Innovative Strategies to Address Domestic Violence in Asian and Pacific Islander Communities :

Examining Themes, Models and Interventions

REPORT BY
Mimi Kim

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FIGURES

FOREWORD

The Asian & Pacific Islander Institute on Domestic Violence is a national network of advocates; community members; professionals from health, mental health, law, education, and social services; survivors; scholars; researchers; and activists from public policy, community organizations, youth programs, immigrants' rights networks, communities of color, women's groups, queer communities, and other social justice organizations. Our goals include:

- Raising awareness in Asian & Pacific Islander communities about the corrosive effects of domestic violence on individual, familial, and community strength.
- Addressing the root causes of violence, the various forms of violence used, the sustained devaluation of women, the impunity of abusers, and community complicity.
- Organizing cultural transformation by emphasizing community accountability and establishing new social norms.
- Expanding leadership and expertise within Asian & Pacific Islander communities about prevention, intervention, advocacy and research.
- Promoting culturally relevant programming, research, and advocacy by identifying promising practices.
- Formulating national policies that prompt initiatives at local and state levels.
- Strengthening the Asian & Pacific Islander anti-violence movement by forging links with other communities of color and social justice organizations.

The Institute has embarked on several projects and documenting the strategies of Asian & Pacific Islander advocacy is one of them. This is our first report. Rather than a straightforward documentation of the best practices of API agencies and programs, we have presented recurring themes; engaged in a critique of existing standardized models; and examined the assumptions behind the interventions designed by API advocates.

This report is not meant to be conclusive. It should be read as an exploration of ideas and questions. The views of individual interviewees should not be considered as endorsements by the Institute of the practices they describe.

We hope you can use the report for discussions inside and outside your agencies. Let us know your comments and questions; we are eager to know what you think.

Firoza Chic Dabby, Director
Asian & Pacific Islander Institute on Domestic Violence

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project is the result of many years of experience of Asian and Pacific Islander women confronting violence against women in their communities. In particular, the Asian and Pacific Islander Institute on Domestic Violence wishes to acknowledge discussions among women who have participated in the Interventions/Services Working Group of the Asian and Pacific Islander Institute on Domestic Violence including Aparna Bhattacharyya, Emma Catague, Chic Dabby, Trishala Deb, Val Kalei Kanuha, Nanette Kaiwii, Mimi Kim, and Sujata Warrier.

The thoughts and visions of many of these women are reflected in the interviews conducted for this project. In addition, the Institute thanks additional interviewees who contributed their honest appraisal of the successes of their work as well as the limitations and who offered visions for the future. The women interviewed include Aparna Bhattacharyya, Emma Catague, Chic Dabby, Quynh Dang, Trishala Deb, Pat Eng, Val Kalei Kanuha, Susun Kim, Bo Thao, and Sujata Warrier.

Mimi Kim conceptualized this project and authored this report. The Institute acknowledges her tremendous contribution to our work and our collective thinking.

Mimi Kim has been active in the anti-violence against women movement since 1985. She worked at Asian Women's Shelter as coordinator of the Multilingual Access Model Program from 1991 to 2002. She is currently a steering committee member of Incite! Women of Color Against Violence, a national group representing issues relevant to women of color fighting against multiple forms of violence, and the Asian and Pacific Islander Institute on Domestic Violence. She is also co-founding member of Shimtuh and Korean American Women in Need (KAN-WIN), domestic violence programs for Korean American women and children in Oakland and Chicago, respectively. Other activities include drumming with Jamaesori, a Korean women's drumming group in Oakland.

INTRODUCTION

Asian and Pacific Islander (API)[i] resistance to violence against women has historical roots extending before the start of the anti-domestic violence movement in the U.S. Survivors of domestic and sexual violence, family members and community have long spoken out against these personal and societal injustices. Their words and actions, however, have often remained in the shadows of history.

In the U.S., specific API organizational responses to domestic violence[ii] have their beginnings in the early 1980's, when programs such as Manavi in New Jersey, New York Asian Women's Center in New York City, Asian Women's Shelter in San Francisco and others lent momentum to the movement. During this era, API women, many of whom had already been involved in the mainstream anti-domestic violence movements in the U.S., began to question their own communities' lack of access to mainstream programs. In response, many founded API specific programs, at times adopting existing models and adjusting them to meet the needs of API communities. The results are a variety of API programmatic responses, many of which developed innovative practices and policies by necessity or by design.

Documentation of our attempts, our challenges, our successes and failures are scarce. Aside from program brochures, grant reports, and an occasional paper appearing in an anthology,[iii] assessments of our work and questions regarding their value and meaning remain the topics of staff meetings, conferences and side conversations among the enthusiastic and the frustrated.

Purpose and Scope of the Innovative Strategies Project

The Innovative Strategies Project is an attempt to document our accomplishments and innovations as well as our limitations. The project goes beyond narrow notions of "cultural competence" and "language accessibility" which have thus far characterized discussions of our work and that of other communities marked by difference whether it be race, ethnicity, language, sexual identity, disability, and their intersections. It examines more deeply the underlying assumptions and principles which guide our intervention[iv] strategies and those that define them as innovations rather than simple cultural accommodations. It explores the edges of innovation and asks where to retreat or where to move forward.

Discussions held by the Interventions/Services Working Group of the Asian and Pacific Islander Institute on Domestic Violence provided a rare national forum for API women to meet and address these concerns. API women working for years as advocates, activists, counselors, attorneys, community educators, organizers, directors and allies in the struggle to stop violence against women in API communities asked each other about the successes and failures of the mainstream movement as well as those of their own programs.

Various themes and issues arose during these discussions. What do we do when not only the abuser but the entire family is participating in the violence? How do we reach women who do not see leaving the relationship as an option? How can we mobilize communities to ban the abuser from community spaces – rather than the survivor as is more often the case? What do we do for women who are so mentally or emotionally disabled from abuse that they cannot meet our program criteria or requirements?

These are among the questions which defy answers generally provided by standardized domestic violence interventions. Our questions and others challenge the very assumptions which have been handed down by the larger movement and which, in many cases, have been adopted by API specific programs. These are also questions which many of our programs have attempted to address, at times with success and at times, with failure.

Because of the great diversity of API experiences in the U.S. and the breadth of intervention strategies which can be addressed, the goals of the API Innovative Strategies project essentially requires a series of reports in order to document and analyze the contributions of the API domestic violence movement. This is the first one.

Goals of This Report

Innovative Strategies to Address Domestic Violence in Asian and Pacific Islander Communities: Examining Themes, Models and Interventions, sets the agenda for future project endeavors. It is an initial inquiry into the broad universe of API experiences and reflections regarding our work towards addressing domestic violence in API communities.

What emerged from interviews with key informants in the API domestic violence movement was the need to contrast API strategies with long-established models of intervention – colloquially referred to as mainstream models. This report answers some preliminary questions about API domestic violence interventions and presents a map for further exploration. Its goals are to:

1) Define the characteristics of the standard or current model of domestic violence intervention;

2) Specify the limitations of the standard model of intervention for API communities;

3) Begin the identification of and analysis of the experiences and strategies of existing API programs; and

4) Identify and prioritize areas of API innovative strategies for future documentation and analysis.

Methodology

This report features the results of interviews with 10 Asian and Pacific Islander women working in the anti-domestic violence movement. These women all have at least 5 years of experience working directly with API survivors of domestic violence and sexual violence. Many have experience extending 15 years or more. All respondents have also played central roles in the creation of community-specific, pan-Asian or pan-immigrant and refugee programs addressing violence against women.

These 10 key informants were selected because of their extensive and varied roles in the development of the API anti-domestic violence movement as well as their contributions to program development, policy formation and analysis within their specific communities and of the national domestic violence agenda. There was also an attempt to reflect diversity in terms of geographic location, ethnicity, sexual identity, roles in domestic violence work, experience as survivors and witnesses of domestic violence, and experience in pan-Asian versus ethnic-specific organizations.

Most of the interviewees are immigrants. And all have provided advocacy and services to domestic violence survivors in the primary language of their Asian or Pacific Islander constituency.[v]

Interview questions are both quantitative and qualitative. However, most findings are based upon the rich anecdotes and reflections presented by these women in their interviews. All interviewees were asked the same questions although the order in which the conversations flowed varied widely. Interviews ranged from 1 to 2 1/2 hours with the average interview lasting approximately 2 hours.[vi]

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
DEFINING API INNOVATIVE STRATEGIES

API domestic violence intervention strategies within the U.S. have arisen both as accommodations and alternatives to mainstream domestic violence programs. They have adopted mainstream assumptions and approaches. And they have crafted innovations based upon necessity and, in some cases, vision and intentionality.

Emerging themes as discussed by the API women interviewed in this report highlight a number of areas which capture our attention for further exploration. While the findings of this report bring up broad, diverse and, at times, contradictory policies and practices among API programs, the following categories summarize themes brought up in this report.

Where We Start: Viewing the Survivor within the Context of Her Community

API programs were started with API communities and API survivors of domestic violence in mind. Even those programs which began as community education projects inevitably came into contact with survivors, abusers and witnesses of domestic violence who needed interventions. Safe access, effective interventions and expanding options became concerns for any API individual or organization addressing the issue of domestic violence.

Although the "helper" versus "client" or "us" versus "them" separation appears to characterize many API domestic violence programs, the divisions become less clear as workers and survivors in small ethnic enclaves in the U.S. often share the same cultures, languages, and even neighborhoods and families.

The importance of community and the complexities of community as a place of abuse and entrapment as well as familiarity and resources has led to innovative approaches to interventions and options.

