



NEW ZEALAND Family Violence Clearinghouse

Newsletter

Volume 2, Issue 2

June 2006

ISSN 1177-147X

Inside this Issue

- 1 Project Manager's View
- 2 Gender Symmetry in Abusive Relationships?
- 3 Attitude and Behaviour Change Project
- 3 Community Action Toolkit Refreshed
- 4 HAIP: A Criminal Justice Response to Women and Children - 15 Years On
- 5 Tairawhiti Conference
- 6 Family Court Decision-Making: A Review of "Gender Bias, Fathers' Rights, Domestic Violence and the Family Court"
- 7 A Strong State Response to Domestic Violence: A US Perspective
- 7 A Useful Website: XY Online
- 8 Upcoming Events

Enclosed: NZFVC User Survey

Welcome to Volume two, Issue two of the New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse (NZFVC) Newsletter. The past three months since the last Newsletter have been very busy ones for the Clearinghouse. During our Governance Board meeting on Friday, 10 March 2006, we had a visit from Hon Lianne Dalziel, the Minister of Women's Affairs. Hon. Dalziel took the opportunity to meet with the Governance Board to discuss the work of the Clearinghouse, including lessons learnt, knowledge gaps, as well as future plans. Violence against women was a particular focus of these discussions.



Hon. Lianne Dalziel meets with the Clearinghouse's Governance Board

This quarter also saw the Clearinghouse reach a major milestone for the year. The update of *An Agenda for Family Violence Research* has been completed and is being prepared for web loading. This was produced in two volumes: a report and appendices (volume 1), discussing the update process, research mapping methodology, quantitative gaps analysis, and future directions for the *Agenda*; and a bibliography (volume 2) containing 439 annotated entries relating to items of New Zealand family violence research published since mid-1996. The Clearinghouse aims to have the report and annotated bibliography available and fully searchable on our website in the near future. The bibliography will also be updated with new items added at regular intervals.

Earlier this year, the Clearinghouse also produced an *Overview of Family Violence Fact Sheet*, which provides an easily understood, evidence-based outline of what family violence is, how common it is, what is known about it, and what works to prevent family violence. This fact sheet can be requested free of charge, along with back issues of the Newsletter, by contacting our office directly or via our website.

The focus of this issue of the Newsletter is perpetrators of family violence and includes items relating to gender and family violence, and programmes and strategies designed to help perpetrators to become and remain violence free. I do hope it both enlightens and inspires you all.

Thank you - Kia ora,

Nick Fahey, Project Manager

NZFVC User Survey

The NZFVC is currently conducting a **User Survey** to establish what users think about Clearinghouse resources and to inform us of other informational needs. This knowledge will help us to improve and further develop our services.

The survey takes approximately 10 minutes to complete and is available both on-line on our website and in printed form. If you complete the personal details at the end of the survey, you will be eligible for one of two prize draws of a \$50 book voucher. All surveys need to be returned to the Clearinghouse by **30 June 2006**.



Gender Symmetry in Abusive Relationships?

In a recently published article, researchers from the Christchurch Health and Development Study report their findings that men and women have similar experiences of victimisation and perpetration of partner abuse, and equally suffer from the mental health effects of violence.

Fergusson, Horwood, and Ridder (2005) interviewed 828 young men and women aged 25, asking them about their victimisation from a partner, their own perpetration of violence, and the effects of the violence on mental health, including depression, anxiety and suicidal ideation. The researchers used a Revised Conflict Tactics Scale to determine the different levels of psychological aggression, physical assault and sexual coercion used by participants.

Fergusson et al. (2005) found that 5.9% of participants reported frequent psychological aggression and some minor physical assaults, while 5.7% reported frequent minor assaults and severe aggression, with many of this group also experiencing at least one severe physical assault (half of this latter group reported injury, and one-quarter reported being fearful or intimidated).

In the research, nearly all those who reported violence (at least 90%) said they both perpetrated violence and were the victims of violence. The researchers also assert there was a substantial similarity in the violence experienced by men and women. Women and men reported similar rates of minor injuries, and while more women reported being fearful, they also reported initiating physical assaults (in the perpetration reports, 58% of women and 32% of men reported initiating physical assaults). Being a victim of violence was found to have a negative effect on the mental health of both women and men.

