime – including crime not reported to the police – after participating in the program. Obtaining such information not only controls for the dark figure of crime, but it determines if the measure used for arrest is valid. Demographic characteristics of the program participants were collected as well. Such demographic characteristics include: age, education level, employment status, socioeconomic status, marital status, number of children in the home, number of prior arrests, and the seriousness of prior arrests. Information pertaining to the participants’ demographic characteristics was obtained through the use of arrest records as well as through the telephone interviews.

**Population**

The population used for the study consisted of all of the individuals who participated in the 3RDVP. Thus, the study employs a census, not a sample. The population consisted of 68 individuals (four of whom participated in the program twice due to failing out of the program the first time and being accepted into the program a second time), all of whom were males by programmatic design. They ranged in age from 20 years to 55 years, with an average age of 34 years during program participation. A more in-depth discussion of the population is provided in the *Frequencies* section.
Data Collection

Data from agency records as well as primary data were collected during this study. Agency records data are data that are collected for public agencies or by public agencies. Agency data consists of three categories: 1) published statistics; 2) non-public agency records that are collected routinely to be used internally; and 3) new data which agency staff collect for the use of research purposes (Maxfield & Babbie, 2011). Published statistics consist of data that are collected routinely by government agencies, compiled together, and published in a statistical format. Examples of published statistics include Uniform Crime Reports (UCRs), the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), and the Census Bureau. Non-public agency records consist of summary data on state court cases, annual expenditure surveys, and summary data on agency budgets and personnel. Lastly, new data, which were used for this study, consists of data obtained by agency personnel in regards to specific information on a criminal, a crime, or organizational actions (Maxfield & Babbie, 2011). Examples of new data consist of an individual’s arrest history, the demographic characteristics pertaining to an individual, or details relating to a crime that an individual committed.

Agency record data were collected from the Allegany County Probation Department’s records, the Allegany County Court House’s records, and the Allegany County Sheriff’s Department’s records. The records contained demographic information on the population participants as well as the prior arrest records of the program participants; the prior arrest records included arrests that occurred before the participants were enrolled in the 3RDVP. If a program participant committed a crime after participating in the 3RDVP and was arrested for such a crime, such information was in the participant’s records as well, as long as they were processed by the probation department during such time. If such information was not provided in the
agency’s arrest records, then such information was obtained during the telephone interviews. These data were also obtained from agency records on individuals who were not accepted into the program. In order to determine if individuals committed crimes that were not reported to police after participating in the 3RDVP as well as to determine if they have been arrested outside of the Allegany County jurisdiction since participating in the program, primary data were collected using telephone interviews.

Primary data are data that are collected and used by the same researcher (Maxfield & Babbie, 2011). Data pertaining to crimes committed but not reported to the police were collected through the use of telephone interviews. The researcher mailed out a letter, presented as Appendix A, to each of the program participants providing them information about the study being conducted. The participants were informed that the researcher would be contacting them through the use of the telephone to interview them about crimes they committed after they participated in the 3RDVP. Confidentiality was explained, and the participants were informed that their names would not be used once the data had been collected. Two weeks after the informational letters were mailed out, the researcher telephoned each of the program participants. In doing so, the researcher explained the study as well as what information would be asked of the participants. The participants were informed for a second time that the information they provide would be confidential, and they were then asked if they would like to participate in the study. If the participant consented to participating in the study, the researcher began interviewing the participant with the use of a survey guide, presented as Appendix B.

3RDVP Background Information. Background information was collected on the 3RDVP as well. In collecting background information on the program as well as the process by which the program is administered, it was determined whether or not the 3RDVP coordinators
are implementing the appropriate process which was designed to be carried out throughout the program. With such information, if the results of the study determine that the program was effective at reducing crime and the background information demonstrated that the program was implemented as it was intended to, then the results will show that the program does in fact reduce crime. However, if the program is determined to not be implemented as it was intended to, then the results will not necessarily show that the program itself caused a decrease in crimes committed by program participants. Not only will it be determined if the program is successful or not, but it will also be determined if the program is effective or ineffective due to the means by which it was implemented (whether it was implemented correctly or incorrectly). In making evaluations between the groups, the coordinators themselves were evaluated, to determine if they are providing the same material in the same manner to both groups. Through evaluation of the program length, program groups, and the program coordinators, it will be determined not only if the program is functioning as it is meant to, but if the characteristics of each group can be applied if the data analysis determines that one group is more successful than the other. Obtaining such background information was for control purposes and as a check on internal validity.

In order to obtain background information on the 3RDVP processes, the researcher sat in on the program sessions for two weeks. Upon doing so, the researcher took notes on how the group coordinators presented the information as well as whether or not the information was given to both groups in the same manner. In order to determine what was to be covered in the meetings which the researcher sat in on, the researcher looked through the program’s manual to determine the information that was to be covered as well as the way in which the information was to be administered to the group participants. Doing so allowed for a comparison of what is
required of the sessions with what is actually occurring during the sessions in order to determine if the sessions are being conducted as they are meant to be.

The collection of background information on the program determined whether or not the program length (36 weeks or 52 weeks) affected the successfulness of the program participants after they successfully completed the program. Due to the fact that two groups meet weekly, the groups were compared to one another to determine the effectiveness of the program as well. For example, participants in the first group might obtain more motivation from the group coordinators because they meet first, whereas participants in the second group, who meet at a later time, might not have as much motivation from the program coordinators due to exhaustion or frustration from working with the first group prior to working with the second group. With there being two groups of participants, characteristics between the groups were compared as well.

Variables

This thesis consists of five dependent variables, two key independent variables, and several control variables. The dependent variables, which focus on reducing recidivism, are: 1) committing another domestic violence crime; 2) the time it took to commit a domestic violence crime; 3) committing a non-DV crime; 4) the time it took to commit a non-DV crime; and 5) the number of crimes committed. The key independent variable is whether the 3RDVP was successfully completed or not, and the control variables consist of the demographic characteristics previously mentioned. In relation to the key independent variable, the time spent in the program – 36 or 52 weeks – will be the second independent variable.

Dependent variables. In order to measure the dependent variables of committing another domestic violence crime and committing a non-DV crime, the data were analyzed to
determine if the 3RDVP participants committed crime after completing the program, as well as how much crime was committed. If the number of crimes committed after program participation are lower than before program participation, then the data will show that the 3RDVP was effective at reducing crime. However, if the number of crimes committed after participation in the program are higher than before participation in the program, then the 3RDVP will be found to not reduce crime. Also, if the number of program participants who commit crime decreases after program participation, then the 3RDVP will be found to reduce crime as well. In order to measure the other two dependent variables, the time it took to commit a domestic violence crime and the time it took to commit a non-DV crime, data were collected on how long after participating in the program, crime was committed, if it was committed at all. The two variables that measure whether crime was committed – committing another domestic violence crime and committing a non-DV crime – are binary. Therefore, they were coded as 0 = did not commit a crime and 1 = did commit a crime. The variable that measures the amount of crime is continuous, while the two variables that measure recidivism time – time it took to commit a domestic violence crime and time it took to commit a non-DV crime – were measured in weeks. Time was measured in weeks because the program participants complete the program in 36 or 52 weeks, hence causing weeks to be the best duration of time to use. In order to obtain data for all of the dependent variables, data from agency records were collected as well as primary data from telephone interviews with the 3RDVP participants.

**Independent variables.** The key independent variable, whether or not the 3RDVP was successfully completed, was measured by the use of agency records. The other independent variable is the length of time in which the program participants remained in the program; 36 or 52 weeks. The independent variables were coded as follows: 1 = completed the program, 0 =
failed the program, and 1 = 52 weeks, 0 = 36 weeks. The independent variable of time was measured through the use of agency records as well. It is believed that program participants who successfully complete the program are less likely to commit crime than those who do not successfully complete the program. It is also hypothesized that those who successfully complete the program and do commit crime after completing the program will commit a crime after a longer period of time from program completion to criminal behavior, than individuals who do not successfully complete the program. Due to this, it was important to determine whether or not the study participants successfully completed the program or not. It was also important to determine whether they successfully completed the program after 36 weeks or the full 52 weeks. This information is important because it was used to determine whether participants who remained in the program for the full 52 weeks were less likely to commit crime after successfully completing the program than those who completed the program in 36 weeks.

With data collected from program participants who have completed or failed out of the program at different times, the information obtained from the participants was compared by the years in which the participants completed or failed out of the program. Due to this, information was obtained on whether a long time period from program completion affects recidivism rates or not. For example, the question of whether individuals who completed the program in 2009 recidivated at higher levels than those who completed the program in 2011 because of the length at which they have been out of the program was determined.

**Control variables.** There are several demographic characteristics that were obtained on each 3RDVP participant. These characteristics – age, education level, employment status, socioeconomic status, marital status, number of children in the home, number of prior arrest charges, and seriousness of prior arrests – were obtained through the Allegany County Probation
Department’s agency records. Due to these characteristics being correlates of criminal behavior (Antonaccio et al., 2010; Elliot, 2004; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Lodge, 1947; Sampson & Laub, 1993; Sutherland, Cressey, & Luckenbill, 1992), they needed to be controlled for, hence the term control variables. If these characteristics were not controlled for, each one of them could potentially affect the independent as well as the dependent variables, thus threatening the study’s internal validity.

Demographic characteristics collected on each study participant are variables that need to be controlled for because such variables are correlates of criminal behavior. A majority of researchers agree that gender and age are the main correlates of criminal behavior (Antonaccio et al., 2010; Elliott, 1994; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Sampson & Laub, 1993; Sutherland, Cressey, & Luckenbill, 1992). For males, marital status greatly impacts the likelihood of participation in criminal behavior. The likelihood of participation decreases when the men are married, and increases when they are not married (Antonaccio et al., 2010). Therefore, marital status at the time of the domestic violence offense that caused the individual to be referred to the program is coded as: 0 = single, 1 = dating, 2 = engaged, 3 = married, and 4 = divorced/separated. Although race and education level are considered to be correlates of criminal behavior, gender is not a variable for this study because the population consists of only men. In relation to education as a correlate, the likelihood of crime participation decreases with the more education an individual receives. Therefore, education level is coded as: 0 = completed eighth grade or lower, 1 = completed ninth grade, 2 = completed tenth grade, 3 = completed eleventh grade, 4 = graduated high school/GED, 5 = trade school, 6 = Associates degree, 7 = Bachelors degree, and 8 = Masters degree or higher. Due to the positive correlation between prior criminal behavior and the likelihood of committing future crime, as well as future crime
positively correlating with the seriousness of the offenses committed (Lodge, 1947), previous criminal behavior and the seriousness of such behavior has been controlled for. For example, the more serious the offense, the more likely the perpetrator is to commit future crime. Therefore, the seriousness of previous criminal behavior is coded as: 0 = felony, 1 = misdemeanor, and 2 = less than misdemeanor.

