Derleme Makalesi / Review Article

The Conditions Around Engagement in Interventions Among Perpetrators of Domestic Violence: Literature Review

Aile İçi Şiddet Faillerinin Müdahalelere Etkin Katılım Nedenleri: Alanyazın İncelemesi

Zeynep TURHAN[1]

[1] Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Bartın Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi Sosyal Hizmet Bölümü, zturhan@bartin.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-5343-9442

ÖZET

Bu makale, erkek faillerin aile içi şiddet müdahalelerine katılım aşamalarına ve koşullarına odaklanarak, katılımı anlamak için temel kuramsal açıklamalara ilişkin mevcut alanyazını gözden geçirmeyi hedeflemiştir. Bu alanyazın taraması, aile içi şiddet failleri programlarına katılanların şiddet içeren davranışlarını değiştirmedeki motivasyonel etkileri ve bakış açılarını kavramsallaştırarak kuramsal açıklamalara ilişkin görüşleri ortaya koymayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu makale, aile içi şiddet faillerinin müdahale hizmetlerine katılımın kuramsal açıklamalarını keşfetmek için eleştirel bakış açısıyla alanyazın taramasına başvurmuştur. Kuramsal kavramsallaştırmalarla ilgili çeşitli faktörler, farklı koşullar faillerin katılımını etkileyebilmektedir. Bu kuramların ve modellerin farkına varmak faillerin müdahalelere katılımlarının etkiliğini nasıl etkilediğini anlamamıza yardımcı olur. Bu makale, müdahale programlarında aile içi faillerin katılım sürecini anlamak için bütüncül bir çerçeve sağlamaya çalışmakta ve katılımı ve sonraki davranış değişikliğini artıracak yaklaşımları önermektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: *Davranış değişimi, müdahalelere etkin katılım, motivasyon, aile içi şiddet failleri, risk faktörleri*

ABSTRACT

This article reviews the available literature on major theoretical explanations for understanding engagement by focusing on the stages and circumstances of male perpetrators' involvement in domestic violence interventions. The review aims to improve the insights into theoretical accounts by conceptualising the perspectives of participants' motivational influences in changing violent behaviour in domestic violence perpetrator programmes. This article applied a critical literature review to explore theoretical explanations of engagement in domestic violence perpetrator interventions. Various factors in relation to theoretical conceptualisations are identified since different conditions can impact on perpetrators' engagement. This theoretical overview is helpful to recognise how these theories and models enable us to understand how key circumstances impact the effectiveness of their involvement in interventions. This article attempts to provide an integrated framework for understanding domestic abusers' engagement process in intervention programs and suggests approaches that will increase engagement and subsequent behaviour change.

Keywords: *Behavioral change, engagement in interventions, motivation, male perpetrators of domestic violence, risk factors*

INTRODUCTION

Domestic violence causes severe physical and psychological consequences on family members. Domestic violence perpetrator interventions play a significant role in reducing and ending these consequences. Exploring the factors around perpetrators' engagement in interventions can help building effective tools and strategies to improve their involvement in behavioural change processes. This article aims to investigate how existing theories and models explain the characteristics and conditions around perpetrators' participation and commitment to domestic violence intervention processes. This investigation should help to recognise how some circumstances and characteristics are linked to individuals' participation and engagement in behavioural change process. Moreover, a theoretical understanding of perpetrators' commitment to therapeutic support can lead to the development of more effective approaches. Importantly, this article has also developed multi-level model that illustrates complex factors and circumstances around participants' engagement in domestic violence interventions. Therefore, this investigation contributes to the domestic violence field by highlighting key theoretical insights into how perpetrators become involved in behavioural change process.

Research related to offenders in interventions has suggested that perpetrators who attend interventions commonly experience obstacles to completing the sessions. (Howells and Day, 2006; Sturgess et al., 2015; Lomo et al., 2016). Furthermore, the men who act violently towards their partners often blame their partners for their violent behaviour by highlighting their patriarchal beliefs and masculine identities (Kandiyoti, 1988; Dutton, 1994; Gondolf and Williams, 2001; Taylor, Nair, and Braham, 2013; Gondolf, 2015). A few studies of domestic violence perpetrator programmes found that these programmes achieve positive outcomes for men's behavioural change process (Murphy and Ting, 2010; Kelly and Westmarland, 2015). For instance, men who regularly attend interventions mostly understand the consequences of their violent behaviour on family members and take action to overcome it (Jenkins, 1990; Kelly & Westmarland, 2015).

Several researchers (Dutton and Hart, 1992; White, Gondolf, Robertson, Goodwin, and Caraveo, 2002) identified the risk factors around the perpetrators of domestic violence in prison settings. These risk factors are often described as "prior criminal offences, chaotic childhoods characterized by abuse, substance abuse problems, demonstrated histories of persistent violence, personality disorders, low income, sporadic employment, low education, and low motivation to change" (Connors et al., 2013, p. 13). The risk factors presented correspond to risks of violent behaviour as well as future violent behaviour. For example, Costa et al. (2015) identified risk factors of domestic violence as being a victim during childhood and adolescent period, poor relationships and socioeconomic circumstances in a family, behavioural risks, adolescent peer risks and sociodemographic risks. Even though the risk factors are not consistent for all domestic violence abusers, this knowledge around differences can help to understand how various risk factors can be interconnected with intimate partner violence. These risk factors might impact on dropping out of the

interventions (Power, and Gondolf, 2001; Bowen and Gilchrist, 2006; Daly, Olver, Stockdale, and Wormith, 2011). Being aware of the relationship between risk factors and low level of attendance interventions can help implement appropriate intervention techniques.