Reshaping Intervention: Expanding Options

While the creation of API shelters has greatly expanded the options for API survivors of domestic violence, API intervention responses have created a variety of innovative strategies which de-center shelters as the primary intervention.

The importance of community as an emotional and material resource has shaped these interventions. Furthermore, the lack of access to resources for immigrant communities can make financial, educational and employment interventions at least as significant as those traditionally offered by domestic violence programs such as emergency shelter or restraining orders. In some cases the latter option may have a negative impact.

Community-based non-shelter programs often provide a complement of options for women who do not desire shelter, who may be unable to access shelters, or who may not be ready for shelter. Options may still follow standardized approaches such as legal advocacy or public assistance advocacy. Programs have developed innovative approaches for women regardless of their choice in terms of leaving or not leaving abusive relationships.

Intervention Approaches: Family-Style

Many API programs view their intervention approaches as "family-style." Despite the negative connotations of "family" within the context of domestic violence, API programs have embraced positive aspects of "family" to imply a greater level of intimacy and care in their interactions with survivors.

Generalist approaches are favored over rigidly defined roles and areas of expertise. Greater flexibility in terms of time, level of accompaniment and advocacy, and distribution of resources also characterize many API interventions. In some cases, boundaries around personal disclosure, gift giving and receiving, and social contact may be more fluid.

At the Edge of Safety: Redefining Survivor/Abuser Boundaries

The conceptualization of the survivor within the context of her community and the expansion of options to reach her where she's at has also pushed the edge of safety for API intervention efforts. Interventions reaching not only into the community, but into the home have led to the questioning of mainstream boundaries between danger and safety, abuser and survivor.

While many API programs have accepted mainstream notions of safety and interventions which explicitly separate survivor from abuser, some are exploring options which transcend these lines, combining traditional programmatic approaches of batterer treatment and survivor support with complementary programs which include both survivor and abuser.

Community Accountability for Abusers

Community accountability for abusers as a complement or alternative to the criminal legal system is an area of great promise as well as challenge. Community accountability strategies may be contained within formalized community-based organizations. Or they may be led by community-based domestic violence organizations with the collaboration of community individuals, families, leaders or other institutions or organizations. Many instances of community accountability take place outside of formal domestic violence interventions. For example, family threats towards and confrontation of abusers have continued historically outside of formal legal structures and inside socio-familial ones. Some communities have meted out remedies through recognized structures of authority such as clan leaders.

Community Organizing

Many API domestic violence programs have rejected conventional service-delivery models for approaches which actively engage the community. While community contact has been key to many programs, the levels of community participation have varied.

Redefining Domestic Violence

Effective domestic violence interventions require expanded definitions of domestic violence. Participants in relationships of violence may extend beyond an individual survivor and individual abuser. Extended members of the family, community members, and community institutions can be directly and actively involved in dynamics of abuse. Furthermore, relations of power and abuse such as racism, classism, homophobia, and imperialism intersect with gender oppression and sexism in ways which need further exploration.

Redefining the Vision

Visions guiding our work shift with experience, evaluation of results, and responses to changing conditions. Many API programs have adopted mission statements which claim goals such as ending domestic violence, increasing survivor safety, increasing independence, and promoting women's self-determination. Practices may or may not concur with such stated goals. In this report, no consensus emerged regarding a vision which most effectively captures the overall spirit and everyday motivations for our work. However, questions regarding the relevance and effectiveness of previously established assumptions and goals revealed the need to reflect collectively and redefine the vision for individual organizations and for the movement.

Other Areas of Innovation

These definitions of innovative strategies are based upon the anecdotes and reflections of 10 API advocates and activists. While common themes emerged, each individual lent a unique area of concern and enthusiasm.

Organization of a Pan-Asian Response
Organizations represented by these respondents reflected a broad range of local or regional responses to diverse pan-Asian or broader immigrant and refugee domestic violence communities and needs. Some were able to create ethnic specific or pan-Asian domestic violence programs. Others required more creative collaborative efforts due to scarce resources or to perceived efficacy.

Children in API Domestic Violence Interventions
The issue of children and youth in the API domestic violence movement and in domestic violence interventions remains largely invisible in this report. It thus remains the task of the API Innovative Strategies Project to prioritize the documentation of existing work in supporting the health and safety of our children and youth. It must also address the gaps which this absence implies.

API Men in Anti- Domestic Violence Movement
The issue of men's participation in the API anti-violence movement and in domestic violence interventions was raised by respondents. Some API programs include men as clients, allies, and active members. Participation of men may be, in some cases, formally structured and proscribed. The role of men remains an area of contention in the anti-domestic violence movement, in general and is not unique to the API community.

THE CRITIQUE: API RESPONSE TO THE STANDARDIZED MODEL OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INTERVENTION

Current established approaches towards resisting and responding to domestic violence in the U.S. are the result of the long history of struggle by courageous women, children and male allies. What is now colloquially referred to as a "mainstream" model are the assumptions and practices which have become institutionalized over time.

API survivors, advocates and community members have been challenging these established practices by insisting on "language accessible" and "culturally competent" services and by developing approaches, practices and institutions more accessible to and effective for API communities.

Articulation of these "innovations" requires some reflection upon a definition of the standardized model of domestic violence intervention. What has the API experience been of existing options for domestic violence survivors? What are some of the characteristics of such approaches? Interviews with key informants yielded several characteristics of established domestic violence interventions.[vii] These characteristics are as follows:

1) The **definition** of domestic violence is limited to **interpersonal** violence.

2) The goal of intervention is to end domestic violence through the survivor/victim **leaving** the relationship.

3) The major intervention for a woman **survivor/victim** is escape of abusive situation through **shelter** and shelter-related services.

4) The major intervention for an **abuser** is the **criminal legal system**, i.e., police, restraining order, arrest, etc.

5) The unit addressed in intervention is the **individual,** woman, man.

6) Keeping **professional boundaries** between the worker and client/survivor is appropriate.

7) Interventions are **standardized** to fit a homogeneous survivor profile: disregarding race, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation and immigrant status; and not accounting for those with disabilities, mental illness or substance abuse problems.

These key informants then shared their assessments of the effectiveness of these interventions within the API community? What works? What are the limitations of these approaches?

Characteristic 1: Interpersonal Definition of Domestic Violence

*The **definition** of domestic violence is limited to **interpersonal** violence.*
Many respondents view the very definition of domestic violence and the conceptual models describing the dynamics of domestic violence as characteristics of a mainstream model of domestic violence intervention.

Definitions of domestic violence focusing on a 2-person intimate relationship, familiar conceptual models such as the "power and control wheel" and the "cycle of violence" present limited conceptual frameworks for the complexities of domestic violence in API communities.

> The kind of violence experienced by API women is different. We can't respond to abuse if we don't know what kind of abuse she's facing. For example, if the ex-wife is holding down the new wife while the husband slits her throat, do our interventions address this situation? (Director, ethnic-specific agency)[viii]

> The mainstream model is focused on interpersonal violence. I distinguish that from organizations who think of the problem as larger – who think within a social justice framework. (Director, pan-Asian shelter)

> What [batterer programs] teach is the domestic violence model which I think is very western. Hmong men who truly believe it's his right to discipline his wife can't look at that [power and control wheel] model and say, "Okay. I'm withholding money from her." He believes that that's his right. (Advocate, ethnic-specific agency)

> The mainstream model isn't even effective for the mainstream. (Program Coordinator, pan-Asian shelter)

Characteristic 2: Leaving as an Intervention Goal

*The goal of intervention is to end domestic violence through the survivor/victim **leaving** the relationship.* What respondents view as the established goal of leaving the relationship evoked a variety of responses. Some focused on the alienating impact this has on API women seeking support.

> I recently got a call from a family friend who called a shelter. She had been told that she needed to leave, and other than that, there weren't any other options for her. (Program Coordinator, pan-Asian shelter)

> I think that for most of the people we work with, their goal is to end the violence and not the relationship. The goal of the mainstream, the survivor leaving the relationship, has really alienated a lot of Asian women, even if they speak English, from seeking services in mainstream organizations. (Advocate, pan-Asian shelter)

> If we had approached cases through the lens that the goal was to get the woman to leave, not only would we be putting women in danger because we'd be pushing them to make decisions that they wouldn't do, but we would have totally lost our clients. (Advocate, pan-Asian agency)

Almost all interviewees stressed the particular difficulties of leaving the relationship among women in the API community. For immigrant women, leaving the relationship often means leaving the community which is a source of identity, familiarity, and resources.

> A really big difference between the mainstream and the immigrant spaces was that the mainstream shelter really minimized what it meant for the woman to leave her community. We just acted like, "You can always pick up and move to the next town or a few towns over or another state." But it was very clear when we were working in immigrant and refugee communities that leaving a community was as hard as leaving home and that the people around you are at times as important as your family. (Advocate, pan-Asian agency)

Others seriously questioned the benefits of leaving for some survivors and were concerned about the implications for programs that uniformly favor this as an option.

> Something what I struggle with is that...we take the women from abusive homes. We put them into housing projects where their children are being abused in the buses and in their neighborhoods. And they

are in this cycle of poverty. Isn't that also abusive? So we're exchanging one type of abuse for another type of abuse. (Advocate, pan-Asian shelter)

It's not necessarily clear cut that someone really has to leave or wants to leave. There are a lot of financial considerations and lifetime considerations and her own implications of her life. It's either you leave or "Adios, you're not our problem." And why should someone necessarily leave? Maybe she has to give up too much to leave. Maybe it would be easier for us if she left. But for her, her life – and I think more people stay anyway – what are we doing for her? Because you don't leave, "You're not brave? You're not smart enough? You're not resourceful enough?" What message are we telling them? (Attorney, pan-Asian agency)

Characteristic 3: Shelter as the Major Intervention for Survivors

*The major intervention for a woman **survivor/victim** is escaping an abusive situation through **shelter** and shelter-related services.*
There was some ambivalence over the value of shelters for API women. Many saw shelters as limited for API women not only because of a lack of language access or cultural competency, but also because of their cultural assumptions, for example, such as pressures to get a restraining order or to follow steps to independence.