The variable of the number of children in the household was controlled for because research has found that parents are more likely to experience stress due to having an increased amount of children, thus causing the likelihood of abuse occurring within the household to increase (Misri et al., 2010; Moore et al., 2007). Due to conflicting research as to whether or not socioeconomic status is a correlate of criminal behavior (Braithwaite, 1981; Dunaway et al., 2000; Lodge, 1947; Thornberry & Farworth, 1982; Tittle, Villemez, & Smith, 1978; Wright et al., 1999), it was controlled for in this study. Therefore, socioeconomic status is continuous and was measured by household income. Employment status, in relation to socioeconomic status, was measured in order to determine if the level of socioeconomic status resulted from a lack of employment or a low paying job. Therefore, employment status is measured as: 0 = unemployed, 1 = employed. The coding of the variables is demonstrated in Table 2.
### Table 2

**Coding Scheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in DV Crime</td>
<td>0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Non-DV crime</td>
<td>0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks to Recidivate DV Crime</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks to Recidivate Non-DV crime</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Crimes Committed</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Program</td>
<td>0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length for Completion</td>
<td>0 = 36 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = 52 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>0 = Completed eighth grade or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Completed ninth grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Completed tenth grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Completed eleventh grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = Graduated high school/GED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = Trade school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 = Associates degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 = Bachelors degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 = Masters degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>0 = unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = employed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = single</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = dating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = engaged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = married</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = divorcer/separated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children in Home</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Prior Arrest Charges</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious of Prior Arrests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = felony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = misdemeanor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = less than misdemeanor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Coding scheme for the dependent, independent, and control variables.

**Method of Analysis**

While analyzing the data, SPSS was used to measure the frequency statistics, such as mode, mean, percentages, and standard deviation. Bivariate statistics, such as Pearson’s $r$ and $X^2$, were measured as well. Analyzing such measurements allowed for a better understanding of the data, and allowed for an understanding of potential relationships.\(^4\)

**Limitations**

There were three primary potential limitations of this study which were mitigated for: 1) the use of data from agency records; 2) an experiment was not conducted; and 3) the population size is small. Other than the three primary limitations, there are also two other potential limitations which cannot be controlled for: 1) selection bias; and 2) 3RDVP participants participating in other treatment programs while enrolled in the 3RDVP. The limitation of using

\(^4\) Due to the fact that an actual experiment was not conducted, I had hoped to be able to run regression analysis, in order to remove the effect of the control variables. This in turn would have allowed for the observation of the unique effects of the independent variables on the dependent variables (Maxfield & Babbie, 2011). However, due to the small sample size, regression analysis was unable to be conducted.
data from agency records is that the data are not always necessarily complete, and do not always provide updated or accurate information (Maxfield & Babbie, 2011). For example, when looking at the arrest records of an agency, the arrest records will only include the information obtained from when the individuals were arrested within that agency’s jurisdiction, as well as any arrest information obtained from performing a background check on the individuals. If such individuals are arrested outside of the agency’s jurisdiction after being arrested within the jurisdiction of that agency, that agency will not have information pertaining to the individual’s current arrest, only to the individual’s prior arrests.

With the study not consisting of an experiment, spurious relationships could occur (Maxfield & Babbie, 2011). This is a limitation because spurious relationships imply that two or more variables are correlated, even if the variables are not related causally (Shannon, 2004); thus a false relationship is identified. Spurious relationships can cause Type I errors during data analysis. Lastly, having a small population size can keep the results of the study from being generalizable (Maxfield & Babbie, 2011). In relation to a lack of generalizability because of a small population size, due to the fact that the study’s population is required from only one county in New York State, the results of the study cannot be generalized to other counties throughout New York State, or the rest of the country.

Due to the 3RDVP determining which referred individuals will be permitted access into the program based on the individual’s evaluation, selection bias can occur. For example, the group coordinators could choose individuals which they think would be most successful in the program, to participate in the program, instead of selecting individuals who would benefit the most from participating in the program. If this occurs, based on the individuals who are permitted access into the program, the 3RDVP group coordinators could be setting up the
program to be effective based on the individuals who are permitted access to the program. Lastly, due to a lack of complete records (i.e., the records not stating other treatment programs the 3RDVP participants were a part of), contamination effects could occur. If information could be obtained as to whether the 3RDVP participants were enrolled in other treatment programs (e.g., substance abuse, alcoholics anonymous, anger management, etc.), than this variable could be controlled for. However, such information was unable to be obtained for this research.

Although the study has limitations, the primary limitations are being mitigated. The limitation of using public agency is being controlled for with the use of telephone interviews. Due to the fact that data from agency records tends to be incomplete, the use of interviewing the study participants through the telephone allowed for missing data to be collected. Lastly, in order to control for the small population size, the external validity of the study will be tested. In testing the study’s external validity, a determination can be made as to the generalizability of the study’s results. In viewing the data presenting in the setting section of the thesis, it can be observed that while Allegany County has a small population, its crime statistics do not differ much from New York State or the United States. For example, 0.88 domestic violence crimes occur per 1,000 individuals in Allegany County, 4.23 domestic violence crimes occur per 1,000 individuals in New York State, and 6.68 domestic violence crimes occur per 1,000 individuals in the United States. This demonstrates how the amount of domestic violence crimes that occur in Allegany County are proportional to its’ population size (49,000), compared to the amount of domestic violence crime that occurs in New York State and the United States compared to their populations.
Human Subjects Protections

Confidentiality of data was maintained in several different ways. First, after collecting all of the data on each of the population participants, the names of the participants were deleted. This left the researcher with an excel sheet of data, but without the names of the subjects.

Second, upon analyzing and discussing the data, the data were portrayed to the population in the aggregate; no single individual was singled out or described. In doing so, the data cannot be traced back to a specific individual. Third, the population participants were informed of how confidentiality would be kept both before and during the telephone interview. Lastly, participants were informed that the data collected would be retained for at least three years, in compliance with federal regulations. They were informed that although the data would be retained for three years, their names in association with the data would not be retained due to the deletion of their names once all of the data had been collected.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This study explored the effectiveness of the *3R Domestic Violence Program*, a male domestic violence perpetrator treatment program. Demographic characteristics were collected on each of the program participants, as well as information pertaining to their completion or failure of the program. Past program participants were also interviewed by the telephone, to obtain other demographic characteristics after they participated in the program, as well as information pertaining to their perception of the program. Using these data, I tested the following hypotheses:

1) Completion of the 3RDVP reduces an offender’s likelihood of engaging in domestic violence again.

2) Those who fail the program will commit another domestic violence crime sooner compared to those who completed the program, yet recidivated.

3) Completion of the 3RDVP reduces an offender’s likelihood of engaging in non-domestic violence crime.

4) Those who fail the program will commit another non-domestic violence crime sooner compared to those who completed the program, yet recidivated.

5) The longer the participant remains in the program, the lower the number of crimes the participant will commit after participating in the program.

This section presents a quasi-process evaluation of the performance of the 3RDVP in the classroom, descriptive statistics, and bivariate analyses, in order to test these hypotheses. Due to the small population size, multivariate statistics were unable to be conducted.
Frequencies

Data were gathered on all individuals who participated in the program between 2009 and 2013. Thus, the study employed a census, not a sample. Of the 72 cases, the 3RDVP coordinators closed 1.4 percent of the files in 2009, 16.7 percent in 2010, 25.0 percent in 2011, 31.0 percent in 2012, and 25.0 percent in 2013. Data for the 2013 year were gathered on all 3RDVP participants whose file was closed before October 2013, while data for the 2009 year was at a low percentage due to the Allegany County Sheriff’s Department destroying all records that were more than three years old. The reason why the department destroyed the 2009 files after three years is unknown. Upon asking one of the group coordinators as to why the files were destroyed after only three years, she said she was unsure but believed it was a way to create more space, especially since the older files were no longer of use to the department. The destruction of the 2009 files does impact this research due to it cutting the population size by up to 25 participants, as well as destroying information pertaining to the individuals who were the first to participate in the program.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Completion Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed 3RDVP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the $N = 72$, as demonstrated in Table 3, 33 participants completed the 3RDVP with 39 failing the program. Table 4 demonstrates that over half (57 participants) graduated high school or received a GED, while 14 participants had an education level of less than a high school

---

5 Coordinators “close” files once an individual completes the program or is dismissed from the program.
degree. Six participants received some form of education higher than the equivalence of a high school diploma, and the education level of one participant was unknown.

The individuals composing the study’s population (68) make up 0.27 percent of the male population of Allegany County (24,745). In comparing the study’s population to the population of Allegany County, 79.2 percent of the study’s population has a high school degree, while 89.7 percent of the county’s population holds such a degree. Of the study’s population, 65.3 percent fell below the poverty level, which is just about even with the percentage of the county’s population (66.6 percent) that falls below the poverty level.

Before participating in the program, 39 participants were employed, 32 were unemployed, and the employment status of one participant was unknown. The individual income before program participation ranged from less than $10,000 per year (47 participants) to $60,001 and up (one participant), with 14 participants having an individual income of $10,001-$20,000, and 7 participants with an individual income of $20,001-$40,000. There were three participants for whom their income was unknown. Before program participation, five population participants were single, 25 participants were dating, three participants were engaged, 29 participants were married, and ten participants were divorced/separated. Out of 72 participants, 27 had no children in the home before program participation, while 12 participants had one child, 19 participants had two children, six participants had three children, five participants had four children, two participants had five children, and one participant had nine children, with an average of 1.49 children per household, ranging from full to step-children.

---

6 In relation to household income, the household income of 66 of the participants was unknown, with two participants having no income, one having an income of $24,000, one having an income of $38,000, one having an income of $80,000, and one having a household income of $100,000.
Table 4

Frequency Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Categories</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>N/($\bar{X}$)</th>
<th>%/(SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Level</strong></td>
<td>Completed 8\textsuperscript{th} grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed 9\textsuperscript{th} grade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed 10\textsuperscript{th} grade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed 11\textsuperscript{th} grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduated high school/GED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associates degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelors degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters degree or higher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Annual Income</strong></td>
<td>&lt;$10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10,001 - $20,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$20,001 - $40,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$40,001 - $60,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$60,001 and up</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced/Separated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Children in Home</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(1.49)</td>
<td>(1.653)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Arrests</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(5.44)</td>
<td>(4.253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Felony Convictions</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>(1.006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Misdemeanor Convictions</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(4.12)</td>
<td>(5.245)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 72*
The 3RDVP participants were arrested an average of 5.44 times ($SD = 4.253$) with the number of total arrests ranging from 0 (two participants) to 20 (one participant), as demonstrated in Figure 3. The mode was two arrests ($n = 2$). The number of arrests for ten of the participants was unknown. In relation to the number of felony convictions, participants had an average of 0.49 felony convictions ($SD = 1.006$). Over half (43 participants) did not have any felony convictions, while ten participants had one felony conviction, one participant had two felony convictions, three participants had three felony convictions, and two participants had four felony convictions. The average number of misdemeanor convictions was 4.12 ($SD = 5.245$), ranging from 0 misdemeanor convictions (five participants) to 30 misdemeanor convictions (one participant). The highest frequency of misdemeanor convictions was one misdemeanor conviction and three misdemeanor convictions: 11 participants had one misdemeanor conviction and 11 participants had three misdemeanor convictions. The total number of misdemeanor convictions for 14 participants was unknown.
As demonstrated in Table 5, after 3RDVP participation, 60 participants did not commit a domestic violence crime, five participants did commit a domestic violence crime, and it is unknown as to whether or not one of the participants did commit a domestic violence crime after program participation. Of those participants who did participate in a domestic violence crime after program participation, the length in weeks which it took the participants to recidivate ranged from 6 weeks to 94 weeks, with one participant having an unknown recidivism time period. The average number of weeks until DV recidivism was 45.70 with a standard deviation of 37.930. In relation to non-DV crime, 49 participants did not commit a non-DV crime after participating in the 3RDVP, while 16 participants did commit a non-DV crime. The length after