Connors, Mills, and Gray (2013) examined intimate partner violence perpetrators' behavioural change process based on "offender self-report, facilitator ratings of improvement and skills acquisition and program content knowledge" (p. 20). They found that motivated offenders for change and facilitators who apply motivational techniques are often associated with achieving positive outcomes. Furthermore, perpetrators being motivated to change might stem from wishing to avoid the consequences of their behaviour, such as criminal justice penalties including prison sentences (McMurran, 2002). It could be argued that understanding the circumstances and characteristics of perpetrators with their motivational dynamics, the factors around resistance, participation and engagement in domestic violence interventions can enhance positive outcomes in interventions.

Preliminary research on domestic violence perpetrator interventions concentrated on the importance of participants' completion rate in programmes (Rosenbaum et al., 2001; Herman et al., 2014; Cuevas and Bui, 2015). Even though the research field of domestic violence has developed in the area of perpetrators' involvement in interventions, there has been limited investigation of theoretical frameworks that trace perpetrators' engagement in interventions to gain a broader understanding of behavioural change process. In this article, I explore how to conceptualise the participants' involvement in interventions by concentrating on the conditions around engagement within theoretical frameworks. This article focused mainly on the male perpetrator by recognising gender-based violence.

METHOD

I used a critical literature review for this article. In order to conduct a critical literature review, this article is divided into two main sections. In the first section, I will discuss theoretical frameworks that illuminate perpetrators' circumstances, characteristics, and stages for their active and insufficient engagement in interventions. Secondly, I will investigate how to increase perpetrators' active engagement and readiness to change in interventions by developing a model of dynamic stages and circumstances for engagement in the intervention process.

The search strategy of this article was searching key words including: Engagement, involvement, perpetrators, interventions, domestic violence, intimate partner violence, batterer, behavioural change, theory of engagement, theories, models, change violent behaviour, attendance and interventions. If the studies examined the perpetrators' engagement in interventions, they were included. If factors around their involvement were explored, they were also counted in. The studies solely examined the effectiveness of interventions or rate of completion in interventions were excluded. If the approaches or theoretical frameworks are related to the practices of only strategies in interventions or preventions, they were excluded. For example, research concentrated on trauma-

based approaches by focusing on individuals' traumatic events to stop violent behaviour, were also excluded.

The following questions will guide the discussion: (1) What is the empirical evidence on the association between engagement and behavioural change? (2) How do the existing theories or models contribute to the understanding of perpetrators' involvement in domestic violence interventions? (3) How can the research improve our understanding of multiple factors and conditions around participants' risk factors for violence which is related to engagement in domestic violence perpetrator interventions? A critical review is conducted to explore the circumstances of engagement to change violent and abusive behaviour that can be analysed to devise effective strategies in interventions. This article also emphasises the circumstances and characteristics behind the adequate engagement in interventions by focusing on motivational dynamics.

RESULTS

According to the literature review, two key themes were emerged. Firstly, the theoretical orientations around risk factors of violent behaviour which is related to the lack of engagement were clarified. The second theme was about theories and models that contribute to the understanding of perpetrators' involvement in domestic violence interventions. Several scholars found the relationship between such risk factors (e.g. alcohol use, criminal background) and intimate partner violence. This risk factors might be associated with dropouts and lack of engagement in interventions because these might be additional obstacles for them preventing from actively involving in interventions. It is critical to overview of key theoretical frameworks around risk factors of perpetrator of domestic violence. This can improve our insights around key dynamics of perpetrators' engagement in interventions.

Askeland and Rakil (2018) claim the theoretical paradigms used to explain interpersonal violence can broadly be divided into three main fields: Socio-cultural models, systemic models and individual-focused models. Socio-cultural models often concentrate on the influences of culture, social structures and beliefs on violent and abusive behaviour (Askeland and Rakil, 2018). Duluth model is one of the important approaches to recognise cultural beliefs related to violent behaviour. For example, this model claims that patriarchal beliefs often result in controlling and violent behaviour. Systemic models recognise the influences of programme related issues based on criminal justice system, community-based programmes or governmental or non-profit types of programmes. The types of programmes and structures may impact on participants' engagement in interventions. Recognising these three broader theoretical paradigms, socioecological theory, feminist approach, intersectionality and culturally sensitive approaches will be presented as an explanation of key concepts of lack or insufficient engagement. Then, the stage of change in trans-theoretical model, the multifactor offender readiness model and the program engagement model are described as important theoretical orientations in explaining engagement in interventions.

Theories Related to The Lack of Engagement

This section presents the theoretical explanations around perpetrators' inadequate engagement in domestic violence interventions. These are socioecological theory, feminist theory, intersectionality and culturally sensitive approaches.

Socio-ecological theory. The socio-ecological model was developed by Bronfenbrenner (1979). Bronfenbrenner (1972, 1975) originally described four levels of environmental factors that influence individuals' behaviour patterns. These levels are the "microsystem; the mesosystem; the exosystem, and the macro system" (Tolman 2001, p. 229). The mesosystem attempts to bring greater coordination among relevant microsystems, generating greater consistency of philosophy and practice among important microsystems. In microsystems within behavioural change process, victims' intervention services, the court system, police and probation might be important circumstances in understanding perpetrators' efforts to take new and positive actions. Socio-ecological theory may offer a more effective explanation than other theories because individual, interpersonal, community and cultural factors provide a broader analysis of a perpetrator's engagement in an intervention programme. The socio-ecological theory helps us to recognise how multiple interactions might produce violent behaviour (Heise, 1998).

