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Practical Strategies for Coping with Child-to-Parent Violence: The Non Violent Resistance Programme in Practice

Eileen Lauster, Alan Quinn, John Brosnahan and Declan Coogan*

Summary: Child-to-parent violence (CPV) is an emerging problem coming more frequently to the attention of practitioners in a wide variety of settings. This paper describes the ways in which the Probation Service and Le Chéile in the Limerick Young Persons’ Probation region implemented the Non Violent Resistance (NVR) programme as a response to CPV. The goal of the programme is to address the parents’ expressed needs to reduce the violent and controlling behaviour of their children in the home. Parents needed a programme that gave practical strategies for coping with CPV violence. We describe how the practitioners in Limerick came to find the NVR programme and how they adapted the programme based on the parents’ feedback from a previous parenting programme and during the NVR programme. We reflect on whether the goal of practical strategies for coping with CPV was reached by the programme end, and suggest how this approach could be useful in future practice. Throughout the paper the authors share quotes from parents who attended the NVR programme in Limerick.

Keywords: Children, child-to-parent violence, Non Violent Resistance Programme, collaborative and strengths-based practice, social support, Probation Service, Young Persons’ Probation, Le Chéile, social work, evidence based practice, Limerick, restorative justice, domestic violence.

* Eileen Lauster is Assistant Research Fellow, Responding to Child to Parent Violence (RCPV) Project, School of Political Science and Sociology, UNESCO Centre for Child and Family Research, National University of Ireland Galway (email: eileen.lauster@nuigalway.ie). Alan Quinn is Mentoring Programme Co-Ordinator, Le Chéile (email: alan@lecheile.ie). John Brosnahan is Senior Probation Officer, Young Person Probation, Limerick (email: jmbrosnahan@probation.ie). Declan Coogan is Lead – RCPV Project in Ireland and Lecturer, MA in Social Work Programme, School of Political Science and Sociology, Research Fellow UNESCO Child & Family Research Centre, National University of Ireland Galway (email: declanp.coogan@nuigalway.ie).
Introduction

Child-to-parent violence (CPV) is an abuse of power through which the child or adolescent attempts to coerce, control or dominate others in the family (Tew and Nixon, 2010; Coogan, 2011, 2012).

*It’s not everyone has family, neighbours and friends around to come in and help so I feel very alone and abused.* (Parent 1 from focus group original transcript)

Many parents, as in this quote, report feeling completely alone as they live in silence with CPV. It is a newly discussed form of domestic violence in Ireland, and as such there are few data on prevalence. Estimates vary. Findings elsewhere are quoted: for example, 18% of two-parent and 29% of one-parent families in the United States experience CPV (Walsh and Kriener, 2009). Pagani et al. (2009) found that among 15–16 year olds in Canada, 12.3% of males and 9.5% of females had been physically aggressive towards their fathers in the previous six months. Unlike the Walsh and Kriener research, which used the statistics from police records, Pagani et al.’s study was a longitudinal childhood developmental study involving families that had not previously presented to statutory or voluntary support services. In Ireland we have provided training to a variety of professionals who, when asked, felt the above estimates of prevalence were low compared to their experiences.

Practitioners often comment on the similarities and differences between CPV and other domestic violence. They are both forms of violence in the home and tend not to be reported due to the special relationship between the abused and abuser. In both types, the victim will tolerate a vast amount of verbal, physical and financial abuse before seeking help (Hunter and Piper, 2012). This is especially true with CPV, where the parents feel particularly guilty. There are also similarities along gender roles as in both cases it is usually the male perpetrating violence on a female in the household, though some female young people do use violence towards their mothers, and both male and female young people use violence towards their fathers (Pagani et al., 2009; Wilcox, 2012; Coogan, 2012).

Probably the biggest difference between these two forms of domestic violence is how they are handled by the criminal justice system in Ireland and the UK. It is not possible for a victim to apply for a Protective Order
against a minor. Even if they could, the parents cannot remove the abuser because they have an ethical, moral and legal responsibility to provide food and shelter for their child. Furthermore there are no government agencies in Ireland or the UK that have CPV as part of their remit, yet families are very much in need of help (RCPV, 2015, forthcoming). It would appear, as a possible practical option, that the youth justice system and domestic violence services in Ireland and the UK working closely together could be well placed to address CPV. An integrated approach by practitioners in these services could draw on their agency mandates and their knowledge, skills and values to respond to and address youth behaviour problems and domestic violence concerns.