---

7 This individual was arrested outside of Allegany County, thus the crime for which he was arrested is unknown because arrest data outside of Allegany County was not accessible.
program participation which it took participants to recidivate non-DV crime was longer than the length which it took participants to recidivate domestic violence crime. The time from program participation to non-DV crime recidivism ranged from 0 weeks to 227 weeks with an average of 81.65 weeks and a standard deviation of 67.578. In total, after program participation, 48 participants did not recidivate, eight participants committed one crime, three participants committed two crimes, three participants committed three crimes, one participant committed four crimes, and one participant committed ten crimes. The average total number of crimes committed was 0.58 with a standard deviation of 1.499.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Categories</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>N/(X)</th>
<th>%/(SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in DV Crime</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks to Recidivate DV Crime</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(45.70)</td>
<td>(37.930)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Non-DV crime</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks to Recidivate Non-DV crime</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(81.65)</td>
<td>(67.578)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Crimes Committed</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
<td>(1.499)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 72

Outside of the 72 cases in which individuals were accepted into and participated in the 3RDVP, from 2009 to 2013, 42 other individuals were referred to participate in the 3RDVP by
various agencies, but were not accepted into the program\(^8\). Upon taking the Domestic Violence Evaluation, these individuals were determined to be unsuitable for 3RDVP participation. Either these individuals did not present a history of violence, or the evaluation determined that they were in need of other treatment (e.g., mental health counseling, alcohol/drug treatment, anger management treatment, couples counseling, individual counseling) before participating in the 3RDVP\(^9\).

Out of the 33 participants who completed the program, all of them completed the program within 36 weeks, meaning none of them needed to participate in the program for the full 52 weeks. Due to this, I was unable to test my fifth hypothesis (*the longer the participant remains in the program, the lower the number of crimes the participant will commit after participating in the program*). Those who did not complete the program dropped out within 29 weeks, with an average attendance of 5.2 weeks. Six program participants never showed up to the program after being accepted and were summarily dismissed, while one individual attended the program for 29 weeks. In total, 25 individuals who did not complete the program remained in the program between 0 and 10 weeks, ten individuals remained in the program between 11 and 19 weeks, and three individuals remained in the program between 21 and 29 weeks. It was unknown how many weeks one of the individuals attended the program before being dismissed.

**Quasi-Process Evaluation**

In order to determine if the 3RDVP was being conducted in the way in which it is supposed to be conducted so as to explore any programmatic effect that may impact the

---

\(^8\) The demographic information of these individuals was not available. Due to not being accepted into the program, such information was not collected on these individuals. The reason as to why these individuals were referred to the program varied from domestic violence charges, assault charges, and family court recommendations. In fact, a majority of the individuals were referred by the child services agency as a recommendation to regaining custody of their children.

\(^9\) According to the 3R Domestic Violence Program records, of the individuals who have participated in the program, none of them partook in the program after originally being referred to enroll in other treatment programs.
dependent variables, a quasi-process evaluation was conducted. A quasi-process evaluation was conducted instead of an actual process evaluation because a very short amount of time (two sessions) was spent on conducting such an evaluation. In fact, the purpose of this research focused on the data collected more than it did the process evaluation. Therefore, instead of conducting a process evaluation, a quasi-process evaluation was conducted in order to obtain background information on the 3RDVP, to determine if the results of this study were affected by the implementation of the program.

In order to conduct the quasi-process evaluation, I sat in on two weeks of classes, for each of the two group sessions. On Tuesday October 1, 2013, I sat in on the first and second group sessions. During these sessions, the groups were in the process of finishing up information relating to the topic of “trust,” in terms of how trust is built from infancy and what factors cause trust issues to occur. The program coordinator was accurately following the program’s curriculum, covering the appropriate information relating to the topic and allowing the group members to engage in the required activities.

Throughout all group sessions, I observed what was occurring and did not participate. While sitting in on both group sessions for the first time, the group coordinator introduced me to the groups and explained that I would be observing the groups in order to obtain information for my thesis. My presence in the room did not impact the group members’ participation throughout their session: after each session the coordinator informed me that the group members acted as they always did, participating normally, thus demonstrating how my presence did not impact the way in which the group members acted during each of the sessions.

10 Only one coordinator was present during the October 1, 2013 group sessions. The second group coordinator, who is a university Psychology professor, had to miss the group session due to a conflict with work.
In comparing the first group with the second group, both groups were provided the same information in the same manner, and were equally asked to participate in the activities provided in the curriculum. The coordinator interacted in the same way with members from both groups. Before starting class, the coordinator would joke around and interact in a positive manner with the group members. If one of the group members forgot to do his homework, or had not paid his dues, the coordinator would address this issue in a serious manner. In providing information during class, the coordinator used both verbal and written communication (e.g., white board notes), allowing for the group members in both sessions to learn the information via various means. In both sessions, if any member had a question, the coordinator took the time to answer his question, providing examples to allow for a better understanding.

On Tuesday October 8, 2013, I sat in on the first and second group sessions for a second time. During the group sessions, which both of the group coordinators attended, one individual from each group gave their “disclosure”. During their disclosures, the individuals provide the information that lead up to their arrest, which ultimately lead to their participation in the 3RDVP. During their presentation, the group coordinators would ask the individual giving their disclosure specific questions, asking the individual to go into detail about what had occurred. Other group members would ask questions of the individual or provide comments, as well. In comparing how the disclosure was conducted to the directions for how to conduct a disclosure in the curriculum, it was clear that the coordinators appropriately conducted the disclosures.

The group coordinators treated the individuals from both sessions who gave their disclosures equally. They asked each individual specific questions in order to get them to provide a detailed account of the actions that had occurred. When the individuals made progress (i.e., they admitted to and took responsibility for their abusive actions), the group coordinators
would give them praise, and explain to them how they were proud of the improvement they had made, as well as explain how they have seen improvement. Due to this, it was determined that the group coordinators treated every group member equally, presented the information to both sessions in the same manner, and had the same positive attitude throughout both sessions. For all intents and purposes, based on four observations at two different time points and two different groups, it appears that the 3RDVP is functioning as designed.

**Initial Bivariate Analyses**

Bivariate statistics such as *t*-test, Pearson’s *r*, *Chi-squared*, and *ANOVA* were conducted for hypotheses one, two, three, and four, as appropriate. The *t*-test analyses were conducted for equations which contained continuous independent variables and categorical dependent variables and Pearson’s *r* was used for equations that contained continuous independent variables and dependent variables. *Chi-squared* (*X^2*) was used for equations that contained categorical independent variables and dependent variables and *ANOVA* was used for equations which contained continuous independent variables and categorical dependent variables that contained more than two categories. Which statistics that were used for each of the variables are summarized in Table 6.

---

11 Pearson’s *r*, *t*, and *ANOVA* values are affected by the small population size, while the *Chi-squared* equations are more robust. Due to the small population size, the results of the *r*, *t*, and *ANOVA* models must be interpreted with caution because of the likelihood of there being β error. Therefore I wanted to be extra conservative because of the low sample size, and that hypothetically the 3RDVP program can be considered a “sample” of the larger population of cognitive behavioral therapy domestic violence programs. However, Type II errors may not be too large of a concern because I am using an actual population. To this end, a larger *p*-value (*α = 0.10*) was chosen to avoid Type II error.
Table 6

*Bivariate Statistic Used for Each Variable*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Hypothesis 1 (Categorical)</th>
<th>Hypothesis 2 (Continuous)</th>
<th>Hypothesis 3 (Categorical)</th>
<th>Hypothesis 4 (Continuous)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (Continuous)</td>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level (Categorical)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$X^2$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>$X^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status (Categorical)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$X^2$</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>$X^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Annual Income (Categorical)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$X^2$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>$X^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status (Categorical)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$X^2$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>$X^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children in Home (Continuous)</td>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Arrests (Continuous)</td>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Felony Convictions (Continuous)</td>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Misdemeanor Convictions (Continuous)</td>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Program (Categorical)</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Crimes Committed (Continuous)</td>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The dependent variable for hypothesis one is “participated in DV crime”, “participated in non-DV crime” for hypothesis two, “weeks to recidivate DV crime” for hypothesis three, and “weeks to recidivate non-DV crime” for hypothesis four.
The bivariate statistics for hypothesis one (*completion of the 3RDVP reduces an offender’s likelihood of engaging in domestic violence again*) that were conducted were *t*-tests and *chi-squared*. These statistics are presented in Table 7. The *t*-test value for “age” is \( t_{(71)} = 33.430 \) \((p = 0.000)\), \( t_{(71)} = 7.629 \) \((p = 0.000)\) for “number of children in home”, \( t_{(61)} = 10.064 \) \((p = 0.000)\) for “number of arrests”, and \( t_{(58)} = 3.751 \) \((p = 0.000)\) for “number of felony arrests”.

“Number of misdemeanor arrests” has a *t*-test value of \( t_{(57)} = 5.983 \) \((p = 0.000)\), “weeks to recidivate DV crime” has a *t*-test value of \( t_{(4)} = 2.694 \) \((p = 0.054)\), and “number of crimes committed” has a *t*-test value of \( t_{(63)} = 3.085 \) \((p = 0.003)\). Each of these variables are statistically significant to the dependent variable “completed program” in relation to DV crime, at \( p < 0.10 \).

In relation to the *chi-squared* analyses, the variables “employment status” and “individual annual income” were statistically significant with the dependent variable “completed program” in relation to DV crime. Each of these variables has *p*-values that fell below \( p < 0.10 \).

“Employment status” has a *chi-squared* value of 5.431 \((p = 0.020)\), and “individual annual income” has a *chi-squared* value of 8.133 \((p = 0.043)\). In comparing the statistical *p*-values of these three variables, “employment status” is the least likely to have Type I error with “completed program” in relation to DV crime, because it has the lowest *p*-value. The variables “education level”, “marital status”, and “participation in DV crime” are not statistically significant with the dependent variable “completed program” in relation to DV crime, because their *p*-values exceed that of \( p < 0.10 \). “Education level” has a *chi-squared* value of 7.944 \((p = 0.338)\), “marital status” has a *chi-squared* value of 3.734 \((p = 0.443)\), and “participation in DV crime” has a *chi-squared* value of 0.251 \((p = 0.616)\).

