

UNIVERSIDAD SAN FRANCISCO DE QUITO USFQ

Colegio de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades

**Family Reunification Program at the Rehabilitation
Center of Latacunga to Reduce Recidivism in Male
Prisoners Convicted of Domestic Violence**

Proyecto de Investigación

Dominique Elizabeth Dobronski Pombo

Psicología Clínica

Trabajo de titulación presentado como requisito
para la obtención del título de
Psicóloga Clínica

Quito, 8 de mayo de 2018

UNIVERSIDAD SAN FRANCISCO DE QUITO USFQ
COLEGIO DE CIENCIAS SOCIALES Y HUMANIDADES

**HOJA DE CALIFICACIÓN
DE TRABAJO DE TITULACIÓN**

Título Trabajo de Titulación

Dominique Elizabeth Dobronski Pombo

Calificación:

Nombre del profesor, Título académico

Richard D. West, Ph.D.

Firma del profesor

Quito, 8 de mayo de 2018

Derechos de Autor

Por medio del presente documento certifico que he leído todas las Políticas y Manuales de la Universidad San Francisco de Quito USFQ, incluyendo la Política de Propiedad Intelectual USFQ, y estoy de acuerdo con su contenido, por lo que los derechos de propiedad intelectual del presente trabajo quedan sujetos a lo dispuesto en esas Políticas.

Asimismo, autorizo a la USFQ para que realice la digitalización y publicación de este trabajo en el repositorio virtual, de conformidad a lo dispuesto en el Art. 144 de la Ley Orgánica de Educación Superior.

Firma del estudiante: _____

Nombres y apellidos: Dominique Elizabeth Dobronski Pombo

Código: 00118155

Cédula de Identidad: 1716385347

Lugar y fecha: Quito, 8 de mayo de 2018

RESUMEN

Antecedentes: Estadísticas indican que en Ecuador más de 24 000 familiares se encuentran separadas debido al encarcelamiento de un miembro de la familia (Celi, 2014). Es necesario enfocarse en esta problemática porque afecta a un número significativo de familias y comunidades. Sentencias dictadas por violencia doméstica usualmente general cambios drásticos en lazos familiares y podrían llevar a una desintegración del núcleo familiar (Solis & Vivanco, 2016). Este estudio propone un programa basado en intervenciones psicológicas con la familia de un preso que esta cerca de culminar su sentencia para analizar los cambios en frecuencia, prevalencia y nivel de violencia. **Metodología:** La muestra busca incluir veinte familias con un miembro encarcelado por violencia doméstica. La escala Conflict Tactics Scale Revised (CTS-2) Spanish Version se usará al inicio y al final del tratamiento terapéutico para evaluar el nivel de conflicto y violencia intrafamiliar. **Resultados:** Los resultados esperados según la revisión de literatura son que el programa de reunificación familiar reduce los niveles de reincidencia a las cárceles, la desintegración familiar y facilita el reintegro del preso a su familia. **Conclusiones:** El programa de reunificación familiar tiene efectos positivos en familias ecuatorianas que sufren de violencia doméstica.

Palabras Clave: encarcelamiento en hombres, programas de reunificación familiar, encarcelamiento en Ecuador, violencia doméstica como un delito, violencia doméstica en Ecuador

ABSTRACT

Background: Statistics indicate that in Ecuador more than 24 000 families are separated because of the imprisonment of a family member (Celi, 2014). This problem needs to be addressed because of its potential to affect a significant number of families and communities. Felony sentences of domestic abuse usually generate drastic changes in family ties and can even lead to the disintegration of the family nucleus (Solis & Vivanco, 2016). This study proposes a program based on psychological interventions with families who have an incarcerated member due to domestic violence and who is about to be released from prison to analyze its differences in violence. **Methodology:** The sample looks for twenty families with one member in prison for domestic violence. The Conflict Tactics Scale Revised (CTS-2) Spanish Version will be used at the beginning and at the end of the treatment process to assess the level of interfamily conflict and violence. **Results:** Based on the literature review, the expected results will prove that the family reunification program will diminish recidivism rates, reduce family disintegration, and provide better reintegration outcomes for the offender and his family. **Conclusions:** The family reunification program has positive effects in Ecuadorian families suffering from domestic violence.

