Typologies of Violence in Family Court Processes

Reflections from the field

Alice Bailey, Danny Blay, Ruth Busch, Marie Hume, Julie Oberin, Margot Scott, Carmel O'Brien, Beth Tinning, Jane Wangmann



The typologies of violence

- ichael Johnson (1995): differences in findings from research by family violence researchers and feminist researchers resulted from exploring different sample groups or different types of 'violence'
- pologies evolved & changed over the years
- Intimate partner terrorism/ controlled coercive violence
- Self defence/ protective violence
- Mutual couple conflict

Post senaration violence

The typologies of violence (cont.)

- Family Law Amendments (2006)
- Commitment to equal shared parenting unless there is evidence of violence
- Family violence a core business of the Family Courts
 - a particular context for consideration
- Do current assessments regarding the presenting 'typology of violence' actually enhance the safety of victims of violence in formal separation processes?

The literature

- Johnson's typologies are contested: methodology; nature of the 'types' (distinct or same over time?); lack of specific tool for assessment; replicating dominant myths.
- Risks of incorrect assessment
- Therefore, importance of treating all cases as CCV until proven otherwise
- Shift of gaze from dangerousness to frequency safety not an 'academic' issue
- The context of Family Law

Experiences from the frontline

The use of typologies in family law processes

- Concerns regarding assessment: training?
 Supervision? Research/ reflection?
- Our experiences of working with men who perpetrate violence: minimising their abusive or violent behaviour in the first instance
- Our experiences of working with women: minimising the violence they received in the first instance

Experiences from the frontline (cont.)

Meaningful assessment: complex. Takes time, requires an understanding of the dynamics of violence, sensitivity and sophistication to get the correct information

Experiences from the frontline(cont)

Concerns regarding inappropriate/ inaccurate assessments

(case example: Peta)

- Who benefits from the use of the typologies?
- The risks?

In conclusion

- Our question: Are the typologies of violence useful tool for family law mechanisms?
- Concerns raised require addressing before it becomes a 'given' that the typologies are used as a tool of assessment in a context of extreme vulnerability
- Placing safety & equity at the centre of decision making: an alternative focus of assessment.

References

- Eriksson, M. & Hester, M. (2001). Violent Men as Good Enough Fathers? A look at England & Sweeden. *Violence Against Women.* **7** 779-798
- Flood, M. (2010). "Fathers' Rights" and the Defense of Paternal Authority in Australia. Violence Against Women. 16 (3), 328-347
- Hay, A. (2003). Child Protection and the Family Court of Australia: the experiences of children and the protective parent. Paper presented at *Child Sexual Abuse: Justice Response or Alternative Resolution*. Adelaide: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Jaffe, P.G., Johnstone, J., Crooks, C., Bala, N. (2008). Custody Disputes Involving Allegations of Domestic Violence: Towards a Differentiated Approach to Parenting Plans. *Family Court Review.* **46**(3) July 2008, 500-522.
- Johnson, M.P. (2006). Conflict & Control: Gender Symmetry and Assymmetry in Domestic Violence. *Violence Against Women.* **12** (11) Nov 2006, 1003-1018
- Johnson, M. P. (2009) Langhinrichsen-Rolling's Confirmation of the Feminist Analysis of Intimate Partner Violence: Comment on "Controversies Involving Gender and Intimate Partner Violence in the United States". *Feminist Forum.* **62** (3-4) http://www.springerlink.com/content/r056373325734859/fulltext.pdf
- Johnson, M.P. & Ferraro, K. (2000). Research on domestic violence in the 1990s: Making Distinctions. *Journal of Marriage & Family.* **62** 126-144
- Johnston, J. (2009). Strategies for resolving inter-professional differences in understanding and responding to family violence to improve outcomes for families: Lessons learned from the Wingspread Conference. Paper presented at Workshop on Family Violence at

References (cont.)

- Kelly, J. B. & Johnson, M.P. (2008). Differentiation among types of intimate partner violence: research update and implications for interventions. *Family Court Review.* **46**(3) July 2008, 476-499.
- Meier, J. (2007). Defining Domestic Violence: Has Johnson's Typology Resolved the Gender Debate? Paper presented at *AALS Workshop on Family Law* June 20-22 2007
- Moloney, L., Smyth, B., Weston, R. & Hall, E. (2008). Different types of intimate partner violence? Reply to Wangmann's comments on the AIFS report. *Australian Journal of Family Law.* **22** (3) 279-295
- Moloney, L., Smyth, B., Weston, R. Richardson, N., Qu, L. & Gray, M. (2007). *Allegations of Family Violence and Child Abuse in Family Law Children's Proceedings.* Melbourne: AIFS.
- Parkinson, P.., Cashmore, J. & Single, J. (2009). *Post-Separation Violence and the use of Family Violence Orders. Legal Studies Research Paper No. 09/124* Sydney: Sydney Law School University of Sydney.
- Rosen, K. H., Stith, S.M., Few, A. L., Daly, K.L., & Tritt, D.R. (2005). A Qualitastive Investigation of Johnson's Typology. *Violence & Victims*, **20**(3), 319-333
- Stark, E. (2007). Coercive Control: How Men Entrap Women in Personal Life. New Yory: Oxford University Press.

References (cont.)

- Trinder, L., Firth, A. & Jenks, C. (2009). 'So presumably things have moved on then? The management of risk allegations in child contact dispute resolution. *International Journal of Law, Policy & the Family.* **24**(1), (2010), 29-53
- Ver Steegh, N. (2005). Differentiating Types of Domestic Violence: Implications for Child Custody. Louisiana Kaw Review. **65** 1379 2004-2005.
- Ver Steegh, N. & Dalton, C. (2007). Report from the Wingspread Conference on Domestic Violence and Family Courts.
- Wangmann, J. (2008). Different types of intimate partner violence? A comment on the Australian Institute of Family Studies report examining allegations of family violence in child proceedings under the Family Law Act. *Australian Journal of Family Law.* **22** (2) 123-151