It was therefore found for hypothesis one that there is no difference between the completion and non-completion groups in relation to “participation in DV crime”. With a *chi-
squared value of 0.251 ($p = 0.616$), having a non-significant $p$-value, whether an individual completes the 3RDVP or not does not impact the likelihood of the individual engaging in domestic violence crime after program participation. Therefore, hypothesis one is not supported by these bivariate statistics.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 1: Domestic Violence Crime Bivariate Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Annual Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children in Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Arrests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in DV Crime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bivariate statistics for hypothesis two (those who fail the program will commit another domestic violence crime sooner compared to those who completed the program, yet recidivated) that were conducted were $t$-test, Pearson’s $r$, and ANOVA. These statistics are demonstrated in Table 8. “Employment status” has a $t$-test value of $t_{(70)} = 9.236$ ($p = 0.000$), and “completed program” has a $t$-test value of $t_{(71)} = 7.751$ ($p = 0.000$). Due to this, “employment status” and “completed program” are the least likely to have Type I error with the dependent variable “weeks to recidivate DV crime”, because their $p$-values fall below $p < 0.10$. 
In relation to Pearson’s $r$, “age”, “number of arrests”, and “number of felony convictions”, have direct but weak correlations with the dependent variable “weeks to recidivate DV crime”. These variables have weak correlations because their $r$-values fall between 0.2 and 0.4, which signifies a weak relationship. “Number of children in home”, “number of misdemeanor convictions”, and “number of crimes committed” have very strong correlations with “weeks to recidivate DV crime”, with “number of misdemeanor convictions” and “number of crimes committed” having direct relationships with “weeks to recidivate DV crime”, and “number of children in home” having an indirect relationship with “weeks to recidivate DV crime”. These variables have very strong correlations because their $r$-values fall between 0.8 and 1.0, which signifies a very strong relationship (Champion & Hartley, 2010; Frankfort-Nachmias & Leon-Guerrero, 2011). “Age” has a correlation of $r = 0.301$ ($p = 0.622$), “number of children in home” has a correlation of $r = -0.906$ ($p = 0.034$), “number of arrests” has a correlation of $r = 0.375$ ($p = 0.534$), and “number of felony convictions” has a correlation of $r = 0.203$ ($p = 0.743$). “Number of misdemeanor convictions” has a correlation of $r = 0.868$ ($p = 0.056$), and “number of crimes committed” has a correlation of $r = 0.868$ ($p = 0.057$). The variable with the weakest correlation is “number of felony convictions” with a correlation of $r = 0.203$ ($p = 0.743$), while “number of children in home” has the strongest correlation with a correlation of $r = -0.906$ ($p = 0.034$).

According to ANOVA, “marital status”, “education level”, and “individual annual income” are most likely to have Type I error. The $p$-values of these variables exceed that of $p < 0.10$, thus causing them to most likely have Type I error. The ANOVA value for “marital status” is $F_{(2,2)} = 0.486$ ($p = 0.673$), “education level” has an ANOVA value of $F_{(1,3)} = 1.340$ ($p = 0.331$), and “individual annual income” has an ANOVA value of $F_{(1,3)} = 0.129$ ($p = 0.743$).
It was found for hypothesis two that program completion did not have an impact on the weeks it took to recidivate DV crime. It is demonstrated by the chi-squared value of 0.747 ($p = 0.147$), with a non-significant $p$-value, that there was no difference between the completed group and the non-completed group in relation to the number of weeks it took 3RDVP participants to recidivate domestic violence crime after participating in the program. Therefore, hypothesis two is not supported by these bivariate statistics.

Table 8

| Hypothesis 2: Weeks to Recidivate Domestic Violence Crime Bivariate Statistics |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------------------|----------|--------|
| Item                        | $t$-test | Pearson’s $r$ | ANOVA   | $p$-value |
| Age                         | --      | 0.301             | --       | 0.622   |
| Education Level             | --      | --                | 1.340    | 0.331   |
| Employment Status           | 9.236   | --                | --       | 0.000   |
| Individual Annual Income    | --      | --                | 0.129    | 0.743   |
| Marital Status              | --      | --                | 0.486    | 0.673   |
| Number of Children in Home  | --      | -0.906            | --       | 0.034   |
| Number of Arrests           | --      | 0.375             | --       | 0.534   |
| Weeks to Recidivate DV Crime| --      | 0.747             | --       | 0.147   |

The bivariate statistics for hypothesis three (completion of the 3RDVP reduces an offender’s likelihood of engaging in non-domestic violence crime) that were conducted were $t$-test and chi-squared. These statistics are demonstrated in Table 9. “Age” has a $t$-test value of $t_{(71)} = 33.430$ ($p = 0.000$), “number of children in home” has a $t$-test value of $t_{(71)} = 7.629$ ($p = 0.000$), “number of arrests” has a $t$-test value of $t_{(61)} = 10.064$ ($p = 0.000$), “number of felony
convictions” has a $t$-test value of $t_{(58)} = 3.751 (p = 0.000)$, and “number of misdemeanor convictions” has a $t$-test value of $t_{(57)} = 5.983 (p = 0.000)$. The $t$-test value for “weeks to recidivate non-DV crime” is $t_{(12)} = 4.357 (p = 0.001)$, and the $t$-test value for “number of crimes committed” is $t_{(63)} = 3.085 (p = 0.003)$. Due to all of these variables having $p$-values that fall below the $p$-value of $p < 0.10$, each of these variables are least likely to have Type I error with the dependent variable “completed program” in relation to non-DV crime.

As with the dependent variable “completed program” in relation to DV crime, the variables “employment status” and “individual annual income” were the least likely to have Type I error with the dependent variable “completed program” in relation to non-DV crime. These variables were found to be the least likely to have Type I error because their $p$-values were below $p < 0.10$, while the variables “education level” and “marital status”, as with the dependent variable “completed program” in relation to DV crime, have $p$-values that exceed the $p$-value of $p < 0.10$, thus causing them to be the most likely to have Type I error with the dependent variable “completed program” in relation to non-DV crime, as well. Also, “participation in non-DV crime” was found to lack Type I error with the dependent variable “completed program” in relation to non-DV crime. “Employment status” has a chi-squared value of 5.431 ($p = 0.020$), and “individual annual income” has a chi-squared value of 8.133 ($p = 0.043$). “Education level” has a chi-squared value of 7.944 ($p = 0.338$), “marital status” has a chi-squared value of 3.734 ($p = 0.443$), and “participation in non-DV crime” has a chi-squared value of 1.495 ($p = 0.221$).

It was found for hypothesis three that program completion did not have an impact on participation in a non-DV crime. Having a chi-squared value of 1.495 ($p = 0.221$), with a non-significant $p$-value, demonstrates that there is no difference between the completed group and the non-completed group in relation to engagement in non-DV crime after program participation.
Thus, completion of the 3RDVP did not impact the likelihood of an individual engaging in non-
domestic violence crime after program participation. Therefore, hypothesis three is not
supported by these bivariate statistics.

Table 9

*Hypothesis 3: Non-Domestic Violence Crime Bivariate Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>33.430</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7.944</td>
<td>0.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.431</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Annual Income</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.133</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.734</td>
<td>0.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children in Home</td>
<td>7.629</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Arrests</td>
<td>10.064</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Non-DV crime</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.495</td>
<td>0.221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bivariate statistics for hypothesis four (*those who fail the program will commit
another non-domestic violence crime sooner compared to those who completed the program, yet
recidivated*) were *t*-test, Pearson’s *r*, and *ANOVA*. These statistics are demonstrated in Table 10.

As with hypothesis two, “employment status” has a *t*-test value of *t*(70) = 9.236 (*p* = 0.000), and
“completed program” has a *t*-test value of *t*(71) = 7.751 (*p* = 0.000). In having *p*-values that are
less than *p* < 0.10, as with hypothesis two, “employment status” and “completed program” have
statistical significance to the dependent variable “weeks to recidivate non-DV crime”.
In relation to Pearson’s $r$, “number of arrests”, “number of felony convictions”, and “number of misdemeanor convictions” have direct relationships with the dependent variable “weeks to recidivate non-DV crime”, while “age”, “number of children in home”, and “number of crimes committed” have an indirect relationship. Due to having $r$-values that fall between 0.0 and 0.2, “age”, “number of children in home”, “number of felony convictions”, and “number of misdemeanor convictions” have weak or non-existing relationships with “weeks to commit non-DV crime”. With having $r$-values that fall between 0.2 and 0.4, “number of arrests” and “number of crimes committed” have a weak relationship with “weeks to recidivate non-DV crime”. “Age” has a correlation of $r = -0.006 (p = 0.984)$, “number of children in home” has a correlation of $r = -0.105 (p = 0.733)$, “number of arrests” has a correlation of $r = 0.335 (p = 0.344)$, and “number of felony convictions” has a correlation of $r = 0.163 (p = 0.653)$. “Number of misdemeanor convictions” has a correlation of $r = 0.126 (p = 0.728)$, and “number of crimes committed” has a correlation of $r = -0.349 (p = 0.243)$.

According to ANOVA, “education level”, “individual annual income”, and “marital status” are not statistically significant to the dependent variable “weeks to recidivate non-DV crime”. These three variables are not statistically significant because their $p$-values exceed $p < 0.10$. The ANOVA value for “education level” is $F_{(2,9)} = 0.104 (p = 0.902)$, “individual annual income” has an ANOVA value of $F_{(1,11)} = 0.768 (p = 0.400)$, and “marital status” has an ANOVA value of $F_{(3,9)} = 0.645 (p = 0.606)$.

It was found for hypothesis four that program completion did not have an impact on the number of weeks it took 3RDVP participants to engage in non-DV crime. Having a chi-squared value of -0.133 ($p = 0.665$), with a non-significant $p$-value demonstrates that there was no difference between the completed group and the non-completed group in relation to how long it
took individuals within the groups to engage in non-domestic violence crime after participating in the 3RDVP. Therefore, hypothesis four is not supported by these bivariate statistics.

Table 10

*Hypothesis 4: Weeks to Recidivate Non-Domestic Violence Crime Bivariate Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>Pearson’s r</th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>9.236</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Annual Income</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children in Home</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Arrests</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks to Recidivate Non-DV Crime</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completion Group vs. Non-Completion Group Differences

While there is no statistically significant difference in outcome between the two groups, it is worthwhile to consider if there are any differences whatsoever between the completion group and the non-completion group. When comparing the frequencies of those who completed the 3RDVP to those who did not complete the 3RDVP, as demonstrated in Table 11, it was found that certain frequencies were similar, while others differed. In relation to education level, 30 out of 33 individuals who completed the program had at least a high school diploma, while 27 out of 39 individuals who did not complete the program had at least a high school diploma. The education level of one of the individuals who completed the program and four of the individuals
who did not complete the program is unknown. While there are differences between the two groups in relation to the education level of the program participations, “education level” was not found to statistically influence the likelihood of participants completing the program \((p = 0.338)\). Therefore, the education level of the participants, while differing between the two groups, was not statistically significant.