Key Words: male imprisonment, family reunification programs, incarceration in Ecuador, domestic violence felony, domestic violence in Ecuador

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	7
Background	9
The Problem	10
Research Question	11
Study Purpose	11
Study Significance	11
Literature Review	12
References	12
Format of the literature review	12
Methodology and research design	24
Methodology Design and Justification	24
Participants	25
Research Tools	25
Recruitment of Participants and Data Analysis	26
Ethical Considerations	27
Probable Results	28
Discussion	30
Limitations	31
Future Implications	32
References	33
ANNEXED A: APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF THE STUDY AND INFORMED CONSENT FORM	37

INTRODUCTION

Statistics indicate that in Ecuador more than 24 000 families are separated because of the imprisonment of a family member (Celi, 2014). This problem needs to be carefully considered and addressed mainly because of its potential to affect a significant number of families and communities. Lilian Rosero, who is in charge of the Pastoral Penitentiary of the Ecuadorian Episcopal Conference, states that in many cases families separate after a family member is incarcerated (Celi, 2014). Ryan & Huang (2012) explain that there are programs and interventions that have been thoroughly researched and have proved to be effective to promote recovery, strengthen family unity, and provide a healthier environment for families, such as parenting classes, family counseling, and assistance with employment and housing. But in Ecuador, where prisons do not have enough resources, these programs are not usually evaluated or even considered.

Reports indicate that the consequences of imprisonment are not limited to the incarcerated individuals, but that they directly impact the offender's family and, especially, his or her children (Font, Fernández, Escurriol, Roig, Leyton & Moreno, 2006, p. 7). For this reason, it is essential to evaluate the outcomes of family reunification programs and the feasibility of applying them in Ecuadorian prisons. Even though the information about psychological interventions in Ecuadorian prisons is limited, this study proposes a family reunification program with male prisoners during and after the fulfillment of their sentences of domestic violence to reduce the likelihood of recidivism.

Research regarding this situation will be presented and a relationship between family cohesion during and after a conviction and recidivism rate of domestic violence will be established. The objective of this study is to demonstrate that the

implementation of a family reunification program for males that have been convicted for domestic violence can reduce the rates of recidivism, diminish criminality frequency, and promote a better environment for Ecuadorian families that have been impacted by the consequences of imprisonment.

Background

History of imprisonment and reintegration to society

Imprisonment is a global situation. Walmsley (2016) informs “that more than 10.25 million people are held in penal institutions throughout the world, either as pre-trial detainees/remand prisoners or having been convicted and sentenced” (p. 2). The notion of prison as a correctional institution is relatively new. Prisons were first established during the 18th century as a way to isolate offenders for meditation. Later, in the 19th century, a new vision was conceived based on a rehabilitative perspective which aimed towards the recovery and reinsertion of transgressors to society (Cornejo, 2017). Still, confinement entails physical, psychological, emotional, and social consequences that need to be taken into account to increase the feasibility of rehabilitation and avoid recidivism. Western, Braga, Davis & Sirois (2015) explain that incarceration rates have increased as compared to previous decades, and imprisonment is now considered a common life event for people from poor communities in the United States.

Reintegration to society after imprisonment significantly impacts an individual and his or her family. Visher & Travis (2003) argue about the importance of focusing on the understanding of “the individual pathways of reintegration after prison release” (p. 96) and the complex dynamic of the moment of release. Many aspects influence the outcomes of reestablishing life after the release: time spent in prison, finding a job with a criminal record, returning to high-risk places and situations, and reestablishing family ties, which can have a significant impact in establishing supportive relationships and having access to a place to live (Visher & Travis, 2003, p. 96).

The focus of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions with families that have a background of domestic violence. Peter Clarke (2018) explains that charges of domestic violence are filed when a household member commits an act of

violence against another resident of the household. The severity of the violence and other aggravating circumstances may turn misdemeanor charges of domestic violence into felonies. The charges of domestic violence can also meet the criteria for a crime when there is a case of death or serious bodily injury to the victim, criminal act directed to a minor, act or threat with the use of a deathly weapon, or criminal acts involving sexual abuse, rape, or sexual assault (Clarke, 2018).