The researchers claim the similar pattern of victimisation and perpetration for men and women evident in their research, indicates that most acts of aggression and violence “occurred in the context of mutual conflict between partners” (Fergusson et al., 2005, p. 1113). This kind of common couple violence, they argue, is better addressed through attention to ‘violent partnerships’ (e.g., encouraging couples to work together to ‘harmonise’ their relationship), rather than focusing on the violent individual. However, the researchers note that gendered violence (power and control) is more uncommon, and so, is largely not the kind of violence found in this research.

In one of the responses to the research findings, Johnson (2005) outlines three major types of partner violence: ‘intimate terrorism’ (violence used to control a partner); ‘violent resistance’ (violence used in response to intimate terrorism); and ‘situational couple violence’ (which is “violence not embedded in a general pattern of power and control but is a function of the escalation of...conflict”, p. 1127). Johnson claims intimate terrorism is mostly perpetrated by men, while

situational couple violence is perpetrated by both men and women. However, situational couple violence is asymmetrical in the sense of men’s violence is more frequent and injurious, and causes fear which is rare in female-to-male-partner violence (p. 1129). (For a further discussion on the gender symmetry of violence and the implications for policy and practice, see Kimmel, 2002.)

Johnson (2005) is critical of Fergusson et al. for over-estimating and over-simplifying partner violence. He claims Fergusson et al. have grouped together physical violence, which causes fear and injury, in with behaviours such as verbal abuse, to significantly over estimate the extent of partner violence. The Christchurch study is said to be about ‘domestic violence’ when it is actually about situational couple violence, a kind of violence that is more common, Johnson maintains. Statistics from police, refuges and hospitals are more likely to be about intimate terrorism because this kind of violence is repetitive and escalates, thus more readily comes to the attention of justice and social services.

Johnson (2005) warns that the error of mistaking situational couple violence for intimate terrorism can lead to “potentially life-threatening errors of intervention strategy and policy” (p. 1129). He cites the example of couple counselling proposed by Fergusson et al. According to Johnson, if we suggest couples attend counselling together when it is a situation of intimate terrorism, “we could actually encourage them to tell the truth to a partner who in many cases has beaten them severely in response to criticism and who might well murder them in response to their attempt to ‘harmonise [their relationship]” (p. 1129).

Fergusson, D., Horwood, L. J., & Ridder, E. (2005). Partner violence and mental health outcomes in a New Zealand birth cohort. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67. 1103-1119.

Johnson, M. (2005). Domestic violence: It’s not about gender - or is it? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67. 1126-1130.

Kimmel, M. (2002). Gender symmetry in domestic violence: A substantive and methodological research review. *Violence Against Women*, 8(11). 1332-1363.

Attitude and Behaviour Change Project

A project is underway within the Ministry of Social Development to change the public's attitudes and behaviours in relation to family violence, at the direction of the Taskforce for Action on Violence Within Families. The Attitude and Behaviour Change Project aims to address the high levels of tolerance for, and use of, violence in Aotearoa New Zealand.

The first objective of the Attitude and Behaviour Change Project is to focus on increasing the safety of women and children by using a social marketing approach to change the behaviour of men who perpetrate partner abuse. This approach to ending violence is a first for New Zealand. Initial research is funded to inform the project and to gain a better understanding of the attitudes and behaviours with different subgroups of violent male perpetrators, including what motivates the perpetrator to stop using violence and, discovering what barriers exist to change behaviour. Gravitas Research and Strategy is undertaking the formative research. This research will involve consultation with family violence service providers and experts; in-depth interviews with men, from across a range of ethnicities, who are or have been perpetrators of violence; and interviews with victims of violence, families and others. The research is expected to be completed by mid-2006.

In the 2006 Budget announced on 18 May, the Government allocated \$11.5m over four years for the Attitudes and Behaviour Change project. The funding injection means that a prevention campaign can now be developed that will involve national initiatives and resource development, as well as support for local community-driven projects aimed at changing the public tolerance of violence and reducing abusive behaviour.

The Social Development Minister David Benson-Pope said, "There has been an increasing awareness within our communities of the number of families who are devastated by family violence. If we are to turn around the appalling statistics our country has for domestic and family violence then as a community our attitudes must change further."