I recently visited [a Hmong program in] California, and while I was visiting, a woman had come into the office saying that her husband had beat her and she didn't know what to do. They asked her if she had gone to shelter. She said, "Yes." But she didn't want to go there because they would just ask her if she wants a protective order and things like that. She didn't want to go that route. (Advocate, ethnic-specific program)

Shelters and formal interventions are very uncreative. There are huge geographical distances in a place like Hawaii, but only 2 shelters. (Counselor, ethnic-specific program)

Shelters primarily assess if she'll fully utilize [their services] to "get with the program." They do not focus on offering refuge. Services are too tightly wrapped around making her independent. (Director, ethnic-specific program)

Some also noted that shelter as an intervention becomes linked to leaving even if that was not initially the woman's choice.

With the women I've worked with, most don't think of actually leaving. But when they get to the shelter, it becomes part of the intervention. It gets plugged in there, and, therefore, yes, you must leave. (Advocate, ethnic-specific program)

For women who do not speak English, women with many children, or queer[ix] API women, shelters are even less of an option.

We tried to find a space for a woman with 8 children. We couldn't find shelter at all. They said, "She can come, but we can't take her children." Well, she's not going to leave if her children cannot come. (Advocate, ethnic-specific program)

For the API dykes [lesbians] in our group, there was really no shelter option. There was an emergency shelter option, but I would only recommend that people take it in only the most dire situation. And I never ended up referring women to a shelter. (Advocate, ethnic-specific program)

Others noted alarm at the general social control nature of shelter attitudes, policies and practices.

We have so many rules. We're very judgmental and controlling about the women. (Advocate, ethnic-specific agency)

Interviewees familiar with or working in shelters for API women felt more comfortable with the flexibility of these shelter programs and their sensitivity to the needs of API women.

Most respondents questioned the value of shelters as the primary intervention strategy but believed that they remain a necessary option for domestic violence survivors.

Characteristic 4: Criminal Legal System as the Major Intervention for Abusers

*The major intervention for an **abuser** is the **criminal legal system**, i.e., police, restraining order, arrest, etc.*

While interviewees generally viewed the criminal legal system as an ineffective intervention for API abusers, the nature of their responses was more ambivalent. Does it work? Is it necessary in some cases?

Many voiced strong concerns about the criminal legal system's effectiveness towards ending domestic violence in the API community. Many responses echo the criticisms of the criminal legal system emerging from other communities of color.

> What we know is that the criminal justice system is operating on a whole different agenda which is to incarcerate and funnel the labor of low income and brown communities into the prison industrial complex. So it is in their interest to have the most number of people, particularly low income men of color in prison. That's their first priority. That's their first interest. I think that it is very clear in low income communities that the police are absolutely not where you go to be safe. (Advocate, pan-Asian agency)

For API communities, immigration issues and, in particular, recent legislation and practice linking the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and deportation to the criminal legal system has raised further concerns.

The laws that are in place can make it very difficult because individuals can be deported, and that may have negative effects on the woman and providing support for the children. (Director, ethnic-specific agency)

> In 1996, the immigration law made a big difference.[x] Women fear that men will get deported. We had a lawyer get up in front of a whole group of Hmong women and tell them not to report domestic violence because their men will get deported. (Advocate, ethnic-specific agency)

> I think that now we're in a new period of time where there's such overt collusion between the INS and the federal authorities and the local police department, that there's a good chance that victims from South Asian, Central Asian, Muslim, Middle Eastern communities – that if they have their partner arrested on a misdemeanor or felony battery charge, that that can lead to deportation, INS detention or any number of other possibilities that we really have no control over. Advocates at this point have such little power … with any of those systems. It can be opening up a world of hate. And I think that down the road, that's going to apply even more for all immigrants. (Advocate, pan-Asian agency)

There was also a general criticism of the over-reliance of the mainstream anti-domestic violence movement on the criminal legal system as an increasingly exclusive intervention for batterers.

> Here we are 20 years later. What we [the anti-violence movement] asked for was "police, police, police" and now that's what we have. There's no room for the community. There's no room for what the woman wants. (Advocate, ethnic-specific agency)

The interesting thing is how you apply the law and how you interpret it. I think that's the failure of the movement in my opinion. We've focused it on using already existing things to fit something where it doesn't. If you're looking more at the issue of "What does justice really mean?" it goes back to that. The criminal justice system isn't [about] justice. (Board member, ethnic specific agency)

Further questions were raised about the effectiveness of batterer's intervention programs mandated by the criminal legal system.

Our experience is [that] they sit there; they stay there; but their attitude is, "No. I'm only here because the judge told me to be here." (Advocate, pan-Asian agency)

I don't think the criminal justice system has been effective at all in changing men. Hmong men go, and they get sentenced to attend the domestic violence groups. So for one, they're not [among] Hmong. [They] just sit there through 10 sessions. (Advocate, ethnic-specific agency)

He might end up in jail or attending a domestic violence group. But nobody else knows about it. Nothing else happens. (Advocate, ethnic-specific agency)

Others acknowledged effectiveness of the criminal legal system for some API women in domestic violence situations.

What we have found at [our agency], though, is that for women who have used the criminal justice system, oftentimes, depending upon the status of the abuser, it would actually help because the men then were themselves fearful of getting involved with the system. In that way, it was a real threat to them and they would really heed what the court had to say. So for those women who were able to use the system, they were able to use it effectively. That's not really true across the board. (Director, pan-Asian shelter)

I think a really key part of outreach is [the message to batterers that] domestic violence is not only wrong but is illegal in this country. [So our message was] "Batterers, you should know this so that you prevent yourself from getting in trouble by landing in jail." And so sometimes for batterers and for community members, it's not so much that they believe in equality of the sexes and that women are working just as hard as men and women's work is valued just as much as men's work. But what some of the women have told us is that the violence ended because he can get arrested and that now that he knows that, he's not going to physically abuse her. (Advocate, pan-Asian shelter]

The need for community levels of abuser accountability as either an alternative to or a complement to the criminal legal system was stressed by all respondents.

[The criminal legal system approach to batterer intervention] is limited in that we see batterers only as a type – a particular personality. And they come in different personalities. There are those clearly where the only place for them is to be jailed. Then there are those for whom a number of different sanctions is probably what is needed. This is where the whole community comes in. Why can't communities hold them accountable? (Board member, ethnic-specific agency)

Characteristic 5: Individual as Unit of Intervention

*The unit addressed in intervention is the **individual** woman, man.*
All respondents agreed that a major limitation of the standardized model of intervention for the API community is their focus on the individual whether it is the survivor, or the abuser and the conceptualization of "independence" as a goal.

First, the definition of domestic violence in the API community often defies the pattern of an individual survivor and individual abuser. Family members and extended community member's active participation in abuse makes intervention on the individual level limited at best.

> This nuclear family model obviously shows that the model came from the mainstream community. If we were to design it for Korean women, we would look at family dynamics and relationships more closely – the in-laws. (Attorney, pan-Asian agency)

Second, API women often view family as extensions of self. Family can be seen not only as a cultural barrier to ending domestic violence, i.e., bearers of oppressive ideas about womanhood or family responsibility, but as positive emotional and financial resources. Solutions sought only at an individual level can be alienating, unrealistic and ineffective.

> If [Hmong women] file a protective order, if they've gone through the shelter, they're going to move out of that community because they are no longer accepted. Nobody in the community is ever going to support them at all. So they needed to totally move. The shelters couldn't understand that. I think before that, they hadn't tried to understand that and to understand why the families are involved and how they can be supportive to clan leaders in assisting the woman. (Advocate, ethnic-specific agency)

Characteristic 6: Professional Boundaries Define Worker/Survivor Relationship

*Keeping **professional boundaries** between the worker and client/survivor is appropriate.*
The issue of boundaries summoned many different interpretations and different opinions towards the notion of appropriate boundaries. Boundaries were seen as programmatic, e.g., length of services, or compartmentalization of services. Boundaries could be around levels of personal disclosure, intimacy or the acceptance of gifts. Boundaries around safety with regard to contact with the abuser also came up in discussion. This diversity of interpretations brought up a variety of programmatic questions which will be explored in the next section, *API Innovative Strategies: Emerging Issues.*

If a pattern could be discerned, it is that programmatic boundaries around service timelines and compartmentalization of services – legal services versus housing services and so on – tends to be limiting for API communities.

> What I found was that many of the shelters were saying that Hmong women tend to continue to come for all sorts of services after. They were seeing these women for 2 or 3 years rather than a short period of time. That's because that's how they define themselves in their communities and the support that they need. It's not one simple thing saying, "Well, let us get a protective order for you, and you're fine. There are no other needs." How many Hmong women see themselves in this context? When they find hope in a place, they continue to go to that place for other types of services. For Hmong women, she continues to go there because she would if it were her community. (Advocate, ethnic-specific program)

Characteristic 7: Standardization

*Interventions are **standardized** to fit a homogeneous survivor profile: disregarding race, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation and immigrant status; and not accounting for those with disabilities, mental illness or substance abuse problems.*
The issue of standardized services and approaches continued to emerge throughout these interviews because assumptions and solutions are applied generically and uniformly to all situations of domestic violence.