The Problem

Felony sentences of domestic abuse usually generate drastic changes in family ties and can even lead to the disintegration of the family nucleus (Solis & Vivanco, 2016). The consequences of imprisonment affect not only the person deprived of liberty but also his or her family. Additionally, the rupture of family cohesion can psychologically, socially, economically or/and emotionally affect all of its members (Solis & Vivanco, 2016). Martí & Cid (2013) explain that family cohesion is a key factor to promote a positive transition after the release from prison since families are an essential source of support.

The evaluation of family reunification programs and their outcomes in cases of males convicted for domestic violence is crucial for the development of effective psychological interventions that can lead to a satisfactory reintegration to society and reduction of recidivism. It is important to consider that in Ecuador there is limited research about psychological interventions used in penal institutions, and it is fundamental to develop strategies to help this vulnerable population during and after imprisonment.

Research Question

How and to what extent applying a family reunification program during and after male imprisonment due to domestic violence can decrease recidivism rates in the Rehabilitation Center of Latacunga?

Study Purpose

This study proposes a program based on psychological interventions with families who have an incarcerated member due to domestic violence and who is about to be released from prison. The expected results will prove that a family reunification program will diminish recidivism rates, reduce family disintegration, and provide better reintegration outcomes for the offender and his family. This project expects to positively impact families of prisoners who are convicted for domestic violence in a Latacunga-Ecuador Rehabilitation Center.

Study Significance

Because of a lack of information regarding psychological interventions with the incarcerated community, this investigation seeks to benefit families that participate in the project into mending and enhancing family relations. This study is the first of its type in Ecuador, therefore, it aims to promote the development of similar family reunification programs; identify effective interventions to facilitate a convict's adaptation to his family; and decrease the rates of recidivism, which is a common problem with offenders.

The Literature Review of this study presents a framework to understand the history of male incarceration, rates of recidivism, the impact of domestic violence in Ecuador, and the dynamics of family reunification programs. Then, an explanation of the methodology applied in the research, the analysis of the collected data, conclusions, and a discussion of the results are presented.

LITERATURE REVIEW

References

The information presented in the Literature Review of this study comes from the Reglamento del Sistema Nacional de Rehabilitación Social, Ecuador's Código Orgánico Integral Penal, scientific articles, books about the subject, peer reviewed journals, interviews, and newspapers. The articles cited were obtained from different databases, like EBSCO Information Services, with the use of keywords such as "male imprisonment", "family reunification programs", "incarceration in Ecuador", and "domestic violence felony". Finally, workers from the Ecuadorian department of justice were interviewed.

Format of the Literature Review

The Literature Review includes four general topics. First, it presents a review of the purpose of incarceration and how it has been perceived over the years. Then, a report of the dynamics of family reunification programs is presented. Next, the causes and rates of recidivism will be explored. And finally, the context of the Ecuadorian Penitentiary System and laws regarding domestic violence in Ecuador are portrayed.

Historic Perspective of Prison

As explained in the introduction, imprisonment objectives have changed over the years and, moreover, the perspective regarding the purpose of imprisonment. Cornejo (2017) states that prisons were first conceived as a precautionary measure to guarantee the presence of the defendant during the trial period in order to properly dictate a sentence. Later, it was not used just as a precautionary measure, but also as the only form of sanction.

Cornejo (2017) explains that the purpose of prisons has been historically defined by three concepts. First, during the XVIII and XIX centuries, prisons were considered

places of correction. This notion was influenced by religious ideas of penance and isolation that would motivate prisoners to meditate and prevent them from committing new crimes. Later, prisons were considered rehabilitation establishments which aimed towards reintegrating offenders into society. And lastly, the perception of prisons as a punitive form of segregation that emphasizes social control and excludes or eliminates those who have committed crimes was established.

With the passage of time, incarceration rates increased and this phenomenon transformed the social atmosphere of low-income communities (Western, et al, 2015, p. 1512) and this has influenced the current perspective of prisons.