Like other domestic violence, CPV is not confined by socioeconomic class or education factors. It takes place in one-parent and two-parent households and in families from well-resourced as well as poorer backgrounds (Weinblatt and Omer, 2008; Coogan, 2011). In his work in Australia with families experiencing CPV, Eddie Gallagher uses the term ‘over-entitled’ to describe children in two-parent families that are well educated, middle class and perpetrate CPV (Gallagher, 2004, 2008). In these situations, the children sometimes react to parents’ refusals with violence and threats. In other cases, the family may over time develop patterns of escalation between the child and parent where the level of abuse by both or by the child continues to increase, leading to incidents of CPV (Walsh and Krienert, 2009).

A mental health diagnosis such as ADHD or oppositional defiant disorder can sometimes blur the realities of what is taking place within a family living with CPV, whereby practitioners and parents attribute the violent behaviour to the diagnosis. This can leave the child and parent feeling helpless and hopeless, with the belief that there is nothing that can be done about the violent and abusive behaviour (Coogan, 2012). Yet children and young people with such diagnoses frequently refrain from using violence towards friends and other family members, while parents remain targets. Children and young people with mental health diagnoses can also develop self-management skills when supported by practitioners and parents to do so. Parents can develop strategies that assist them in dealing with the difficulties that living with a child with a mental health diagnosis entails.

Families experiencing CPV in the Limerick NVR group talked about their isolation as a family. As one mother said:
they [parents with CPV in the house] don’t want people judging them or judging their children and people who don’t know what’s going on and whose child isn’t doing the same thing can be very judgemental and say ‘they’re a little scumbag’. At the end of the day they’re your child no matter what they do. (Parent 5 from focus group original transcript)

As the above quote suggests, parents experiencing CPV have concerns that they and their children are being judged by others, and even though their child uses violence towards them, parents still feel a strong bond with their son or daughter. Their unique needs required an innovative approach and combination of expertise from the partners in this project: Le Chéile,¹ the Probation Service and academia.

Training and research on CPV has started in earnest in Ireland with the involvement of NUI Galway in the Responding to Child to Parent Violence (RCPV) project,² funded by the DAPHNE Programme³ of the European Commission. Drawing on this resource, Alan Quinn of Le Chéile was able to attend practitioner training in the NVR programme.

Le Chéile, as an Irish Youth Justice Service/Probation Service funded project, has a remit to provide a mentoring service to young people involved with Young Persons’ Probation (YPP).⁴ The mentors act as a positive role model, adviser and friend. Le Chéile also has a mentoring service for parents. The role of the Parent Mentor is to offer support and a listening ear, and to provide some help in managing the child’s offending behaviour. John Brosnahan, YPP manager, observed the similarities between NVR and restorative justice theory. We will discuss this briefly when we explain how Le Chéile and the Probation Service combined their efforts to meet the needs of the parents.

What is the RCPV project?

As there are significant gaps internationally in the knowledge and understanding of CPV, there are disconnected and fragmentary

¹ Le Chéile is a child-centred, non-judgemental non-governmental organisation funded by the Irish Youth Justice Service through the Probation Service. Le Chéile provides mentoring and restorative justice services. www.lecheile.ie
² See www.rcpv.eu/the-project for further information.
³ The Daphne III programme aims to contribute to the protection of children, young people and women against all forms of violence and attain a high level of health protection, wellbeing and social cohesion. http://ec.europa.eu/justice/grants/programmes/daphne/index_en.htm
⁴ Young Persons’ Probation is a division of the Probation Service working with child offenders referred by the Children Courts.
responses to it across Europe (Holt, 2013). Out of this need the RCPV project was initiated by Paula Wilcox from Brighton University and Michelle Pooley from Brighton and Hove City Council. They gathered a partnership involving practitioners and academics across Europe, which became the RCPV. Based in Ireland, England, Spain, Sweden and Bulgaria, the project partners share the hope of increasing awareness about CPV and of implementing and carrying out research on intervention programmes including NVR. The RCPV Project continues until January 2015, with an emphasis on integrating intervention and research in responding to CPV. This is achieved through research, training, practitioner support and the dissemination of findings. Break4Change and NVR are the two intervention programmes that are being implemented and researched through the project. Break4Change works with young people and their parents in parallel groups.

How and why was the NVR programme implemented by the Probation Service and Le Chéile?

During a parenting programme provided by Le Chéile, some parents revealed that they were experiencing CPV in the home. These parents and new referrals all had a child currently or recently engaged with the Probation Service. From Limerick city and county, most were single-parent households relying on social benefit payments as the main source of income.