I think [one characteristic] is having a formula, having to fit a routine. If it doesn't fit the routine, then it's not done. If someone speaks a different language or does something different, there's a hesitance to provide the services – even if the situation is just as serious as another situation. (Director, ethnic-specific agency)

The impact of standardization could be viewed as creating rigidity when addressing the needs of survivors of domestic violence who do not conform to typical survivor demographics. In some instances, such women could even be harmed by standardized interventions.

Race/Ethnicity/Immigrant Bias
This report reaches beyond a narrow "cultural competence" or "language accessibility" critique. Therefore, the limitations of standardized approaches which disregard the significance of race/ethnicity or immigration status appear throughout.

Middle Class Bias
Some respondents viewed the standardization around a class bias. In so far as middle class assumptions were seen as defining goals or success for survivors of domestic violence, interventions based on these assumptions presume middle class values and, furthermore, do not work for all women.

I feel like there were all these women who would come to the [mainstream] shelter, and their dilemma would be, "If I leave my husband, I'm going to lose access to a middle class or wealthy lifestyle." And there wasn't a class analysis to that. Instead the response was, "If you work really hard and go back to school, over a period of time, you can get back to that middle class lifestyle without the guy," as opposed to saying, "It's possible to be safe and have a happy family without being middle class." (Advocate, Mainstream shelter and API domestic violence program)

Heterosexual Bias
Standardized interventions were also viewed as focusing on domestic violence in heterosexual relationships.

[The mainstream model] doesn't work. It doesn't address same sex [domestic violence], bi[sexual], trans[gender], nothing. (Board member, ethnic-specific agency)

Mental Health Bias
Interviewees saw standardized intervention approaches as limiting for women with mental health difficulties, depression and/or substance abuse problems from continued exposure to abuse or other conditions.

[The domestic violence movement] didn't have a good way to talk about women for whom the trauma has been so severe that they were experiencing temporary or long-term mental health issues. We didn't talk very much about the importance of them healing, having long-term mental health support to heal from their abuse regardless of if they were showing symptoms of any more serious mental health problem. (Advocate, pan-Asian agency)

Bias Against Persons With Physical Disabilities
Although interviewees in this report did not specifically discuss issues of women and children with physical disabilities, these standardized approaches similarly disregard the needs of survivors with physical disabilities.

SUMMARY OF API RESPONSE TO THE STANDARD MODEL OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INTERVENTION

For the API community, the mainstream model of domestic violence intervention has limited effectiveness.

Interpersonal Definition of Domestic Violence
Standardized interpersonal definitions and conceptual models of domestic violence such as the "power and control wheel" and the "cycle of violence" fail to capture the complexities of domestic violence in general, and in API communities in particular. A result of these limited frameworks is the inability to envision and to create interventions which address the realities of the violence which API women face.

Leaving as an Intervention Goal
The implied or explicit goal of leaving the relationship can be alienating or unrealistic for API women. While leaving the relationship should still remain an option, simply stating this as an option without recognizing the particular difficulties that this raises for API women can subject her to alienation from domestic violence services, blame for failing to carry out this option, or further abuse as she attempts to leave the relationship.

Individual as Unit of Intervention
In particular, the individualistic approach to domestic violence intervention is ineffective for the API population. First, API women do not necessarily experience domestic violence as an individual survivor abused by an individual batterer. Immediate and extended family members are often actively involved in the pattern of abuse. Likewise, abusers may not abuse in isolation of other family members or members of the community. They may be actively joined by others or view the community as supporting or resisting the abuse. Family and community need to be a critical component of intervention. Thus, definitions of domestic violence need to extend beyond individual interpersonal violence to include abusers within the extended family and the community.

Shelter as the Major Intervention for Survivors
While shelters are a necessary intervention strategy for many survivors of domestic violence, existing shelter practices including time limits, pressure to follow standardized procedures, lack of language access and lack of safety for API women, non-English speakers and others who fall out of the "norm" of the shelter population, and general controlling practices limit their effectiveness for API women and families. Furthermore, many API women will never view shelters as a realistic option. Non-shelter as well as shelter options need to be developed as more accessible and realistic resources for API women and families.

Criminal Legal System as the Major Intervention for Abusers
The criminal legal system has limited effectiveness as an intervention for abusers. It has become the only legitimate intervention for batterers thus removing the community from an active role in abuser accountability. Police brutality and other injustices within the criminal legal system as well as a significant increase in INS and police collaboration heighten the dangers for API women seeking safety from violence. In addition, API experiences with abusers confronting the criminal legal system are mixed. While some effectiveness in the threat of arrest and imprisonment has been noted, others have seen no change or worse among abusers who have entered the criminal legal system.

Professional Boundaries Define Worker/Survivor Relationship

The appropriateness of professional boundaries in domestic violence intervention is less conclusive. The very term "boundaries" evokes a number of interpretations ranging from the extent to which services are provided to appropriate levels of personal disclosure. There was general agreement that standardized programs compartmentalize or draw service boundaries which do not meet the needs of API women. Opinions regarding other areas of boundaries revealed a number of questions and practices related to the diverse issues of boundaries which will be explored in the next section, *API Innovative Strategies: Emerging Issues.*

Standardization
These all relate to the issue of standardization which arose in many discussions regarding the limitations of the mainstream model of domestic violence intervention. Standardization around definitions of domestic violence, assumptions around appropriate interventions and general inflexibility in practices characterize mainstream models and add to their ineffectiveness for API populations. While some conjectured that existing models perhaps work for white, heterosexual, middle-class, non-immigrant, able-bodied population, others questioned even that presumption.

API Innovative Strategies: Emerging Themes

Several issues regarding domestic violence intervention arose in these discussions with longtime activists, service providers and advocates in the API domestic violence movement. Work within API communities has led intentionally or not towards alternative "ways of thinking" and "ways of doing."

Are these "innovations," "alternatives," the natural responses of grassroots approaches perhaps akin to an earlier phase of the movement of the U.S. anti-violence movement, or hybrid responses resulting from necessary accommodations between different contradictory systems?

Distinctions between intervention versus prevention, individual and community, survivor and abuser blur and overlap. As we know, domestic violence touches us on all levels in many complex ways.

This section groups emerging issues and themes in the following manner:

- Redefining the Problem
- Redefining the Vision
- Meeting Diverse Needs: Variations on a pan-Asian Model
- Interventions for Survivors
- Interventions for Abusers
- Staying in the Community
- Limitations of API Intervention Strategies

Redefining the Problem

Many agreed that the very concept of domestic violence needs reevaluation. While the larger anti-violence movement has struggled with moving from the notion of physical violence to other dimensions including emotional, financial, sexual and other components of what has popularly become known as the "Power and Control Wheel," women of color have also insisted on broadening the context of power and control from the individual relationship and the power dimension of patriarchy to include systems of racism, anti-immigration, homophobia, and so on.

For API women in particular, anti-immigrant legislation has had a profound impact on opportunities for U.S. citizen or permanent resident spouses to control and abuse immigrant wives.[xi] In addition, U.S. military presence in Asia has contributed to the creation of geopolitical, economic, and sexually exploitative conditions which have complex implications for API women and their communities. U.S. military policy has had further impact on the flow of API immigration to the U.S. Many API immigrants are in the U.S. as a direct or indirect result of these policies and actions thus further influencing trauma prior to immigration, conditions during transit, and conditions within immigrant families and communities in the U.S.

> I would say that overall the problem [with the existing models has been that it has been so focused on interpersonal violence. Our work hasn't been looked at in a broader framework, for example, looking at issues of poverty – looking at issues of race – so that strategies have not been so helpful, particularly to communities of color. (Director, pan-Asian shelter)

Even within the context of API families, domestic violence often involves dynamics beyond the "intimate relationship." While extended family networks may serve as important positive resources for survivors of

domestic violence, they can also actively participate in abuse. Within some families or cultures, complex extended family structures such as expected living arrangements, familial roles, dowry or bride price patterns, clan leader roles and so on can significantly define patterns of abuse as well as potential resources for the resistance of abuse.

Noting the struggles of women in Asia, one long-time advocate looks to rural India for an alternative conceptualization of domestic violence.

> What does domestic violence look like [for API women]? It looks so different in all these groups. The cycle of violence just doesn't apply. We haven't stopped to ask, "Does it apply all women?" A group of abused women in rural India has come up with an image of a "coiled spring." Each coil represents one cycle or episode of violence. Each time the woman leaves the marital home to seek refuge in her natal home, the latter becomes less welcoming and even abusive. So when she returns to her marital home, she gets re-abused with greater impunity. Each time she goes back and returns, the coil gets tighter and tighter, eventually leading to her "subjugation or death." (Director, ethnic specific agency)

Redefining the Vision

What then is our vision of intervention? Is it removing the survivor and her children from the home? Is it reducing violence within an abusive family? Is it removing the abuser or "fixing" the abuser? Is it preventing violence in the first place?

While this report reveals no clear consensus with regard to a vision of domestic violence intervention, some possibilities emerged from conversations with these API advocates and activists.