It helps to examine participants' personal characteristics and programme approaches in order to assess their engagement. This model presents various interactions between individual and other environmental factors. Similarly, Moran et al. (2004) describe a three-phase process of 'getting', 'keeping' and 'engaging' to explain engagement within the ecological perspective. These three phases comprise practical, relational, cultural, contextual, strategic and structural factors. Such interactions might explain individuals' motivational circumstances and their engagement during interventions. Socio-ecological theory recognises the origins of violence against women while conceptualizing violent behaviour as a four-layered occurrence based on an interchange between individual, interpersonal, community, and socio-cultural factors (Heise, 1998). These four layers in socio-ecological theory are individual factors, family factors, community layer, and societal structures (e.g. cultural norms, social policies and laws) (Sitaker, 2007).

Multilevel influences are connected to perpetrators' perspectives on their engagement in interventions. These levels are personal, interpersonal and community-based influences (Silvergleid and Mankowski, 2006). This section describes how socio-ecological theory may support the understanding of perpetrators' engagement in interventions while identifying the ecological factors such as personal, interpersonal, community, and societal level interactions that impact on perpetrators' violent and abusive behaviour. Moreover, these multilevel interconnections can be useful to recognise the participants' motivations to apply alternative behaviour. It could be argued that such risk factors are interrelated to perpetrators' insufficient engagement. For instance, the men who hold strong patriarchal perspectives might challenge regularly attending interventions when they

confront their masculinity (Turhan, 2019). Key concepts of socio-ecological theory are helpful to recognise four level of interactions around perpetrators' engagement in interventions.

Feminist theory. This section moves on to investigate how perpetrators' power and control behaviour might be explained as an issue of perpetrators' insufficient engagement in behavioural change processes. Feminist perspectives set out a framework for understanding how individuals interact with each other and shape their meanings of events. Feminist theorists argue that meanings and actions are socially constructed, and that gender plays a significant role in understanding social relations and interactions (Catlett et al., 2010). They also emphasise that gender roles shape behaviour and reproduce social structure (Ferree, 1990; Creswell, 2012). Feminist theory emphasises the role of power control tactics, gender differences, social structure and masculinity in domestic violence. According to the feminist approach, power is a core element of men's abusive acts (Lancaster and Lumb, 1999). This power reflects the fact that men play a dominant role in patriarchal society (Healey et al. 1999; Mooney 2000).

Zinn (1990) and Ferree (1990) noted that the feminist framework conceptualizes gender in intimate relationships in the context of a patriarchal social structure. For instance, gender role stress is likely to arise when men do not follow societal gender role expectations for their masculinity as this situation poses a threat to their male competence (Catlett et al., 2010). Importantly, feminist-based gender theory is key in analysing the relationship between individual practices and social structure. Under this perspective, the masculine gender role will be discussed to understand how men construct and make a meaning of their engagement in the intervention process.

The pro-feminist approach claims that violent men are responsible for their abusive behaviour because they are able to make a decision not to be violent towards their partner and/or children (Harne and Radford, 2008). This approach claims that violence is socially learnt but also incorporates an understanding of patriarchal power structures and ideologies (Harne and Radford 2008). The pro-feminist approach educates abusive men on strategies for using power and control in their intimate relationships (Scourfield, 1998). Intervention programmes based on the feminist approach are confrontational rather than open to discussing things with abusive men, and this approach might not allow men to engage in the programme (Healey et al., 1999). To change perpetrators' violent behaviour, they need to recognise that their powerlessness is not the same as their inability to be abusive (Lancaster and Lumb, 1999). However, these men might feel powerless in terms of taking new actions because of their potential vulnerable positions.

While the patriarchal framework explains maleness and changeable behaviours towards women and children within a socio-cultural approach, the facilitators also need to consider psychological factors (Lancaster and Lumb, 1999). Nowadays, the facilitators apply sociological and psychological frameworks as well as an awareness of the complexities of power relationships when they work with perpetrators (Lancaster and Lumb, 1999). Feminist theory appears to be limited to explain the men's

own vulnerabilities. For example, feminist theory fails to recognise the perpetrators' mental health problems or traumatic experiences related to their abusive actions.

Intersectionality. Intersectionality can help to recognise other structural issues around engagement in interventions. Intersectionality theory within feminism recognises the dynamics of gender, race and class around individuals' behaviour (Bograd, 2006). Specifically, black and minority ethnic men's involvement in interventions can be better understood within intersectionality theory. For instance, several studies paid attention to the influences of ethnicity and race on participants' involvement in therapeutic support (Castonguay et al., 2006; Sue and Sue, 2013; Walling et al., 2012 Aldarondo and Malhotra, 2014). Likewise, Reis and Brown (1999) noted that socio-economic factors and ethnicity are key conditions in the drop-out rate from sessions. Even though these studies did not focus on perpetrators of domestic violence, the evidence and knowledge around the therapy experiences among black and minority ethnic clients can be helpful in recognising the influences of race, ethnicity and class on behavioural change interventions.

Culturally sensitive approaches. several scholars have stated that a strong link between black and minority ethnic participants' active engagement and the implementation of culturally-sensitive techniques (Williams, 1992; Guru, 2006; Hancock and Siu, 2009; Pfitzner et al., 2015). Likewise, a limited or lack of culturally-sensitive interventions is linked to black and minority ethnic participants' early dropouts in interventions (Gondolf, 1988; Williams, 1992; Williams, 1994; Williams and Becker, 1994; Hancock and Siu, 2009). Therefore, the domestic violence perpetrator programmes should take into account issues around employment, historical trauma, and social and cultural backgrounds among men of colour. These issues are not solely for men of colour and this article recognises these problems can occur for all perpetrators. However, many scholars paid attention to the ethnic minority men's additional obstacles (Williams, 1992; Williams, 1994; Gondolf & Williams, 2001; Turhan, 2019).