Additional 2006 Budget news

A pre-Budget announcement of \$9 million over four years signaled increased funding for family violence prevention agencies, including funding for 24-hour crisis lines, counselling, social work support, safe-house accommodation, advocacy and information. Reaction from some community agencies however was muted. Some are saying that because the money is spread over so many agencies over four years, in reality local organisations will be lucky to receive a few thousand dollars each. This would not address the critical under-funding of over-loaded services. For more 2006 Budget information, see www.nzfvc.org.nz/News.aspx

Community Action Toolkit Refreshed



The *Community Action to Prevent Family Violence Toolkit*, a favourite resource of many community groups, has been refreshed as part of the Attitudes and Behaviour Change project.

First produced by the Crime Prevention Unit in 1997, the updated version is the result of a partnership between Family and Community Services and ACC.

The Toolkit is based on the key messages that:

- Family violence is preventable. Attitudes and behaviours can change.
- Preventing family violence is a public issue. It's everyone's business.
- Community action can change the nation's culture of tolerance to family violence.

The Toolkit offers information, ideas and inspiration for community groups and collaborations working towards preventing family violence. The Toolkit can be used to plan a community event, media campaign, or a violence prevention project with specific groups such as youth or faith communities. It includes information on getting started, planning, media management, and evaluation and change theories. A second part of the Toolkit has 40 information sheets, which can be easily photocopied or used as the basis for training and publicity.

The material in the Toolkit can be freely used, copied, shared, adapted and distributed to suit each community's particular needs. It will be distributed to community groups at no cost.

A comprehensive consultation process is now taking place, with the Toolkit being trialled with community groups to ensure that it meets their needs.

A draft of the Toolkit, along with a feedback form, are available on the NZFVC website, www.nzfvc.org.nz/communityaction.



HAIP: A Criminal Justice Response to Violence Against Women and Children - 15 Years On

While there is a current impetus towards coordinated family violence services, and significant effort with collaborative networking, interagency protocols and improved systems responses around the country, it is appropriate to look at a local agency that has been doing this work for 15 years.

Beginning originally as a national pilot project in 1990/1991, the Hamilton Abuse Intervention Project (HAIP) was independently established in 1995. HAIP continues today as New Zealand's longest running cross-agency family violence intervention project, and is the model for many recent initiatives in violence intervention. As well as developing a multi-agency integrated approach unique for Aotearoa New Zealand, HAIP has set new standards for offender accountability and the prioritisation of the victim's safety. Victim advocacy and stopping violence programmes for perpetrators are connected with a social justice agenda, situating the programmes within a whole of justice sector response.

The original idea for coordinating justice and social service responses to family violence came from Women's Refuge advocates who had seen evidence from the successful project in Duluth, Minnesota, USA. The Duluth Domestic Abuse Intervention Project (DAIP) worked alongside victim advocates and perpetrator programme providers to develop ways to make community and government responses to violence more accountable to victims. (For information on the Duluth intervention model, see www.duluth-model.org/.)

The New Zealand Family Violence Prevention Coordinating Committee (FVPCC), a group of government and community representatives established in 1987, developed and implemented the intervention model, choosing Hamilton as the pilot site. Roma Balzer (1999), the first coordinator of HAIP, states that Maori and Tauitihi Women's Refuge advocates supported the Duluth model because it "contextualised men's violence within a cultural framework of power, domination and control" and showed the potential for "creating significant systemic change for the benefit of battered women, many of whom were Maori" (p. 240).

HAIP aimed to create a cultural shift from a community colluding with violence, to a community confronting violence. Staff worked firstly to develop an interagency approach, which involved identifying each agency's role in family violence intervention, developing and providing staff training, negotiating internal and across-agency protocols, and organising a community family violence network. Women's Refuges, men's groups, Family Court, District Court, New Zealand Police, and Probation Services came together around this project.

With the focus on improving the response to battered women and children, and to men who were perpetrators of violence, HAIP developed a system to track every family violence

incident that was known to police and courts. Out of necessity, HAIP developed and ran stopping violence programmes for male offenders, with specialist programmes for Maori. Women's Refuge worked with the partners and children of perpetrators to facilitate their safety. Education and support programmes for women and children who had experienced violence were developed. HAIP operated a 24-hour phone line service in collaboration with Hamilton's Women's Refuges, and Refuge advocates attempted to visit every battered woman immediately after there had been a police call out. Women's advocates gathered information that would aid the prosecution of cases. HAIP employed specialist court advocates to attend court sessions, provide information and advocate for victims, and monitor cases as they went through the justice system.