> Our goal is minimizing violence [or] increasing safety. I've been asked, "Are we shortchanging the women? Are we shortchanging ourselves? Are we minimizing our goals because we're just talking about ending physical abuse and not the emotional and psychological and financial abuse?" Minimizing the physical abuse [may be] the best case scenario and better than independence and having her own subsidized Section 8 apartment unless she could speak English fluently and get gainful employment. Putting her in that situation could be more abusive for her. (Program coordinator, pan-Asian shelter)

> I think that part of the key to figuring out how to not be focused on straight middle class women is having a multi-issue analysis which includes issues of economic justice, environmental justice, more liberated ideas around sexual identity and gender identity and also a strong anti-white supremacist and anti-imperialist analysis. (Advocate, pan-Asian agency)

> The goals should be self-sufficiency, both economically as well as emotionally. (Board member, ethnic-specific agency)

> We need a "harm reduction" model. (Advocate, ethnic-specific agency)

Meeting Diverse Needs: Variations on a Pan-Asian Model

Domestic violence intervention programs targeting API communities in the U.S. have arisen in a variety of formations. While the experiences of these 10 interviewees do not include all categories of domestic violence programmatic response to API communities, their programs reflect a range of organizational responses. These include but are not limited to the following:

1) API individual within broader domestic violence organization;
2) Domestic violence specialist within broader single ethnic-specific or pan-ethnic agency;
3) Ethnic-specific domestic violence agency;

4) Domestic violence collaboration among ethnic-specific and/or pan-Asian agencies;
5) Domestic violence pan-Asian program sponsored by collaboration of ethnic-specific and/or pan-Asian or immigrant agencies; and
6) Pan-Asian domestic violence agency working collaboratively with various agency partners.

Interventions for Survivors

We have seen that the standard definitions of intervention fall short in API communities. Reliance on shelters or interventions simply based upon women and children leaving abusive relationships do not work or do not work well enough for women in API communities. Again, one could question how effective they are for non-API communities.

Most would agree that standardized intervention strategies such as shelter are still necessary. Over the past 20 years, API-specific shelter and other domestic violence service projects have emerged across the U.S. Language accessibility and cultural competence have been incorporated into these programs.[xii] What other types of innovations have marked some of these programs?

Moving Shelter from the Center
Since the establishment of the first pan-Asian shelter, New York Asian Women's Center in 1982, a handful of pan-Asian, pan-immigrant and ethnic-specific shelter programs[xiii] have developed throughout the U.S. Many of the women interviewed were actively involved in the founding of these programs.

Shelter philosophies, scope of services, collaborative relationships with other programs, and other characteristics vary widely. The following themes emerged from the interviewees.

While shelters are viewed as a necessary component of intervention strategies, they should be regarded as an option, not as the central one.

> This is something that has been very hard to explain to the mainstream and very hard, in particular, to explain to funders, that is, the shelter is probably the smaller part of the intervention services. There [are] non-residential services or community-based services. (Program coordinator, pan-Asian shelter)

Domestic violence interventions expanded beyond simple shelter or what may be more typical advocacy services such as support groups, legal advocacy and so on. Some API programs view themselves as an alternative or complement to shelter programs.

> Our agency doesn't have just one service in the house. We use existing resources to serve women. Because it doesn't have all its services in-house, it doesn't need its own shelters or attorneys on staff. It's not driven to one particular solution. Case management is decentralized which works because women's needs are complex. It allows us to take care of these needs in some serial fashion. She can call at any time. And you can deal with one thing at a time. And it can be long term. The problem with the shelter model is that [services] end after she leaves. (Director, ethnic-specific agency)

> There's a lot of things we help connect them with. Usually we connect them to all the resources like, "You need ESL," or "You need these disability [resources.]" We really have to go beyond domestic violence, really looking at their needs, their kid's needs and to make sure that we're not going to put them in jeopardy. (Advocate, ethnic-specific agency)

Many API programs have created interventions which reach into communities and even into women's homes. Interviewees noted various strategies which would increase accessibility to API survivors

remaining in abusive relationships such as driving lessons, parenting classes (one offers classes to both the survivor and the abuser), and micro-credit programs.

Generalization versus Specialization

Many brought up the issue of compartmentalization of services referring to the tendency of programs to create specialized areas of expertise such as the legal advocate versus the housing specialist and so on. Some advocates noted the necessity of being a specialist in a particular language and/or culture, but a generalist in terms of information and resources.

> What was different with the [pan-Asian shelter] compared to how the mainstream divided the work was that by necessity, a lot of organizations serving linguistic minority groups [are] arranged according to linguistic expertise rather than by any area of work specialization. So the Korean advocate, the Chinese advocates, they were generalists in domestic violence work, but they were specialists in their community which is something that the mainstream tends not to do. They knew a little bit about everything, but their job was to go and investigate and to help gain access to these resources. (Advocate, pan-Asian shelter)

Time and Resources: Family-Style

Others interpreted boundaries as the extent to which one offers assistance. One way in which some API programs differ is in the amount of time services extend to survivors of domestic violence, both in terms of amount of time spent each step of the way as well as the total length of time programs expected to work with particular survivors.

> I think that community based organizations are more creative in reaching out because they have to. So if a woman needs to go to court, [mainstream programs] will either have a court advocate, or they'll say, "You do that on your own." I think that there's a lot more of an understanding amongst community based programs that those are real tough barriers for women, and there needs to be much more support built into that. There's a lot more handholding – a lot more advocacy than those other programs. (Director, pan-Asian shelter)

> What we've been doing from the get-go that really works is that we're there for the clients, for the victims. We pretty much do it "family-style." We pretty much make them feel at home. [Our] approach is different. It really varies. We don't have a standard basic approach. We have basic guidelines like safety. But pretty much everybody does it differently based upon the situation. And a lot of time, it's just to be there for them, just to show that you care, just to listen to them. A lot of time it helps. We've had clients who've been with us 3 or 4 years. And they're still in the situation. And finally after 3 years, she decided to leave. But we're there, and she calls. We will be on the phone for 2 hours, and it's okay. (Advocate, pan-Asian agency)

Although most agreed that time flexibility is important in working with API survivors, there was some disagreement over freer distribution of resources. Greater flexibility around resource distribution characterizes many API programs.

> At the [mainstream] shelter, we kind of mete out resources. A woman gets so much food every month or so much monetary support or whatever. At [our refugee program,] our goal is to get as many resources as we could to women as fast as we could. I think that was because at a mainstream program, there's a suspicion of people living in poverty – that they take advantage of resources. I think that in the [refugee program], we know that poverty is not a crime and that people should have what they need. (Advocate, pan-refugee agency)

However, at least one advocate noted that freer distribution of resources can become problematic. When does this contradict the notion of empowerment? Does this lead to additional rules and regulations regarding the distribution of these resources?

What we have been trying to do is to give [survivors] access – to show them how to access things so that they can become independent. But there is consistently a clash with providing because as soon as you say you have to provide this, then you have to have a set of policies to guide that. And then you start creating rules for rules. (Board member, ethnic-specific agency)

Boundaries: Worker/Client Relationship
Boundaries also describe the relationships existing between client or survivor and worker. Interpretations of this relationship fell into 3 categories:

1) Pre-existing relationships
2) Personal disclosure
3) Social boundaries

Because workers in API agencies often come from within ethnic or other culturally defined communities and because these communities are generally small, workers often know community members seeking assistance. These pre-existing relationships have multiple influences on worker/client relationships. Issues of confidentiality, conflict of interest and worker safety, issues of particular importance within domestic violence work, can be easily compromised in these situations. As a result, API programs have developed guidelines, casual or formal, regarding these situations. Rotation of workers and the intentional hiring of more than one worker within a particular ethnic or other group are often adopted as policies.

Boundaries with regard to personal disclosure are fairly flexible within the domestic violence movement in general. The history of survivors as founders of the movement has challenged more traditional social service notions of worker and client boundaries. In recent years, professionalization within the movement has moved these boundaries towards more formal, traditional definitions.

API programs appear to vary widely in terms of their stance with regard to these types of boundaries. Perhaps because many have been established after increasing professionalization of the movement, notions of privacy or perhaps unresolved internalization of shame with regard to personal disclosure, program responses to the question of appropriateness of personal disclosure appear to be remain varied and relatively undefined.

Respondents who have grappled with this question appear to have adopted positions promoting relatively open boundaries with regard to personal disclosure.

I think there was a more holistic approach. We were clear that it wasn't good for us to create overly dependent relationships with the women that we worked with, but to try to be real and honest about who we were. The women would regularly ask me, "Are you married?" "Where did you come from?" "Have you ever been through a situation like this?" And I would just answer them as honestly as I could because they were really wanting to relate to me as a woman and not as a worker. And I never wanted them to feel like they were in a space where they were just another number. (Advocate, pan-Asian agency)

[If] we are asking people to disclose parts of their private life and we're saying, "Okay, we have none of those things happening to us," why should they want to talk to us? I know a lot of times, women say, "Divorce, how can you do that? Indian women don't get divorced." And [I say], "Who are you talking to? I'm divorced. I was divorced 20 years ago." So [they say], "Oh, you can have a life after that?" And I say, "Yeah. Sure you can." I think a lot of people think those are pieces of information that you don't disclose. Whereas I think it helps you establish yourself in the same sort of human context that she's finding herself in. (Board member, ethnic-specific agency)

Another area regarding worker/client boundaries is with regard to social boundaries including socializing outside of the work context and the exchange of meals or gifts. Many API agencies have adopted policies similar to those within mainstream domestic violence agencies, i.e., policies which tend to prohibit exchanges on this level. Many also noted that while such policies may exist, they are regularly violated resulting in secrecy and feelings of guilt among workers.

Some advocates noted policy decisions which modify or defy such boundaries. For example, respondents noted that in their programs non-monetary gifts or meals are accepted, but some kind of reciprocity follows to equalize the exchange.