However, domestic violence perpetrator intervention programmes often ignore considering black and minority ethnic men's additional challenges in terms of living in a country where hold different social and cultural values than their home country (Turhan, 2019). The facilitators skills and knowledge about culturally-sensitive approaches should be improved (Williams, 1994). This can help them to recognise how cultural and ethnic differences may affect the therapeutic process in interventions (Gondolf, 1998; Almeida and Dolan-Delvecchio, 1999; Bent-Goodley et al., 2007). Moreover, the lack of engagement in interventions might be relates to the structural aspects. For example, poorly designed programs or the conditions in terms of treatment in prison settings compared to voluntary treatment outside prison.

Given key theoretical frameworks around the stages of engagement for offenders, such techniques and approaches are essential in increasing domestic violence abusers' motivation in involving in interventions and taking responsibility process for their violence. For instance, several scholars

stated that the facilitators' application of working alliance or building a therapeutic alliance is often useful for the participants' active engagement (Taft et al., 2004; Walling et al., 2012; Boira and Castillo, 2013; Lømo et al., 2019). Similarly, motivational interviewing is identified as critical approach for the men's involvement in as well as completion of the intervention programme (Kistenmacher and Weiss, 2008; Musser et al., 2008; Zalmanowitz et al., 2013). According to Birgden (2004), major therapeutic strategies of the behavioural change process include "helping relationships combine care, openness, trust, acceptance, and support for change (e.g. a therapeutic alliance)" (p. 286). It could be argued that motivational interviewing and working alliance can be effective at the initial phase of interventions as this can enhance the participants' readiness to change.

Theoretical Frameworks Linked to The Perpetrators' Active Engagement

Given the socio-ecological theory and feminist frameworks around the perpetrators violent and abusive actions by focusing on the men's readiness to change, the section moves on to discuss theoretical frameworks of engagement in domestic violence perpetrator interventions. These frameworks are stage of change in trans-theoretical model, the multifactor offender readiness model and the program engagement model. Black and minority ethnic men's additional issues and obstacles in attending interventions are also discussed.

The stage of change in trans-theoretical model. To achieve a successful outcome and improve participants' positive skills in domestic violence perpetrator interventions, a consideration of their stage of change in the treatment process is essential (Carbajosa et al., 2013). Readiness to change which varies among participants should be considered (Daniels and Murphy, 1997). Similarly, motivation-based approaches are often stated as readiness to change (Butters et al., 2020). Taft et al. (2004) found that the dynamics around motivations to take new action among perpetrators of domestic violence are critical factors for their commitment in interventions. Even though this theoretical model does not provide empirical findings, it would be useful to illuminate the various stages that linked to engagement in interventions.

The stages of change model are useful in understanding the relationships between perpetrators' level of readiness to change and the factors of men's engagement. For instance, if a man enters the programme at the stage of pre-contemplation, this man might lack individual awareness of his violent acts. The applications of the trans-theoretical model reported that interventions were more beneficial in reducing violence when treatment readiness was high at the beginning of the treatment (Scott and Wolfe, 2003). According to Bowen (2011), offenders are more likely to be in the pre-contemplation or contemplation stages of change. Studies showed that a successful treatment model could involve adopting stage-based intervention approaches and this would improve treatment outcomes (Bowen, 2011). Moreover, under the trans-theoretical model, perpetrators' responsivity for their violent behaviour and understanding the consequences of their violent acts on family members seem to be vital to achieving a high willingness to change violent behaviour.

Eckhardt et al. (2008) evaluated whether pre-readiness to change within trans-theoretical model and the types of partner violence predicted programme "completion, criminal recidivism, and post adjudication partner violence" (p. 446). This study focused on the evidence after six-month post-domestic violence perpetrator programmes. They explored the association between motivational dynamics linked to readiness to change at the beginning of intervention and the typologies of perpetrators of domestic violence. They tried to predict how this association could be helpful to estimate the behavioural change outcomes among "a post-adjudication sample of men convicted of misdemeanour partner assault offences" (p. 447). Holtzworth-Munroe et al. (2000) identified four partner violence subtypes: Family only, low-level antisocial, borderline/dysphoric, and generally violent/antisocial. Eckhardt et al. (2008) implemented cluster analysis and predicted some hypothesis within self-report measures based on partner violence subtypes and stages of change. They found that family-only, low-level antisocial, generally violent/antisocial and borderline/dysphoric perpetrators are often in pre-contemplative, contemplative and preparation stages respectively. However, they did not find a direct overlap between these subtypes and stages of change. This study is helpful to recognise how perpetrators who resist taking new actions are mostly in more troubled perpetrator subtypes such as generally violent/antisocial and borderline/dysphoric subtypes.

The multifactor offender readiness model. This model is for conceptualising perpetrators' readiness to change their violent behaviour (Ward et al., 2004). This model focuses on internal and external factors as a consequence of readiness to change (Devaney and Lazenbatt 2016). Devaney and Lazenbatt (2016) describe internal factors as "person" centred factors and include cognitive (beliefs, cognitive strategies), affective (emotions), and identity (personal and social) factors" (p. 75). Moreover, they identify external factors of perpetrators' motivations to change as: Type of attendance (voluntarily or mandated), category of intervention (prison- or community-based), availability of intervention, the skills of facilitators, social support systems and time period of intervention programmes. Therefore, external factors are mostly associated with programme-related dynamics and resources.