In order to improve the systemic response, HAIP took on the role of collecting, collating and then disseminating information on every case or callout attended by police. HAIP initiated the monitoring of 111 call logs, Police family violence reports and court records. Refuge provided their reports on cases visited, and justice staff provided information on court outcomes. Battered women were regularly brought together to evaluate the system responses, and their recommendations were taken back to the agencies involved. Interagency coordination meetings were held monthly to discuss local issues and solutions.

This comprehensive and early access to information helped the team identify gaps and barriers within the system. The measure of effective intervention was deemed to be whether battered women and children were safer as a result of intervention and whether the offender received a clear and unambiguous message that violence was unacceptable.

A series of evaluations of the pilot project in the early 1990s found that 90% of women felt they and their children were safer since the project had been established (Balzer, 1999, p. 252); while perpetrator arrests, convictions and sentencing (including mandated attendance at stopping violence programme) all increased (Robertson, 1999, p. 282). HAIP's coordination and monitoring was found to be successful "in terms of cooperation, and the sense of teamship that exists between front line agencies. It can also be seen in the consistency of the message being delivered to offenders... [and] there are indicators that interagency coordination is having a positive effect on the safety of victims" (Buchanan, 1994, p. 35).

However, in light of new policy directions and inconsistent findings (re-offending rates were found to be similar to those in areas with no programmes – see Robertson, 1999, for a

Tairawhiti Conference



The Tairawhiti Abuse Intervention Network (TAIN) recently hosted a successful conference, bringing together people from across Tairawhiti who work within the field of family violence.

TAIN has been in operation for around 15 years, and recently developed family violence case management and information

sharing networks in Gisborne and Ruatoria; community awareness campaigns and workshops; and training sessions for local workers, including DHB and Police staff.

In April 2006, the hui provided an opportunity for locals to hear from experts in the field, to discuss ideas, and to begin developing their own Violence-Free Tairawhiti strategy.

The conference was attended by around 120 people from a range of community and government agencies. Keynote speakers included Dr Paratene Ngata (foundation TAIN member), Teina Mita (Ngati Porou Hauora, Ruatoria), Joe Waru (Auckland), Brian Gardner (National Network of Stopping Violence Services, Wellington), Judge Peter Boshier (Principal Family Court Judge, Wellington), Rob Veale (Office of the Police Commissioner, Wellington), and Gael Strack and Dr George McClane (Family Justice Centre, San Diego USA).

Strack and McClane gave a presentation on a one-stop-shop model for domestic violence victim services and domestic violence strangulations, which will be reviewed in a future issue of the NZFVC newsletter.

Papers from conference will be made available on the NZFVC website in June. Judge Boshier's speech can be found at www.justice.govt.nz/family/media/speeches.html.

fuller discussion of evaluation issues), the government funders decided to discontinue the HAIP funding for monitoring. In his review of HAIP, Robertson is critical of the funding cut, claiming that monitoring is central to the collaborative approach to stop violence. Furthermore, he asserts that monitoring is needed not only for an agency's internal and financial accountabilities, but more importantly, interagency protocols need to be monitored to ensure each agency's on-going accountability to the needs of victims of violence.

Today, HAIP leads the community's response to family violence prevention in Hamilton, and continues to provide a model for successful community collaboration. Hamilton still enjoys sound working relationships between agencies in the family violence sector with a vibrant family violence network; monitoring systems have continued unfunded; and there is wide community support for local family violence prevention initiatives.

The Hamilton Family Safety Team pilot is co-located with HAIP and has taken up some of the monitoring and system improvement work started by HAIP. Also situated in the HAIP building is the newly established Family Violence Technical Assistance Unit, a team providing assistance to communities, employers, local refuges and stopping violence agencies, as well as undertaking contracts for research and training.

For more information about HAIP and the coordinated family violence intervention model, see the reports referenced below.