The issue of social boundaries such as the giving of telephone numbers and the formation of personal relationships outside of work appeared to be more comfortably adhered to by API programs. However, this was not always the case. As one director of an agency notes:

> There are clients that we form friendships with and become part of our social group. Because we're a volunteer based organization, some of the individuals come in through volunteering or they may get services and also volunteer in different areas. Through volunteering, it does become more of a social atmosphere. So you have access to more social interaction. And you can't alienate somebody. Because I think one of the things we want to keep in mind is not making someone feel like they have to be treated differently because of what they experienced. And I think one thing we don't want to do is isolate somebody because they are a survivor and not let them become part of the social interactions they would normally be a part of. (Director, ethnic-specific agency)

Boundaries: Personal Safety
Boundaries regarding personal safety such as entering the home of a survivor who is still living with the abuser or entering a home in order to assist a survivor in her escape seem to be regularly challenged by API domestic violence programs. Respondents related program practices which insist on caution but not necessarily prohibition of such practices.

> Recently we went to a woman's home, and we were doing a home visit with her. The husband was asking about jobs. The husband would come and ask me questions, and that gave me access to spend more time with the women because they knew I was an employment specialist. They didn't know I was a battered women's employment specialist. (Director, ethnic-specific agency)

> We [went to the home of the women who were abused] regularly because that was the only way we could see them. So sometimes if women weren't allowed to leave their homes, we would pose as social service providers from another agency and say we were there to talk to them about food stamps. (Advocate, pan-refugee agency)

Interventions for Abusers

As already stated, respondents were strongly dissatisfied with the criminal legal system as an effective intervention for abusers within the API community. However, unlike shelters which were still seen as having a legitimate and important role within the range of intervention options for women, the criminal legal system was viewed with varying degrees of support.

For some, the oppressive role of the criminal legal system within API communities, in particular, in light of its increasingly collaborative relationship with the INS marks it as harmful in its impact on API survivors. Others noted its limited effectiveness as a threat to abusers even if its actual impact once one enters the criminal legal system may be more problematic. These responses were already noted in the previous section, *The Critique: API Response to the Standard Model of Domestic Violence Intervention.*

All respondents strongly stated the need for what was often called "community accountability," that is, interventions generally outside of the criminal legal system which are located within the community.

What does community accountability look like? Several examples described a range of community responses. Throughout these interviews, "community" was conceptualized as community-based domestic violence programs, extended family networks, clan networks, survivor-based groups, faith-based groups, and broader non-institutional community responses. Some were spontaneous, and some were structured programmatic responses. Often, community-based domestic violence programs took the lead on organizing collaborative strategies which incorporated various levels of community.

Community Accountability: Community-Based Batterer Treatment Alternatives
An example of community-based domestic violence programs include more traditional batterer groups which are conducted specifically for API abusers or for a particular ethnic group in the language of that ethnic group. While the effectiveness of batterer groups even if they specifically target API communities was questioned, several ethnic-specific groups have emerged in the past few years.

Other examples combine these more traditional batterer programs with complementary programs which address both the survivor and the abuser in a unified intervention strategy.

> One thing we did do was something that I very closely supervised, and it was on a case by case basis. There's a local batterer intervention program that we had partnered [with] to help them start up batterer intervention programs for Asian men. What we had done was to send out an advocate along with a batterer intervention counselor to do home visits. The batterer intervention counselor who was a man would talk to the batterer. And then the advocate would talk to the woman survivor, both reinforcing the same message. And they would both go back weekly so the messages weren't just dropped like, "Oh, wrong! Don't do that!" (Program Coordinator, pan-Asian shelter)

In another example, abuser intervention combined the faith-based community, batterer and survivor intervention programs and a parenting program which brought together the survivor and abuser as parents.

> One of the things that I've done in the Samoan community, it really works. We have a husband and wife that is in the [domestic violence] situation. In the Samoan community, they look up to the pastor. The pastor actually has power. And if there is any problem in the marital thing, they always go to the pastor. I work with the pastor and the wife. So they bring them to the parenting class. We talk about domestic violence, everything. The guy actually goes to the batterer's treatment, and the woman comes to us so we provide them support. And at the same time, they go to the parenting class. And we don't just talk about domestic violence. We talk about all kinds of stuff, discipline, communication with the kids, better relationships, all kinds of things. (Advocate, pan-Asian agency)

Community Accountability: Community Monitoring of Abusers
Another example of faith-based support of community accountability is a faith-based volunteer program which actually places church members to temporarily live in abusive homes as monitors.

> One program is a church-based program. Instead of shelter, there's this whole huge church of potential volunteers who go out and stay in a woman's home until she feels safe. So they have this one [Asian] family that they're working with – very dangerous – the woman has a restraining order. The abuser was actually put in jail for awhile. But he got out. All the shelters are full, and she has a lot of children. So they arranged for the church volunteers to come, and two people come and stay with the family. (Program Coordinator, pan-Asian shelter)

Community organizing efforts to provide safe community spaces by confronting and restricting abusers were noted. This acknowledges the limitations of API women to simply leave the community as well as the necessity to change the notion of safe space beyond that of shelter to include broader community spaces.

In these interviews, some examples of community attempts to enforce such strategies appeared in API queer communities.

> There should be much more partnering with community sanctions like he can't go to certain things. They're developing this with lesbian battering. "You can't come to this dance or to this concert." (Advocate, ethnic-specific agency)

Others noted the need for such strategies in all communities.

> These big shots are always there at these different festivals. Why can't we bar them for awhile? I mean, we bar women. Women can't come to any of those things because it would be like, "Oh, my God, here he comes." Nobody's saying that of him. He comes and goes as he pleases. (Board member, ethnic-specific agency)

Community Accountability: Shame-Based Strategies
Many expressed alarm at the tendency of the community to condemn women when their abusers suffer serious consequences for their violence. Such consequences range from divorce and loss of child custody to incarceration to physical assaults by women acting in self-defense. They stressed the need for shame-based strategies which publicly target perpetrators of violence rather than the victims.

> We can use the concept of shame, relieving the survivor of shame and moving on to spotlight the batterer with shame. (Program Coordinator, pan-Asian shelter)

Some addressed attempts by community-based programs to acknowledge and support extended family and larger community efforts to confront abuse.

We want to do much more with the family – the kids, the guy, the battered woman. If she doesn't want it done, that's okay. That doesn't fit our usual way of asking her to not talk to him or him talk to her. We also want to involve the elders. You have to be accountable to her, her elders, everyone in the community. You have to look them right in the eye. It's a whole shaming technique.

> We're exploring this in our own domestic violence program – public amends. They would say in front of everybody. He would invite his people to come to the closing ceremony. And he would say to the family, the counselors, all the people who came – everyone would hear, "I'm not going to do this anymore." He would say this in front of everyone. (Counselor, ethnic-specific program)

Some pointed to community tactics to publicly condemn known abusers. Such tactics include pickets at businesses owned by abusers and public exposure in the media.

Community Accountability: Community Sanctions
In some communities, domestic violence advocates are working towards a creative negotiation of already existing clan or village authority structures which can exercise sanctions against domestic violence. While the U.S. criminal legal system has in many ways undermined these structures, possibilities for redefinition of and re-legitimizing of these systems is being explored.

Traditionally, if a person beats up their wife, then the village leader or families would settle it. If the man is found guilty, he would have to pay a hefty fine to the family. That is no longer practiced because that

system is no longer valued here where clan leaders say something, but if you go to the courts, the courts say something else. It totally takes their leadership away.

> I think it works when there's a balance of the traditional mechanisms of family safety and leadership involvement. So when there is the traditional mechanism in place where the husband is disciplined for his behaviors and fined, and there's some accountability for the whole family, then there's some safety net for her. (Advocate, ethnic-specific agency)

Others mentioned more spontaneous responses involving verbal or physical confrontation by family or community supporters of the survivor.

> One [example] was where women were meeting in a support group. One of the women was beaten badly and ended up in the hospital. The women went to visit the home, tied him up in a chair and slapped him for hours. It never happened again. (Program Coordinator, pan-Asian shelter)

Staying in the Community

The notion of "community" pervades the responses of these long-time API domestic violence advocates and activists. Community connotes places of comfort, of entrapment, of nostalgia and of escape.

The "community" is also used to describe the location where one educates, raises or transforms awareness, does outreach, organizes and places accountability. Work in the community, however defined, characterizes many API domestic violence interventions.

> It's a key thing that distinguishes services for the Asian community – that the prevention piece is tied in and that it's community-based. (Advocate, pan-Asian shelter)

Some examples of community-based interventions such as the creation of domestic violence organizations within specific communities, interventions for survivors which reach not only into communities but into survivor's homes, and community accountability for abusers have already been described.

Another area of activity, community organizing, was also frequently mentioned by respondents. While the distinction between community outreach, community education and organizing is not always clear, many API programs regularly engage community individuals, leaders, organizations and media as a central part of their work.

Respondents referred to domestic violence outreach to ethnic-based festivals, ESL classes, community breakfasts for leaders, door-knocking, community-based conferences and other activities. These efforts increase accessibility to survivors in the community, increase education and awareness on domestic violence, and, in some cases, promote the participation of community members both in prevention and intervention.

An example of the latter was given by a participant who describes herself as a "community organizer."

> We have a "natural helper" concept. It is actually the backbone of this organization. We train volunteers in the community to become our eyes and ears. So they have a basic understanding of domestic violence. And they become our liaison. (Advocate, pan-Asian agency)

Limitations of API Intervention Strategies

Are Community-Based Agencies Part of the Problem?
Ironically, some respondents viewed community-based organizations as having a hand in the movement away from community accessibility and responsibility.

