



The NOMS Quality and Outcomes Team supports effective policy development and operational delivery within the National Offender Management Service and Ministry of Justice by conducting and commissioning high-quality social research and statistical analysis. We aim to publish information to add to the evidence-base and assist with informed debate.



© Crown copyright 2015

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright material you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

First published July 2015

ISBN 978-1-84099-710-1

Contact info:
National.Research@noms.gsi.gov.uk

The views expressed in this Analytical Summary are those of the author, not necessarily those of the Ministry of Justice (nor do they reflect Government policy)

An outcome evaluation of the Integrated Domestic Abuse Programme (IDAP) and Community Domestic Violence Programme (CDVP)

Sinead Bloomfield & Louise Dixon

Two Domestic Violence interventions were delivered by the National Probation Service: the Integrated Domestic Abuse Programme (IDAP) and the Community Domestic Violence Programme (CDVP). This study evaluated the effectiveness of these two interventions in reducing three categories of reoffending (any offence, core violence and domestic violence) during a two year follow up period. The sample consisted of 6,695 offenders referred to either IDAP or CDVP between January 2002 and April 2007. A total of 4,537 had at least started IDAP or CDVP and formed the treatment group; a total of 2,158 had never started IDAP or CDVP and formed the control group.

The full report has been submitted for publication in an academic journal – further details can be obtained from the lead author.

Key findings

- The results indicated that both IDAP and CDVP were effective in reducing domestic violence and any reoffending in the two-year follow up period with small but significant effects; IDAP also produced significant small effects in reducing core violence reoffending.
- A difference of 13.2 percentage points was observed between those who received treatment and those who did not for any reoffending across both programmes (13.3 for IDAP and 12.7 for CDVP).
- A difference of 10.9 percentage points was observed for domestic violence reoffending across both programmes (11.0 for IDAP and 9.6 for CDVP).
- A difference of 6.5 percentage points was observed for core violent reoffending across both programmes (7.1 for IDAP and 2.6 for CDVP, although the difference for CDVP was not significant).
- For those participants who did go on to reoffend, those who received treatment took significantly longer to reoffend than the control group.
- A difference of 1.3 months was observed between those who received treatment and those who did not for any reoffending across both programmes (1.3 months for IDAP and 1.8 for CDVP).
- A difference of 0.9 months was observed for domestic violence reoffending across both programmes (0.9 months for IDAP and 1.8 months for CDVP).
- A difference of 1.1 months was observed for core violent reoffending across both programmes (1.0 for IDAP and 0.9 for CDVP).

Introduction

Domestic violence (DV) is a major concern attracting high political and academic interest, particularly with regard to the effective management of DV perpetrators. There is a lack of research evidence for the effectiveness of the most common treatments provided for perpetrators of DV (Aos *et al.*, 2006; Babcock, Green & Robie, 2004; Feder & Wilson, 2005; Stover, Meadows & Kaufman, 2009).

The National Offender Management Service (NOMS) is committed to evidence based practice when working with offenders and delivers a suite of offending behaviour programmes (OBP's) across prison and probation that address different types of offending such as DV. These programmes are accredited by the Correctional Services Accreditation and Advice panel (CSAAP). There is an expectation from CSAAP that NOMS evaluates its suite of OBP's delivered both in custody and the community.

The National Probation Service delivered two accredited interventions for DV offenders:

- Integrated Domestic Abuse Programme (IDAP, delivered between 2004 and 2013); and
- Community Domestic Violence Programme (CDVP; delivered between 2005 and 2013).

IDAP was a cognitive-behavioural programme which challenged convicted offenders' attitudes and beliefs in order to change their behaviour. It was targeted at heterosexual male DV offenders with a medium to high risk of harm towards their partner. The programme was modular and consisted of 27 group work sessions which last two hours, and 13 individual sessions. Completion of the programme usually took 27 weeks. The programme was accredited by CSAAP in 2004 and was delivered nationally by the probation service between 2004 and 2013.

CDVP was a cognitive-behavioural programme targeted at convicted heterosexual male DV offenders where there was medium to high risk of harm towards their partner. The programme consisted of 25 group work sessions which lasted two hours, and nine individual sessions which were delivered over nine to thirteen weeks. CDVP was accredited by CSAAP in 2005 and was delivered nationally by the probation service between 2005 and 2013.

Both IDAP and CDVP included inter-agency risk assessment and management, victim contact, proactive offender management and core 'group-work' applying an integrated approach to working with DV offenders with the 'group-work' element playing its part alongside input from Public Protection and the Women Safety Worker teams.

The main difference between the two programmes was that IDAP drew heavily from the Duluth model programmes developed in the US with some cognitive behavioural techniques embedded within it, whereas CDVP was a cognitive behavioural treatment programme. A further difference was that IDAP was a modular rolling programme. Participants could start the group work element at the start of each module (with the exception of the sexual respect module). CDVP was a closed group programme where participants could only start at one point of the programme. Each probation area/trust in England and Wales was given the option of delivering one of the two programmes. As such it was decided to look at IDAP and CDVP together to provide a national picture of DV programmes delivered by the National Probation Service, as well as looking at the two programmes separately.

The aim of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the IDAP and CDVP interventions in reducing future reoffending using a robust data matching design – Propensity Score Matching (PSM).

Approach

Sample: The sample consisted of 6,695 offenders referred to either IDAP or CDVP between January 2002 and April 2007 where there was a complete set of data available in terms of variables used for selection onto the programme (i.e. risk). Those that did not start the programme before their order had expired (by April 2008) formed the control group. The treatment group consisted of both programme completers and non-completers. Table 1 provides the breakdown of the sample by programme.

Table 1: Sample sizes by programme

Programme	Treatment Group			Control Group
	Completers	Non completers	Total	
CDVP	704	263	967	553
IDAP	2,645	925	3,570	1,605
Both IDAP & CDVP	3,349	1,188	4,537	2,158

Measures: Data sources used were:

- Offender Assessment System (OASys);¹
- Integrated Accredited Programmes Software (IAPS)²; and
- Police National Computer (PNC).

Outcome: This study looked at two-year 'proven reoffending', which is any offence that led to a caution, court conviction, reprimand or warning within a two year follow up period. A further 'buffer period' of six months was added to allow for any offences committed within this two year follow up period to be convicted in court. Analysis was also conducted looking at the time to first offence.

Follow up period: Individuals who received treatment were followed up from the date of the last session they attended (the final group work session for those who completed the programme and the last session attended for those who did not complete the programme); the individuals who did not start the programme and formed the control group were followed up from the date of the sentence that involved them being referred to either IDAP or CDVP. We used this approach as it has been commonly used in previous programme evaluations

(e.g. Hollin, Hounscome, Bilby, & Palmer, 2008; Lowenkamp, Hubbard, Makarios & Latessa, 2009; Palmer, McGuire, Hounscome, Hatcher, Bilby, & Hollin, 2007; Palmer, McGuire, Hatcher, Hounscome, Bilby, & Hollin, 2007).

The propensity score matching was performed using all IDAP/CDVP suitability criteria variables along with a number of other variables which could potentially affect selection on to the programme and that were potentially related to reoffending. The treatment and control cases were matched using the kernel procedure which uses weighted averages of all control participants against each treated case (see Annex A for a full list of the matching criteria and examples of scores pre and post-matching).

Results

Findings are reported for the two year follow up period for the following outcomes:

- 1) whether any offence was committed;
- 2) whether a core violence offence was committed; and
- 3) whether a domestic violence offence was committed.

Table 2 provides the reoffending rates within a two year period across the three types of offending. A difference of 13.2 percentage points was observed between those who received treatment and those who did not for any offending across both programmes (13.3 for IDAP and 12.7 for CDVP). A difference of 10.9 percentage points was found for domestic violence reoffending across both programmes (11.0 for IDAP and 9.6 for CDVP). A difference of 6.5 percentage points was observed for core violent reoffending across both programmes (7.1 for IDAP and 2.6 for CDVP, although the difference for CDVP was not significant).

Additionally, the time to first re-offence for those who did go on to reoffend was examined. Participants who received treatment took statistically significantly longer to reoffend than the control group across the three types of offending. Table 3 provides the time to reoffend in months.

¹ OASys is a structured clinical risk/needs assessment and management tool. It is used throughout NOMS with offenders aged 18 years and over who are convicted, awaiting sentence, serving custodial sentences of at least 12 months or serving probation sentences involving supervision.

² The Integrated Accredited Programmes Software (IAPS) package is used in the probation service of England and Wales as a means to support delivery of Accredited Programmes and provide reporting and research data nationally and locally.

Table 2: Reoffending rates by programme

Type of Reoffending	Programme	Reoffending rate (2 yr %)		
		Treatment Group	Control group	Observed Difference
Any Offence	IDAP	31.0	44.3	13.3* ^a
	CDVP	37.1	49.7	12.7* ^a
	Both	32.3	45.5	13.2* ^a
Core Violence Offence	IDAP	14.7	21.8	7.1* ^a
	CDVP	17.6	20.2	2.6
	Both	15.3	21.8	6.5* ^a
Domestic Violence Offence	IDAP	22.0	33.0	11.0* ^a
	CDVP	25.5	34.9	9.6* ^a
	Both	22.8	33.7	10.9* ^a

* Significant difference observed (p<0.05)

^a Small effect size observed using odds ratio

Table 3: Time to reoffend by programme

Type of Reoffending	Programme	Time to reoffend in Months		
		Treatment Group	Control group	Observed Difference
Any Offence	IDAP	9.4	8.1	1.3*
	CDVP	9.3	7.5	1.8*
	Both	9.4	8.1	1.3*
Core Violence Offence	IDAP	10.2	9.2	1.0*
	CDVP	10.3	9.4	0.9*
	Both	10.3	9.2	1.1*
Domestic Violence Offence	IDAP	9.6	8.7	0.9*
	CDVP	9.8	8.0	1.8*
	Both	9.6	8.7	0.9*

* Significant difference observed using Cox regression (p<0.001)

Implications/Conclusions

The findings demonstrate that both IDAP and CDVP were effective in producing significant small effect sizes in reducing DV and any reoffending. To a lesser degree, IDAP also produced significant small effects in reducing core violence reoffending.

Although the results are promising, many men undergoing treatment went onto reoffend. Further work to improve the effects of DV intervention is therefore warranted. Our knowledge about ways to work with offenders generally and DV offenders specifically have advanced since IDAP and CDVP were developed. Therefore we need to adopt these new approaches when working with DV offenders to enhance the positive findings found within this study.

Limitations

DV is largely underreported and therefore this is an important factor when considering the proven reoffending rates from the PNC.

Even though an over-inclusive approach was employed to try and match for all relevant variables to avoid systematic bias produced by factors unaccounted for in the matching process, it is possible that some bias was not accounted for in this study.

Due to the unavailability of Spousal Assault Risk Assessment (SARA) scores for all DV offenders, Offender Group Reconviction Scale v.3 (OGRS3) and OASys Violence Predictor (OVP) scores were used to measure risk of reoffending.

We followed up the control group from the date of sentence. However there are alternative approaches that could be used (For example, both the control group and treatment group can be followed up from the end of their order). This needs to be considered when interpreting these findings. Future research could also include victim reports as well as police records – including victim reports would allow the capture of potential offences not reaching the criminal justice system.