Based on their need for practical skills for this particular type of family crisis, Alan Quinn of Le Chéile believed that NVR would be the best programme. Following consultation with Declan Coogan, NUIG, Alan Quinn made a presentation to the Probation Service on the NVR programme. The Probation Service and Le Chéile then piloted the group programme that is the subject of this paper.

The parents from the parenting group that originally expressed a need were contacted, and new referrals were also welcomed from Probation Officers for parents in the same or a similar situation: they had a child engaged with the Probation Service and were experiencing CPV. All parents were contacted by phone, in person and attended an initial group session before the start of the programme, which aimed to outline the

5 www.rcpv.eu/the-project
6 For further information see www.justice.gov.uk/youth-justice/effective-practice-library/break-4-change
aims of the NVR programme, allow parents to meet the facilitators and each other, and address any concerns they might have.

As there was no handbook in Ireland at the time, the NVR programme in Limerick used a manual from the UK called *Non-violent Resistance Programme* (Day and Heismann, 2010). The 12-week programme in the manual was revised to eight sessions. The methodology of the sessions included small- and whole-group discussions, role plays, and creative discussions with parents on key concepts. Each week, parents were encouraged to put concepts into practice between sessions, equipped with hand-outs and mnemonic devices they created as a group around key phrases. Some parents had literacy issues, so there was a focus on more discussion and less written information in the sessions.

During the course of the programme contact by phone and in person was continued by Le Chéile staff and Probation Officers to reinforce new concepts, address any new concerns and offer advice to parents. Parents also gave each other informal support between sessions; they had volunteered to share contact details with each other at the start of the programme. Based on their feedback during the programme and an ongoing session review by John Brosnahan and Alan Quinn, some material and the pacing of the programme were adjusted to meet the parents’ needs. The group ran for a total of eight weeks with eight participants. At the conclusion of the sessions parents were referred to the Family Resource Centre, where Alan Quinn and the Co-Ordinator of the Centre ran a six week programme that combined with a women’s group there. This new group focused on coping and wellbeing skills.

Another reason why NVR was chosen as an intervention programme for the families was that it shares principles with Braithwaite’s theories on restorative justice (Braithwaite, 2007). Both promote providing stakeholders with the opportunity to discuss the hurts and how future hurts can be prevented. The definition of restorative justice used in Ireland, from the National Commission on Restorative Justice, is: ‘Restorative justice is a victim-sensitive response to criminal offending, which, through engagement with those affected by crime, aims to make amends for the harm that has been caused to victims and communities and which facilitates offender rehabilitation and integration into society’ (DJELR, 2009).

NVR does not explicitly focus on amends for harm, as restorative justice does. However, in both approaches the focus is on improving the relationship between perpetrator and victim; in the case of CPV, between
the parent and their child. As we will see below, another aspect of NVR is that the parents can also suggest to the child that he/she make reconciliation gestures as well as the parent. In some cases, this can be a way of a son or daughter making amends for harm. Both approaches offer vehicles for participatory learning, and the emphasis throughout is on engagement and inclusion (see also O'Donovan, 2011).

**What is the NVR programme?**

The origins of the programme are based on the concepts of non-violent resistance to social injustices movements, where participants commit to using non-violent means to change their circumstances. As evidenced by the work of Gandhi in India and Daniel O’Connell in Ireland, an approach of protest, resistance, mutual respect and reconciliation can lead to significant positive outcomes (independence in India and Catholic Emancipation in Ireland) and a reduction in violence and injustices (Sharp, 1973).

The two-day NVR practitioner training programme in Ireland was developed by Declan Coogan, adapted from the work of Haim Omer and his colleagues in Israel (Omer, 2004; Weinblatt and Omer, 2008). The Weinblatt and Omer (2008) study involved parents from 41 families with children aged four to 17 who were displaying acute behavioural problems. Of the families in the study, 32 were two-parent and nine were single-parent households. There were few families with very low socio-economic backgrounds; most fell into the middle- to lower-middle-class range. The study found that the NVR programme had a low drop-out rate and produced significant reductions in the child’s aggressive behaviours together with an increase in the child’s positive behaviours. Parents in the study also reported significant reductions in their own aggressive and provocative behaviours, together with less permissiveness and less helplessness in their parenting style (Weinblatt and Omer, 2008).