> I feel a bit like what has happened now is that we've created this layer that the services provide – that the community-based organizations that we have built makes us then one step removed from the community. It's created an additional layer, and in some ways it's taking power away from the community in dealing with the problem. So now we say, "Oh yeah. Domestic violence -- we now recognize that as a problem. 30 years ago we didn't. That group over there. Go talk to them about this." And so it becomes the responsibility of this group to take care of that problem. And the community itself feels like it's no longer responsible for that problem – no longer has power to change that problem. (Advocate, pan-Asian shelter)

Institutionalization of API Domestic Violence Programs
Likewise, institutionalization of API domestic violence programs have resulted in standardization, bureaucracy, professionalization and some of the bias which can characterize mainstream intervention strategies.

> I don't think that in the domestic violence field, there's much room for alternative ideas or programs. I think even in my own agency, one didn't really question what was handed down to us – the definition of abuse, or definition of domestic violence and what intervention programs are acceptable or desired. You know things are pretty well structured now. And I don't think there's really much room for questions. (Attorney, pan-Asian agency)

> I'd really like to see class and sexuality and sexual orientation as issues brought into the center of the analysis of how we work with each other as women. And I feel like classism and homophobia are very deeply engrained in our work right now and impact our strategy and the way we treat each other, and the way we build organizations and institutions. I think that very few organizations have demonstrated a commitment to being overtly anti-classist and anti-homophobic in their practice and not just in their theories. (Advocate, ethnic-specific agency)

> We have so many rules. We're very judgmental and controlling about the women. (Advocate, ethnic-specific agency)

From Organizing to Service-Delivery
Some lamented that programs which once engaged the community have succumbed to a service-delivery model.

> What I think is flawed is the whole premise that we can stop domestic violence by creating services for women. That's only the beginning. We're at a different historic point. What we've seen is that in creating a wonderful system, we still haven't stopped male violence. Now our project needs to go there as well – creating different conditions, where violence isn't so much part of the response. This doesn't mean just making batterers go to batterer's programs. It's a larger project – ending violence. (Director, ethnic-specific agency)

> I sometimes get frustrated that when we did the work initially, we did the community organizing. We were there in almost all of the community events whether they wanted us to be there or not. We showed up. But there's no community work that's going on now. The community knows about us because of the work that came in the early years that we did. (Board member, ethnic-specific agency)

The Limitations of a Domestic Violence Focus

Furthermore, some questioned the transformative power of what may be viewed as the successes of community education and awareness on domestic violence.

> When you talk to people and somebody is divorced, previously they would say, "Oh, my God. You were divorced." It's like you're not just a pariah coming in, but a community pariah – like you're going to infect everybody. It's very interesting because now what I have seen happening is that people say, "Oh, you're divorced. It must be why you're doing this kind of [work]." So now we've come to a point where people accept that battering is an okay reason for a divorce. Then I would say that community education has been unsuccessful because it wasn't linked to violence against women generally. We cannot talk to the community about incest. We cannot talk about rape and sexual assault. We cannot talk in our community about women who kill their partners. We cannot talk about sexual harassment. You're really talking about patriarchy and misogyny – not about domestic violence. I think the way that people are beginning to see it and understand it is -- it's a few aberrant men. So even when you talk about community organizing and community sanctions, you're talking about a few aberrant men, not about fundamentally changing the way we look at gender relationships. And that's the harder task. (Board member, ethnic-specific agency)

Children: Still Invisible
The relative absence of children in respondent discussions is perhaps a reflection of the continuing invisibility of children in domestic violence intervention. As children are clearly victims and survivors in domestic violence households, make up a significant portion of shelter residents and often attempt their own courageous interventions to stop abuse, intervention strategies must clearly involve children.

Addressing Men in the Community
While respondents clearly supported a woman-centered intervention approach, the issue of addressing men's violent behavior was noted.

> Men have to be included and not just thrown in the criminal justice system. (Advocate, pan-Asian agency)

SUMMARY OF API INNOVATIVE STRATEGIES: EMERGING THEMES

Discussions with respondents revealed some emerging themes with regard to domestic violence interventions.

Redefining the Problem

Definitions of domestic violence were not the original topic of discussion, but frustrations with existing definitions and the search for conceptualizations of domestic violence, the scope of violence and the relational dynamics which better describe API communities emerged in many interviews. Although no clear patterns or conclusions could be drawn from this report, this is an area which appears to have an impact on domestic violence interventions and should be explored further.

Redefining the Vision

The breadth of domestic violence advocacy and activism influenced the goals and practices of intervention. Our answers to the usual soul-searching questions are broader. What is it that we are trying to do? What is our focus? To what end? These underlying questions merit serious reevaluation and reassessment in order to ensure that appropriate and effective interventions are developed.

Meeting Diverse Needs: Variations on a Pan-Asian Model

API communities in the U.S. are unique in their ethnic, cultural and language diversity. The need to address such wide diversity was handled in many different ways. Creative measures to meet broad and diverse needs with limited resources could also be considered innovative approaches to interventions.

Interventions for Survivors

Intervention practices including location of services/interventions, content of interventions, target populations and so on brought up areas of innovation in working with API survivors. What might also be called "cultural" approaches to intervention including redefining issues of boundaries, compartmentalization, and professionalization lead to areas of innovation.

Interventions for Abusers

Discussion of interventions for abusers brought up an array of possible approaches, some actually attempted, some planned and some simply speculative, with equally diverse intervention goals. In general, respondents agreed that intervention needs to happen at a variety of levels and that family and community need to be significant agents of confrontation and change.

Staying in the Community

The notion of "community" emerged in virtually all areas of concern. All respondents shared frustration with individualized and compartmentalized definitions of and responses to domestic violence. While

focus on the "community" characterizes many API domestic violence interventions, the nature of and goals of these interventions is unclear. The issue of community-based interventions needs further unpacking.

Limitations of API Intervention Strategies

API advocates and activists revealed some criticisms of their own approaches. Some of these were based upon the adoption of mainstream practices which have limited effectiveness for API communities. Others reflect the growing institutionalization of once innovative programs.

Many of these areas of critique parallel those of mainstream domestic violence programs. Demarcating and expanding on areas of innovation as defined within this report could address what some viewed as the limitations of API programs.

~ Page 27 ~

Innovative Strategies to Address Domestic Violence in Asian and Pacific Islander Communities: Examining Themes, Models and Interventions
Asian & Pacific Islander Institute on Domestic Violence, June 2002, Revised February 2010

CONCLUSION

This report signifies the first inquiry into the exploration of API contributions to interventions addressing domestic violence, and thereby the safety and health of API women and communities.

Future reports will focus on documenting and analyzing concrete examples within theme areas emerging from this report. Further exploration will undoubtedly present new areas of promise and of challenge. Examples and results from diverse ethnic or other communities, geographic areas and institutional contexts will inform our future strategies. Examination of the assumptions, values and visions underlying these strategies will create more solid foundations for our work.

Each theme area poses unique questions regarding effectiveness, ethics and implications for the future. Answers to these questions will contribute to greater safety for abused women and children; replacement of systems of oppression with the promotion of equity; and to the enhanced wellbeing of API communities and to all of us facing violence in our lives.

Where We Start: Viewing the Survivor within the Context of Her Community

How have API programs created interventions and options which take these factors into account? How are these interventions structured? Where are they located? How are they presented?

Reshaping Intervention: Expanding Options

What do these programs look like? What are their goals – self-determination, empowerment, independence, increased safety, leaving abusive relationships? How do they reach survivors – in the community, at home, at school, at work? Do any of these options include children? Youth?

Intervention Approaches: "Family-Style"

Are these innovations? Do these types of interventions foster paternalism as opposed to empowerment? Do they help women and their children increase their safety? Do they address gender bias, sexism?

At the Edge of Safety: Redefining Survivor/Abuser Boundaries

What do these approaches look like? Do they compromise safety? Do they collude with abuser denial? Do they impose agendas of family unity? What is the survivor role in defining these interventions? When and how are they effective?

Community Accountability for Abusers

What defines community accountability? Is it based on notions of "treatment," monitoring and management of abusive behavior, public shame or humiliation, punishment, revenge, abuser responsibility, survivor safety? Is there a presumption of guilt? Who determines the intervention? How is it implemented? How is the survivor involved in acts of community accountability? Are these interventions effective in increasing safety in the relationship addressed? In preventing future violence within the larger community? When and how?

Community Organizing
What do community organizing strategies look like? What is their relationship to intervention? How do programs balance interventions and community organizing? How do organizing strategies differ from community education, outreach or increased awareness? Which sectors of community do these engage? Where and how? What are the goals of community organizing? What are the results?

Redefining Domestic Violence
Does the nature of domestic violence need to be redefined? Do the relationships need to go beyond the intimate relationship or the nuclear family? Do we need to reconceptualize the dynamics of domestic violence in order to effectively address violence? Do we need to move beyond interpersonal violence to larger societal notions of violence? Are there universal responses for API communities or are they relative to that particular community?

Redefining the Vision
What goals or visions most effectively capture our work? What goals or visions lead to more effective and/or ethical strategies?

Organization of a Pan-Asian Response
What are some of these organizational formations? Under what conditions are these most effective? What degree of autonomy and collaboration do various formations require?

Children in API Domestic Violence Interventions
What programs have developed interventions for children and for youth? What are the underlying assumptions regarding the impact of domestic violence on children and youth? How have these assumptions influenced interventions? Are these interventions innovative? How?

Men in the API Domestic Violence Movement and API Domestic Violence Interventions
Is this an area of innovation? How have men been included in the API domestic violence movement? How have men been included in domestic violence intervention? How is the issue of men in the movement related to the issue of patriarchy? Masculinity? How have API programs conceived of the role of men? When and how does the inclusion of men appear effective or necessary?