Perpetrators' experiences of criminal sanctions, fear of losing their partners and children, understanding the consequences of their violent behaviour on family members and other specific events are likely to lead them to change their violent behaviour (Sheehan et al., 2012; Devaney and Lazenbatt, 2016). While these external factors impact on engagement, informing perpetrators about a non-judgmental and therapeutic environment in interventions can reduce their defensiveness and increase their involvement in interventions (Crockett et al., 2015). Mossière and Serin (2014) noted that self-referral to interventions is often more effective than when perpetrators feel coerced to attend. The men who use violence towards their partners are often unwilling to attend intervention programmes and are not ready to change (Levesque et al 2000). In considering this strong evidence of perpetrators' unwillingness to attend programmes, "it is possible that intervention outcomes can be improved if the programme is targeted towards those in pre-contemplative and contemplative

stages" (Devaney and Lazenbatt 2016, p. 74). Therefore, domestic violence perpetrator programmes should implement appropriate strategies based on men's readiness to change rather than applying general approaches to all perpetrators.

The good lives model. While the multifactor offender readiness model concentrates on internal and external factors in relation to the readiness to change violent behaviour, the good lives model identifies human agency and human motivation as key influences for both violent behaviour and behavioural change efforts (Ward and Marshall, 2004). According to this model, individuals always aim to achieve primary goals related to universal needs and desires. The model is used on perpetrators and tries to teach them how to achieve their primary goals by applying prosocial skills without applying violence. As seen in this approach, individuals' motivational dynamics are very important for taking new actions by focusing on their priorities and wishes. Similarly, it is highlighted that the transition to change and active engagement will be achieved when the participants' motivations and desired goals are taken into account during interventions (Mann et al., 2004). While the program engagement model covers principles for general offenders rather than domestic violence abusers, these principles illustrate the factors that influence offenders' and group facilitators' engagement in group-based intervention process (Holdsworth et al., 2016). They describe experiences and circumstances that impact on offenders' engagement in group offending behaviour programmes by applying a constructivist grounded theory analysis. In this analysis, Holdsworth et al. (2016) created a programme engagement model by conducting interviews and session observations. This was done in order to understand circumstances that are linked to offenders' engagement and motivations during intervention processes. It explains three stages of engagement among offenders. These are: Getting started, working, and getting somewhere.

The first stage of offenders' engagement which is getting started includes feeling ambivalent and negotiating the group. Programme facilitators should be welcoming to group members and work on reducing participants' resistance at the initial stage of interventions (Holdsworth et al., 2016). This stage of engagement is vital to keep offenders in the programme because initial negative experiences may cause drop outs. Therefore, understanding their perspectives about how they feel about entering group-based intervention sessions is significant in improving their willingness to take responsibility for their violence. Moreover, Holdsworth et al. (2016) note that offenders can develop their positions by comparing themselves with other group members and improving their relationships with them while learning new skills and experiences from them. The second stage of the working process is offenders' efforts to build relationships with group members and attend group activities. Moving on as a group means learning new skills from other group members and building group cohesion. Also, facilitators' efforts at "establishing roles and positions; building engagement; personalising treatment framework" are part of the working process stage (Holdsworth et al. 2016, p. 7). Personalising the treatment framework is about informing group members about the goals and structure of the programme. In this stage, facilitators make participants find links between

programme concepts and their lives. Following this, facilitators observed that offenders become more comfortable with and engage in the programme.

The final stage of the engagement process is called getting somewhere. The idea is that offenders will acknowledge and accept their wrong acts and take new actions to make changes. Programme facilitators hold an important role in recognising and sustaining engagement in interventions. Holdsworth et al. (2016) highlight that change should be considered a process in relation to individuals' engagement rather than simply a programme outcome. They suggest that attention should be paid to how self-disclosure may encourage the offenders to take responsibility for their violent behaviour. Therefore, their realisation of their wrong behaviour is crucial for their engagement in behaviour change in interventions (Holdsworth et al., 2016). Every stage of intervention should take into consideration the participants' needs and implement more appropriate techniques for them.

DISCUSSION

This article has explored the available theoretical frameworks of engagement in domestic violence interventions among perpetrators. Key theoretical frameworks have been identified to better understand the contributing factors of perpetrators' lack of and active engagement in interventions. For example, lack of engagement can be better understood within the socioecological theory, feminist theory, intersectionality and culturally sensitive approaches. Also, some theoretical orientations have better recognised key issues around active engagement such as the stage of change in trans-theoretical model, the multifactor offender readiness model and the program engagement model. While perpetrators' engagement in domestic violence interventions is a very dynamic and complex issue, this article attempts to illustrate how theories enhance our understanding of engagement in behavioural change processes among perpetrators of domestic violence.

There are barriers and motivational enhancers across the levels of the ecological model as Heise (1998) describes. For instance, in the individual level, a man's childhood traumas might lead to some problem if he has not received any help. More importantly such problem areas can interconnect with their lower motivations for getting help. If the intervention programmes or therapeutic help are not effective and beneficial for the individuals, they might not trust the services and they might not attend further interventions. For example, the study by Turhan (2019) found that the lack of trust in the services has been interconnected with lack of engagement in domestic violence services in the UK among Turkish groups. Similarly, masculinity and patriarchal society are also associated with lower motivations for involving in interventions based on feminist frameworks. However, it could be argued that motivational enhancers and obstacles in attending interventions need to be recognised in individual, interpersonal, community and societal levels.