Balzer, R. (1999). Hamilton Abuse Intervention Project: The Aotearoa experience. In M. Shepard & E. Pence (Eds.), *Coordinating community responses to domestic violence: Lessons from Duluth and beyond*. (pp. 239-254). Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage.

Buchanan, D. (1994). *HAIPP: Coordination and monitoring*. Wellington: Rivers Buchan.

Department of Social Welfare, Family Violence Unit. (1994). *Good practice guidelines for co-ordination of family violence services*. Retrieved April 7, 2006, from <http://www.nzfvc.org.nz/12286.pub>

Mulrone, J. (2003). *Trends in interagency work*. Retrieved April 7, 2006, from the Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse Web site: http://www.austdvclearinghouse.unsw.edu.au/topics/topics_pdf_files/trends_interagency_final.pdf

Robertson, N. R. (1999). *Reforming institutional responses to violence against women*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Waikato, New Zealand.

Shepard, M. F., & Pence, E. L. (Eds.). (1999). *Coordinating community responses to domestic violence: Lessons from Duluth and beyond*. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage.



Family Court Decision-Making: A Review of: “Gender Bias, Father’s Rights, Domestic Violence and the Family Court”

Although groundless, claims that it is biased against men has had a damaging impact on the Family Court, asserts Wendy Davis in her article “Gender Bias, Fathers’ Rights, Domestic Violence and the Family Court” (2004).

Davis, a Wellington family lawyer, contends fathers’ rights groups, internationally and locally, have influenced judicial and legal systems despite a striking lack of evidence to support their claims that the Family Court is ‘anti-male’ or unfair to fathers.

The author turns recent gender-bias claims on their head, arguing that the easy acceptance of fathers’ rights rhetoric, and the changes within Family Court practice and discourse that have ensued, are evidence of the continuing gender bias against women within the legal system.

In her analysis, Davis questions the validity of four central claims of gender bias within the Family Court:

- It is too easy for women to get without-notice protection orders.
- The law and the way it is applied by the Family Court is fundamentally unfair to fathers.
- Protection orders are used by women for tactical advantage in custody and access disputes.
- Large numbers of fathers are being deprived of contact with their children.

Davis argues it has become increasingly difficult for women to obtain without-notice protection orders. She cites Ministry of Justice figures quoted by the Law Society (Crawshaw & O’Dwyer, 2004) that show an increase in without-notice applications being put on notice (in the period 1998-2004, numbers rose from 15.5% to 24.3% of applications), and argues this is in part due to an increased judicial reluctance to make temporary protection orders.

Furthermore, Davis (2004) asks the reader to consider who is making the complaints of unfairness. She states:

What has been largely overlooked in the debate so far is the rather obvious point that the angry reaction of some male respondents to the making of temporary protection orders may have more to do with loss of control over their perceived right to behave as they see fit towards their partners and children than a legitimate grievance based on an unfair denial of rights. (p. 304)

Davis cites an analysis of Family Court orders in the context of the Bill of Rights (Clark, 2003), which concluded that the Act was consistent with the principles of natural justice.

Rejecting the claims that significant numbers of women misuse the Family Court, Davis observes that very few applications for protection orders fail because of lack of credibility. She cites a Law Commission report (2003) that found there was

no evidence to support submissions that alleged women in custody disputes were using protection orders to undermine the fathers’ position. Pointing to a ‘double standard’, Davis (2004) claims there has been a “failure to ask whether men act strategically or make unfounded allegations in Family Court proceedings. Information available on fathers’ rights websites indicates that those groups advise fathers to approach Family Court proceedings in a highly strategic way” (p. 305).

There is no body of research that suggests the legislation is depriving significant numbers of children of contact with their fathers, Davis argues. Citing a Ministry of Justice evaluation (Chetwin, Knaggs & Ahiahi Young, 1999), Davis found fathers’ loss of access after a protection order was most often temporary, and only a very small number of cases involved access being completely suspended; in these cases it was unclear whether the non-custodial parents would have pursued access anyway. By contrast, Davis observes recent High Court decisions that have been critical of the Family Court for failing to correctly apply section 16b of the Guardianship Act (1968) (now sections 59 and 60 of the Care of Children Act, 2004) to ensure the safety of children. She also claims that, as a lawyer, she has witnessed increased pressure on women to agree to access when they do not feel it is safe for their children, and increased numbers of fathers not using access they have fought for in the Family Court.

