

Report of the evaluation of pilot of the Respect toolkit for work with young people using violence against partners, ex-partners or family members

Chris Newman and Thangam Debbonaire, March 2011

Contents:

1 Introduction (page 3)

1.1 Background

2. The Respect pilot project (page 4)

2.1 Development

2.2 The pilot sites, staffing and training

2.3 Targets for the pilot sites

2.4 Aims for the evaluation

2.5 Data collection for this evaluation

2.6 Limitations of the data and evaluation

3. Evidence base for the toolkit and the evaluation (page 8)

3.1 Incidence of teenage intimate partner violence and family violence

3.2 Factors influencing the perpetration of intimate partner violence

3.3 Factors influencing child to parent violence

4. Preparation and implementation of the pilots (page 12)

4.1 Initial training on the use of the toolkit

4.2 Structuring programmes from the toolkit

5. Delivery of work (page 14)

5.1 Numbers, facilitators

5.2 The young people

5.3 The violence and aggression used and experienced by the young people

5.4 Vulnerability

6. Processes (page 20)

6.1 Getting referrals

6.2 Assessment and intake

6.3 Case management

6.4 Partner/parent contact/support

7. Evaluation of content of work delivered (page 23)

- 7.1 Activities which went well:
- 7.2 Activities which didn't go so well:
- 7.3 Activities which were needed
- 7.4 Use of 'control log' or equivalent
- 7.5 Emphasis on group process and 'here and now'
- 7.6 Use of films
- 7.7 Use of other material
- 7.8 Impact of the setting of the work
- 7.9 Impact of practitioner background
- 7.10 Impact of organisational setting and history

8. Outputs of the pilot projects (page 30)

9. Outcomes of the pilot projects (page 32)

- 9.1 Project outcomes
- 9.2 Outcomes for young people and their behaviour
- 9.3 Outcome analysis against risk factors for future perpetration

10. Conclusions (page 34)

11. Final recommendations (page 35)

Bibliography (page 36)

Appendix: alternative to 'control log' (page 38)

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Domestic violence perpetrator programmes (DVPPs) working with adult males who use intimate partner against their female partner or ex-partner have been established in the USA and the UK for more than twenty years. Initially in the UK, the provision was organised in voluntary organisations only. They took self referrals and then referrals from criminal courts for men on probation orders for relevant crimes. During the last ten years, the probation service in the UK has brought the provision of DVPPs for criminally convicted men in house. Community based programmes now work with self referred men and others who have been referred by social services, health, couples counselling or the family courts.

The geographical coverage of community based DVPPs in the UK varies widely. Some cities have had a DVPP for at least a decade, others have only just established one. Some regions have no community based programme at all. Respect, the national association of Domestic Violence Perpetrator programmes (www.respect.uk.net) has been working with local services and funders to attempt to fill these gaps. The skills, models of work and approaches in these programmes are well developed. Some have been the subject of research, most are monitoring and evaluating the outcomes of their work at a local level. US research on DVPPs (known in the USA as Batterer Intervention Programs or BIPs) varies in its assessment of the effects of the work with violent men. However, the longest and largest longitudinal research on programme outcomes, with a quasi experimental approach comparing programme completers with programme drop outs, found that over 80% of the men were violence free four years after programme completion and that most of the women said their safety had been improved by their partner's participation in the programme (Gondolf, 2002).

In recent years referring agencies have highlighted a need for programmes to work with young people using violence. Research is also picking up a rate of teenage intimate partner violence of between 10% and 37% in the UK (from a review of relevant research by Kate Iwi, Respect Young People's Worker, in the Respect newsletter, 2008). Youth projects and social services identified young people who use violence against their parents or carers or siblings, as well as young people involved in intimate partner violence or violence carried out by groups of young men against young women associated with them (experience of the evaluators and the project coordinator). Projects working with young people developed an understanding that some of these young people had themselves also been the victim of violence or that violence they had experienced within the home may be underlying the violence they themselves were using, for example, to defend a parent from another parent or carer, or out of frustration with a parent who was a victim of domestic violence (Iwi, 2008; anecdotal evidence supplied by youth projects and DVPPs to evaluators).

In the mean time in the UK and elsewhere, schools and youth work have been the subject of programmes to work with whole groups of young people in order to prevent them from becoming the perpetrators or victims of the future and to equip all young people with the skills and knowledge to

recognise a potentially abusive relationship of their own or of friends and how to respond (Ellis, 2007). There are now well developed programmes of such activities and some schools and youth services have been delivering these for some time.

In Canada, the US and the UK, group work programmes to support children and young people who have been experiencing living with domestic violence in their parents' or carers' relationships have been developed. The programme developed in London Ontario has been a particular source of inspiration and source materials for UK programmes (Loosely et al, 1997, updated 2006), initiated by the Sutton group work programme for children and their non-abusing mothers (Debbonaire, 2007). Against Violence and Abuse (AVA – formerly known as the Greater London Domestic Violence Project) has supported the establishment of such programmes in London through training and consultancy (see www.avaproject.org.uk).

The gap in service provision for work with young people about their use of violence was being reported by domestic violence programmes and their referring agencies. Source materials and skills for developing a coherent package to respond to young people's violence was available (anecdotal evidence from discussions between evaluators and practitioners in DVPPs and young people's projects).

2. The Respect pilot project

2.1 Development

In 2008, Respect obtained funding from Nationwide, Department of Children Schools and Families (as was) and from Comic Relief, to develop a specific toolkit for work with young people using violence, abuse and/or aggression in intimate or family relationships. Two part time workers were recruited to develop the draft toolkit and a training and support package for assisting local projects to pilot the work.

The Respect staff carried out a literature and resources review (Iwi, 2008). Using this information and also their own experience as domestic violence practitioners and in work with young people, they prepared a full draft toolkit (Iwi, 2008) and training package.

Five local projects from around the UK were contracted, following a tendering process which attracted a great deal of attention, to take part in the training and to deliver programmes of work with young people using violence.

Two evaluators were recruited to carry out evaluation activities and participation in evaluation was made one of the conditions of becoming a pilot project. This is the report of the pilot of these activities in the five projects and of the use of the toolkit.

2.2 The pilot sites, staffing and training

Five projects were successful in tendering to be one of the pilot sites. They varied in setting, history, size, structure and usual client group.

Project B: this is an **inner city youth project** with no background in domestic violence. The project worker was recruited after the Respect initial training had taken place but other staff from the project did participate.

Project C: set within a Relate project which also runs an adult domestic violence intervention programme working with perpetrators and survivors. The project worker has considerable specialist knowledge and skills, including work with young people who have experienced domestic violence at home and also those distressed by parental separation. The project has strong relationship with local schools. The part time young people's worker and her colleague in Relate developed and delivered the work. They also attended the initial training from Respect.

Project N: set in a children's charity, the organisation also has a substantial history of delivering domestic violence interventions with perpetrators and survivors. The project worker was part time, the other part of his hours were spent on the adult programme. He had considerable skills in domestic violence interventions and also history as a social worker in child protection in the city. He also has strong connections to child protection staff and to Youth Offending. He was not in post until Autumn 2009 and did not attend the initial training, however he had substantial relevant experience.

Project R: this is specialist organisation working with young people with learning difficulties in North West London. All staff are trained and qualified therapists. Project has strong relationships with local schools particularly those for children with moderate learning difficulties. Practitioners attended the Respect training.

Project S: this is a specialist organisation working with adults and young people of African descent in South London, with an emphasis on culturally appropriate services and activities. Practitioners attended the training.

2.3 Targets for the pilot sites

In return for a fee to support the costs of the pilot, each of the five pilot sites agreed to test the toolkit out. The brief for the project stated that:

"In each of 5 partners [the] this will involve:

- 12 young people assessed for groupwork
- 8-10 young people start groupwork
- 6-8 complete a course of at least 10 group sessions (completion includes the collection of evaluation data)
- 8 young people (aged 13-19) assessed for 1-1 work
- 5 young people participating in 1-1 work
- 3-4 young people complete individual work, including evaluation data
- Linked support services offered to an average of one vulnerable partner or family member per young person worked with”

2.4 Aims for the evaluation

The following boxed text is taken from the brief for the evaluation, as devised by Respect Young People’s Project staff.

The core purpose of this evaluation is to assess what works (and what does not), with respect to:

- Making the client group of young people using or at risk of using violence against partners or family (around 60 assessed for - and 40 participating in - the groupwork across 5 pilot regions and around 40 assessed for - and 25 participating in - the individual work) less likely to use violence and more respectful in their close relationships
- Increasing the safety and decreasing the vulnerability of those who are in family or intimate relationships these young people (in order of priority the safety of children will be paramount)

We expect that this will include:

1. Consideration of which materials worked and didn’t work with clear recommendations as to how to adjust the toolkit.
2. Consideration of what structures / settings and processes resulted in successful engagement with young people using or at risk of using violence in their close relationships (including getting referrals, assessing and motivating these clients)
3. Consideration of what interventions, structures and protocols best increased the safety of those at risk from these young people.

2.5 Data collection for this evaluation

The evaluators worked with the Respect project staff to develop evaluation tools to fulfil the original aims of the evaluation. These included: session evaluation forms for staff; pre- and post-programme questionnaires for use with young people taking part in the programme; pre- and post-programme questionnaires for use by parents of young people taking part; pre- and post-programme questionnaires

for use by partners/ex-partners of young people taking part. The questionnaires were adapted for online use and also distributed in paper version in folders to each project.

In the end, the following data collection methods were partially or mostly successful:

Site visits to each of the projects and repeated **telephone interviews** with practitioners helped the evaluators to track the process of development, implementation and review of the pilot.

Regular phone calls and emails between researchers and the projects.

Project B: Session records - detailed and included feedback from participants. Session evaluation sheets provided by the evaluators; additional written record of exact lesson plan, attendance register and copies of feedback forms from each participant of each session.

Project C: nine pairs of pre and post programme questionnaires for young people taking part in group work in school (using the forms provided by the evaluators)

Project C: interview in person with young person and his mother who had been receiving joint sessions with one of the project workers; matching set of pre programme questionnaires from this young person and his mother (using the forms provided by the evaluators)

Project N: pre programme questionnaires using full inventories of abuse completed with the young person by the programme worker and assessment forms. These forms were similar to those provided by the evaluators but inventories of abuse were more details.

Project R: detailed session records for two rounds of a 10 week group work programme (20 sets of session records in all, plus post group reflections by the therapists); 2 sets of records of 5 individual work sessions (10 in all). All session records included session evaluation sheets provided by the evaluators, plus detailed additional notes and attendance records.

Project S: 9 partly completed pre programme questionnaires completed by young people during (not before) the residential programme; 3 pairs of pre programme questionnaires completed by young person and parent each. All questionnaires using the forms provided by the evaluators. Their record sheet indicates that there as evaluation data collected from more of the young people but this was not provided to the evaluators.

Project S: record of number of sessions and young people worked with.

2.6 Limitations of the data and evaluation

The initial evaluation outline from Respect specified various other evaluation activities which became impossible due to the nature of the implementation. For example, gathering data from partners and/or parents was simply not possible because of the lack or total absence of such contact from the projects. Session evaluation forms were provided to all project workers but used in very varied ways and none.

Two programmes used the session evaluation forms consistently and provided copies of these to the evaluators (R and B). The other three projects did not provide session evaluation forms to the evaluators.

Focus groups with young people were not practical because of the limited time scale of most of the interventions or because of the way the project was delivered, for example in school time and sites.

Online questionnaires were requested in the original evaluation requirements but the project workers subsequently reported that most of the young people had no access to computers and could not use project computers for various reasons. One project simply photocopied the pages of the online questionnaire and used these in paper form pre- and post- programme delivery (C).

As this was a pilot project involving five sites with hugely varying expectations, staffing, and eventual delivery of the programmes, it was perhaps an unrealistic expectation to have pre- and post-programme questionnaires to evaluate outcomes. Many young people did not complete the programme and therefore could not be asked to complete post programme questionnaires. Some of the young people were in great chaos and it was not practical to expect them to complete any questionnaires.

Evaluating outcomes for a moving target, particularly five moving targets, is very unlikely to produce valid outcome results. It is also a job requiring considerably more evaluator time than allocated for this project – probably needs an evaluator to be able to be on site regularly, which was not feasible for this project.

No significant comparisons could be made within the evaluation brief when the differences between projects and clients were so huge. No meaningful combinations of data from young people could be made when there were such great variations of presenting problems, compounding factors and demographic differences.

Having said all that, the practitioners and the available data did provide a substantial picture of what happened, why, when and how, together with a reasonable profile of the young people who were involved, feedback on the use and content of the toolkit and training and some data about the young people's perceptions of their own behaviour and changes to it.

3. Evidence base for the toolkit and the evaluation

3.1 Incidence of teenage intimate partner violence and family violence

Studies appear to show that violence is commonplace in young people's relationships – some US research suggests that nearly half of all young people experience this (Barter, 2009 for a review of the US research on young people's experience of partner violence).

Complicating factors include the lack of recognition of the variations in definitions of relationship (Hickman et al, 2000). Young people experience violence and sexual coercion in the context of changing and developing adolescent relationships, which don't always fit with the constraints of domestic violence research definitions (Chung, 2005). If relationship is not a term which is clear and shared between teenagers and researchers, the abuse or coercion which takes place in a situation involving "friends with privileges" or "casual sex partners" could be and probably is missed.

Studies show similarities between male and female levels of use of physical violence in relationships but differences by gender in context, consequences and meaning of that violence (Barter, 2009). Girls tend to suffer from more serious forms of violence from males than vice versa (see, for example, Molidar et al, 2001). They also report greater levels of fear and long term impact, particularly from sexually abusive behaviours (Jackson et al, 2000). However, boys may be reacting in part with their own cultural assumptions about the acceptability of expressing fear as a male. Hickman et al, 2004 concluded that teenage partner violence is difficult to measure, because of the challenges of disentangling initiating, defensive and retaliatory violence and aggression.

Assumptions and expectations of gender roles play a significant part in young people's experience, use and justification of IPV as well as their responses to it. This is particularly clear in relation to sexual violence and coercion. Research carried out in the Netherlands found that young men with traditional gender views are more likely to perpetrate sexual violence than others. Other work has found that perceptions of "no" are gender specific: girls tend to blame themselves for violence used against them (Chung, 2005; Bannister et al, 2006). However, some researchers found little evidence of a link with gender (Vezina and Hebert, 2007).

In the UK, Jane Ellis found a range of programmes in use in schools to help to prevent domestic violence and other forms of gender based violence (Ellis, 2004) and that the implementation of these was at too early a stage for clear outcomes.

3.2 Factors influencing the perpetration of intimate partner violence

Practitioners, researchers and policy makers have long theorised and argued about what causes some people to use domestic violence. A substantial body of research has now built up, providing rigorous evidence of the influence, including the comparative influence, of different factors on the use of various forms of domestic violence and gender based violence. This can now help to inform the development of programmes to address these forms of violence.

A recent meta analysis of research on factors influencing adult perpetration of various forms of violence against women, including intimate partner violence (IPV), stalking and sexual abuse/rape provides a rigorous evidence base for work with adults already using IPV and young people using it or at risk of

using it (Haggerman-White et al, 2010). The four most significant factors for IPV perpetration identified were:

- Defensive/hostile masculinity
- Sense of male entitlement over women
- Peer approval of the behaviour
- Poor parenting

This analysis of research on the factors for adult use of violence against women and children provides useful pointers for work with young people, particularly young men, to **prevent their current use of violence becoming entrenched as they move into adulthood.**

Three of these four factors can be and are worked on in some domestic violence prevention programmes with young people and with many DVPPs with adult males already using IPV. Whilst poor parenting cannot be directly remedied within a young people's project, the effects of it can be allayed **and supportive practical help can also be brought in to deal with some of the impact.**

RECOMMENDATION: that the toolkit and the delivery of activities with young people using violence against partners or similar continue to emphasise the use of activities which address a) **defensive/hostile sense of masculinity**, b) **culture of male entitlement over women** and c) **peer approval of IPV** as these are risk factors for continuing use of intimate partner violence. Additionally, help which deals with some of the effects of poor parenting may also help to reduce the likelihood of further IPV.

The meta analysis further identified the following factors of lesser significance than the four listed above but still significant for future use of IPV:

- Emotional dysregulation
- Family stress
- Cognitive distortion
- Gender stereotyping
- High concentrations of poverty and social exclusion
- Failed sanctions or impunity
- Stimulus abuse, including drink, drugs and pornography
- Exposure to violence on screen

Again, some of these can be directly addressed in the work of a DVPP working with young people. Some can be addressed indirectly or the young person referred to an agency which can help to deal with them. It also helps to know that it is important to address the surrounding factors such as stress, poverty, social exclusion and sanctions.

For some young people, attendance on a programme to address violence may be part of the sanction for that violence. The N participants, for example, were referred to the programme partly because of the sanction of Youth Offending responses to their violence.

RECOMMENDATION: programmes can also help to reduce future IPV by addressing a) poor emotional regulation; b) gender stereotyping and c) cognitive distortions.

RECOMMENDATION: programmes will also help to reduce young people's likelihood of future IPV if they ensure that family stress, stimulus abuse, social exclusion, and failed sanctions

3.3 Factors influencing child to parent violence

Kate Iwi's review of the available research on young people and violence (Iwi, 2008) in preparation for the draft toolkit identified some key themes in the literature. This review provided a useful review of the theoretical underpinning to the preparation of the toolkit. Key findings from the literature include:

There is a connection between corporal punishment of children and their use of violence to a parent when they are a young person – those young people who have been hit as children, particularly if this amounts to abuse, are more likely to use child to parent violence than those who have not (Brezina 1999, Hartz 1995, Hotaling Straus & Lincoln 1990)

There is a complex relationship between child to parent violence and intimate partner violence in the lives of the parent(s) - where the mother was the sole perpetrator of domestic violence the rates of child to parent violence to mothers were highest, followed by both parents using violence, followed by father doing sole violence. Where mothers only or both parents hit, there were rates of 60% child to parent violence in past year (Ullman and Straus, 2005); domestic violence is strongly related to children hitting mothers but not to children hitting fathers (Ullman and Straus, 2005). Some child-to-parent violence is also of course not related to parental domestic violence. Clearly, child-to-parent violence is perhaps more prevalent in the UK than we have previously officially recognised.

Gender is also related to child-to-parent violence: Of the studies that compared boys and girls, most found more boys than girls hit parents (Langhinichsen-Rohling, Neidig and Thorn, 1995); Of the studies that compare mothers and fathers, most found that mothers were victims of CPV more often than fathers (Cornell and Gelles, 1982).

4. Preparation and implementation of the pilots

4.1 Initial training on the use of the toolkit

All practitioners in the pilot sites were offered a 4 day training course delivered by the Respect Young people's workers. However, some of the projects had not recruited by the time of the training and others subsequently had staff changes which mean that the work was delivered by people who had not attended the training.

A recurrent theme in the feedback from practitioners who had attended the training was that they wanted more on how to structure the programme from the tool kit and more practice using the content of the tool kit. Those who had no specialist experience or knowledge of domestic violence also wanted more on the domestic violence content. Practitioners also had considerable skills and experience to share amongst the group. The facilitative style of the training did allow for discussion and this was helpful.

RECOMMENDATION: that future training includes time for practitioners to work with trainers on structuring the programme for their particular client group and setting, with opportunities for feedback from the rest of the group and the trainers.

Another theme from practitioners with no prior specialist experience of working with domestic violence was that the training did not provide sufficient time for that gap to be filled. This indicates an additional training need for this group of practitioners, who have substantial experience of work with young people and may be very well placed to deliver the work but need additional initial training on domestic violence with a specific emphasis on the particular needs for this client group and work. It was noticeable that these practitioners were also the ones who struggled the most with partner/parent contact.

RECOMMENDATION: that additional training is offered to practitioners with little or no domestic violence experience before they start to run this type of programme. This training should include: understanding young people's experiences of domestic violence in the carers' relationships and in their own relationships; the challenges of working with people on their use of violence and force; understanding the cultural landscape of the clients and how this affects their understanding and use of violence and aggression; partner/parent contact.

Finally, some practitioners clearly felt more comfortable than others using role play and drama techniques generally. One practitioner who was clearly very skilled in other ways commented:

"I've never known young people want to do role play" [interview with evaluator]

Whilst for others, working with the same age group and on the same topic, said that they found it invaluable. One young man feeding back on a session at Wolverhampton B said:

“it was great because of the role play” [feedback form from young man on programme]

The practitioner who stated young people didn't want to do role play nevertheless also described a very successful activity in which she took on a role of an aggressive person spontaneously to help the young people to understand the impact of their aggression on others. She did not identify this as role play and clearly felt confident to deliver it (she had used it on other programmes) which suggests that given some additional training or assistance to develop this skill she and others in a similar position could develop the capacity to use drama and role play with young people regularly.

As these techniques are often a key feature of lively, engaging programmes (though by no means essential) and the practitioners concerned stated they had had no training on the use of drama, it would be useful to provide additional training on this technical aspect.

RECOMMENDATION: that the training includes specific sections for building skills using drama, with an emphasis on the fact that practitioners do not need to be skilled actors or drama teachers to use these techniques and on building their confidence to use simple techniques constructively.

4.2 Structuring programmes from the toolkit

FINDING: the toolkit provides the source materials and clear guidance for developing and running a programme for young people using violence

FINDING: the national practitioners' network for work with young people provides opportunities for practitioners to share experiences about using this toolkit and other resources and how to structure these into programmes.

A clear theme in the responses from the practitioners about the tool kit was that it was packed full of activities and that whilst this was helpful it was a challenge to turn this into a programme for their specific client group. A recommendation has been made above for including this in the initial training.

“Overall I think it's fantastic, it's all there” [practitioner, interview with evaluator]

“I would have liked more time in the training spent on how we structure programmes”
[practitioner, interview with evaluator]

“the young people we are working with have very specific needs and some of the materials don't work for them – they have backgrounds where they may have come to this country without other family” [practitioner, interview with evaluator]

“Some of the activities worked better when we used visual and creative methods of delivering them, particularly as some of the young people have poor reading and writing” [practitioner, group interview with both evaluators and practitioners]

Whilst initial training is one event which was and could be used to help prepare practitioners for structuring the activities, it is by no means the only one. The Respect Young People's project team have now established and supported a national practitioners' network for practitioners working on young people's use of violence and will shortly be running a national conference on the topic. These and other such events provide excellent opportunities for practitioners to share experiences and develop knowledge and skills. The Respect young people's project workers should be commended for establishing these supporting and developmental events as part of their work.

RECOMMENDATION: that practitioners make use of the national practitioners' network meetings and other relevant events for developing practice.

5. Delivery of work

5.1 Numbers, facilitators

Project B:

1. Assessment and delivery of two group work programmes, each lasting nine weeks and each involving three young men (total six). One female and one male facilitator.

Project C:

1. Joint work with a young man who had been using violence against his mother, jointly with the mother, at the young man's insistence. Towards the end of his involvement the young man agreed to separate sessions. The young man had been living with domestic violence from his step father to his mother and had witnessed substantial amounts of abuse as well as experienced some from his step father. Female practitioner.
2. One attempt at group work on site with young people recruited from a local school did not work, as there was low to zero turnout at the two sessions the workers planned to deliver at the project site. The project workers concluded that expecting young people with chaotic lives to be able to manage to get to a regular session in the project site was unrealistic. No evaluation data provided for this.
3. They then recruited another group of 16 young people with another school and delivered an 8 week programme for them on the school premises and during school time, which ensured attendance. However, this school had misunderstood (or ignored?) the criteria and referred young people who were being aggressive in class rather than towards partner or parent. Some

disclosed in individual assessment that they were living with domestic violence at home but did not want to discuss it in the group. Of the 16 who started, 10 attended most or all of the 8 week programme. Most group work sessions had about 8 or 9 attending. Pre and post questionnaires were submitted completed by 8 of these young people. All but one of these young people was female. Both facilitators were female.

Project N:

1. A one-off group session with young male asylum seekers living in the city, some of whom had been cautioned by police for alleged inappropriate behaviour towards women. The session was on sexual respect and involved about 12 young men and 3 interpreters as he was working with young people who spoke a range of different languages. Male facilitator.
2. Assessment and initial support and motivation sessions for 8 young men referred by the Youth Offending team, all of whom were involved in the criminal justice system, some of whom had already been incarcerated and some of whom were at imminent risk of incarceration. Of these, 2 young men attended 3 sessions each, 1 attended 2 sessions, 3 never attended and 2 attended all the sessions. Male practitioner, working with female facilitator in group work.
3. Individual intervention and support for a young woman who was referred for her use of violence but on assessment was identified as a vulnerable young woman who was experiencing physical and sexual abuse from carers. Work carried out by the female partner contact worker in the project.

Project R:

1. Two rounds (one with five young men, one with six young men) of a ten week programme of group work delivered on school premises for young men with moderate learning difficulties and behavioural difficulties. One male and one female facilitator.
2. Two individual work programmes, one lasting six weeks and one lasting two weeks, for two young men with moderate learning difficulties. This was followed up by a 12-week individual programme with each of three young men.

Project S:

1. Weekend assessment day for 26 young people and carers. Mixed male and female practitioners.
2. Week long residential for 12 young people at a theme park and then follow up sessions on a weekend. Mixed male and female practitioners.

5.2 The young people

B: six young men identified from within the local school as using violence or aggression.

C: for the group work the clients were young people who were being aggressive in school. One young man who had been violent to his mother and sibling had joint sessions with his mother, at his firm insistence, on site.

N: there was a one-off session with young asylum seekers who had limited or no English and were unaccompanied by carers. The group work was with young male offenders referred by Youth Offending, either convicted or at risk of conviction. One individual young woman using violence was also identified as experiencing physical and sexual abuse from within the family and the N female partner support worker worked with this young woman.

R: two groups and two additional individual work programmes, all with young people with moderate learning and behavioural difficulties, mixed ethnicity, North London identified with the school as needing help to stop using violence or aggression.

S: young people who are African in descent, identified as needing help with violence or aggression. Many have arrived from country of origin to live with an unknown relative or other adult.

5.3 The violence and aggression used and experienced by the young people

Programme	Targets of their violence	Consequences of their violence	Violence they had experienced	Notes about risk and vulnerability
B (N = 6 all male)	No data	No data	No data	No data
C in school (Number of evaluation forms =8 all female; total assessed for group work 16)	Five had used violence: against own partner, mum, dad, mum's partner or dad's partner or another child in family or outside family	Some had caused injuries 7 had been excluded from school because of their violence at some point.	Five had been victims of violence, including two from own partner, two from mother, two from dad, one from adult family relative, two from another adult or child outside the family.	
C individual support (N = 1 male)	Young man had been violent to mother and sibling		Witnessed violence from step father to mother, some violence towards him	Low self esteem, poor school attendance

Programme	Targets of their violence	Consequences of their violence	Violence they had experienced	Notes about risk and vulnerability
N young asylum seeker session (N = 12 all male)	Reported sexual harassment of women in public. No assessment data	<i>Young people had been cautioned by the police</i>	<i>No clear data, but given their legal status, likely to be significant in home country and in the UK</i>	Vulnerable, unaccompanied minors with limited English
N assessed for group work programme (N = 10 all male)	4 to mother 8 to partner 3 to sister	8 convictions, including 1 conviction for arson and endangering life 4 used serious violence including choking/strangling One had child on child protection plan 2 had restricted contact with child	4 Witnessed and lived with domestic violence mum	
R group work programmes (N = 11 all male; most detail about second group of 6)	General aggression and some violence in school and outside to peers – all of them to varying degrees and some not recently violent	Some risk of exclusion	Some neglect – most didn't live with father, two had mothers who couldn't cope Some direct abuse from father At least 2 had lived with violent adult males Some violence from peers	Young people with moderate learning difficulties At least 3 in foster care for other reasons

Programme	Targets of their violence	Consequences of their violence	Violence they had experienced	Notes about risk and vulnerability
R individual work (N = 5 male; 1 of whom had attended the group work programme above)	Not clear General aggression and behavioural difficulties. Some involvement with gangs in local area.	One young man at risk of exclusion – sent home because of his behaviour at school several times and missed most sessions	Father Lived with domestic violence in earlier childhood. Violence in gangs of young men Knife crime in local area.	Moderate learning difficulties; chaotic family background and now in foster care; contact with strong drug users/dealers
S group work (N = 10, mixed group, 26 assessed, 9 completed)	Mixture of violent to parent/carer and/or partner/ex		Not clear	
S individual work (N = 8; 10 assessed; 7 participated fully)	Mixture of violence to step parents/parents and/or partner/ex		Evidence not clear or completed	1 had been excluded from school

Total N = 65, where N is number of young people who started group or individual work.

The five pilot projects sent information about assessment and/or group participation for groups and individual work involving fifty eight young people. Fifteen of these were young women and forty three were young men.

FINDINGS: all five projects wholly or very nearly met the targets for assessment for group work of twelve young people. Only one of the projects met the target of eight young people to be assessed for individual work and there was a lack of forthcoming evaluation data from this programme about this work. As a result, the contents of the toolkit were less well tested out for their use in individual work.

FINDING: The range of violence and aggression used by the young people was wide. Some had committed serious acts, causing significant harm and often resulting in criminal action against them. Others had used no physical violence but had sometimes been in trouble with school for aggression.

FINDING: At least fifteen of the young people had been excluded from school because of their violence or aggression. At least eight had convictions for their violence.

5.4 Vulnerability

FINDING: Most of the young people in the pilot projects were also vulnerable or at risk of harm or affected by past experiences of harm or both.

To varying degrees, all the young people in the projects were vulnerable in one way or another. However, some specific groups can be identified as particularly vulnerable:

1. Unaccompanied minors seeking asylum with little or no spoken English (N)
2. Young people with moderate learning difficulties (R)
3. Young people whose parents lived in a different country and were experiencing unstable care from care givers who were not kin or who were remotely related (N asylum seeker session; S)
4. Young people who were primarily the victims of violence (all sites)
5. Young people who had been regularly witnessing violence in the home (C – the work with the young man and his mother; others in group work in other projects)
6. Young people in foster care (R)
7. Young people not in education and with unstable finances or housing situations (N)

As noted in the earlier sections of this report on the evidence base, the research on factors leading to future use of IPV suggest that the impact of poor parenting, early childhood trauma and family stress all contribute. It is far from inevitable that witnessing violence as a child or living with other childhood violence or trauma will lead to adult use of violence and the link is not a straightforward one. However, it is important for the sake of both the young person and the people around them to attend to long term impacts of childhood experiences. This is in order that lingering trauma does not lead to further emotional harm to that child or young person. It is also because that lingering trauma will in some, not all, cases will become a contributing factor to future use of violence in their own relationships. Practitioners in this pilot project found that attending to current stresses such as lack of money or homelessness, and any consequences of poor parenting, was essential to enable the young person to attend sessions, get the most out of them and be able to focus.

RECOMMENDATIONS: the additional needs and vulnerabilities of young people using violence and aggression need to be addressed in parallel to or even before addressing their own violence and

aggression. Without this, the effects of the programme on their own violence may be difficult for them to sustain.

6. Processes

6.1 Getting referrals

The routes for referrals depended strongly on the setting, practitioner background and organisational history. Those with strong connections to and history with youth offending were more likely to get referrals of young people with a criminal involvement (N). Those with strong relationships to schools in their area worked with those schools to get referrals. The organisation with a history of delivering services for separating adults and/or their children could also take referrals from within the organisation (C – a Relate project with a strong history of work with young people). The organisation providing specialist therapeutic services for young people with behavioural and learning difficulties used routes they had used for other services, such as working directly within the local school for children with MLD (R).

Four of the five projects had a slow rate of referrals initially and were only beginning to pick up substantial numbers as the pilot period ended. This suggests that the time allowed for development of working and referral methods was not sufficient for all the projects, or possibly that other practical difficulties had reduced the speed of implementation.

A common theme when discussing referrals was the surprising lack of take up from agencies the project workers had expected would make referrals. For example, the N project worker had a high profile and strong links to child protection. He made use of these to promote the service and everywhere he went he got encouraging feedback from his former colleagues who said they would be making referrals, but subsequently didn't. He made use of his time to continue to promote the service but also respond to a request from the local Domestic Violence Forum Coordinator to deliver some work on sexual respect for young asylum seekers. Eventually he established a group of high risk young men involved with Youth Offending, some who already had convictions and some who were at risk of conviction.

6.2 Assessment and intake

FINDING: assessment methods in the pilot project varied widely

S carried out a day long assessment and intake process on a Saturday, with an open invitation.

N used the Controlling Behaviour Inventories used in assessment with adults using or experiencing domestic violence. The worker found a high level of co-operation with this process, the young people

did not minimise what they had done, though they did blame others or circumstances. He also used other assessment tools for identifying the young people's related needs, such as homelessness or finance or training/employment. The worker took the view that this was all part of assessment and also preparing the young people to participate in the group work, having concluded that if a young person had no money and nowhere to live he was very unlikely to make it to a group work session but also that if he was helped with both of these this would increase the engagement and also help with some of the factors possibly contributing to their use of violence.

"I think that that intervention starts from the first contact with the young person"

[interview with N practitioner]

C's group work in schools was carried out with young people identified by the school as needing the project. The practitioners felt that it was possible some of the referral criteria had been misunderstood or deliberately ignored "I think they sent us the kids they were having problems with". Some disclosed use or experience of intimate partner violence in their individual assessments with the practitioners but did not want to talk about this in the group work. For the work with the young man and his mum, they carried out the client assessments they usually used with clients in C Relate projects.

RECOMMENDATIONS: that programmes treat the intervention as starting from the first contact, using assessment processes as a way of engaging and motivating young people and as a means of ensuring or trying to ensure that their basic needs are met and that they stand a reasonable chance of benefitting from the group work on violence and aggression.

6.3 Case management

N and C kept detailed records of each client and relevant others connected to them. N used the same or similar forms and assessment tools for the young people as they use for work with adults using or experiencing domestic violence.

R has a structure based on the needs for professional supervision for therapists, as all the staff are trained therapists. This provided for regular supervision discussing individual young people as well as the relationship between them and the therapists.

6.4 Partner/parent contact/support

FINDING: none of the pilot projects met the target for partner/parent contact of a minimum of one person associated with each young person worked with. Reasons included lack of opportunity, existing support elsewhere, inability to make proactive contact, lack of experience of carrying out such work.

There was little or no contact with parents or partners with some key exceptions. There was clearly substantial contact with the caring parent of the young man who received joint work with his mother in

C as she attended with him. However, the partners or parents of the young people in their schools based group programme were not contacted. Some of the young people S worked with were living with or otherwise connected to some of the adults they have worked with in the past. S stated that they had contact with five parents or partners of the young people.

Some projects reported that partners and parents did not see the relevance for them of having contact. Young people who had been abused by young people on the programme often felt it no longer applied to them as the relationship had ended. This is also a feature of some adult perpetrator programmes where the partner support worker has limited experience of proactive partner contact and limited understanding of the specific needs for work with a partner or ex-partner of a person (adult or young) on a perpetrator or similar programme such as this one. It may be that this is a training need for the young people's project workers as it is for the partner contact workers in adult programmes.

Some practitioners reported feeling unconfident about making proactive contact with partner/parent as this was outside their normal practice. One project had more success (*N) and greater understanding of techniques and reasons, but nevertheless found that the take up was low.

For some projects, practitioners felt that there was no scope for making proactive partner or parental contact, when the referrals were made directly through school and the setting of the work was entirely in school.

Some projects identified that the partner or parent was receiving support from elsewhere. The N practitioner identified who else was involved in the situation and this frequently included a social worker allocated to the partner or family.

Some projects were able to make some contact with partner or parent. N is a specialist DVPP so had a partner contact worker available with skills and experience to carry this out and to communicate with the young people's worker in case management. C similarly had this experience although this was not possible for most of the young people as they were working through and in schools. S had good contacts with parents as part of their working methods as an organisation and so were able to make contact with at least five.

One project worked jointly with the young man and the mother he had been violent to (C). This pair of clients agreed to take part in an interview with the evaluator, on condition that they could do it together and initially with the support worker present and participating. This may sound as if they were unwilling to take part, and certainly the young man spent the majority of the interview with his head hidden in his hood. However, he had plenty to say from within that hood as time went on and he eventually emerged to complete the interview and then go off with the support worker for his first ever session alone, quite willingly. The mother could then continue the interview, exploring the impact on her of the work she and her son had been doing. She had strong feelings about the impact of this joint work on her son and on her family life:

“He wasn’t going to come here without me, even though it’s me and his sister he’s aggressive to. He didn’t used to get up to go to school or anything. M [support worker] has helped us both. He doesn’t go to school every day yet, but at least it’s not impossible to get him out of bed most mornings, without a load of abuse. He’s had a lot to cope with and M is really good at listening to him and getting him to talk. He’d never have gone off with M like that just now, or talked to you, before [we came here]. M understands what he’s been through with my ex and what we’ve all been through”.
[Interview with mother who had taken part in joint work with her son]

FINDING: as a result of the lack of successful partner/parent contact, there is no evaluation data available from people associated with the young people on the project, with one exception.

RECOMMENDATION: that there is specific training for partner/parent contact workers provided or included in the training on work with young people. The training should include specific attention to each set of challenges in making and sustaining proactive contact with a) partners or ex-partners (if relevant) and b) parents.

7. Evaluation of content of work delivered

FINDINGS: the toolkit was thoroughly tested in the pilot project. The five projects used almost all of the activities between them. Some were tested by each programme. All gave their feedback to the evaluators on their experiences of using the toolkit, which helped the evaluators to provide detailed analysis for the Respect young people’s workers in order to help them to revise the toolkit.

A full list of the activities in the toolkit, with notes on which project delivered them and their feedback, is available as a separate document (it is 20 pages long so not included in this document).

7.1 Activities which went well:

N practitioner reported that the sessions on sexual abuse which he adapted for use with the one-off session with young asylum seekers was very successful for meeting the needs of that group of young people.

Project N practitioner found the scenarios in the sexual abuse session (Rico and Yaz) to be useful for stimulating discussion. He stated that the group responded well to the facilitators using role play.

The practitioner at N reported that the sessions on signals, jealousy, sexual abuse, myths/truths and the ideal relationship to be the most useful activities from the toolkit, all of which worked well with the young people worked with.

Spiralling film was reported by some practitioners to be useful and stimulating for discussion about partner violence and particularly about sexual abuse (C, N).

R project used a range of activities from the toolkit in individual and group work and integrated these with the process and attention to the narratives of the individual young people's lives. These included **the assessment forms and attitude questionnaires; building motivation; the activities on anger, including recognising signals of anger in the body; own parents; ideal relationship; greet argue and make up.**

B project used a range of activities from the toolkit in their group work. The activities they reported as used successfully included: **talk show; negotiation role play; what is jealousy; Spiralling; iceberg; sexual abuse scenario; hearing domestic violence; anger in my body.**

S project made a great deal of use of role play and activities which encouraged active participation. This included young people who subsequently performed their own scenarios at a Respect event on work with young people using violence. Other activities they reported as used successfully included: warm up activities; guided relaxation; time out; all anger recognition and management activities;

C project also used a range of activities from the toolkit in their group work. The activities they reported as used successfully included: **repertory grid; iceberg; eco-grams; ways of expressing anger; jealousy (adapted); winding up/winding down; thoughts feelings and beliefs;** how does someone know you are angry (adapted).

7.2 Activities which didn't go so well:

Some practitioners found role play difficult, whilst some made great use of it. This is identified as a training need above. C and N found it difficult to impossible to engage the young people in role play themselves, although both made use of role play by a facilitator.

Some practitioners (R, S) reported that the **impact of the Spiralling film** was more intense than they had expected. They felt that it needed longer and to be used over several sessions. They also reported technical problems downloading the movie, as it couldn't be downloaded in one go and couldn't be copied onto CD.

Some sessions had to be **heavily adapted to suit the specific needs of the young people**. For example, the sessions run by R were sometimes frustrated by poor timekeeping, chaotic behaviour and repeated exits from the classroom by the young people (for drinks). However, these disruptions were used and

worked with by the therapists from R, who were well trained in working in the here and now, helping young people to reflect on what is taking place in the present.

The young man and his mum were united and clear that the one activity they both hadn't liked was the **iceberg activity**. They were also united in saying that they had found all other activities useful.

The N practitioner reported that the session on **learning to be abusive** was difficult for the young people worked with, as they didn't want to talk about their own parents. He also reported that the session on **learning about sex** hadn't worked well as the young people had been too immature to discuss it productively, unlike the session on sexual abuse.

7.3 Activities which were needed

Some of the **activities directly addressing domestic violence were less appropriate for young people whose aggression was directed at people other than their partners**. In one sense this is simply a matter of more consistent criteria and making sure that referring agencies understand the purpose and nature of the programmes. However, the toolkit emphasis is clearly more on partner violence than on parental violence.

The practitioners from several projects reported that they wanted **more help with the activities on conflict resolution**.

Practitioners commented that there was a **lack of sufficient consistent regular time** to pursue topics fully. This was for a range of reasons, including the chaos of the lives of some of the young people, changes in room allocation in schools, young people missing sessions in school because of non-attendance or exclusion from school.

N and C practitioners reported that they would like extra help with role play, either by getting in specialist practitioner to work with the young people using role play or by having more training for themselves on how to do this.

RECOMMENDATION: that practitioners working with young people on violence are provided with information about specialist training on the use of role play in the context of work on violence. That future meetings of the national practitioners' network try to include sessions on the use of drama based activities and specialist training includes a session on these skills or refers practitioners on to specialist trainers.

7.4 Use of ‘control log’ or equivalent

Many programmes working with adult perpetrators of intimate partner violence use a tool called the ‘control log’ for helping adults to slow down and analyse their underlying assumptions, feelings, thoughts as well as behaviour before, during and after an abusive incident. N and C made use of the equivalent of a control log, or a similar structure for discussion about incidents of violence. This was as useful for C’s young people who were being generally aggressive or only in school as for N’s who were more clearly being violent to partner/parent. Following discussion with some of the practitioners about how the control log had been or could be adapted, we drafted an amended version which is attached to this report as appendix 1. The structure of this process, well tried and tested in work with adults, clearly helps practitioners and clients to think through violence and the beliefs and thoughts behind it in a helpfully structured way.

7.5 Emphasis on group process and ‘here and now’

A theme reported by all the practitioners was the use of the group process as a key part of the learning and support for group members. Initial chaos, acting out, sulking, refusing to remain seated, challenging the practitioner, over-excitement – all of these behaviours were reported by the practitioners in all the projects. Fortunately, though not accidentally of course, the practitioners and projects had been selected for their skill in group work amongst other attributes and all the practitioners demonstrated and described how they used this behaviour and the process of observing it, reflecting on it and learning from it as a group.

“the first session was chaos! But we expected that. We worked on group ground rules together, which helped. We referred to these later on when needed”. [C practitioner in interview with evaluator, re group in school]

“the first few weeks they were literally climbing out of the windows and trying to leave the room for hot chocolate all the time. But we were prepared for this and we encouraged them to think about what they were doing and how it affected the rest of the group.” [R group worker, in group interview with evaluators]

It also showed in the work with young people on their own or with parent:

“at first, he wouldn’t come out of his hood, he spent the whole session with his face buried. And he wanted his mum with him, even though she was the one he had been violent to. This helped them to be able to say things to each other they needed to say, with me there to help them hear each other. By the end, though, he was out of the hood and even willing to do some things on his own without his mum.” [C practitioner in interview with evaluator, re work with young man and his mum]

The atmosphere in the room of the group sessions changed and developed as the group life continued.

“we did the eco grams about half way through, not at the start as in the toolkit, in week 4. It was the most quiet, reflective, thoughtful part of the whole programme and they really seemed to enjoy working together thoughtfully. Most of them chose to show the whole group what they had done and talk about it afterwards.” [C re group in school]

To a great extent, this reflects the considerable skill and training of the practitioners but also the value of the toolkit. The toolkit provides activities which help group process and provide ways for the group to develop as a group.

7.6 Use of films

S and R found Spiralling in the way it was delivered disturbed the young people, particularly the rape scene and felt it needed more time, better preparation and shorter bursts of film watching to be most effective with their clients.

N practitioner felt that the Spiralling film reflected a lot of the behaviours used by the young people and engaged them in discussion. C practitioner said that she would have liked more guidance on how to link activities to Spiralling.

B found that Spiralling engaged the young people but was less relevant for their own use of violence as this was against parents and siblings.

The Respect young people’s workers used the feedback from the practitioners to redraft and expand the toolkit. It is now available to download on the internet. Since the preparation of the draft toolkit, the Respect young people’s workers commissioned an original film for work with young people which is also now available. This covers a wide range of settings and contexts for violence. The toolkit also suggests using other film clips for stimulus materials such as KIM, and Spiralling, both of which were used by projects in the pilot.

RECOMMENDATION: that the new film is accompanied by clearly laid out activities and guidance for use and this is included in the revised toolkit.

7.7 Use of other material

FINDING: All the pilot projects used material other than the tool kit.

The materials used to supplement the toolkit included:

- Bullying programme materials [all]
- Other calming or relaxation exercises [C]
- More drama activities [S, R]
- Materials from adult perpetrator programme – adapted [N]
- Self esteem and confidence building activities from other work [all]

The activities used by B, for example, for the first two sessions with their group, were entirely from other source materials. These included warm up games involving a ball, using this to focus on names initially and on self awareness subsequently, they also discussed what self esteem and confidence are. They carried out an activity using the concept of a mirror to discuss how the young people see themselves and how they think others see them.

RECOMMENDATION: that practitioners are actively encouraged to use their own skills and other materials as part of the programmes they deliver and also given guidance about how to fit these with the overall aims and structure of the programme.

7.8 Impact of the setting of the work

C first attempted to deliver a group work programme on their own site. They found that this was completely unsuccessful for the young people referred – none of them would come to the site. The young man who attended with his mother would clearly not have been able to manage this without the considerable assistance and encouragement from his mother - she basically got him up, got him breakfast and got him to the site on those days, something she and he reported he was unable or unwilling to do without her at the start of the sessions.

C, B and R found that working from within a school and delivering all the activities within the school site and day helped to maintain attendance and cohesion. However, the fact that they were all in school together also had some negative impacts, such as individual young people not wanting to lose face in front of regular peers, or reveal personal information which could then be spread around school quickly, or unable to attend the programme if they had been sent home.

S chose a residential setting for the main part of their group work. They found this helpful to bring the young people together as a group. However, some of the other attractions of the site and the domestic arrangements did sometimes affect the focus.

N worked for the one-off session with unaccompanied asylum seekers in a central venue organised by the Domestic Violence Forum Coordinator. This session was closely organised by the worker with

responsibilities for unaccompanied minors and there were interpreters available, which helped to ensure participation.

RECOMMENDATION: that projects working with young people using violence pay careful attention to the location of the assessments and group or individual work. Ideally, the venue should be somewhere a young person can come to without cost, adult accompaniment or a long journey.

7.9 Impact of practitioner background

Practitioners with experience of delivering domestic violence perpetrator work or support for survivors were clearly more confident about what is involved in discussions about domestic violence.

Practitioners with more experience of work with young people were more confident about process than content. Some commented that they really needed more specialist training on domestic violence.

RECOMMENDATION: that the initial and follow up training for practitioners wanting to deliver this work includes specific sessions for practitioners who have little or no experience of working on intimate partner violence or gender based violence. This should be clearly linked to the relevant sessions in the toolkit, with guidance for common pitfalls and how to manage these.

7.10 Impact of organisational setting and history

FINDING: existing relationships with a local school or youth offending team helped the pilot projects to establish the work. Such relationships helped to deliver referrals, provide a site for the work to take place and in one case provided a co-facilitator for the group work.

Two of the organisations (N, C) had a strong and substantial history of delivering domestic violence interventions including perpetrator programmes working with adult men and women. The practitioners and managers involved had a pre-existing level of specialist knowledge about domestic violence and about intervention programmes which appear to have helped them significantly. Confidence with the topic was high in both these programmes, whereas in the two others the specifics of the topic were not familiar, which leaves them more open to falling into traps in discussions which domestic violence specialist may be more familiar with. However, both R and B reported in their session evaluation forms that the toolkit mostly (though not always) provided them with sufficient guidance.

N's relationship with the local youth offending team provided referrals and a co-facilitator for the group work with young men. They also had a relationship with the local Domestic Violence Forum coordinator who arranged the session with the unaccompanied asylum seekers.

R, C and B had relationships with schools who provided referrals and a place to carry out the work with the young people.

R clearly had substantial experience and specialist skill in working with their specific client group and local schools. This provided them with insights and techniques for working with the young people on any topic including this challenging one, which they appeared to use to great effect. However, their choice of materials and activities suggested that they had broadened the focus of the work to general use of violence and aggressive behaviour, rather than the specifics. This is not necessarily a problem – they were tackling the problems most relevant to the young people they were working with. However, it does mean that the relevance of the materials in the tool kit to this particular client group have been less well tested than was hoped.

S is a member of Respect and has worked with domestic violence victims and perpetrators. Despite this, their approach to the topic also appeared to be more general than specific. Feedback from the practitioners involved suggests that they had less confidence about the very specific domestic violence related activities than their considerable confidence about group work in general, working with troubled young people from ethnic minority backgrounds and residential work in particular.

They were also clearly very knowledgeable about the very specific circumstances for their client group, which included complicated family patterns and care arrangements which do not clearly fit with the model in the tool kit. As noted in the earlier section of this report on the evidence base for the work, impunity and lack of consequences for use of violence is a contributory factor for future use of violence.

Having good links to other relevant organisations, particularly those who are involved in responses to young people's offending or risky behaviour, will help to ensure that interventions are supportive and practical but also pay attention to the consequences of not changing the behaviour.

RECOMMENDATION: that projects working with young people using violence do so in collaboration with other local relevant agencies such as schools, youth offending, domestic violence forum etc.

8. Outputs of the pilot projects

In return for a fee to support the costs of the pilot, they agreed to test the toolkit out. The brief for the project stated that:

“In each of 5 partners [the] this will involve:

- *12 young people assessed for groupwork*

- 8-10 young people start groupwork
- 6-8 complete a course of at least 10 group sessions (completion includes the collection of evaluation data)
- 8 young people (aged 13-19) assessed for 1-1 work
- 5 young people participating in 1-1 work
- 3-4 young people complete individual work, including evaluation data
- Linked support services offered to an average of one vulnerable partner or family member per young person worked with”

Name of project	Number assessed or referred	Number started individual or similar	Number completed individual	Number started group work	Number completed most group work programme
B	16 minimum	10	10	6 (3 in 2 groups)	6
C	17 (plus 1 mum)	1 plus mum	1 plus mum	16	8
N	10 minimum	1	1	3 in programme 12 in one-off session	2
R	16 minimum	5	5	5 (group 1) 6 (group 2)	11
S	36 minimum	8	7	10	9
TOTAL	95 minimum	25	24	58	36

FINDING: At least ninety-five young people had some contact with the five pilot projects in total during the period in total.

Of these, sixty completed a programme of group or individual work.

9. Outcomes of the pilot projects

9.1 Project outcomes

- a. Referral routes were developed with relevant local agencies in each of the five areas. These included referrals from youth offending and schools as well as self referrals.
- b. The profile of the project was highlighted to local agencies in each area. This included highlighting the service to local schools, youth offending, child protection and other youth work.
- c. The toolkit was tested to varying degrees and found to be useful for work with a very wide range of client groups with a wide range of needs, including some outside the original brief.
- d. Feedback was provided on the detail of the delivery and use of the toolkit activities by practitioners using the toolkit, including feedback on young people's participation in the activities.
- e. Implementation at local level was not straightforward and each project had a number of unexpected challenges to deal with before they could start the work.
- f. At least ninety-two young people were assessed for one of the five pilot projects, twenty-two started individual work and forty six started group work with an additional twelve who took part in a one-off group session who were not formally assessed.
- g. At least thirty six young people completed group work in one of the five pilot projects.
- h. This means that all the projects met the Respect target for numbers of young people assessed; three met the target for numbers starting group work and two met the target for numbers starting individual work. Two met the target for numbers completing individual work and four met the target for numbers completing a programme of group work.
- i. All attempted to meet the targets for collection of evaluation data and all provided some evaluation data.
- j. The Respect young people's workers were provided with an interim report from the evaluators on the use of the toolkit and detailed feedback on the content, which they then used as part of the process of revising the toolkit for final publication early in 2011.
- k. The Respect young people's workers developed a package of training and recruited additional trainers from the Respect Approved Trainers' pool to deliver training around the UK.
- l. The Respect young people's workers established a national practitioners' network of practitioners working with young people on their use of violence and aggression. This network is

now self administering and has met every six months for the last two years, involving the pilot projects and other projects and practitioners from around the UK.

9.2 Outcomes for young people and their behaviour

Despite the shortcomings identified above in the evaluation data available for outcome measurement, there was a range of indicators of positive outcomes for the young people, from various forms of evidence. For example:

- The two young men who completed the group work at N were observed by the practitioner to have learnt understanding of the impact of their violence and to have changed some of their attitudes [*N practitioner in interview with evaluator*].
- The young women in the C group demonstrated changes in attitudes about roles in relationships, comparing their pre and post group questionnaire responses to the attitude scenarios [*pre and post questionnaires from participants*].
- Three of the young women in the C group indicated that they had stopped using violence since starting the programme [*pre and post questionnaires from participants*].
- The facilitators indicated that the young men in the B programme in Wolverhampton had increased their recognition of the harm done by violence and aggression [*B session records*].
- One young man from the N project subsequently took part in a local radio interview with the practitioner, talking about what he had gained from the project, comparing his behaviour before and after the programme. He stated that he had learnt from the sessions about jealousy and also gained practical skills in violence avoidance. The practitioner also reported that taking part in the radio interview was in itself an achievement for this young man, demonstrating increase in confidence and accountability for his violence [*N interview with evaluator*].
- The mother of the young man who attended joint sessions at C reported: “He is much calmer, he is going to school more regularly, it isn’t such a struggle to get him up and motivated” [*C, interview with evaluator*].

FINDING: the majority of the young people who took part in one of the pilot programmes appear, from the evidence available, to have stopped using violence, reduced their use of threatening and aggressive behaviour to others and changed some of their attitudes about rights and roles in relationships.

9.3 Outcome analysis against risk factors for future perpetration

Attitudinal shifts indicate reduction in the risk factors relating to beliefs about rights and roles in relationships. Most participants in the group and individual work in the pilot projects demonstrated improved attitudes to violence and to rights and roles in relationships.

Evidence from young people about their reductions in use of violence indicate a reduction in the risk factor of current use of violence. Participants in the group and individual work in the five pilot projects stopped using violence during the programme. Most reduced their use of aggressive and controlling behaviour.

Evidence from practitioners about the improvements in life circumstances for the young people indicate a reduction in the risk factors of individual stress and additional difficulties such as finances, family stress and homelessness.

10. Conclusions

This project has improved the lives of more than seventy young people who have been involved in the pilot and the lives of those immediately around them – their parents, siblings, partners, friends and teachers. The local practitioners, young people and their families should be commended for their contribution to developing and testing this model of work. The Respect staff should be commended for their commitment, energy and imagination in developing, implementing and supporting the creation and development of the local projects and the national networking.

The majority of the participants in the pilot project stopped using violence and reduce their use of aggressive and controlling behaviour. Work with young people using violence is still in an early stage in the UK and there is a need for further exploration and research about what helps particular young people to stop being violent.

The factors identified in section three of this report have been comprehensively addressed in the draft toolkit and in the use of this toolkit in the pilot projects. Given the rigour of the evidence about factors influencing perpetration of IPV, it is highly likely that the participants of the programmes have reduced their risk of future violence. Without clear and substantial comparable data it is not possible to be absolutely certain of this. However, the pilot also produced tools and methods for evaluating this in future when the projects delivering the work are more well-established.

Referring agencies sometimes made inappropriate referrals, based on their own needs rather than the experiences and needs of the young people. This needs further work in the pilot projects and other projects, with clearer referral criteria.

The pilot toolkit, training and approaches have now been well tested by practitioners with a range of skills and in a range of settings with a wide range of clients with varying needs and backgrounds. The feedback from practitioners and participants has been overwhelmingly positive, with suggestions for improvement which are being incorporated into the revised toolkit and training package. The toolkit is evidence based, addressing key risk factors for future perpetration of interpersonal violence and particularly intimate partner violence.

The need for this work is clear and supported by research evidence and the evidence of this pilot. The value of the approaches taken in the Respect pilot and the five pilot sites is considerable and other projects are already learning and adapting from their experience.

The Respect Young People's pilot project team and management have developed a comprehensive and effective model of work, including the toolkit, the training, the support and advice and the provision of national events. This second tier level of support and assistance has contributed directly to the establishment and development of high quality responses to young people's use of violence. It is to be hoped that the staff will be able to secure funding to continue this work in local projects as the need is clear and the resources and staff skill and knowledge already in place.

At a time of funding cuts and constrained development for voluntary and statutory organisations, services for young people and adults who have used violence could easily be seen as undeserving. However, the costs of failing to address young people's violence are considerable. Supporting this work locally and at national level to support the development of new projects and the consolidation of existing ones should be seen as an investment in the future and a long term saving.

11. Final recommendations

1. That funding for work with young people using violence in intimate relationships is recognised as an investment to save on future costs if their violence is not stopped at an early stage.
2. That funding for second tier work to support frontline work with young people is recognised as adding value to the local investment in the direct services, as it provides high quality training, support, resources and networking at low unit cost because of the economies of scale that having a national project provides.
3. That young people using violence and experiencing violence are recognised as vulnerable and in need. Agencies identifying such young people should assess their additional vulnerabilities and ensure that as far as possible these are also dealt with in combination with addressing their violence.

Bibliography

Banister, E. M., Jakubec, S. L. and Stein, J. A. (2003) “Like, What am I supposed to do?” Adolescent girl’s health concerns in their dating relationships’, *Canadian Journal of Nursing Research*, 35(2), pp. 16–33.

Brezina, T. (1999) Teenage violence toward parents as an adaptation to family strain: Evidence from a national survey of male adolescents. *Youth & Society* 30: 416-444.

Hartz, D.T. (1995) Comparative conflict resolution patterns among parent-teen dyads of four ethnic groups in Hawaii. *Child Abuse & Neglect* 19: 681-689.

Hotaling, G.T., Straus, M.A. and Lincoln, A. (1990) Intrafamily violence and crime and violence outside the family. In *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*, **Straus, M.A. and Gelles, R.J. (eds)**. 3 15-375. New Brunswick, New Jersey Transaction Publishers

Barter, C (2009) In the Name of Love: Partner Abuse and Violence in Teenage Relationships in *British Journal of Social Work* (2009) **39**, 211–233; doi:10.1093/bjsw/bcm127

Chung, D (2005) *Violence, control, romance and gender equality: Young women and heterosexual relationships*. University of South Australia.

Cornell, C. P. and Gelles, R.J. (1982) Adolescent to parent violence. In *The Urban and Social Change Review* 15: 8-14.

Debonnaire, T (2007) *An Evaluation of the Sutton group work programme for children who have lived with domestic abuse*. London: GLDVP

Ellis, J (2004) *Preventing Violence Against Women and Girls. A Study of Educational Programmes for Children and Young People*, London: WOMANKIND Worldwide

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

Haggerman-White, C. et al (2010) *Factors influencing perpetration of violence against women and children*. Brussels: European Commission.

Hickman, L., Jaycox, L. and Aronoff, J. (2004) ‘Dating violence among adolescents: Prevalence, gender distribution and prevention program effectiveness’, *Trauma, Violence and Abuse*, 5(2), pp. 123–42.

Iwi, K (2008) Teenage intimate partner violence, child to parent violence, experience of dv and physical maltreatment in family of origin, in *Respect newsletter*. London: Respect.

Iwi, K (2008) *A toolkit for working with young people who have used violence in intimate relationships*. London: Respect.

Jackson, S. M., Cram, F. and Seymour, F. W. (2000) 'Violence and sexual coercion in high school students dating relationships', *Journal of Family Violence*, **15**, pp. 23–36.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Neidig, P., & Thorn, G. (1995). Violent marriages: Gender differences in levels of current violence and past abuse. *Journal of Family Violence*, *10* (2), 159-175.

Loosley et al. (2006). *Groupwork with Children Exposed to Woman Abuse, A Concurrent Group Program for Children and their Mothers, a Children's Program Manual*. London Ontario.

Ullman, A., & Straus, M. (2003). Violence by children against mothers in relation to violence between parents and corporal punishment by parents. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, *34*, 41-60.

Vézina, J. and Hébert, M. (2007) Risk factors for victimization in romantic relationships of young women: A review of empirical studies and implications for prevention, *Trauma, Violence and Abuse*, **8**(1), pp. 33–66.

APPENDIX ONE

Some thoughts for an alternative to control log/iceberg activities in the Young Person's Toolkit

1. What happened that you think wasn't ok, or your mum or girlfriend would think wasn't ok?
2. What was it that wasn't ok?
3. How did that make your girlfriend/boyfriend/mum/other adult carer feel?
4. What does this tell me about how you think relationships should be?
5. What does this tell me about how you think things should be?
6. How is that working out for you – those ideas of how things should be?
7. What were you afraid of?
8. What would be so bad about this happening?
9. What were you trying to make happen or stop from happening?
10. What would it be about this happening/not that would be so bad? Why is this?
11. How is this working out for you?
12. What might be the long term consequences of doing this?