Joycelyn Pollock (2009) emphasizes the fundamental rationale for the existence of prisons in her book *Prisons Today and Tomorrow*. Pollock (2009) states that the philosophical line that divides the perception about the purpose of prisons is based on whether or not imprisonment should be considered a form of punishment (p. 3). One stance is that imposing pain as a penance is essentially different from inflicting pain on innocents, and consequently is not fundamentally wrong; and the other position is that punishment is a wrong that can be vindicated only if it results in a “greater good”. The first stance is supported by the idea that it is not necessary to justify the punishment because the offender deserved it. This is considered a “retributive approach”, a way of balancing a wrong act by punishment. In the other view, punishment is justified through the rationale of “incapacitation of rehabilitation” which is a “utilitarian approach”. Under this approach, punishment is perceived as evil but it can be justified by the greater benefits that result from it; this means that punishment is acceptable when it benefits “the many” and accomplishes more good than evil.

As I mentioned above, the utilitarian approach goes by two rationales. First, incapacitation, which prevents further inflicting damage while the individual is under

control, and the other one, rehabilitation, which pursues internal change and cessation of the criminal behavior. The logic behind the utilitarian approach is that pain can serve as a learning tool. Pollock (2009) also explains that prison is one of the most complex punishments because it does not only affect material possessions, but it also interferes with the level of freedom and the physical and mental health of offenders.

During the progressive era, psychiatric professional started to get involved in penology with the idea that science could solve inmates' problems (Pollock, 2009). This idea resulted in the conceptualization of prison as a laboratory, a correctional institution in which prisoners had benefits such as psychiatric treatment and social work assistance, which lead to the proliferation of correctional programs. Pollock (2009) explains that there are philosophers that support the idea that there is no evidence that treatment programs reduce crime and that the penal enterprise should return to the retributive rationale (p. 16). Nonetheless, this author concludes that the penal system is always going to have more than one philosophy or rationale and that it will change with the passage of time but that it should always emphasize the general wellness of society.

Effects of Domestic Violence in the Family System

According to Herman-Stahl, Kan, & McKay (2008), research on the effects of domestic violence reveals that women who have suffered from domestic violence are most likely to end their relationship with the abuser. Also, when fathers perpetrate domestic abuse prior to imprisonment, other members of the family tend to consider incarceration as a relief measure for the family's children, who have witnessed or underwent violence within the familiar nucleus. It is stated that in such cases families have low motivation to maintain contact during incarceration (Hairston & Oliver, 2006; Herman-Stahl, et al., 2008).

Considering this, if the family has the intention to maintain ties with the offender, and the court considers it a feasible option, the process can be trying and worrisome. There are numerous challenges that the family has to overcome for the reunification process to be successful. This is why it is important to consider the pre-incarceration history, prison experience, and personality traits of the members of the family to identify appropriate interventions (Herman-Stahl, Kan, & McKay, 2008 p. 5).

In families with a history of domestic violence, there are some factors that have to be taken into consideration, one of these is the high correlation between domestic violence and substance abuse. Also, variables regarding the actual situation of the relationship between partners, which include possible infidelity, differences in child discipline, and new relationships of the partner that is not incarcerated need to be addressed (Hairston & Oliver, 2006; Herman-Stahl, Kan, & McKay, 2008 p. 5).

Interventions

Herman-Stahl, Kan & McKay (2008) explain that batterer interventions tend to lean towards cognitive behavioral and relaxation techniques that address power, impulsivity and control issues (p, 5). Likewise, in terms of marital education, it focuses on educational approaches toward “anger management, conflict resolution, negotiation, problem-solving, and empathy.” (p. 5). Still, these interventions are not considered sufficient to assist this population. Herman-Stahl, Kan & McKay (2008) state that it is important to treat with extreme caution any situation that could lead to abuse (p. 5).

It is important to consider that when children are involved, the quality of the relationship during incarceration is a predictor of good outcomes in the process of family reunification. The results of a qualitative research study with 20 former prisoners who desisted from committing new crimes showed that former offenders believe that a

huge protective factor against recidivism is a strong father-child relationship (Herman-Stahl, Kan, & McKay, 2008 p. 6).