Following a review of key theories and models around perpetrators' behavioural change process, this article suggests a dynamic multi-level that includes taking account of circumstances that impact

on men's engagement in interventions. This model has three main levels: Understanding the risk factors for violent behaviour, the circumstances surrounding interventions, and professionals' efforts in recognising the men's circumstances and characteristics in relation to their violence as well as their willingness to attend interventions. Through each of these levels, a professional can reduce participants' apprehension and unwillingness around engagement in interventions. It is critical to be aware that not all participants require the same stages of change and activities. However, providing available intervention services for men who act violently towards their partners is essential for the safety of survivors.

Based on the critical literature review, I set the model out on three levels in Figure 1. This illustrates multiple circumstances and characteristics impacting on engagement in interventions. The first level illustrates the risk factors for violence in socio-ecological, feminist theories and intersectionality. The second level examines the complicated circumstances around motivations to change by focusing on stages in treatment processes. The third level suggests appropriate strategies based on the men's needs linked to their social and cultural contexts. The resources in programmes and facilitators' knowledge and skills about appropriate strategies for participants are identified as key elements for effective programme outcomes. The third level includes the roles of facilitators. This final stage focuses on how the facilitators' awareness, knowledge and practices around perpetrators' needs can increase their engagement and positive outcomes.

Figure 1: A dynamic multi-level model that takes account of circumstances that impact on men's engagement in interventions

Level 1: Factors around violent behaviour	Level 2: Conditions around stages of change in interventions	Level 3: The facilitators' awareness, knowledge and practices
• **Individual and internal factors:** own attitudes, genes, identities; beliefs, cognitions, emotions; identity: race, gender, class, masculinity. • **Family factors:** intimate relationships; interpersonal support. • **Community or external influences:** institutional and neighbourhood relationships. • **Societal structures:** cultural norms, social policies, laws and patriarchy.	• **Lack of engagement stage:** No motivations; feelings of ambivalence, lack of awareness about the consequences of violence. • **Initial stage in interventions:** Complex negotiations with programme providers or therapists; building relationships with group members and facilitators; some level of realisation of their wrongs and criminal actions; fear of losing their partners and children. • **Feelings of having a problem:** accepting violent behaviour; recognising the influences of patriarchal cultures and the ideologies of masculinity; the influences of mandated or voluntary interventions and criminal sanction; understanding the consequences of their violence. • **Stage of active engagement:** taking responsibility for their violent behaviour; taking actions; making changes; being able to access appropriate and available intervention programmes.	• **Awareness:** Being aware of the factors around participants' violent behaviour related to risk factors; • Being aware of the influences of ethnic, social and cultural backgrounds on behaviour change • **Knowledge:** Recognising the circumstances of the participants' readiness to change; • **Practices:** Applying motivational interviewing and working alliance in order to increase participants' motivational dynamics. This can enhance participants' regular attendance and positive outcomes. • Improving their knowledge about black and minority ethnic groups in order to apply appropriate techniques based on their needs.

CONCLUSION

This article described two major influences on men's engagement in interventions. First, I clarified socio-ecological levels of circumstances, feminist-informed gender perspectives and culturally-sensitive approaches to examine how personal and socio-cultural influences impact on men's insufficient engagement in interventions. It was highlighted that there are interconnections among personal characteristics in their interpersonal interactions based on community and societal influences. Second, the stage of change appeared to be vital in understanding men's motivations and engagement in the behavioural change process because their positions are likely to be associated with their involvement in interventions. Active engagement was found in various concepts such as programme adaptation, relationship with group members, and family members. These different concepts of explaining men's engagement in domestic violence interventions are strongly interconnected. This article contributes to the literature on perpetrator of domestic violence by clarifying engagement as a broader way to illustrate key theoretical concepts in recognising multiple conditions in behavioural change process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Aldarondo, E., & Malhotra, K. (2014). Domestic violence: what every multicultural clinician should know. In M. L. Miville & A. D. Ferguson (Eds.), *Handbook of Race-Ethnicity and Gender in Psychology* (1st ed., pp. 379–405). Springer Science & Business Media.

Almeida, R. V, & Dolan-Delvecchio, K. en. (1999). Addressing culture in batterers intervention. *Violence against Women*, *5*(6), 654–683.

Askeland, I. R., & Rakil, M. (2018). Models on treatment of intimate partner violence. In *Responding to Domestic Violence: Emerging Challenges for Policy, Practice*.

Bent-Goodley, T. B., Rice II, J., Williams, O. J., & Pope, M. (2007). Treatment for perpetrators of domestic violence. In M. P. Koss & A. E. Kazdin (Eds.), *Violence against women and children, Vol 2: Navigating solutions* (2nd ed., pp. 199–213). American Psychological Association.

Birgden, A. (2004). Therapeutic jurisprudence and responsivity: Finding the will and the way in offender rehabilitation. *Psychology, Crime, and Law*, *10*(3), 283–295. https://doi.org/10.1080/10683160410001662771

Bograd, M. (2006). Strengthening domestic violence theories: intersections of race, class, sexual orientation, and gender. In N. J. Sokoloff & C. Pratt (Eds.), *Domestic Vvolence at the margins: Readings on race, class, gender, and culture*. Rutgers University Press.

Boira, S., & Castillo, M. del. (2013). Context of treatment and therapeutic alliance: Critical factors in

court-mandated batterer intervention programs. *The Spanish Journal ….*

Bowen, E. (2011). *The rehabilitation of partner-violent men* (1st ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.

Butters, R. P., Droubay, B. A., Seawright, L., Tollefson, D. R., Lundahl, B., & Whitaker, L. (2020). Intimate Partner Violence Perpetrator Treatment: Tailoring Interventions to Individual Needs. *Clinical Social Work Journal*.