Building on the existing knowledge, skills and values of practitioners working with children and families, the training programme in Ireland equips practitioners with the confidence and the skills to offer parents the NVR programme as a response to CPV. It is an evidence-based, innovative and short-term intervention that responds to the needs of parents while protecting children and responding to needs of agencies to assist and support families presenting with CPV.
The NVR programme for CPV can be used in one-to-one therapy or in a group, as was the case in Limerick. Parents learn new skills and approaches to use with their child and it is designed to work in tandem with other services or interventions. It is an integrated, systemic, strengths-based and cognitive behavioural skill based programme with specific topics. The topics covered during the Limerick group, in order, were: Group Introductions/Contract/Hopes and Fears; Escalations; The Baskets (prioritising desired change); The Support Network; Parental Presence; The Announcement; Refusal of Orders; The Service Strike; Sit-In; and Reconciliation Gestures. We will discuss some of these briefly.

The Support Network

The Support Network is a group of people chosen by each parent with whom they talk about the level of violence in the home and whom they ask for support as they move forward. Specifically, Support Network members are asked to share with the child that they know what is going on and that they support the parent’s efforts to bring about an end to violence at home. One of the significant elements of the programme is that the problem of violence is externalised so that the problem is the behaviour and not the child.

Whenever the child is spoken with by parents or support network members about the problem, the message is reinforced that the specific violence and abuse (for example threats of harm, hurtful name-calling, hitting) must end and that the parents are also committed to respect and resisting violence, rather than only the child must change. Taking this non-pathologising approach, the child can also be asked by parents to make suggestions that would bring about an end to violence.

When telling the child about a commitment to non-violence and The Support Network, the parent will have already chosen and spoken with the members of The Support Network. One of the ways in which this can be implemented is illustrated by one of the parents, who said:

What I used the most was saying that I was going to call people to have a word with him if he kept carrying on like that. He just laughed in my face but deep down inside the people I have in mind will have a good influence on him and he’s just putting up a bit of a front. He doesn’t like to be named or shamed. He’s used to a small amount of people knowing but there’s certain people he doesn’t want to know so I find that one the best. (Parent 4 from focus group original transcript)
Anyone the parent chooses to support them in the ways that they might find useful can be a member and approached by the parent to join The Support Network. Another parent found a support person outside her family:

*I did use it during the course when I let his girlfriend’s father know what was going on. I didn’t have to use it again because he has been all right but I would use it again if all came to all.* (Parent 5 from focus group original transcript)

**The Announcement**

Once a parent is ready to commit to non-violence, has discussed with the practitioner how to avoid escalation and has The Support Network in place, the parent makes what is called The Announcement. All the children are told that the whole family, including the parent, are to refrain from using violent language or behaviours. The specific types of violence and abuse that have been problems for the family are identified. So as part of The Announcement, a parent could say, for example, ‘I am no longer putting up with constant name-calling, screaming and punching. I will never do any of these things myself. Here are the names and numbers of the people who are helping us stop violence and abuse at home …’

In the Limerick group, parents reflected on the usefulness of The Announcement. One parent said:

*I think The Announcement has worked ’cos now and again he will say to me ’look I am not stoned’ or ’I didn’t do anything’ so I think it’s getting through to him that he knows he is not allowed into my house if he is not himself. So he’s taken it on board. It is getting in there slowly but surely.* (Parent 5 from focus group original transcript)

**Refusal of Orders**

Parents are asked to make a list of all the services they provide for their child, including those that are their responsibility, like providing meals. Parents then may refuse to carry out actions that they may have felt forced to do in the past, like providing a constant supply of cash or a taxi service. This can significantly change the dynamic between the parent and child, as illustrated by one parent who stated:
What changed in my house is that my son doesn’t come in and roar and shout at me saying I want this and I want that. Now he just asks me. (Parent 2 from focus group original transcript)

Reconciliation Gestures

One of the perhaps understandable consequences of CPV is that parents reduce their interaction with their child to an absolute minimum in order to avoid escalation and violence. As part of the NVR programme, the parent moves from either almost complete withdrawal from interaction with their child or every interaction with their child being negative to more positive and more active involvement through Reconciliation Gestures. Examples of Reconciliation Gestures used by parents could include watching a film chosen by the child or getting in the child’s favourite take-away. Parents seem to particularly like this element of the NVR programme, as it releases them from feeling like the ‘bad guy’, implementing new rules all the time. It also makes space for positive interaction between parent and child. As one parent said:

I liked the Reconciliation Gestures because it works out more positive for me and we seem to be getting on a lot better now and it’s easier to talk to him and get on with him. It’s a lot healthier than fighting. (Parent 3 from focus group original transcript)

Was the goal of practical strategies for coping with CPV reached by the programme’s end?

At the end of the NVR programme in Limerick, parents were invited to attend a focus group meeting to explore the usefulness of the intervention. The focus group was conducted six weeks after the programme ended, and consisted of seven of the eight parents who attended the programme in full.

One of the aspects that most parents said they found helpful was The Support Network. Based on feedback from the parents, it seems that the positive effects of The Support Network and The Announcement can create major shifts quickly in the behaviour of the child. For example, one parent identified that the most stressful thing for her was being called names by her son in public. During the focus group she shared:
It [telling others about the abuse] was the hardest thing for me to do but it was the best thing I did because with the verbal abuse he doesn’t call me those names out on the street any more. All I get now is ‘Hi love, how are you?’ As I said, that was the hardest but the best. (Parent 2 from focus group original transcript)

Other parents seemed to really appreciate the support available through attending a group focused on CPV and taking part in the discussion with the facilitators and the other parents. For example, one parent said:

I just thought that joining the group was good. This was the first time I joined any group like this and I felt very apprehensive but when I got to know everyone and everyone is going through the same thing, you feel as if you’re not on your own and it’s that surety in yourself and your child that it’s not just you. I felt that my confidence just grew and grew, where my child was concerned, every week. (Parent 5 from focus group original transcript)

Other parents described fundamental shifts in the relationship between them and their sons and how their sons treated them. Parent 5 stated:

The change in my house is the respect me and my son are starting to show each other. Now he respects me and I respect him and he’s starting to respect my house too and the other people who live there whereas before he didn’t. (Parent 5 from focus group original transcript)

The practical help they received in the group seems to be in practice and becoming part of the family dynamics, as illustrated by one parent:

There’s a lot more calm in the house and when there is trouble and things start going out of control it’s very easy to bring things back down. I’ve learnt to walk away and not stand there fighting and answering back. He started getting confused. He didn’t know what was going on. But when I explained to him when he was calm he understood and that’s what we’ll keep doing. (Parent 3 from focus group original transcript)

**How can this approach be useful in future practice?**

To answer this question it might be useful to share some of the learning for practice gained in adapting the NVR programme with parents involved in the Le Chéile/Probation Service group in Limerick.
Practitioners should meet with each parent individually before the group begins. It was useful to explain clearly that the group was not a support or therapy group, although support will be offered, and that it is skills-based to assist them in making their situations better. It was also found to be essential to introduce a positive element in each session as the subject matter can create a very negative environment. This positive focus and discussions about what the parents are thinking and doing differently helps parents to think more positively about their child. When planning the group, it is useful that the co-facilitators, for every session, agree two or three core messages to convey so that while arising issues are addressed, they can ensure that key skills targets are covered for that session.

In the matter of pacing, it was found best to spend at least two full sessions on the Announcement. The Announcement is a key part of NVR so that the young person gets an accurate picture of what they need to change. The two sessions are needed to explain the concept, break down the individual elements of the Announcement, practise it in pairs, deliver it to the group, get support and feedback, decide when and where the parents will deliver it, and look at possible negative reactions from the child. This increases the likelihood of NVR working and achieving results. It was also found helpful for the attendees to have the group gather in a circle. The parents reported that it felt like it was an open discussion and not as if the facilitators were lecturing to them. The goal should be to create a safe and open environment.

For NVR groups it may be beneficial to examine the viability of offering the programme as a wrap-around systemic intervention. This could involve, for example, the parents being offered a parent mentor before, during and after the eight-week programme as a support to learning, practising, implementing and persisting with the NVR techniques. Where appropriate, and when resources allow, the child could be assigned a youth mentor to work on the child’s behaviour in tandem with the parent addressing their own behaviour. It could be of benefit for a facilitator to contact all the families in the group to offer support around NVR for the duration of the programme. The child’s Probation Officer should also be informed of the topics as they are addressed during the course of the programme.
Conclusions

The experience of the parents that attended the NVR programme in the Limerick YPP Region reflects a group that trusted the facilitators and were willing to focus on changing their own and not only their child’s behaviour. It is hoped that, from the achievements, practitioners will find in NVR a programme that can be used in groups or as a one-to-one intervention with families experiencing CPV.

As adapted in Limerick, the NVR group work programme evolved from the needs of parents and developed through a collaborative initiative between parents, practitioners and NUI Galway. The feedback from parents who participated appears to demonstrate that it met the objectives of providing parents with practical strategies to cope with CPV. As it is a key objective of the EU co-funded RCPV project, it is hoped that the sharing of the experience in implementing the NVR programme, the new ideas, practices, learning and research will continue to assist parents, families and practitioners in dealing effectively with CPV and enhancing safety and wellbeing throughout Europe.

Information on the Responding to Child to Parent Violence Project is available at www.rcpv.eu.
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