References

- Aos, S, Miller, M, & Drake, E. (2006). *Evidence-Based Adult Corrections Programs: What Works and What Does Not*. Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- Babcock, J. C., Green, C. E., & Robie, C. (2004). Does batterers' treatment work? A meta-analytic review of domestic violence treatment. *Clinical Psychology Review, 23*, 1023-053. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2002.07.001.
- Feder, L., & Wilson, D. B. (2005). A meta-analytic review of court-mandated batterer intervention programs: Can courts affect abusers' behavior? *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 1*, 239-262. doi: 10.1007/s11292-005-1179-0.
- Hollin, C. R., McGuire, J., Hounscome, J. C., Bilby, C. A. L., & Palmer, E. J. (2008). Cognitive skills behaviour programs for offenders in the community: A reconviction analysis. *Criminal Justice & Behavior, 35*, 269-283
- Lowenkamp, C. T., Hubbard, D., Makarios, D., & Latessa, E. J. (2009). A quasi-experimental evaluation of thinking for a change: A "real world" application. *Criminal Justice & Behavior, 36*, 137-146.
- Palmer, E. J., McGuire, J., Hounscome, J. C., Hatcher, R. M., Bilby, C. A. L., & Hollin, C. R. (2007). Offending behaviour programmes in the community: The effects on reconviction of three programmes with adult male offenders. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 12*, 251-264.
- Palmer, E. J., McGuire, J., Hatcher, R. M., Hounscome, J. C., Bilby, C. A. L., & Hollin, C. R. (2007). The importance of appropriate allocation to offending behaviour programs. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 52*, 206-221.
- Stover, C. S., Meadows, A. L., and Kaufman, J. (2009). Interventions for intimate partner violence: Review and implications for evidence-based practice. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 40*: 223-233.

Annex A: Propensity score matching variables and scores

Factors used for matching

1. Suitability factors:

- i. Evidence of Domestic Violence/partner abuse
- ii. OGRS3 score
- iii. OVP score

2. Static risk:

- i. Age
- ii. Number of previous convictions
- iii. Experience of childhood
- iv. Childhood behaviour problems

3. Dynamic risk:

- i. Lives with partner
- ii. Literacy problems
- iii. Learning difficulties
- iv. Manipulative/predatory lifestyle
- v. Reckless/risk taking behaviour
- vi. Ever misused drugs
- vii. Violent behaviour related to drug use
- viii. Current alcohol use a problem
- ix. Binge drinking
- x. Violent behaviour related to alcohol use at any time
- xi. Difficulties coping
- xii. Current psychological problems/depression
- xiii. Social isolation
- xiv. Attitude to themselves
- xv. History of self harm. Attempted suicide, suicidal thoughts or feelings
- xvi. Interpersonal skills
- xvii. Impulsivity
- xviii. Aggressive/controlling behaviour
- xix. Temper control

- xx. Ability to recognise problems
- xxi. Problem solving skills
- xxii. Awareness of consequences a problem
- xxiii. Achieves goals is a problem
- xxiv. Understands other peoples views is a problem
- xxv. Concrete/abstract thinking
- xxvi. Pro-criminal attitudes
- xxvii. Understand motivation for offending is a problem
- xxviii. Motivation to address offending
- xxix. Accommodation is a criminogenic need
- xxx. Education, training & employability is a criminogenic need
- xxxi. Financial management & income is a criminogenic need
- xxxii. Relationships is a criminogenic need
- xxxiii. Lifestyle & associates is a criminogenic need
- xxxiv. Drug misuse is a criminogenic need
- xxxv. Alcohol misuse is a criminogenic need
- xxxvi. Emotional well-being is a criminogenic need
- xxxvii. Thinking & Behavior is a criminogenic need
- xxxviii. Attitudes is a criminogenic need
- xxxix. Risk of serious harm
- xl. Total number of needs

4. Other factors:

- i. Year of sentence
- ii. Ethnicity
- iii. Months at risk of reoffending
- iv. DV programme attended – IDAP or CDVP

Table A1: Example of mean scores of variables before and after matching and bias reduction

Variable	Sample	Treatment Group	Control Group	% bias
Total number of needs	Unmatched	4.0919	4.6487*	-0.9
	Matched	4.0918	4.1119	
Age	Unmatched	34.626	33.027*	-1.1
	Matched	34.618	34.719	
OGRS3 Score	Unmatched	38.195	47.061*	-1.2
	Matched	38.213	38.474	
OVP Score	Unmatched	33.049	39.362*	-1
	Matched	33.062	33.227	
Months at risk of reoffending	Unmatched	37.259	35.785*	1.3
	Matched	37.246	37.132	
Number of previous sanctions	Unmatched	6.7767	9.2553*	-1
	Matched	6.7805	6.8489	

* Significant difference observed ($p < 0.05$)