The Dynamics of Family Reunification Programs

Research suggests that family interventions can help with the stress of the transition after the release from prison. Western, et al (2015) explains that family intervention programs may be the most effective tool to facilitate a convict's adaptation to the community in the first months after the release. Furthermore, Western, et al (2015) indicate that surveys directed by Nelson, Deess, and Allen in 1999 showed that if there is fluidity during the post-incarceration period and motivation for criminal withdrawal, there are strong probabilities of good outcomes. Western, et al (2015) also emphasizes the fact that there is evidence that supports that "long-term effects of incarceration on communities depend partly on the individual experiences of the first months after prison release" (p. 1513). This accentuates the importance of maintaining psychological interventions with the offender and his family after the release.

There are several reasons for family disruption during and after incarceration. These reasons could be rational, irrational, justified, or unjustified (Friedman, Bradshaw, King, Warshak, & Webb, 2014). Every family has different dynamics and it is important to consider the specifics of the relationship between the members of the family in disrupted environments to address what factors to contemplate when drafting therapeutic interventions. These authors highlight the need for identifying how to resolve and rectify the issues of the relationship within the family before taking any action (Friedman et al., 2014, p. 3).

Miller, Perryman, Markovitz, Frazen, Cochran & Brown (2013) inform that almost two million children in the United States have at least one parent in prison. Considering the consequences of this situation, not just mental health professionals but

also lawyers and judges are proposing reunification interventions with family members. These interventions are a new phenomenon that is becoming more frequent (Friedman et al., 2014).

It is important to consider the specifics of every case to involve a family in a reunification program (Friedman et al., 2014). Richard Warshak spent many years researching this topic and concluded that in cases of extreme alienation or violence, physical separation of the family nucleus is a better option. However, in cases that are not considered extreme, the question is based on how to fix the relationships within the family (Friedman et al., 2014).

According to Friedman and colleagues (2014), the North Texas Families in Transition Professionals (NTXFIT) have assessed this issue and identified different protocols, policies, and procedures on how to effectively manage family disruption (p. 3). The NTXFIT considers that an interdisciplinary methodology which closely involves a legal team is important for this type of work.

There are five factors that had resulted from their investigation which have confirmed its efficacy (Friedman et al., 2014):

First, it must be decided in court whether the reunification is an “if” or a “when”. This means that the legal team needs to determine if the family will need a reunification counselor or not and if it does, when is a good time to start the process. It is stated that if the court resolves that the family does not qualify for reunification and there are children involved, a custody evaluation is necessary.

Second, parents always need to be informed about the court’s decisions. It is important that both parts comprehend the court’s determination so both can act within the decision towards a possible reunification. The reunification counselor should notify authorities if any member of the family is not complying with the court’s decision.

Third, if there are children involved, and it is concluded in court that the reunification process should be considered in a specific time period, the final goals of reunification should be legally stated. This process includes different aspects and outcomes. For example, if the parents want to maintain their relationship, it is important to contemplate the permanent custody of the children; if the parents do not want to remain together, then a custody agreement is necessary. This process requires that the counselor follows the court's guidance to define how to start a "stair step visitation schedule" (Friedman et al., 2014).

The stair step parenting time plan is based on three different types of visitation schedules to integrate the family: 1. *Supervised visitation* in which the non-custodial parent has contact with one or more children accompanied by a third person that is responsible for ensuring the safety of the members of the family; 2. *Monitored visitations* that consist of the parent and the child interacting with a third person nearby for precaution; and 3. *Therapeutically supervised visitations* which are similar to the supervised visitations, but with the attendance of a licensed mental health professional to help improve interactions within the family. These interventions share the main goal of protecting the children (p. 9) and have the objective of progressing the family toward a Standard Possession Order (Friedman et al., 2014).

Fourth, it is necessary that both parents get involved in the process; it is important that the child has contact with both parents for the reunification to be successful, and for the child to feel supported by both caregivers.

And lastly, the reunification counselor must communicate the legal team if there is any difficulty in compliance from the family.