Carbajosa, P., Boira, S., & Tomás-Aragonés, L. (2013). Difficulties, skills and therapy strategies in interventions with court-ordered batterers in Spain. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *18*(1), 118–124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.11.005

Castonguay, L. G., Constantino, M. J., & Holtforth, M. G. (2006). The working alliance: Where are we and where should we go? *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, *43*(3), 271–279. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-3204.43.3.271

Catlett, B. S., Toews, M. L., & Walilko, V. (2010). Men's gendered constructions of intimate partner violence as predictors of court-mandated batterer treatment drop out. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *45*(1–2), 107–123. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-009-9292-2

Connors, A. D., Mills, J. F., & Gray, A. L. (2013). Intimate partner violence intervention for high-risk offenders. *Psychological Services*, *10*(1), 12–23. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028979

Costa, B. M., Kaestle, C. E., Walker, A., Curtis, A., Day, A., Toumbourou, J. W., & Miller, P. (2015). Longitudinal predictors of domestic violence perpetration and victimization: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *24*, 261–272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2015.06.001

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. SAGE Publications.

Crockett, E. E., Keneski, E., Yeager, K., & Loving, T. J. (2015). Breaking the mold: evaluating a non-punitive domestic violence intervention program. *Journal of Family Violence*, *30*(4), 489–499. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-015-9706-x

Cuevas, D. A., & Bui, N. H. (2015). Social factors affecting the completion of a batterer intervention program. *Journal of Family Violence*, *31*(1), 95–107. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-015-9748-0

Daniels, J. W., & Murphy, C. M. (1997). Stages and processes of change in batterers' treatment. *Cognitive and Behavior Practice*, *4*(1), 123–145. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1077-7229(97)80015-6

Devaney, J., & Lazenbatt, A. (2016). *Domestic violence perpetrators: evidence-informed responses.*

Routledge.

Dutton, D. G. (1994). Patriarchy and wife assault: the ecological fallacy. *Violence and Victims*, *9*(2), 125–140.

Dutton, Donald G., & Hart, S. D. (1992). Risk markers for family violence in a federally incarcerated population. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, *15*(1), 101–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-2527(92)90030-5

Eckhardt, C. I., Holtzworth-Munroe, A. Norlander, B., Sibley, A., & Cahill, M. (2008). Readiness to change, partner violence subtypes, and treatment outcomes among men in treatment for partner assault. *Violence and Victims*, *23*(4), 446–475. https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.23.4.446

Ferree, M. M. (1990). Beyond separate spheres: Feminism and family research. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *52*, 866–884.

Gondolf, E. (1988). The effect of batterer counseling on shelter outcome. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *3*(3), 187–203.

Gondolf, E. W. (1998). *Assessing woman battering in mental health services*. SAGE Publications.

Gondolf, E. W. (2015). *Gender-based perspectives on batterer programs: program leaders on history, approach, research, and development*. Lexington Books.

Gondolf, E. W., & Fisher, E. R. (1988). *Battered women as survivors: an alternative to treating learned helplessness*. Lexington Books.

Gondolf, E. W., & Williams, O. J. (2001). Culturally focused batterer counseling for African American men. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *2*(4), 283–295.

Hancock, T. U., & Siu, K. (2009). A culturally sensitive intervention with domestically violent Latino immigrant men. *Journal of Family Violence*, *24*(2), 123–132. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-008-9217-0

Harne, L., & Radford, J. (2008). *Tackling domestic violence: Theories, policies and practice* (First). McGraw-Hill International.

Healey, K., Smith, S., & O'Sulivan, C. (1999). *Batterer intervention: Program approaches & criminal justice strategies*. US Department of Justice Office of Justice Programmes, National Institute of Justice.

Heise, L. L. (1998). Violence against women: an integrated, ecological framework. *Violence Against Women*, *4*(3), 262–290. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801298004003002

Herman, K., Rotunda, R., Williamson, G., & Vodanovich, S. (2014). Outcomes from a Duluth model batterer intervention program at completion and long term follow-up. *Journal of Offender*

Rehabilitation, *53*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2013.861316

Holdsworth, E., Bowen, E., Brown, S., & Howat, D. (2016). The development of a program engagement theory for group offending behavior programs. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X15624177

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Meehan, J. C., Herron, K., Rehman, U., & Stuart, G. L. (2000). Testing the Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart (1994) batterer typology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *68*, 1000–1019.

Howells, K., & Day, A. (2006). Affective determinants of treatment engagement in violent offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *50*(2), 174–186.

Jenkins, A. (1990). *Invitations to responsibility: the therapeutic engagement of men who are violent and abusive*. Dulwich Centre Publications.

Kandiyoti, D. (1988). Bargaining with patriarchy. *Gender & Society*, *2*(3), 274–290. https://doi.org/10.1177/089124388002003004

Kelly, L., & Westmarland, N. (2015). *Domestic violence perpetrator programmes: steps towards change. Project Mirabal Final Report*.

Kistenmacher, B. R., & Weiss, R. L. (2008). Motivational interviewing as a mechanism for change in men who batter: A randomized controlled trial. *Violence and Victims*, *23*(5), 558–570. https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.23.5.558

Lancaster, E., & Lumb, J. (1999). Bridging the gap: Feminist theory and practice reality in work with the perpetrators of child sexual abuse. *Child and Family Social Work*, *4*, 119–129.

Lomo, B., Haavind, H., & Tjersland, O. A. (2016). From resistance to invitations: How men voluntarily in therapy for intimate partner violence may contribute to the development of a working alliance. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *33*(16), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516628290

Lømo, B., Haavind, H., & Tjersland, O. A. (2019). Finding a common ground: therapist responsiveness to male clients who have acted violently against their female partner. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 088626051986227. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519862271

Mann, R. E., Webster, S. D., Schofield, C., & Marshall, W. L. (2004). Approach versus avoidance goals in relapse prevention with sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment*, *16*, 65–75.

