

Tri-County Batterer Intervention Provider Network Meeting Minutes—10/13/2009

Present: Chris Huffine (Allies in Change Counseling Center), Paul Lee (Men's Resource Center), Ryan Alonzo (Bridges to Safety), Shari Blasio (Bridges to Safety), Nana Lapham (Bridges to Safety), Harley Earl (ChangePoint), Paula Manley (Manley Interventions), Melinda Sherman (MRC), Dean Camarda (MRC/Allies), Guruseva Mason (Choices), Sarah McDowell (Raphael House of Portland), Matt Johnson (ChangePoint), Michael Davis (ChangePoint), Johnnie Burt (Abuse Recovery Ministry Services), Sara Windsheimer-Roark (Choices), Emily Szeliga (Allies), Kelly Strider (Bridges to Safety), Gino Galvez (PSU), Jennifer Warren (Women's Counseling Center/Men's Resource Center), Regina Rosann (ARMS)

Minutes by Paula Manley, edited by Chris Huffine

PRESENTATION:

Perpetration of Work-Related Intimate Partner Violence

Eric Mankowski, Ph.D. & Gino Galvez, MS, PSU

Please also refer to the attached report which was distributed at the meeting.

Work-related IVP is not recognized. A goal of the project is to bring employers into the resolution of the problem of domestic violence. A couple years ago Gino did a presentation and TCBIP members have been involved since then.

36-75 % of employed women who experience IPV have been harassed by partners at work.

Work-related IVP Behaviors are varied. There is great impact on victim's healthy, safety, employment and productivity.

Impact on abusers - men prone to abuse missed work more often and made more mistakes on the job. Survey was based on beliefs, etc. revealed in a survey.

Cost of work-related IPV is great (see stats in the attached report). Study results are available in a brochure. The first phase of the research was to have a survey to measure impact of IPV from the viewpoint of the abuser. The research goal was to find out how common are various forms of work-related IPV, what workplace resources are used to perpetrate this abuse, impact on workers' employment and productivity, how employers respond, are there distinct types of work-related abusers.

They are using the information gathered to develop training. The focus of the study is to provide resources to victims in the workplace who are not otherwise receiving services. There is also a particular focus on Latina victims of IVP.

They talked to 198 men in 9 BIP programs in Oregon. 99% participation rate. 40% of the men interviewed said that in their lifetime they had an intimate partner relationship with a coworker.

The survey was done at Latino community health agencies or at BIPs. The survey was done on paper or iPod administration. They utilized men in regular BIP meetings. Behaviors included threatening to hurt people physically, lying to partner to get her to leave work, argued on the phone with her when she is at work, followed partner to or from the job, called her partner's job to check up on her, tried to stop her from spending time from coworkers.

Impact on perpetrator = missed work or mistakes, boss found out, denied a job or lost, etc.

Survey Validation - reviewed by local DV victim advocates and BIP providers, pilot tested and revised, subject matter expert sort and review.

Purposely over-sampled Spanish-language BIPs. 44% Mexico, 44% USA, 11% other.

Sample behaviors (see report) were listed as to behaviors they had *ever* done to their partner, not just current.

Sometimes IPV spreads over to coworkers or boss. These % reports include men whose partners have never worked out of the home. Therefore, the frequency of offenses toward worker partners is under-estimated.

Most important is effect on the survivor, but they need to hook the employer, so focus on pointing out the effect on work performance, productivity, etc.

Abuser effect - almost 70% of participants missed work, had difficulty concentrating at work or made mistakes at work due to their obsession/abuse.

About 7% of abusers had learned control tactics from boss or coworkers.

They wondered: Are there different typologies of work place related abuse based on the pattern of behaviors they reported? Cluster analysis yielded five types:

1. Low level tactics
2. Interference
3. Interference w/threatened or actual violence
4. Extreme abuse without jealousy
5. Extreme abuse

One would think that impact on abusers' own work would be greater based. In fact, the study showed that odds of impact on job performance were 24x higher for extreme abuse cluster than low level tactics cluster.

Conclusions - they want input from agencies on their report.

Implications - they think employers need training and incentives on how to respond to victims and referrals for employees to BIPs.

As BIPS, perhaps we should talk more about the controlling behaviors that affect the partner's

work and their own work performance.

Comments: Sometimes the boss is aware of the perpetrator's abuse and colludes. 86% of employers knew about the abuser's actions, and in some cases the boss bailed out the abusive man.

Note that these are summaries of the men's responses about how others/they respond. The study also interviewed some employers. Many of them felt helpless to deal with the situation.

New law in Oregon requires employers with 6 or more employees to allow victims to take (unpaid) time off to deal with DV court dates, housing, etc. OR was the 13th state to do this. It is also now illegal to fire individuals for being DV victims.