FOOTNOTES

[i] Historically, Asians and Pacific Islanders in the United States have been grouped together under various names both by government classifications as well as by us, as part of an intentional community-based strategy to build coalitions with one another. We recognize the tremendous diversity of more than fifty distinct ethnic and national origin subgroups included within any one grouping. We also recognize that there are conflicting views on the appropriateness of any aggregate classification or reference. For example, "Asian and Pacific Islander", "Asian Pacific American", "Asian American and Pacific Islander" have all been used in recent years to name our communities. Such groupings are ultimately political and part of a dynamic continuing process of self-determination and self-identification.

[ii] This report focuses on domestic violence and the experiences of API women working mostly in the field of domestic violence. Although the findings of this report extend beyond the category of domestic violence and, indeed, point to the need to expand our definitions and visions of violence, the limited scope of this study also limits its applicability to other forms of violence against API women.

[iii] For examples, see Bhattarcharjee, Annanya, "A Slippery Path: Organizing Resistance to Violence Against Women." *Dragon Ladies: Asian American Feminists Breathe Fire.* Ed. Sonia Shah. Boston: South End Press, 1997. Rimonte, Nilda. "Domestic Violence Among Pacific Asians." *Making Waves.* Ed. Asian Women United of California. Boston: Beacon Press, 1989. Tan, Cheng Imm, "Building Shelter: Asian Women and Domestic Violence." *Dragon Ladies: Asian American Feminists Breathe Fire.* Ed. Sonia Shah. Boston: South End Press, 1997.

[iv] The term "intervention" is used as a broader term to designate service delivery practices as well as those which may be viewed as "community organizing" or "prevention." One goal of the Innovative Strategies Project and of the Asian and Pacific Islander Institute on Domestic Violence is to expand and clarify our understanding of these terms.

[v] See appendix for demographic and other descriptors of interviewees.

[vi] See appendix for full text of interview questions.

[vii] This list was constructed from discussions by the Interventions/Services Working Group of the Asian and Pacific Islander Domestic Violence Institute. Further modifications, namely characteristics number 1 and 7 were added after interviews yielded these additions. This list is not meant to be a conclusive nor universal characterization of all domestic violence programs. However, it was useful to have some general consensus on our understanding of these characteristics before further defining "innovative strategies." See appendix for originally formulated list of characteristics proposed to interviewees.

[viii] Quotes are identified by the role and organizational category in which the interviewee gained the experience leading to the observation. They do not necessarily reflect current roles or organizational identifications.

[ix] "Queer" is a term which has held historically derogatory connotations in the U.S., but which is currently being embraced by many lesbian, gay, bi-sexual and transgender people in the U.S. as one which celebrates their collective positive identity.

[x] The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility act of 1996 was passed under the Clinton administration. This Act strengthened grounds for deportation for domestic violence, child abuse and stalking.

[xi] A series of anti-immigrant legislation beginning most recently with the the passage of the Immigration Fraud and Marriage Amendments (IMFA) in 1986 severely limited immigrant rights and, in particular, subjected women (and men) married to U.S. citizen or permanent legal resident spouses to greater time restrictions and other conditions before receiving permanent legal immigrant status. Many API domestic violence advocates were critical to efforts advocating for immigrant rights and protection for abused immigrant women and their children.

xii See Asian Women's Shelter, *The Multilingual Access Model: A Model for Outreach and Services in Non-English Speaking Communities*. Harrisburg, PA: The National Resource Center on Domestic Violence, 1999.

xiii Currently, API shelter programs include Aasra (South Asian, Hayward, CA), Apna Ghar (South Asian, Chicago), Asian Task Force Against Domestic Violence (pan-Asian, Boston, MA), Asian Women's Home (pan-Asian, San Jose), Asian Women United of Minnesota/House of Peace (pan-Asian, St. Paul, MN), Asian Women's Shelter (pan-Asian, San Francisco, CA), Center for the Pacific/Asian Family (Los Angeles), House of Green Pastures (Korean-specific, Tustin, CA), International Women's House (pan-immigrant, Atlanta, GA), My Sister's House (not yet open) (pan-Asian, Sacramento), Manavi (transitional shelter for South Asian, New Brunswick, NJ), New York Asian Women's Center (pan-Asian, New York City, NY).

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEWEE DEMOGRAPHICS

Figure 1. Ethnicity[i]

	N
Chinese	1
Filipina	1
Hawaiian	1
Hmong	1
Indian (South Asian)	4
Japanese	1
Korean	1

Figure 2. Geographic Location of Program[ii]

	N
East Coast	2
Pacific Islands	1
Pacific Northwest	1
South	2
West Coast	1

Figure 3. Immigration History

	N
Immigrant	7
U.S. Born	3

Figure 4. Sexual Identity[iii]

	N
Lesbian or Bisexual	2

Figure 5. Survivor Identity[iv]

	N
Survivor of Violence	4

Figure 6. Program Position[v]

	N
Attorney	1
Batterer Counselor	1
Community Organizer	1
Counselor/Therapist	2
DV Program Advocate	9
DV Program Board Member	2
DV Program Executive Director	3
DV Program Coordinator	2
Foundation Program Officer	1
Government Program Officer	2

Figure 7. Years of Experience in Anti-Violence Against Women Movement

	N
5 – 9 years	4
10 – 14 years	2
15 – 19 years	2
20 or more years	2

[i] Due to variation in ethnic self-identification such as " – American," some ethnic identities do not match interviewee responses exactly. Total number more than 10 due to multiple identities for some individuals.
[ii] Geographic location of program which represents the interviewee's domestic violence experience. Some individuals no longer live in that location.
[iii] Not all interviewees disclosed their sexual identity.
[iv] Not all interviewees disclosed their survivor history.
[v] Total number more than 10 due to multiple program roles for most individuals.

APPENDIX B

A) Personal Information/Domestic Violence Experience/Organizational Information

A1) What is your name?

A2) What is the name of the organization which is relevant to this questionnaire?

A3) What is the type of organization?

A4) What is the unit of your organization?

A5) What is the number of years your organization has been in existence?

A6) What is the number of years your organization has been serving API population?

A7) What is your primary position at the organizations?

A8) How long have you worked at your organization?

A9) How do you identify? (Ethnicity, sexual identity, immigration status, survivor, etc.)

A10) What language(s) do you speak in your workplace?

B) Standardized Models of Domestic Violence Intervention
Presentation of Standardized Models of Domestic Violence Intervention

B1) Would you define each of these as a component of a standardized model?

1) Strongly agree
2) Moderately agree
3) Uncertain or it depends
4) Moderately disagree
5) Strongly disagree

1) The goal is ending domestic violence through survivor/victim leaving the abusive relationship

2) The major intervention for a woman survivor/victim is escape of abusive situation through shelter and shelter-related services

3) The major intervention for the abuser is criminal justice system (police, restraining order, arrest, etc.)

4) The unit addressed is the individual woman, man.

5) It is appropriate to keep well-defined professional boundaries between the worker and the client/survivor.

B2) *What else do you think defines the current standardized model?*

B3) *For each of these elements, do these address the API community or your specific community?*

Yes or No
Why or why not?

1) The goal is ending domestic violence through survivor/victim leaving the abusive relationship

2) The major intervention for a woman survivor/victim is escape of abusive situation through shelter and shelter-related services.

3) The major intervention for the abuser is criminal justice system (police, restraining order, arrest, etc.)

4) The unit addressed is the individual woman, man.

5) It is appropriate to keep well-defined professional boundaries between the worker and the client/survivor.

6) Others identified in B2:

B4) *Besides those things already mentioned, what do you think are areas of specific concern to API communities?*

C) Knowledge of Existing Interventions/Desired Interventions

C1) *For each of these, do you know of individuals or programs addressing these issues in a different way? What issues? How?*

Do you have contact information?

C2) *What would you like to see happen differently?*

C3) *Of everything you mentioned, what is the priority area of concern? Why?*

D) Involvement in Innovative Interventions Project:

D1) *How else would you like to be involved in this project?*

D2) *Would you be willing to read a draft of the results?*

D3) *Do you want more involvement? How?*

D4) *Do you know anyone else who should be asked to respond to these questions?*

APPENDIX C

Interviewee Responses to Questions Regarding the Standardized Model of Domestic Violence Intervention

Figure 8. Would you define each of these as a component of a mainstream model?

	N	Strongly Agree (%)	Mod Agree (%)	It depends (%)	Mod Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)
1) The goal of intervention is to end domestic violence through the survivor/victim leaving the relationship.	10	9 (90.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
2) The major intervention for a woman survivor/victim is escape of abusive situation through shelter and shelter-related services.	10	6 (60.0)	3 (30.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)
3) The major intervention for an abuser is the criminal legal system, i.e., police, restraining order, arrest, etc.	10	9 (90.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)
4) The unit addressed in intervention is the individual woman, man.	10	10 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
5) Keeping professional boundaries between the worker and client/survivor is appropriate.	10	8 (80.0)	2 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)

Figure 9. For each of these elements, do these address the API community or your specific community?

	N	Yes (%)	It Depends (%)	No (%)
1) The goal of intervention is to end domestic violence through the survivor/victim leaving the relationship.	10	0 (0.0)	2 (20.0)	8 (80.0)
2) The major intervention for a woman survivor/victim is escape o abusive situation through shelter and shelter-related services.	10	0 (0.0)	3 (30.0)	7 (70.0)
3) The major intervention for an abuser is the criminal legal system i.e., police, restraining order, arrest, etc.	10	1 (10.0)	3 (30.0)	6 (60.0)
4) The unit addressed in intervention is the individual woman, man	10	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	10 (100.0)
5) Keeping professional boundaries between the worker and client/survivor is appropriate.	10	3 (30.0)	0 (0.0)	7 (70.0)