Davis is concerned that the fathers’ rights claims have negatively impacted on the way domestic violence-related legislation is being applied (e.g. protection orders and relocation orders). She calls for any changes to legislation or practice to be informed by research that focuses on the safety, needs, experiences, perspectives and rights of children, rather than being driven by a parental rights agenda or media attention.

Cawshaw, V., & O’Dwyer, M. (2004). *Without notice applications*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Law Society.

Chetwin, A., Knaggs, T., & Ahiahi Young, P. (1999). *The domestic violence legislation and child access in New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Justice.

Clark, E. (2003). Ex parte orders in the Family Court and the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990. *Butterworths Family Law Journal*, 4(8), 205-212.

Davis, W. (2004). Gender bias, fathers’ rights, domestic violence and the Family Court. *Butterworths Family Law Journal*, 4(12), 299-312.

Law Commission. (2003). *Dispute resolution in the Family Court*. (NZLC R 82). Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

A Strong State Response to Domestic Violence: A US Perspective

Karen Berlin, Supervising Probation Officer with the Santa Clara County Probation Department, USA, recently held a workshop in Wellington hosted by The National Collective of Independent Women's Refuges. Berlin has been involved in developing standards for batterers and juvenile domestic violence programmes, and she helped establish the first Juvenile Delinquency Domestic Violence Court in the USA. She discussed the provision of men's stopping violence programmes and the development of a strong state response to domestic violence.

Berlin outlined the current situation in California where family violence offenders are ordered by the court to attend and to pay for a stopping violence programme of 52 two-hour sessions, as well as often being directed to parenting without violence, and drug and alcohol programmes.

Speaking about the effectiveness of stopping violence programmes, Berlin said she was very concerned that some judges, lawyers and other professionals think these programmes are the magic solution to men's violence in the home. While programmes do give perpetrators the opportunity to change their belief systems if they want to, Berlin claimed that in reality, there is only a limited effectiveness, with a lack of evidence to say programmes reduce violence. Berlin maintained that in her jurisdiction, programmes are seen firstly as a strong state sanction, and court staff are aware victims are not necessarily safe just because an offender is attending a programme. Berlin highlighted the importance of close monitoring of the programme material and offender's attendance at programmes, if programmes are to have even a limited effect. In some cases, she maintained, the most a stopping violence programme does is give the victims just two hours a week of safety and independence (during the time the offender is attending the programme).

According to Berlin, stopping violence programmes have to be part of a strong and coordinated state response to violence, which includes prosecution for even minor domestic violence crimes; strong penalties for those who use violence; well-organised monitoring of programmes and perpetrators; domestic violence training for everyone involved in the criminal justice system, including judges, court staff, court report writers, probation officers and corrections staff; and a justice system that is accountable to victims of violence.

Berlin said probation officers are key players in the process of keeping victims safe and holding abusers to account. As a supervising probation officer, she stated it was vital to be able to recognise indicators of domestic violence and signs that a perpetrator may be a continued danger to his family. Through pre-sentencing reports, probation officers aware of family violence issues can provide vital information that leads to the

court ordering a safe level of contact between the offender, victim and children.

Finally, Berlin discussed the progress of prosecutions without the victim's cooperation. She maintained that the courts need to find ways to follow through with prosecutions of offenders even when victims withdraw their statements or ask for the charges to be dropped, because victims are often coerced into withdrawing statements or supporting their abusers, and may fear repercussions if they do not. Furthermore, Berlin believes that some women suffering from the effects of violence are, at that time, not able to make the best decisions for their own safety. However, several months later, women often say they support the fact that the prosecution continued, and that it contributed to their safety.

Berlin argued that the state needs to take responsibility for violence, and take the responsibility away from victims. She claimed prosecutions for violence play a wider prevention role, and stopping violence is in the interest of the whole of society, not just the few individuals involved in the case.

**A Useful Website:
XY Online
www.xyonline.net**



XY Online is an Australian-based website providing access to information related to men, masculinities, and gender politics. A variety of researchers and practitioners have contributed material to the website about the personal, political and academic aspects of masculinity and 'men's issues'.