In relation to an individual’s employment status, less than half (10 out of 33) of the individuals who completed the program were unemployed before program participation, while over half (22 out of 39) of the individuals who did not complete the program were unemployed before program participation. This means that more than half (20 out of 33) of the individuals who completed the program were employed before program participation, while less than half (16 out of 39) of the individuals who did not complete the program were employed before program participation. The employment status of three of the individuals who completed the program and one individual who did not complete the program are unknown. The differences in employment status between the two groups were found to be statistically significant \((p = 0.020)\), causing “employment status” to influence to a statistically significant degree, whether or not program participants successfully completed the program. Therefore, it is suggested that individuals with employment are less likely to recidivate than individuals who are unemployed, thus supporting Hirschi’s social bond theory\(^{12}\).

In relation to individual annual income, 27 out of 33 individuals who completed the program have an individual annual income below $20,000, while 34 out of 39 individuals who did not complete the program have an individual annual income below $20,000. Out of 33 individuals who did complete the program, 17 fall below the poverty level, while 30 out of 39

---

\(^{12}\) Social bond theory, as well as the support provided by these results, will be discussed in-depth in the *Theoretical Implications* section.
individuals who did not complete the program fall below the poverty level. The individual annual income of one individual who did complete the program is unknown, while it is unknown for two of the individuals who did not complete the program. Due to the statistical significance of an individual’s annual income ($p = 0.043$) in relation to program completion, the differences between the completion and non-completion group in relation to “individual annual income”, are significant. Therefore, it is suggested that individuals above the poverty line (who obtain a higher income), as less likely to recidivate than individuals who fall below the poverty line, thus supporting Agnew’s general strain theory$^{13}$.

The marital status of the two groups, which was known for every individual within the two groups, was equivalent yet differentiated as well. Three out of 33 individuals who completed the program were single, while two out of 39 individuals who did not complete the program were single. For individuals who completed the program, eight out of 33 were dating, while 17 out of 39 individuals who did not complete the program were dating. One out of 33 individuals who completed the program was engaged, while two out of 39 individuals who did not complete the program were engaged. In relation to the marital status of “married”, 15 out of 33 individuals who completed the program were married, and 14 out of 39 individuals who did not complete the program were married. Lastly, out of 33 individuals who completed the program, six were divorced/separated, and four out of 39 individuals who did not complete the program were divorced/separated. This means that 18 out of 33 individuals who completed the program were not married, while 25 out of 39 individuals who did not complete the program were not married. While there are slight differences between the two groups in relation to program participants’ marital status, “marital status” was not found to statistically influence the

$^{13}$ General strain theory, as well as the support provided by these results, will be discussed in-depth in the Theoretical Implications section.
likelihood of participants completing the program \((p = 0.443)\). Therefore, the marital status of the participants was not statistically significant.

The average number of children in the home, the average number of arrests, and the average number of felony convictions were very similar between the two groups, with the average number of misdemeanor convictions having the most differentiation. For those who completed the program, the average number of children per household is 1.52, which is 0.06 higher than the average for those who did not complete the program \((\bar{X} = 1.46)\). The average number of arrests for those who completed the program \((\bar{X} = 5.40)\) is slightly lower than the average number of arrests for those who did not complete the program \((\bar{X} = 5.47)\). The average number of felony convictions differentiates from the two groups by 0.02, with the individuals who completed the program having a slightly higher average of 0.50 felony convictions, while the average for those who did not complete the program was 0.48 felony convictions. Although the individuals who completed the program had a slightly higher felony conviction average than the individuals who did not complete the program, their misdemeanor conviction average was 0.16 lower than the misdemeanor conviction average for those who did complete the program. Those who did not complete the program had a misdemeanor conviction average of 4.20, while those who completed the program had an average of 4.04 misdemeanor convictions.

With the “average number of children in home”, “average number of arrests”, “average number of felony convictions”, and “average number of misdemeanor convictions”, being very similar between the completion and non-completion group, it can be stated that these variables do not influence the likelihood of an individual completing the program. The lack of statistical significance for these variables supports this statement. Due to having \(p\)-values that are higher than \(p < 0.10\), the variables “number of children in home” \((p = 0.440)\), “number of arrests” \((p =\)
0.595), “number of felony convictions” ($p = 0.845$), and “number of misdemeanor convictions” ($p = 0.421$), do not influence the likelihood of an individual completing the program.

Table 11

*Completed 3RDVP Versus did not Complete 3RDVP*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Categories</th>
<th>Completed (33)</th>
<th>Failed (39)</th>
<th>$X^2$ (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modal Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school/GED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated high school/GED</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(0.338)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than high school/GED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal Individual Annual Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $20,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.043)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not married</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(0.443)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Children in Home</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>5.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Arrests</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>14.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.595)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Felony Convictions</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.845)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Misdemeanor Convictions</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>12.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.421)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 72*

**Supplemental Analysis**

Out of the potential 68 respondents that could be contacted from telephone interviews, eight (11.1 percent) willingly agreed to take part in the survey. Of the eight responses, two belonged to the same individual: one response for each time the individual participated in the
3RDVP\textsuperscript{14}. For the individuals who responded to the telephone interviews as demonstrated in Table 12, five successfully completed the 3RDVP while three failed the program. In comparing the telephone respondents’ demographic characteristics before program participation to their demographic characteristics after program participation, four were employed before participating in the program, while six were employed after participating in the program. The household income increased for two of the respondents ($80,000 to $120,000 and no income to $18,500), while remaining the same for the other six respondents. The marital status of six of the participants changed from before their participation in the program to after their participation in the program, while it remained the same for two of the respondents. The number of children in the household did not change for four of the respondents from before to after program participation, while the number of children in the household decreased for three of the respondents, and increased for one of the respondents\textsuperscript{15}.

This analysis suggests that individuals who completed the program were more likely to obtain and maintain employment after completing the program, and that individuals who failed the program were more likely to lose relationships with their former intimate partners and spouses. Also, it is suggested that individuals who completed the program were less likely to recidivate than individuals who did not complete the program, due to individuals who completed the program learning how to control their anger, identify their triggers for aggression, and use calming techniques, compared to the individuals who failed the program and were therefore unable to learn such triggers and techniques.

\textsuperscript{14} Of the two participants who participated in the program twice, their survey responses did not differ between each program enrollment.

\textsuperscript{15} Due to the low response rate, these data were not used for the analyses. However, the qualitative answers from the telephone surveys will be integrated in the discussion section.
Table 12

*Telephone Interviews*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Categories</th>
<th>Completed (5)</th>
<th>Failed (3)</th>
<th>$X^2$ (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modal Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school/GED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated high school/GED</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.532)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than high school/GED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modal Employment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.585)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modal Household Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $40,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $40,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.386)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modal Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not married</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.096)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modal Number of Children in Home</strong></td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.564)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 8*
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

This chapter provides a discussion of the limitations of this study. A discussion of the results as they pertain to each of the hypotheses is provided as well, followed by a discussion of the telephone surveys. Theoretical and policy implications pertaining to the research are provided, along with a discussion of ideas for future research.

Limitations

As discussed in Chapters 3 and 4, there were three primary potential limitations of the study, for each of which I attempted to mitigate. These limitations included the use of data from agency records, conducting a quasi-experiment, and the population size being small. Other limitations, which could not be mitigated for, were selection bias and the potential for 3RDVP participants to participate in other treatment programs while enrolled in the 3RDVP. The impact these limitations had on the study’s results will also be discussed.

Use of Data from Agency Records

Using data from agency records limited the data that could be collected in relation to an individual’s arrest history. For example, access was granted to the Allegany County arrest records. Thus, data on 3RDVP participants who were arrested outside of Allegany County after program participation is unknown for this study. One way in which this limitation was mitigated was by contacting participants via telephone and surveying them about their demographic characteristics as well as their criminal activity after program participation. Due to the low response rate for telephone interviews, as well as the potential of participants answering questions untruthfully, data collection through the use of agency records remains a limitation of this study.
Another issue with using data from agency records is the potential inaccuracy of the data collected as well as the different ways in which the data could have been recorded. For example, not all law enforcement officers enter data into a system in the same way: one officer could enter information in a detailed manner, while another could enter data in a brief, non-detailed manner. If this occurs, data that could be obtained on one individual might not be able to be obtained on another individual, simply because data for each individual was entered by different law enforcement officers. Another limitation of using agency data is that due to the increase in technological advances, over the past few years, agencies in the criminal justice system have been moving from paper files to electronic files. With this shift in data collection, individuals need to be trained on how to use the new technology. Individuals who are improperly trained, or not trained at all, can inaccurately enter data pertaining to individuals; data which could invalidate the results of the study. Not only could the lack of technological education influence data collection, but lost paper files could as well. If certain individuals’ information was originally entered into electronic files, or if their information was transferred from paper files to electronic files, than information pertaining to these individuals can all be obtained through electronic means. However, information that has yet to be transferred from paper files to electronic files can be accidentally destroyed by the agency, lost among the storage, or unable to be accessed by the researcher, causing information useful to the study to be unable to be obtained.

Not only could different law enforcement officers enter data in a different way, but this also introduces the possibility of human error. With human error, information could be entered wrong or skipped over and left out. If this occurs, information obtained through agency records could be missing information or obtain inaccurate information. A lack of information could lead
to insufficient data, which could in turn lead to unreliable results, while inaccurate data could lead to unreliable results as well.

**Small Population Size**

The small population size not only impacted the analyses that could be conducted, but it could have potentially limited the generalizability of the results as well. Due to the small population size, regression equations were unable to be carried out. As a result, a supplemental analysis was introduced in the results chapter. Without the use of regression, the effects of the control variables on the dependent variables were unable to be removed, causing for an inability to isolate the effect of the independent variables themselves on the dependent variables. This in turn calls into question the significance or lack of significance between the variables.

In relation to generalizability, it was determined that the 3RDVP population was representative of the population of Allegany County. Therefore, the results of this study can be generalized to counties that are statistically similar to that of Allegany County. However, due to the small population size, the results cannot be generalizable to counties that are statistically different from that of Allegany County.

**Selection Bias**

Due to the way in which individuals were accepted into or rejected from the program upon referral to the program, selection bias can occur. While selecting participants based on their likelihood of success in the program is good program practice, it is not good for the methodology of this research, due to its likelihood of introducing selection bias. In determining which individuals would be best suited for the program, the individuals that are accepted into the program are those whom are most likely to benefit from participating in the program. Thus, selection bias occurs because instead of accepting all referred individuals into the program, only
the individuals who are deemed to benefit from program participation are accepted into the program. Consequently, accepting individuals who are best suited for the program increases the likelihood that individuals will successfully complete the program, while decreasing the likelihood of such individuals recidivating after program participation.

In observing the frequency of individuals who completed the program versus those who failed the program, it calls into question whether selection bias matters in this study. For example, only 33 individuals completed the program, while 39 individuals failed the program. With the program coordinators only accepting individuals who were more likely to benefit from program participation, the likelihood of completing the program should have increased. Also, the likelihood of recidivating after participating in the program should have decreased due to the program only accepting individuals who would benefit from program participation. However, it was found that more individuals failed the program than completed the program, and it was suggested that individuals who did complete the program and recidivated, recidivated on average, sooner than individuals who failed the program and recidivated. Due to this, it is uncertain as to whether selection bias was a limitation of this study.

**Hypotheses**

The results of the study did not support any of the hypotheses. Hypothesis one (completion of the 3RDVP reduces an offender’s likelihood of engaging in domestic violence again), hypothesis two (those who fail the program will commit another domestic violence crime sooner compared to those who completed the program, yet recidivated), hypothesis three (completion of the 3RDVP reduces an offender’s likelihood of engaging in non-domestic violence crime), and hypothesis four (those who fail the program will commit another non-domestic violence crime sooner compared to those who completed the program, yet recidivated), did not
receive support from the findings of the study. Lastly, hypothesis five (*the longer the participant remains in the program, the lower the number of crimes the participant will commit after participating in the program*) was unable to be tested due to all of the individuals who completed the program, completing the program within the 36 week time frame; no one remained in the program for the full 52 weeks. This section will reiterate the results of the study in regards to each of the hypotheses.

**Hypothesis One**

The bivariate statistics revealed that an individual’s age, employment status, individual annual income, the number of children in the home, their criminal history, and the severity of their criminal history, will impact their likelihood of completing the 3RDVP as well as the likelihood of the individual recidivating domestic violence crime. For example, individuals who were employed were more likely to complete the program and less likely to recidivate domestic violence crime than individuals who were unemployed. However, while the bivariate statistics demonstrates which factors increased the likelihood of 3RDVP participants engaging in domestic violence crime after program participation, the statistics did not find a difference between the completion group and the non-completion group in relation to recidivating domestic violence crime. It was determined that of the 33 individuals who completed the program, only two recidivated domestic violence crime, while three of the 39 individuals who did not complete the program recidivated domestic violence crime. Thus, 6.1 percent of individuals who completed the program recidivated domestic violence crime, while 7.7 percent of individuals who did not complete the program recidivated domestic violence crime. Therefore, the results of the study suggest that individuals who complete the 3RDVP are just as likely to recidivate DV crime as individuals who did not complete the 3RDVP. Thus, hypothesis one (*completion of the 3RDVP...*)
reduces an offender’s likelihood of engaging in domestic violence again) is not supported by the results of the study.

A lack of support for hypothesis one in relation to the quantitative data, goes against the previous research. Previous research has found participation in domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs, specifically programs based on cognitive behavioral therapy, to significantly reduce the likelihood of individuals recidivating domestic violence crime (Adams & Cayouette, 2002; Babcock, Green, & Robie, 2002). However, in relation to the qualitative data obtained through the use of telephone interviews, the data was found to support past research. For example, individuals who completed the program reported finding the 3RDVP to be helpful, that the information provided to them through the 3RDVP was useful, and that they did learn something from participating in the 3RDVP. In fact, of the individuals who completed the program, they reported that participation in the program helped them to identify their anger triggers as well as to control their anger, which is a goal of cognitive behavioral therapy (Babcock, Green, & Robie, 2002; Saunders, 2008; Simmons & Griffiths, 2009; Whitfield & Davidson, 2007). Therefore, the quantitative data lacks support for previous research in relation to hypothesis one, while the qualitative data provides support for previous research.

Hypothesis Two

In relation to the bivariate statistics, it was determined that whether an individual completed the 3RDVP, the number of children in the home, their employment status, and the severity of their criminal history, impacted how long it would take them to recidivate a domestic violence crime. For example, if an individual completed the 3RDVP, it would take him longer to recidivate a domestic violence crime than an individual who did not complete the 3RDVP. While the bivariate statistics demonstrate which factors affect the length of time until program
participants recidivate domestic violence, the statistics did not find a different between the completion group and the non-completion group in relation to the number of weeks it took 3RDVP participants to recidivate domestic violence crime after program participation. It was determined that the average number of weeks it took individuals who completed the program to recidivate domestic violence crime was two weeks more than the average number of weeks it took individuals who did not complete the program to recidivate domestic violence crime. The average number of weeks it took individuals who completed the program to recidivate domestic violence crime was 77 weeks, while it took individuals who did not complete the program an average of 75 weeks to recidivate domestic violence crime. Thus, it is suggested that individuals who did not complete the 3RDVP recidivated domestic violence crime at a quicker rate than individuals who did complete the 3RDVP. Therefore, the results of the study vary on support for hypothesis two (those who fail the program will commit another domestic violence crime sooner compared to those who completed the program, yet recidivated).

With previous research demonstrating the decreased likelihood of recidivism of domestic violence crime among program participants who successfully completed the program, it can be suggested that individuals who successfully complete the program and do recidivate, will take longer to recidivate than individuals who did not complete the program. As with hypothesis one, the quantitative data does not support such suggestion. However, the qualitative data does not provide any significant information in relation to hypothesis two. Therefore, this research demonstrates a lack of support in relation to the suggestion that individuals who complete the 3RDVP yet recidivate will take longer to recidivate than individuals who did not complete the program.
Hypothesis Three

The bivariate statistics for hypothesis three revealed that an individual’s age, employment status, individual annual income, the number of children in the home, their criminal history, and the severity of their criminal history are factors that impact the likelihood of an individual completing the program as well as the likelihood of the individual committing non-domestic violence crime after program participation. For example, the higher the individual’s annual income, the more likely they are to complete the program and the less likely they are to engage in non-domestic violence crime than individuals with lower individual annual incomes.

However, while the bivariate statistics demonstrates which factors increased the likelihood of 3RDVP participants engaging in non-domestic violence crime after program participation, the statistics did not find a difference between the completion group and the non-completion group in relation to engaging in non-domestic violence crime. It was determined that of the 33 individuals who completed the program, six engaged in non-domestic violence crime, while ten of the 39 individuals who did not complete the program engaged in non-domestic violence crime after program participation. Accordingly, 18.1 percent of individuals who completed the program engaged in non-domestic violence crime, while 25.6 percent of individuals who did not complete the program engaged in non-domestic violence crime. Therefore, the results of the study suggest that individuals who complete the 3RDVP are just as likely to engage in non-domestic violence crime as individuals who did not complete the 3RDVP. Thus, hypotheses three (completion of the 3RDVP reduces an offender’s likelihood of engaging in non-domestic violence crime) is not supported by the results of the study.

While past research on domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs in relation to non-domestic violence crime recidivism has not been conducted, such research has been
conducted on sex offenders. This research found that sex offenders who participate in a cognitive behavioral-based treatment program were less likely to commit non-sexual crimes than sex offenders who did not participate in such a treatment program (Marques et al., 1994). In fact, research found that sex offenders who recidivated were more likely to commit non-sexual crimes than sexual crimes (Weinrott & Saylor, 1991), further strengthening the research that cognitive behavioral-based treatment programs are affective at reducing the likelihood of sex offenders recidivating non-sexual crimes. In relation to domestic violence perpetrators, the quantitative data does not support such research, whereas the qualitative data, as discussed previously, does support such findings due to the usefulness and helpfulness of 3RDVP participation and the information provided through such participation.

**Hypothesis Four**

In relation to the bivariate statistics, it was determined whether or not an individual completed the 3RDVP as well as the individual’s employment status, impacted how long it would take the individual to engage in non-domestic violence crime after program participation. For example, if an individual did not complete the program, it took them longer to engage in non-domestic violence crime than an individual who did complete the program. However, while the bivariate statistics demonstrate which factors affect the length of time until program participants engage in non-domestic violence crime, the statistics did not a difference between the completion group and the non-completion group in relation to the number of weeks it took 3RDVP participants to engage in non-domestic violence crime after program participation. It was determined that the average number of weeks it took individuals who completed the program to engage in non-domestic violence crime after program participation was 72.5 weeks. This average was 17.2 weeks shorter than the average time it took individuals who did not
complete the program to engage in non-domestic violence crime (89.7 weeks). Therefore, it appears as though it took individuals who completed the 3RDVP a shorter amount of time to engage in non-domestic violence crime than individuals who did not complete the 3RDVP.

However, due to the non-existing relationship between program completion and weeks to engage in non-domestic violence crime, as demonstrated by the bivariate statistics, hypothesis four (those who fail the program will commit another non-domestic violence crime sooner compared to those who completed the program, yet recidivated) is not supported by the results of the study.

While there is no previous research pertaining to the length before recidivism for individuals who participate in domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs, the quantitative data demonstrates that individuals who do recidivate non-domestic violence crimes take longer to recidivate such crimes than individuals who recidivate domestic violence crimes. This demonstrates an increase in the length of time before recidivism occurs among individuals who recidivate non-domestic violence crime, thus demonstrating the effectiveness of participating in the 3RDVP in relation to hypothesis four. As for the qualitative data, such data did not provide any information in relation to support for hypothesis four.

**Commonalities**

Between the hypotheses, there were variables that were found to be statistically significant for at least two, as well as statistically significant for all four hypotheses. For all four hypotheses, there was one variable that was found to be statistically significant; “employment status”. The $p$-values ranged from $p = 0.000$ for hypotheses two and four, and $p = 0.020$ for hypotheses one and three. Therefore, individuals who were employed were less likely to recidivate domestic violence and non-domestic violence crime than individuals who were unemployed, and individuals who were employed and did recidivate, on average took longer to
recidivate after program participation than individuals who were unemployed and recidivated. These results demonstrate support for Hirschi’s (1969) social bond theory as well as Agnew’s (2006) general strain theory. For example, individuals who are employed have stronger bonds/relationships to the community, and are therefore less likely to commit crime for fear of losing such relationships, therefore demonstrating support for Hirschi’s social bond theory. Also, individuals who are employed are likely to have a higher income than individuals who are unemployed, therefore allowing them to have potentially less strain from finances, which in turn decrease the likelihood of them committing crime, as explained by general strain theory.

For hypotheses one, two, and three, “number of children in home” was found to be statistically significant for each of these three hypotheses. The $p$-values for this variable ranged from $p = 0.000$ for hypotheses one and three to $p = 0.034$ for hypothesis two. Therefore, individuals who had a lesser amount of children in the household were less likely to commit domestic violence and non-domestic violence crime than individuals who had a greater number of children in the home. Also, upon recidivating domestic violence crime, individuals who had a lesser number of children in the home, on average, took longer to recidivate after program participation than individuals who had a greater number of children in the home. Such results support general strain theory as well. For example, as the number of children in the household decreases, the amount of finances needed to support the children decreases, therefore allowing financial strain to potentially be lessened for individuals who have fewer children in the household compared to individuals with an increased number of children in the household.

In relation to hypotheses one and three, these two hypotheses had three variables which were found to be statistically significant for each of these two hypotheses. The statistically significant variables were “age”, “individual annual income”, and “number of arrests”.
Therefore, in relation to “age”, the older an individual, the less likely they were to recidivate domestic violence and non-domestic violence crime. This demonstrates support for the theory that individuals age out of crime. For “individual annual income”, individuals with a lower income were more likely to recidivate domestic violence and non-domestic violence crime than individuals with higher incomes, and in relation to “number of arrests”; individuals with a larger arrest history were more likely to recidivate domestic violence and non-domestic violence crime than individuals with a history of fewer arrests.

The results demonstrated by “individual annual income”, as discussed above, demonstrate support for Agnew’s general strain theory. For example, the higher an individual’s annual income, the potential there is for them to face financial strains, which in turn decreases the likelihood that they will commit crime to offset their financial stresses. Therefore, individuals with lower incomes who are unable to obtain their goals, and are strained due to this, are more likely to commit crime in an attempt to fight against and lessen their strains (Agnew, 1992; Agnew, 2001).

While the quantitative data provides commonalities between the hypotheses, the qualitative data does as well. For example, the telephone interviews provided information for hypotheses one and three, which supported these two hypotheses, while the telephone interviews did not provide information pertaining to hypotheses two and four. Through the use of the telephone interviews, it was determined that individuals who completed the 3RDVP not only found the program to be helpful and the information provided through the program to be useful, but ultimately, individuals who completed the program were less likely to recidivate domestic violence crime as well as non-domestic violence crime, therefore demonstrating support for hypotheses one and three.
Theoretical Implications

While there is no prior research on the effectiveness of the socio-political theory or the Social Change Model in relation to domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs, there is numerous research on the cognitive behavioral theory in relation to domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs. Saunders (2008) stated that majority of the existing domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs are based on cognitive behavioral theory. In fact, several of the domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs that are not based on cognitive behavioral theory incorporate some aspects of it into the programs. With cognitive behavioral theory being an important aspect of domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs, research has been done to determine the effectiveness of its use in such programs. Gondolf (2004) and Saunders (2008) note that not only are cognitive behavioral based treatment approaches the most used form of treatment, but they are the most effective form of treatment as well.

While prior research demonstrates the effectiveness of cognitive behavioral theory based treatment programs, this current study calls into question such effectiveness. With support lacking for each of the testable hypotheses of the study, the results demonstrate the ineffectiveness of the 3RDVP. However, as previously stated in the result section, due to the small population size, multivariate statistics were unable to be conducted. Because of this, the significance and accuracy of the bivariate statistics are called into question. In order to determine if the 3RDVP is in fact ineffective at reducing recidivism rates among its participants in relation to both domestic violence and non-domestic violence crime, further research needs to be conducted. Essentially, a larger population size needs to be obtained before it can be accurately determined that a cognitive behavioral theory based domestic violence perpetrator treatment program is ineffective at reducing crime, specifically domestic violence crime,
especially since previous research provides an overwhelming amount of support for the use of such programs in treating domestic violence perpetrators.

Although the statistical analyses do not demonstrate support for the 3RDVP, a cognitive behavioral-based domestic violence treatment programs, the telephone interviews suggest that this program is effective. As discussed previously, almost all of the individuals who participated in the telephone interview portion of the study, stated that they found the 3RDVP to be helpful, that the information provided in the program was useful, and that they learned something from participating in the program, even if they did not successfully complete the program. In fact, individuals even commented that they found that participating in the 3RDVP helped them learn how to control their anger. Therefore, data obtained through the telephone interviews suggests that domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs based on cognitive behavioral theory are in fact effective at helping perpetrators change their ways of thinking, by teaching them how to control their anger.

While support for cognitive behavioral theory is mixed, the results of this study do in fact support various criminological theories. Such theories include Hirschi’s social bond theory, Agnew’s general strain theory, and the theory that individuals age out of crime. These theories will be discussed throughout the rest of this section.

**Hirschi’s Social Bond Theory**

Under social bond theory, Hirschi (1969) categorized social bond elements as “families, commitment to social norms and institutions (school, employment), involvement in activities, and the belief that these things are important (p. 16). According to Hirschi (1969), when an individual is attached, committed to, involved in conventional activities, or has common values among his peers, an individual is less likely to commit crime (Krohn & Massey, 1980; Hodwitz,
Therefore, when a bond is broken, or an individual is surrounded by deviant behavior, he is more likely himself to engage in criminal activity (Gardner & Shoemaker, 1989). For that reason, when an individual is lacking bonds such as a strong relationship with their family or employment, that individual is more likely to become deviant.

In relation to domestic violence, research has demonstrated that when an individual has a strong, positive bond with their family, or they are employed, they are less likely to engage in violence acts against their spouses (Lackey & Williams, 1995). Although the current study did not find statistical support for married men having a lower chance of recidivating domestic violence crime or non-domestic violence crime, the study does support the research in regards to employment status and criminal activity. For example, the current study adds supporting research to this aspect in that the statistical analyses shows that individuals who were employed after participating in the 3RDVP were less likely to recidivate than individuals who were unemployed after program participation. This supports the idea of social bond theory in that individuals who are employed and have a social bond with that institution, are in fact less likely to engage in deviant behavior for fear of losing that social bond, or in this case, for fear of losing their job and becoming unemployed. The factor of employment not only applies to Hirschi’s social bond theory, but it applies to Agnew’s general strain theory as well.

**Agnew’s General Strain Theory**

General strain theory, posits that individuals face strain from the structural as well as the individual levels (Agnew, 1992; 1997). For purposes of this research, we will focus on the individual level. Under the individual level, individuals experience strain due to a lack of ability to provide for ones wants and needs. For example, individuals who lack employment are unable to reach, what Rosenfeld and Messner (1995) termed the American Dream, due to a lack of
finances. Therefore, in order to obtain such finances, these individuals may look towards criminal behavior, in an attempt to achieve the American Dream. Another way of looking at this is that individuals who are unable to obtain goals which they themselves value can become frustrated and use criminal behavior as a means to obtain such goals (Agnew, 1985; 1997; Akers, 2013; Rosenfeld & Messner, 1995).

In relation to domestic violence, the current study has found that individuals who are unemployed or have an increased number of children in the household are more likely to face individual strain, and therefore look towards criminal behavior. According to the current study, individuals who are unemployed are more likely to recidivate domestic violence and non-domestic violence crime than individuals who are unemployed. When viewed from a general strain theory perspective, it is suggested that these individuals are faced with the financial strain of not being able to obtain goals that are valuable to them. Therefore, these individuals become frustrated and either take their frustration out on their spouses, or they commit other forms of deviant behavior in an attempt to lessen such strains. In relation to the number of children in the household, financial strain can occur as well. This is due to the fact that as the number of children increases, the amount of money needed to raise these children increases. Therefore, as demonstrated by the current study, individuals who have a higher number of children in their household are more likely to commit domestic violence or non-domestic violence crime than individuals with fewer children in their household.

“Aging Out” of Crime Phenomenon

The “aging out” of crime phenomenon, is the theory that as individuals age, they become less likely to engage in criminal behavior (Adams, 1997; Benda & Pavlak, 1983; Hirschi & Gottfredson, 1983; Maruna, 2001; Massoglia & Uggen, 2010). There are several reasons for
this, each of which can be explained by various criminological, psychological, sociological, and biological theories. It is believed that as individuals age, they go through transitions which are embedded within the culture of the United States (Massoglia & Uggen, 2010). For example, individuals are expected to obtain employment, get married, and start a family (Sampson & Laub, 1990). In making such a transition, it is believed that individuals will move away from their juvenile mentality and begin acting appropriately with their age (Massoglia & Udden, 2010). Due to this, individuals are less likely to engage in criminal behavior.

While research in lacking in regards to this phenomenon (Maruna, 2001), some research has been done which demonstrates the existence of the phenomenon. Researchers have found that individuals themselves mature out of crime (Anglin, Brecht, Woodward, & Bonett, 1986; Carrington, 2001; Gove, 1985; Johnson, Simons, & Conger, 2004; McNeill, 2006; Sampson & Laub, 1992; Adorjan & Chui, 2014). For example, Anglin and colleagues (1986) found that as individuals age, they are more likely to mature out of heroin addiction, while Johnson, Simons, and Conger (2004) found that as long as juveniles have more non-deviant influences, they were more likely to age out of crime compared to juveniles who were provided with only deviant influences. In fact, “official data [has] consistently shown that crime rates rise rapidly in the teenage years, peak in the late adolescence, then decline through the life course” (Bosick, 2009, p. 472; Blumstein & Cohen, 1979; Bottoms, Shapland, Costello, Holmes, & Muir, 2004; Hirschi & Gottfredson, 1983; Sampson & Laub, 1993; Adorjan & Chui, 2014), therefore demonstrating support for the “aging out” of crime phenomenon. In supporting such data, Phillips (2006) found that homicide rates were higher among individuals aged 15 to 24 years, and that such rates dropped among individuals aged 25 to 34 years, and Andresen, Frank, and Felson (2014) found
that all crime rates sharply increased until their peak at the age of 20 years, at which time the rates began to decrease before leveling out at age 40.

While there is not much previous research on the “aging out” of crime phenomenon, this current study provides support for the phenomenon. Such support is provided through the statistical analysis, which demonstrates that age is a significant factor in relation to crime. For example, it was found that older individuals who participated in the 3RDVP were less likely to recidivate domestic violence crime as well as non-domestic violence crime, than younger individuals. Therefore, this study supports the theory that as individuals age, they become less likely to engage in criminal behavior.

**Policy Implications**

With a lack of evidence-based support for the 3RDVP, one could argue that funding for the program should cease, and that the program should be shut-down. However, due to the small population size obtained for this study, the results of the study are to be interpreted with caution. Therefore one cannot say with complete certainty that the program is ineffective at reducing recidivism rates among its participants for both domestic violence crime and non-domestic violence crime. The 3RDVP, which was implemented approximately five years ago, has not been in operation long enough to allow for enough participants to pass through the program. Therefore, there has not been enough participants to allow for enough data to be obtained and analyzed to efficiently determine if the program is effective or not. Instead of finding the program to be ineffective, more research (as discussed later in this chapter) needs to first be conducted. In order for an efficient amount of data to be collected, another five years worth of participants need to participate in the program. Allowing the program to run an additional five years before conducting another study would more than double the population size which data
could be obtained from. Increasing the population size would allow for more data to be obtained, thus allowing the results to be interpreted with less caution, due to their reliability.

Outside of conducting future research, various programs could be created and/or implemented to help decrease crime. First, with unemployment and a low annual income being significant factors of criminal activity, programs should be created which work towards increased employment opportunities. For example, Allegany County could create a county foundation based off of the Temporary Assistance to Needed Families Emergency Fund. This fund, created through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, has been found to be successful at creating and maintaining employment (Roder & Elliot, 2013). In creating such a fund, the county would be able to create employment opportunities for the unemployed, therefore decreasing the likelihood that such individuals would commit crime, as demonstrated by Hirschi’s social bond theory and Agnew’s general strain theory.

Along with creating employment opportunities, more individuals should be placed in anger management programs that are based on cognitive behavioral theory. As demonstrated by the qualitative section of the research, individuals who attended the 3RDVP were able to learn how to control their anger, thus allowing them to prevent themselves from becoming violent. This demonstrates a need for individuals to attend cognitive behavioral-based anger management programs. Having individuals attend such programs will allow them to learn how to as well as work towards controlling their anger, therefore preventing them from engaging in criminal activity.

As described by Hirschi’s (1969) social bond theory, individuals who have strong community and family relationships are less likely to engage in criminal activity. Combining this information with the results of the study which demonstrate an increased level of criminal
behavior as the number of children in the household increase, Allegany County should create family-based programs. These programs would allow individuals with exceedingly strained families to attend counseling sessions and receive assistance that will in turn work towards strengthening the family bond, therefore lessening the strains brought on by a distraught family setting. In doing so, the program can work towards preventing as well as decreasing criminal activity by strengthening social bonds and decreasing familial strains on an individual.

**Future Research**

As briefly discussed throughout this chapter, various research could be done to better understand the effectiveness of the 3RDVP as well as to improve upon the results of this study. With the results of this study being mixed because of the contradictions between the quantitative and qualitative data, in relation to hypotheses support, further research on the 3RDVP could potentially allow for more general results to be obtained. Data on future 3RDVP cases could be collected in order to obtain a larger population size. In obtaining a larger population size, not only could regression analyses be conducted, but the results would be more generalizable as a whole. In order to collect enough information so that the population size is large enough for statistical analyses to be successfully conducted, data should be collected for the next five years of 3RDVP implementation. In allowing five more years worth of individuals to participate in the program, the size of the population will more than double, allowing for a population size of over 150 participants.

While the 3RDVP is being implemented for another five years, a process evaluation can be done to better understand the 3RDVP. In conducting a process evaluation, it can be determined if the 3RDVP is being implemented as it was intended to be implemented. This means that it will be evaluated to determine if the program staff are providing the correct
material to the participants, and providing the material to the participants in the way in which the material was intended to be implemented. Along with determining if the staff is acting as they are supposed to, and that the appropriate material is being provided to the program participants in the appropriate manner, it will be determined if the activities which were to be provided to the participants are being given to them as they were intended to be implemented. If it is determined that an aspect, or aspects, of the program are not being implemented as they were intended to, then such implementation problems can be addressed and fixed. However, if there are no implementation problems, and the 3RDVP is still found after further research to be ineffective at reducing recidivism rates, especially domestic violence recidivism rates, then it can be accurately determined that the 3RDVP is an ineffective program at successfully treating domestic violence perpetrators.

Lastly, not only could more research be conducted on the 3RDVP in Allegany County, but research could be conducted on the same program in other counties. Conducting this research would allow for a comparison between the counties, in order to determine if one county is more efficiently implementing the 3RDVP, as well as if the 3RDVP is more effective depending on the geographic location in which it is provided. Also, not only could future research compare 3RDVP programs from various counties to one another, but the 3RDVP results could be compared to results of other domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs, in an attempt to determine which program is more effective at reducing recidivism rates among participants.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

In order to determine the effectiveness of the 3R Domestic Violence Program at reducing domestic crime as well as non-DV crime, data from agency records were collected from the Allegany County Probation Department in Belmont, New York, as well as from telephone interviews with the program participants. Background information on the program was collected as well in order to determine if the program is functioning in the way that it was set up to function.

Through the use of frequency and bivariate statistics, no support was found for hypothesis one (completion of the 3RDVP reduces and offender’s likelihood of engaging in domestic violence again), hypothesis two (those who fail the program will commit another domestic violence crime sooner compared to those who completed the program, yet recidivated), hypothesis three (completion of the 3RDVP reduces an offender’s likelihood of engaging in non-domestic violence crime), or hypothesis four (those who fail the program will commit another non-domestic violence crime sooner compared to those who completed the program, yet recidivated). Hypothesis five (the longer the participant remains in the program, the lower the number of crimes the participant will commit after participating in the program) was unable to be tested due to there being no 3RDVP program participants who remained in the program for more than 36 weeks. While the quantitative data did not find support for any of the testable hypotheses, the qualitative data did demonstrate support for the 3RDVP overall. Through the use of telephone interviews, individuals reported finding the 3RDVP to be helpful, the information provided through the program to be useful, and that they learned something, particularly how to control their anger, from participating in the program.
As discussed previously, most existing domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs are based on cognitive behavioral theory (Saunders, 2008). In fact, along with being the most used form of domestic violence perpetrator treatment, cognitive behavioral based treatment programs for domestic violence perpetrators have been found to be the most effective form of domestic violence perpetrator treatment (Gondolf, 2004; Saunders, 2008). Currently, the results of the study cause one to question whether such perpetrator treatment programs are in fact effective at treatment domestic violence perpetrators. However, with the caution which is needed to interpret the results of the study, it cannot be stated that domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs based on cognitive behavioral theory are ineffective. In fact, it cannot be stated that such a program combined with the use of socio-political theory and the Social Change Model, is ineffective at treatment domestic violence perpetrators.

While domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs based on cognitive behavioral theory alone have been found to be the most effective treatment programs, treatment programs that contain cognitive behavioral theory along with other theories, have been found to be effective as well. Due to this, along with the caution with which the results of the study are to be interpreted, and the fact that 3RDVP participants stated that participating in the program helped them to identify and control their anger, which is the purpose of cognitive behavioral theory, without future research, it cannot be determined if the 3RDVP, a domestic violence perpetrator treatment program that is based on cognitive behavioral theory in combination with socio-political theory and the Social Change Model, is or is not effective at reducing an individual’s involvement in domestic violence crime or non-domestic violence crime.
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My name is Samantha Gavin. I am a graduate criminology student at Indiana University of Pennsylvania in Indiana, Pennsylvania. For my Master’s thesis, I am conducting a research study involving the 3R Domestic Violence Program. You are invited to participate in this research study. The following information is provided in order to help you make an informed decision whether or not to participate. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to ask. You may contact myself, Jon Cooper; my thesis chair, or the Institutional Review Board for Indiana University of Pennsylvania (contact information is provided below). You are eligible to participate because you were a previous 3R Domestic Violence Program participant.

The purpose of this study is to determine the effectiveness of the 3R Domestic Violence Program. It will be determined if the program is effective at reducing domestic violence crime as well as non-DV crime. Participation in this study will require approximately 20 minutes of your time and is not considered part of the 3R Domestic Violence Program. Participation or non-participation will not affect you in any legal matters.

Your name, address, and telephone number(s) were obtained through the use of your arrest records, which makes this information accessible to the public. Approximately two weeks from now I will be contacting you by the use of telephone to ask you to participate in a survey. The survey will consist of questions relating to criminal activity you may have engaged in after you participated in the 3R Domestic Violence Program. The information you provide to me will be confidential, and will not be given to the program coordinators, nor will the information be shared with law enforcement. Your participation or non-participation will not be revealed to the Allegany County Probation Department nor to any law enforcement officials. Your participation or non-participation will be kept confidential from all sources. In fact, I have no affiliation with the probation department, or with any law enforcement agency, which means I will not be sharing any information with them. The survey consists of questions relating to crimes that you may have engaged in after participating in the program.

Obtaining this information will allow me to evaluate whether the 3R Domestic Violence Program was effective in treating its participants. In determining the effectiveness of the program, we will know if modifications need to be made to the program, or if the program can be used for crimes other than domestic violence crimes.

Your participation for this survey is voluntary. You are free to decide to not participate in this survey or to withdraw at any time without adversely affecting your relationship with this investigator. Your decision will not result in any legal repercussions. If you choose to participate, you may withdraw at any time by notifying the researcher during the telephone session. Upon your request to withdraw, all information pertaining to you obtained through the telephone survey will be destroyed. If you choose to participate, all information will be held in strict confidence and have no bearing on your criminal record. Your response will be considered only in combination with responses from other participants. Upon surveying each of the past 3R Domestic Violence Program participants, your name, as well as the other program...
participants’ names will be erased from my research files, causing the information you gave to me to be confidential. Survey information will only be presented in generalized terms, so that nothing can be attributed to any individual participant.

Upon calling you to complete the survey, I will inform you of this information again, and will ask if you are willing to participate in the survey. If you choose to not participate, the phone conversation will end, and any information obtained from the conversation will be destroyed. If you agree to participate, I will ask you a series of questions that will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. By taking and completing the telephone survey, you are indicating your voluntary participation.

If you have any questions or concerns, do not hesitate to ask.

Samantha Gavin
qqxs@iup.edu
724-471-0034

Dr. Cooper
Department of Criminology
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Wilson Hall, Room G20
Indiana, PA 15705
jon.cooper@iup.edu
724-357-2335

Institutional Review Board (IRB)
Assistant Dean for Research
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Stright Hall, Room 113
Indiana, PA 15705
irb-research@iup.edu
724-357-7730
APPENDIX B

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

1: How old are you?
__________________________________

2: What is the highest level of education you have completed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed 8th grade or lower</th>
<th>Completed 9th grade</th>
<th>Completed 10th grade</th>
<th>Completed 11th grade</th>
<th>Graduated high school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade school</td>
<td>Associates degree</td>
<td>Bachelors degree</td>
<td>Masters degree or higher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3: Are you currently employed?

YES       NO

4: What is your annual household income?
__________________________________

5: What is your current marital status?

SINGLE    DATING    ENGAGED    MARRIED    DIVORCED/SEPARATED

6: How many children are there in your household?
__________________________________

7: What was your employment status before you participated in the 3R Domestic Violence Program?

EMPLOYED    UNEMPLOYED

8: What was your annual household income before you participated in the 3R Domestic Violence Program?
__________________________________

9: What was your marital status before you participated in the 3R Domestic Violence Program?

SINGLE    DATING    ENGAGED    MARRIED    DIVORCED/SEPARATED
10: How many children were in your household before you participated in the *3R Domestic Violence Program*?

__________________________________

11: What were the names of the *3R Domestic Violence Program* group instructors?

__________________________________

12: Did you successfully complete the *3R Domestic Violence Program*?
(If no, skip to question 14.)

YES  
NO

13: Approximately how long ago, in months, did you successfully complete the program?
(Skip to question 16.)

__________________________________

14: Approximately how long ago did you stop participating in the program?

__________________________________

15: What were you required to do for not successfully completing the program?

JAIL  
PRISON  
OTHER TREATMENT PROGRAM  
NOTHING

16: Since participating in the *3R Domestic Violence Program*, have you been arrested?
(If no, skip to question 20.)

YES  
NO

17: What sort of crime(s) did you commit?

__________________________________

18: How many of these crimes were domestic violence crimes? (Was that crime a domestic violence crime?)

__________________________________

19: How long after participating in the program, in months, did you commit a crime?
(Convert to weeks. This question will be asked for each crime provided in question 17.)

__________________________________
20: Did you find the 3R Domestic Violence Program to be helpful?

YES   NO

21: Did you find the information provided to you in the 3R Domestic Violence Program to be useful?

YES   NO

22: Do you feel as though you learned anything from participating in the 3R Domestic Violence Program?

YES   NO