McMurran, M. (2002). *Motivating offenders to change: A guide to enhancing engagement in therapy*. John Wiley & Sons.

Mooney, J. (2000). 3. Violence and the three feminisms. In J. Mooney (Ed.), *Gender, Violence and the Social Order* (Vol. 18, pp. 66–93). Palgrave Macmillan.

Moran, P., Ghate, D., & Van der Merwe, A. (2004). *What works in parenting support? A review of the international evidence.*

Mossière, A., & Serin, R. (2014). A critique of models and measures of treatment readiness in offenders. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *19*(4), 383–389.

Murphy, C. M., & Ting, L. A. (2010). Interventions for perpetrators of intimate partner violence: A review of efficacy research and recent trends. *Partner Abuse*, *1*(1), 26–44. https://doi.org/10.1891/1946

Musser, P. H., Semiatin, J. N., Taft, C. T., & Murphy, C. M. (2008). Motivational interviewing as a pregroup intervention for partner-violent men. *Violence and Victims*, *23*(5), 539–557. https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.23.5.539

Pfitzner, N., Humphreys, C., & Hegarty, K. (2015). Research review: engaging men: a multi-level model to support father engagement. *Child & Family Social Work*, *2*(1), 537–547. https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12250

Reis, B., & Brown, L. (1999). Reducing psychotherapy dropouts: Maximizing perspective convergence in the psychotherapy dyad. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice*, *36*(2), 123–136.

Rosenbaum, A., Gearan, P. J., & Ondovic, C. (2001). Completion and recidivism among court-and self-referred batterers in a psychoeducational group treatment program: Implications for intervention and public policy. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment &Trauma*, *5*(2), 199–220.

Scott, K. L., & Wolfe, D. a. (2003). Readiness to change as a predictor of outcome in batterer treatment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *71*(5), 879–889. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.71.5.879

Scourfield, J. (1998). Probation officers working with men. *British Journal of Social Work*, *4*(28), 581–599.

Sheehan, K. a, Thakor, S., & Stewart, D. E. (2012). Turning points for perpetrators of intimate partner violence. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *13*(1), 30–40. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838011426016

Silvergleid, C. S., & Mankowski, E. S. (2006). How batterer intervention programs work: Participant and facilitator accounts of processes of change. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *21*(1), 139–159. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260505282103

Sitaker, M. (2007). The ecology of intimate partner violence: theorized impacts on women's use of violence. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, *15*(3–4), 179–219. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926770802097335

Sturgess, D., Woodhams, J., & Tonkin, M. (2015). Treatment engagement from the perspective of

the offender reasons for noncompletion and completion of treatment—a systematic review. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *60*(16), 1873–1896.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2013). *Counseling the culturally diverse: theory and practice*. John Wiley & Sons.

Taft, C. T., Murphy, C. M., Musser, P. H., & Remington, N. A. (2004). Personality, interpersonal, and motivational predictors of the working alliance in group cognitive-behavioral therapy for partner violent men. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *72*, 349–354.

Taylor, N., Nair, R. Das, & Braham, L. (2013). Perpetrator and victim perceptions of perpetrator's masculinity as a risk factor for violence: A meta-ethnography synthesis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *18*(6), 774–783. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2013.09.002

Tolman, R. M. (2001). An ecological analysis of batterer intervention program standards. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, *5*(2), 221–233. https://doi.org/10.1300/J146v05n02_13

Turhan, Z. (2019). *The lived experiences of Turkish perpetrators' engagement in domestic violence interventions*. Goldsmiths, University of London.

Walling, S. M., Suvak, M. K., Howard, J. M., Taft, C. T., & Murphy, C. M. (2012). Race/ethnicity as a predictor of change in working alliance during cognitive behavioral therapy for intimate partner violence perpetrators. *Psychotherapy (Chicago, Ill.)*, *49*(2), 180–189. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025751

Ward, T., & Marshall, W. L. (2004). Good lives, aetiology and the rehabilitation of sex offenders: A bridging theory. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, *10*, 153–169.

Ward, Tony, Day, A., Howells, K., & Birgden, A. (2004). The multifactor offender readiness model. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *9*(6), 645–673. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2003.08.001

White, R. J., Gondolf, E. W., Robertson, D. U., Goodwin, B. J., & Caraveo, E., L. (2002). Extent and characteristics of woman batterers among federal inmates. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *46*, 412–426. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X02464004

Williams, O. J. (1994). Group work with African American men who batter: Toward more ethnically sensitive practice. In *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* (Vol. 25, Issue 1, pp. 91–104).

Williams, O.J. (1994). Group work with African American men who batter: Toward more ethnically sensitive practice. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, *25*(1), 91–103.

Williams, Oliver J. (1992). Ethnically sensitive practice to enhance treatment participation of African American men who batter. *The Journal of Contemporary Human Services*, *73*(10), 588–595.

Williams, Oliver J., & Becker, L. R. (1994). Domestic partner abuse treatment programs and cultural competence: the results of a national survey. *Violence and Victims*, *9*(3), 287–296.

Zalmanowitz, S. J., Babins-Wagner, R., Rodger, S., Corbett, B. A., & Leschied, A. (2013). The association of readiness to change and motivational interviewing with treatment outcomes in males involved in domestic violence group therapy. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *28*(5), 956–974. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260512459381

Zinn, M. (1990). Family, feminism, and race in America. *Gender & Society*, *4*(1), 68–82.