The site promotes personal and social change through exploring how gender and sexuality affects the everyday lives of men and women. XY Online "starts from the belief that many of our society's attitudes about masculinity are harmful to men and boys in a variety of ways, as well as being oppressive to women and children." The hosts call the site 'male positive' and aim to generate a "forum for men who are seeking to build life-affirming, joyful, and non-oppressive ways of being."

The site contains articles ranging from topics on growing up male, fatherhood, intimacy, gay men, men's rights and men's liberation, as well as masculinity in relation to ethnicity, class, sexuality, criminology and family violence. There is an impressive volume and range of information available on the website.

The Men's Bibliography, a regularly updated resource listing over 15,000 articles and reports can be accessed from the home page. There is also a comprehensive links page, with links to many different family violence sites, among others.

Upcoming Events

7 - 9 June 2006

Third International Conference on Therapeutic Jurisprudence in Perth, Australia.

Presented by Australian Institute of Judicial Administration, et al. Website: www.aija.org.au/TJ

26 June or 3 October 2006

Responding Effectively to Victims of Domestic Violence

Professional intensive one-day training for social service professionals in Auckland, New Zealand.

For information, contact: trainer@preventingviolence.org.nz

5 - 7 July 2006 (rescheduled date)

National Tangata Whenua Stopping Violence Hui: Whanaungatanga in Christchurch, New Zealand.

For information, contact: Tainia Rangiwhehu on 03 381 8472 or email te-punaoranga@xtra.co.nz

9 - 12 July 2006

National Coalition Against Domestic Violence Conference: Organizing for Collective Power in Atlanta, Georgia, USA. Website: www.ncadv.org

July/August/October 2006

Child Protection Studies Programme in Palmerston North (17 - 21 July 2006), Hastings (31 July - 4 August 2006), and Wellington (25 - 31 October 2006)

For information, contact: 07 838 3370, or email info@cps.org.nz

8 - 9 August 2006

Child Protection Studies Workshops in Wellington, New Zealand.

Preparing a Comprehensive Child Protection Policy (8 August)

Recognising and Responding to Child Abuse (9 August)

For information, phone 07 838 3370, or email info@cps.org.nz

14 - 15 August 2006

Safer Communities Conference in Wellington, New Zealand.

For information, contact: Victoria Owen on 04 978 1221.

3 - 6 September 2006

XVIth ISPCAN International Congress: Children in a Changing World: Getting it Right in York, UK.

Website: www.ispcan.org/congress2006

12 - 13 September 2006

"Positive Ways: An Indigenous Say" National Conference in Darwin, Australia.

Hosted by Victims of Crime NT.

For information, contact: vocalnt@bigpond.com.au

16 - 18 October 2006

Strengths-Based Practice Conference: Weaving the Threads in Brisbane, Australia.

Hosted by Kyabra & Lighthouse Resources.

Website: www.strengths2006.com.au

22 - 24 October 2006

Résovi's International Conference: Violence Against Women: Diversifying Social Responses in Montreal, Canada.

Organised by Résovi, a research component of the Interdisciplinary Research Centre on Family Violence and Violence Against Women (CRI-VIFF).

Website: www.criviff.qc.ca/colloque/accueil_ang.asp

13 - 14 November 2006

Second International Asian Health and Wellbeing Conference: Prevention, Protection and Promotion in Auckland, New Zealand.

Hosted by Centre for Asian Health Research and Evaluation (CAHRE), in partnership with The Asian Network Inc. (TANI).

For information, contact: Dr Samson Tse s.tse@auckland.ac.nz

Website: www.health.auckland.ac.nz/population-health/cahre/conference/

23 - 24 November 2006

QEC 4th Biennial Conference: Early Childhood: Evidence into Practice in Melbourne, Australia.

Website: www.qec.org.au/4th-national.htm

Please note that Call for Papers/Abstracts deadlines for the listed conferences are now closed.



NEW ZEALAND

Family Violence Clearinghouse

New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse

University of Canterbury

Private Bag 4800

CHRISTCHURCH

Phone: 64 3 364 2296

Fax: 64 3 364 2744

E-mail: administrator@nzfvc.org.nz

Website: www.nzfvc.org.nz

If you wish to subscribe to the New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse Newsletter, please contact us at the address above.

The views expressed in NZFVC newsletter are those of the contributors and do not necessarily reflect those of the New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse.