

Family Violence Perpetrator Treatment

EVIDENCE BRIEF

Family Violence Perpetrator Treatment is an important investment intended to reduce reoffending and protect victims of family violence. International evidence of its effectiveness is mixed, but the NZ Department of Corrections has demonstrated success with its programmes for these perpetrators.

OVERVIEW

- This brief uses the generic term ‘perpetrator’ to refer to all those who commit violent offences against family members, regardless of whether those offences are reported.
- Family violence perpetrators serving a prison or community sentence are dealt with by Corrections, which provides them with one of four types of service depending on the level of risk and broader needs of each individual.
- There is also a range of community providers who deliver specialist family violence programmes under contract from a range of Government agencies.
- The international evidence is mixed and does not allow us to conclude that the services provided by these community providers are effective.
- However, Corrections has evaluated three of the four types of service it provides to or funds for family violence perpetrators and have found that all of these programmes lead to statistically significant reductions in re-imprisonment.
- Further research would be desirable to confirm that the success Corrections has had in reducing reimprisonment is also achieved by the community-based programmes.

- Further research would also be desirable to confirm that these programmes are also reducing revictimisation, as international evidence sometimes finds a discrepancy between official records and victim reports of reoffending.

INVESTMENT CLASS SUMMARY

Evidence rating:	Very Promising (Corrections-delivered and funded programmes) Speculative (others)
Effect size (number needed to treat):	Latest results from Corrections suggest that for every 24 people attending a programme one fewer will be reconvicted, and for every 50 people attending a programme one fewer will be re-imprisoned.
Current spend:	\$9.6m (MSD, MOJ, Corrections combined)
Unmet demand:	Unknown as family violence is often unreported

DOES FAMILY VIOLENCE PERPETRATOR TREATMENT REDUCE CRIME?

International evidence

In the international literature the evidence for the effectiveness of treatment for family violence perpetrators is mixed. For example, a substantial number of studies purport to show that family violence perpetrator treatment reduces reoffending, but other researchers raise concerns about the reliability of these findings because of fundamental methodological shortcomings.

The meta-analyses and systematic reviews provide different conclusions about the effectiveness of perpetrator treatment depending on how they treat these methodological problems and which studies they include (see appendix one for details).

Older reviews and studies are generally supportive of the effectiveness of these programmes, but not conclusively so.ⁱ More recent meta-analyses are relatively less supportive.ⁱⁱ

Meta-analyses also disagree on the magnitude of the effect of perpetrator treatment on reoffending. The estimates range from non-existent or tinyⁱⁱⁱ through to substantial.^{iv}

Methodological problems: Perhaps the largest methodological problem is that large differences typically emerge depending on whether reoffending is measured using victim reports or police records.

Only three of the seven meta-analyses examine separately police records and victim-reported outcomes. Of these, two found that programmes appear to be effective when looking at police records, whereas victim reports suggest the programmes are ineffective.^v

The third meta-analysis finds the same effect size for both police- and victim-reported offending, and is the only one to find a significant effect using victim-reported measures of offending.^{vi}

Of the other four meta-analyses, two failed to find that perpetrator treatment is effective despite collapsing victim reports and police records together.^{vii}

These results leave the possibility that what appears to be a reduction in violence through official records may just be a reduction in victims' willingness to report offending after their partner has completed treatment, perhaps because they have lost faith in the ability of official processes to keep them safe.^{viii}

Another important limitation to the evaluation of treatment programmes is that participants often fail to complete their treatment, and many evaluations compare treatment completers to drop-outs or no-shows. Both these factors make it difficult to untangle programme-effects from selection effects.

This potential bias is concerning because, as noted by Feder and others (2008, p15), *'...studies using men who were rejected from treatment or who rejected treatment were the only studies to consistently show a large, positive and significant effect on reducing re-offending.'*

These inconsistent findings are not limited to programmes delivered in the United States, where most research in this area has been conducted. Akoensi and others (2012) conducted a systematic review of family violence perpetrator programmes in Europe and were unable to conclude that these programmes are effective.

New Zealand Evidence

The Department of Corrections refers offenders convicted for family violence offending to a range of rehabilitative options.

In prison, the highest-risk violent offenders serving longer (>24 months) sentences are likely to be placed in the Special Treatment Unit Rehabilitation Programme (STURP). This 9-month long programme is staffed by psychologists and delivers a high-intensity structured programme designed to remediate the range of personal characteristics of offenders that predispose them to violent offending. Results for this programme over the last six years have been excellent, with effect sizes amongst the highest recorded for any programme.

Corrections uses reduced rates of reconviction and re-imprisonment amongst participants in comparison to a matched control group as the primary measure of effectiveness.

Year	Percentage point reduction in reimprisonment in 12 months (RQ)	Offenders needing to complete programme to prevent one from being reimprisoned within 12 months
2010	5.7*	18
2011	7.2*	14
2012	12.9*	8
2013	11.9*	8
2014	9.2*	11
2015	12.3*	8

Prisoners and community-sentenced offenders with risk scores in the medium range are placed in the Medium Intensity Rehabilitation Programme, which is of shorter duration and lower intensity, but which also tends to produce reasonably good results (usually between 4 – 8 percentage point reductions in both reconviction and reimprisonment).

Corrections has also piloted a new family violence programme both in prisons and the

community, which is designed for those with low to medium risk and serving shorter (prison) sentences. This programme has yet to be evaluated.

Corrections also funds places for community-based offenders in specialist family violence programmes delivered by community organisations.

The results from evaluations of these community programmes are summarised in the following tables:

Year	Percentage point reduction in reconviction in 12 months (RQ)	Offenders needing to complete programme to prevent one from being reconvicted within 12 months
2008	6.0*	17*
2009	4.0*	25*
2010	7.0*	14*
2011	0.4	250
2012	1.0	100
2013	0.1	1000
2014	4.5*	22*
2015	4.2*	24*

Year	Percentage point reduction in re-imprisonment in 12 months (RQ)	Offenders needing to complete programme to prevent one from being re-imprisoned within 12 months
2008	2.0	50
2009	2.0	50
2010	3.0	33
2011	0.1	1000
2012	-	-
2013	2.9*	34*
2014	2.1*	48*
2015	2.1*	48*

* statistically significant

The tables show variable effectiveness over the years. However, over 2014 and 2015 there appears to have been a stabilising of effect. In both years the programme has led to a modest but statistically significant reduction in reoffending and re-imprisonment rates among

those who attended dedicated non-violence programmes.

However, these results only focus on offending that results in conviction or imprisonment, not victim-reported offending. As noted in the international evidence above, this can create difficulties in interpretation given high levels of non-reporting of family violence.

Other than this annual Corrections evaluation, three New Zealand studies have looked at the effectiveness of specialist family violence programmes are provided by a range of community-based organisations that are funded by the Department of Corrections, the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Social Development.^{ix}

All three studies used a pre-test-post-test design and showed that men were less likely to be violent after completing the programme.

While these appear encouraging results, these studies did not use a control group. As such, our ability to attribute the reduction in offending to the intervention is limited.

A further problem with these studies is the sample sizes used. McMaster and others (2000) started with 83 couples, reducing to 40 by the second follow-up, but Hetherington (2009) had only 17, and Lloyd-Pask and McMaster (1992) only 21. Small sample sizes reduce statistical power and make it more difficult to conclude that a programme has reduced reoffending.

Summary of effectiveness

Although the international evidence is mixed, Corrections has found some degree of success at reducing reoffending over the last three years with the community-based family violence programmes it funds. Corrections also has sound evidence for effectiveness with family violence offenders completing its core CBT programmes such as the STURP and the MRP.

As noted above, Corrections has led a process recently to redesign and update this type of programmes to ensure a more consistent and evidence-based approach, which should further increase their effectiveness at reducing reoffending.

However, given the mixed international research, the general effectiveness of family violence treatment cannot be assumed. Given the international findings that effectiveness can differ depending on whether official or victim-reported offending is used as the outcome measure, expanding the existing Corrections evaluation to include victim reports would seem an important next step.

Further investment in this area needs to be preceded by further investment in programme development, either using the existing programmes as a base or designing new programmes, as well as rigorous outcome evaluation using a range of measures. This evaluation process is well underway for these programmes in relation to the participants which Corrections funds, but adequate evaluation of outcomes for clients referred to these programmes by the Ministries of Justice and Social Development has yet to occur.

WHAT MAKES FAMILY VIOLENCE PERPETRATOR TREATMENT EFFECTIVE?

Given the inconsistency of results, the research base does not conclusively show which types of perpetrators are most likely to benefit from programmes, or what features of a programme design would make it more likely to reduce reoffending.

One central argument in the literature is which theory of behavioural change the programmes should adopt: the feminist theory or the psychological theory.

Feminist Theory: Many family violence programmes were originally based on the Family Abuse Intervention Project Programme, originally designed in the early 1980s in Duluth, Minnesota.^x

The Duluth approach, as it is known, is a psycho-educational model based on feminist analysis. Treatment of perpetrators under this approach focuses on teaching them about the power and control elements within male-female relationships that can contribute to family violence.

Treatment of perpetrators is only one part of the Duluth approach, which also focuses on changing societal attitudes towards women.

When first introduced in the 1980s, programmes in New Zealand were explicitly modelled on the Duluth approach.^{xi}

Psychological theory: Internationally and in New Zealand, the Duluth model has been modified to incorporate elements of cognitive-behavioural therapy, which considers family violence to be a learned behaviour that can be modified.

While programmes generally can be classed as either Duluth or cognitive-behavioural therapy, in

practice programmes are diverse, and often include components of both philosophies.^{xii}

Despite the vigorous theoretical debate about the relative merits of feminist- or psychology-derived treatments, the type of intervention model does not seem to change the result. Duluth, cognitive-behavioural therapy and other treatment types demonstrate similar effect sizes.^{xiii}

Miller and others (2013) found that non-Duluth treatments tend to reduce reoffending. But these alternative programmes are diverse, including couples and relationship therapy, as well as combined alcohol/family violence treatment and cognitive-behavioural therapy. This limits our ability to interpret Miller and others' (2013) finding.

For a good overview of the detailed research into practice models, see the recent work by Morrison and others (2015).

BROADER CONSIDERATIONS

Supporting Desistance: Although repeat offending and repeat victimisation are both common for family violence, perpetrators can and do desist, sometimes without intervention. Understanding the processes underlying desistance can help support the design of programmes.

This literature is summarised in a recent Corrections literature review. Key factors associated with desistance include:

- involvement in situational couple violence rather than coercive controlling violence
- having little or no offending history
- changing partners
- access to pro-social networks and ongoing support
- having a sense of hope and the ability to forge a positive non-violent identity in the context of intimate and broader familial relationships.^{xiv}

Supporting desistance can be aided by adherence to the well-evidenced principles of Risk, Need and Responsivity.^{xv} These principles are widely used in offender rehabilitation. The most effective rehabilitation programmes appropriately match an offender to a programme based on their likelihood of reoffending (risk), target changeable risk factors (need) and the learning style of the offender (responsivity).

Systematic social response: The designers of the Duluth model emphasised the importance of a coherent social response to family violence, of which perpetrator treatment is just one part.

For example, Robertson (1999) argued for compulsory treatment as a way for society to condemn offending, and to not offer treatment as a 'choice' to the perpetrator.

From this perspective, it may be less important that the programmes in themselves deliver

results, if they help deliver a consistent message that family violence is unacceptable and is associated with clear and meaningful consequences. However, we did not encounter any research to assess the effectiveness of a system-wide response.

Alternative approaches: While it is beyond the scope of this brief to provide a comprehensive assessment of the various approaches to preventing family violence, we note briefly that there is emerging evidence for the effectiveness of alternative approaches. A brief overview of research examining some of these alternative approaches is provided below.

Kilmer and others (2013) illustrated that an enforced abstinence programme for repeat drink-drivers also reduced the number of family violence arrests by 9%.

Easton and others (2007) and Stuart and others (2003) similarly found that providing substance abuse treatment for alcohol-dependent family violence perpetrators can reduce violent recidivism.

We cannot conclude that this approach is effective on the basis of two studies, one of which used a pre-test-post-test research design, but these findings suggest that this is a promising area for further development.

There is also evidence from a recent meta-analysis that victim-centred programmes can be effective at reducing re-victimisation, as well as improving other markers of well-being.^{xvi}

At the same time, we note that some other approaches have not yet demonstrated success. For example, Davis and others (2008) found in a meta-analysis that the brief intervention for victims known as 'second responder programmes' does not tend to reduce the likelihood of re-victimisation.

CURRENT INVESTMENT IN NEW ZEALAND

Family violence perpetrator programmes are primarily delivered by non-government organisations. These organisations are funded by the Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Social Development and Department of Corrections.

The Ministry of Justice funding relates to services provided either after the Family Court orders a respondent to attend under the Domestic Violence Act 1995, or during a pre-sentence remand in the criminal court for a family violence related offence where attendance at a programme is requested.

The aim of these programmes funded by the Ministry of Justice is to both reduce reoffending and reduce harm.

Attendance mandated through the family court is supported by legislation. However, provision of programmes in the criminal jurisdiction has been introduced in 2008 primarily as a component of the Judiciary-led Family Violence Courts initiative.

The current appropriation for these services is about \$5.5m for referrals coming from both the family and criminal courts. The Ministry of Justice also funds safety programmes for adult victims and children. The Ministry contracts with 101 providers to deliver these programmes.

Reforms to the Domestic Violence Act came into effect on 1 October 2014. These reforms changed the structure and delivery of programmes and introduced a requirement for a respondent to attend for an assessment and non violence programme.

This new approach allows for programmes to be tailored to address the assessed risk and need of the individual – a tiered approach based on risk, need and responsivity principles.

In 2014/15, there were 4944 referrals from the family and district courts.

In addition, providers report that they also accept many referrals that have not been initiated through the court process and for which they receive no funding.

The Ministry of Social Development provides contributory funding to 37 providers of services for non-mandated adult and youth perpetrators of family violence (both male and female) to address their violent behaviour. The number of self-referrals has increased following the successful “It’s not OK” campaign. Current expenditure is estimated to be approximately \$1.41m.

The Department of Corrections purchases non-violence programmes as a component of community sentences for perpetrators convicted of family violence in the criminal court.

Corrections’ current spend is about \$3.3m on these specialist community-based family violence programmes, with about 2,000 offenders starting one of these programmes each year.

Those of medium- or high-risk of reoffending are offered mainstream general rehabilitation programmes or individualised treatment with Corrections psychologists. These programmes are covered in a separate evidence brief on Cognitive-Behavioural Therapy.

Corrections has also developed and implemented a specialist family violence programme that it delivers itself.

EVIDENCE RATING AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Each evidence brief provides an evidence rating between Poor and Very Strong. According to the standard criteria for all evidence briefs¹, the appropriate evidence rating for family violence perpetrator treatment is Very Promising for the Corrections programmes, but Speculative for other programmes.

Poor	Robust evidence that investment does not reduce crime or increases crime
Speculative	Little or conflicting evidence that investment can reduce crime
Fair	Some evidence that investment can reduce crime
Very Promising	Robust international <i>or</i> local evidence that investment tends to reduce crime
Strong	Robust international <i>and</i> local evidence that investment tends to reduce crime
Very Strong	Very robust international and local evidence that investment tends to reduce crime

According to the standard interpretation this rating means that, for the Corrections programmes:

- there is robust international or local evidence that investment tends to reduce crime
- investment may well reduce crime if implemented well
- further evaluation is desirable to confirm the investment is reducing crime, and to support fine-tuning of the investment design.

This result is encouraging, given the serious problems with family violence in New Zealand.

¹Available at <http://www.justice.govt.nz/justice-sector-policy/key-initiatives/investment-approach-to-justice/what-works-to-reduce-crime/#methodology>

Nonetheless, more remains to be done to continue improving these programmes, and the effectiveness of the Justice- and Social Development-funded programmes is still unknown.

For the Justice and Social Development programmes, the standard interpretation of the evidence rating is that:

- there is little or conflicting evidence that the investment can reduce crime
- it is highly uncertain whether the investment will generate return even if implemented well
- the investment type is primarily suited to trial approaches with a strong research and development focus
- full rollout should be subject to high-quality evaluation to ensure investment is reducing crime, and to deliver insights into detailed service design questions.

First edition completed: January 2014

Second edition completed: November 2016

Primary author: Tim Hughes, Sector Group, Ministry of Justice

FIND OUT MORE

Go to the website

<http://www.justice.govt.nz/justice-sector-policy/key-initiatives/investment-approach-to-justice/>

Email

investmentapproach@justice.govt.nz

Recommended reading

Arias, E., Arce, R. & Vilarino, M. (2013). Batterer intervention programmes: a meta-analytic review of effectiveness. *Psychosocial Intervention*, 22(2).

Feder, L., Wilson, D. & Austin, S. (2008). Court-mandated interventions for individuals convicted of family violence. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 2008(12).

Stover, C., Meadows, A. & Kaufman, J. (2009). Interventions for intimate partner violence: review and implications for evidence-based practice. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 40(3).

Morrison, B., Bevan, M., Tamaki, M., Patel, V., Goodall, W., Thomson, P. & Jurke, A. (2015). *Bringing perpetrators into focus: A brief assessment of international and New Zealand evidence on effective responses to family violence perpetrators*. Wellington: Department of Corrections.

Citations

ⁱ Davis and Taylor 1999, Babcock et al 2004 and MacKenzie 2006

ⁱⁱ Feder et al 2008, Smedslund et al 2011, Miller et al 2013 and Arias et al 2013

ⁱⁱⁱ Miller et al 2013

^{iv} MacKenzie 2006

^v Arias et al 2013 and Feder et al 2008

^{vi} Babcock et al 2004

^{vii} Smedslund et al 2011 and Miller et al 2013

^{viii} Feder et al 2008

^{ix} Lloyd-Pask and McMaster 1992, McMaster et al 2000 and Hetherington 2009

^x Slabber 2012

^{xi} McMaster et al 2003

^{xii} Slabber 2012

^{xiii} Babcock et al (2004) and Arias et al (2013)

^{xiv} Morrison et al 2015

^{xv} Slabber 2012, Day et al 2009, Andrews and Bonta 2010

^{xvi} Hackett et al 2015

REFERENCES

- Akoensi, T., Koehler, J., Losel, F. & Humphrey, D. (2012). Family violence perpetrator programs in Europe, part 2: a systematic review of the state of evidence. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 57(10).
- Andrews, D. & Bonta, J. (2010). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct, fifth edition*. Matthew Bender and Company.
- Arias, E., Arce, R. & Vilarino, M. (2013). Batterer intervention programmes: a meta-analytic review of effectiveness. *Psychosocial Intervention*, 22(2).
- Babcock, J., Green, C. & Robie, C. (2004). Does batterers' treatment work? A meta-analytic review of family violence treatment. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 23(8).
- Banks, J., Kini, S. & Babcock, J. (2013). Interventions that work to stop intimate partner violence. In Craig et al (eds). *What Works in Offender Rehabilitation: An evidence-based approach to assessment and treatment*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Baker, G. (2010). *What makes offender programmes effective?* Wellington, New Zealand: Catholic Social Services.
- Brooks, O., Burman, M., Lombard, N., Mclvor, G., Stevenson-Hastings, L. & Kyle, D. (2014). *Violence against women: effective interventions and practices with perpetrators*. Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research.
- Craig, L., Dixon, L. & Gannon, T. (2013). *What Works in Offender Rehabilitation: An evidence-based approach to assessment and treatment*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Davis, R. & Taylor, B. (1999). Does batterer treatment reduce violence? A synthesis of the literature. *Women and Criminal Justice*, 10(2).
- Davis, R. & Weisburd, D. (2008). Effects of second responder programs on reported family abuse. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 2008(15).
- Day, A., Chung, D. & O'Leary, P. (2009). Programs for men who perpetrate family violence: An examination of the issues underlying effectiveness of intervention programs. *Journal of Family Violence* 24: 203–212.
- Easton, C., Mandel, D., Hunkele, K., Nich, C., Rounsaville, B. & Carroll, K. (2007). A cognitive-behavioral therapy for alcohol-dependent family violence offenders: an integrated substance abuse-family violence treatment approach (SADV). *American Journal on Addictions*, 16(1).
- Farrington, D., Gottfredson, D., Sherman, L. & Welsh, B. (2002). The Maryland Scientific Methods Scale. In Sherman, L., Farrington, D., Welsh, B. & Mackenzie, D. (eds). *Evidence-Based Crime Prevention*. New York: Routledge.
- Feder, L., Wilson, D. & Austin, S. (2008). Court-mandated interventions for individuals convicted of family violence. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 2008(12).
- Gondolf, E. (2012). *The Future of Batterer Programs: Reassessing Evidence-Based Practice*. Northeastern.
- Grealy, C. & Wallace, A. (2012). *Literature Review on Domestic Violence Perpetrators*. Melbourne: Urbis.
- Hackett, S., McWhirter, P. & Leshner, S. (2015). The therapeutic efficacy of domestic violence victim interventions. *Trauma, Violence and Abuse*, 1(10).
- Hetherington, S. (2009). *Evaluation of a community based programme for male perpetrators of intimate partner violence*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Massey University, Albany, New Zealand. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10179/1361>
- Kilmer, B., Nicosia, N., Heaton, P. & Midgette, G. (2013). Efficacy of Frequent Monitoring with Swift, Certain and Moderate Sanctions for Violations: Insights from South Dakota's 24/7 Sobriety Project. *American Journal of Public Health*, 103(1).
- Levesque, D. & Gelles, R. (1998). *Does treatment reduce recidivism in men who batter: A meta-analytic evaluation of treatment outcome*. Paper presented at the Program Evaluation and Family Violence Research: An International Conference: Durham, NH .
- Lloyd-Pask, J., & McMaster, K. (1992). What changes as a result of participation in a stopping violence programme? Wellington, New Zealand: *New Zealand Family Violence Co-ordinating Committee*.
- MacKenzie, D. (2006). *What Works in Corrections, ch. 6: Family Violence Offenders*. Cambridge University Press.
- McMaster, K., & Wells, A. (2003). *Innovative approaches to stopping family violence*. Wellington, New Zealand: Steele Roberts.
- McMaster, K., Maxwell, G., & Anderson, T. (2000). *Evaluation of community based stopping violence prevention programmes: Research report*. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Corrections.
- Miller, M., Drake, E. & Nafziger, M. (2013). *What works to reduce recidivism by family violence offenders?* (Document no. 13-01-1201). Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- Morrison, B., Bevan, M., Tamaki, M., Patel, V., Goodall, W., Thomson, P. & Jurke, A. (2015). Bringing perpetrators into focus: *A brief assessment of international and New Zealand evidence on effective responses to family violence perpetrators*. Wellington: Department of Corrections.
- Murphy, C. & Ting, L. (2010). Interventions for perpetrators of intimate partner violence: A review of efficacy research and recent trends. *Partner Abuse*, 1(26).
- Ramsay, J., Carter, Y., Davidson, I., Dunne, D., Eldridge, S., Hegarty, K., Rivas, C., Taft, A., Warburton, A. & Feder, G. (2009). Advocacy interventions to reduce or eliminate violence and promote the physical and psychosocial well-being of women who experience intimate partner abuse. *The Cochrane Library*, 2009(4).
- Robertson, N. (1999). Stopping Violence Programmes: Enhancing the safety of battered women or producing better-educated batterers? *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 28(2).
- Slabber, M. (2012). *Community-based Family Violence Interventions*. Wellington: Department of Corrections.
- Smedslund, G., Dalsbo, T., Steiro, A., Winsvold, A. & Clench-Aas, J. (2011). Cognitive-behavioural therapy for men who physically abuse their female partner. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 2011(1).
- Stover, C., Meadows, A. & Kaufman, J. (2009). Interventions for intimate partner violence: review and implications for evidence-based practice. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 40(3).
- Stuart, G., Ramsey, S., Moore, T., Kahler, C., Farrell, L., Recupero, P. (2003). Reductions in marital violence following treatment for alcohol dependence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18(10).

SUMMARY OF EFFECT SIZES FROM META-ANALYSES

Meta-analysis	Treatment type	Outcome measure	Reported average effect size	Number of estimates meta-analysis based on	Percentage point reduction in offending (assuming 50% untreated recidivism)	Number needed to treat (assuming 50% untreated recidivism)
MacKenzie 2006	Feminist (Duluth) approaches	Re-abuse (victim- or police- reported)	OR=2.82*	5	0.24	4
Davis and Taylor 1999	All treatment	Re-abuse (victim- or police- reported)	d=0.412 (NR)	5	0.16	6
Arias et al 2013	All treatment	Officially recorded re-abuse	d=0.42 (NS)	33	0.17	6
Miller et al 2013	Non-duluth treatments	Official or victim-reported recidivism	d=0.4*	5	0.16	6
Feder et al 2008	Court-mandated interventions	Re-abuse (officially recorded)	d=0.26*	7	0.11	9
Babcock et al 2004	All treatment	Re-abuse (victim-reported)	d=0.18*	16	0.07	14
Babcock et al 2004	All treatment	Re-abuse (police-report)	d=0.18*	20	0.07	14
Smedslund et al 2011	CBT	Violent behaviour	RR=0.86(NS)	6	0.07	14
MacKenzie 2006	CBT	Re-abuse (victim- or police- reported)	OR=1.20 (NS)	5	0.05	22
Arias et al 2013	All treatment	Couple reported re-abuse	d=0.05 (NS)	13	0.02	49
Miller et al 2013	Duluth model	Official or victim-reported recidivism	d=-0.1 (NS)	6	Not effective	-
Feder et al 2008	Court-mandated interventions	Re-abuse (victim-reported)	d=0.00 (NS)	7	Not effective	-

* Statistically significant at a 95% threshold

OR=Odds ratio

d=Cohen's d or variant (standardised mean difference)

Φ=phi coefficient (variant of correlation coefficient)

NA=Not applicable (no positive impact from treatment)

NS: Not significant

NR: Significance not reported

RRR: Relative risk