It is essential to consider that the reunification process always depends on the specific needs of each family. In some cases, it is possible that they require a therapy-

oriented approach that the therapist is responsible to identify, for example, “filial therapy techniques, parent-child interaction therapy, or other modalities” (Friedman et al., 2014, p. 10). Miller, et al. (2013) explain that these interventions focus on promoting “child social-emotional growth, family communication, and social support by increasing protective factors and reducing risk factors” (p. 3). It is paramount to evaluate if these programs have a reasonable level of effectiveness and the best quantitative way of assessing their effectiveness is by the rate of recidivism.

Recidivism in Prisons

Duwe and Clark (2011) found that visitation to offenders significantly reduced the risk of recidivism and identified the social support provided by the family as the main influencing factor. Research findings indicate that family and social support helps offenders desist from committing new crimes, which diminishes the rates of recidivism (p. 272).

Because of a low educational level, lack of vocational skills and working experience, and even stigma, many offenders struggle to find jobs, and unemployment has a high correlation with recidivism (Duwe & Clark, 2011, p. 275). However, research indicates that offenders who had solid family connections were more likely to maintain a job as compared to less attached prisoners (Berge & Huebner, 2011).

Duwe & Clark (2011) explain that even though visitation and reunification programs are expensive to apply, the sense of community well-being and safety benefits resulting from social support could be substantial as compared to non-beneficiaries of the programs (p. 292). Also, many researchers suggest that these programs tend to have better outcomes when there is a continuum of care from the institution to the community (Duwe & Clark, 2011, p. 292) which includes psychological, educational, and recreational benefits.

The Connecticut Statistical Analysis Center (2010) addresses some predictors of recidivism in male offenders; some of these variables are age and large extensiveness of incarceration history. Analyses concluded that there is a higher possibility of recidivism if the offender is released at a young age; 47% of males under the age of 24 who were released were returned to serve new a sentence within three years. On the other hand, among offenders that were released from their 3 or 4 prior sentences, 61% were incarcerated within three years (The Connecticut Statistical Analysis Center, 2010, p. 1). This shows that it is important for the penitentiary system to take into account certain factors that could be targeted to decrease reinsertion.

In a personal interview to the Justice Ministry official, Elizabeth Coronel, she stated that there were no statistics about recidivism in Ecuador and emphasized the fact that they strictly adhere to the political regulations (E. Coronel, personal communication, March 7, 2018). This shows that in Ecuador recidivism prevention policies are minimal or nonexistent.

Ecuadorian Penitentiary System

According to the Ecuadorian Law, the State is obligated to guarantee medical and psychological immediate attention to every inmate (CEDHU, 2008). Nonetheless, in 2008 the Ecuadorian rehabilitation system had an average of 19 251 inmates, and only 51 doctors and 47 psychologists. Additionally, some institutions did not have any mental health professionals (CEDHU, 2008). This data shows that the number of doctors and psychologists that work in the Ecuadorian rehabilitation system is undoubtedly insufficient to cover the needs of such a high number of inmates.

This suggests the need for examining available psychological approaches that are developed and applied to reduce the risk of reoffending. According to Cunneen & Luke (2007) "Recidivism is a common way of measuring the effectiveness of the

criminal justice system and interventions” (p. 199) so it is important to consider that recidivism rates can be a good indicator to assess if the rehabilitation and reintegration programs available are being effective or if there is a need to modify the interventions.

To understand the Ecuadorian Penitentiary System, it is important to look into the Regulations of the National System of Social Rehabilitation. The Consejo Nacional de Rehabilitación Social (2009) states that the main objectives of the Penitentiary System are the integral rehabilitation of inmates to successfully reintegrate them into society, the prevention of recidivism, and the successful adjustment to society with an emphasis to achieve a reduction in delinquency. However, considering that the Ministry of Justice does not have information about recidivism percentages, it is hard to understand how they assess the effectivity of the System.

The Article 51 of the Reglamento del Sistema Nacional de Rehabilitación Social (2017) states that:

“El tratamiento de las personas privadas de libertad tiene los siguientes ejes: laboral, educación, cultura, deporte, salud, vinculación familiar y social y reinserción; que serán ejecutados según los niveles de seguridad. Cada uno de los ejes contará con un modelo de gestión en contextos penitenciarios que deberá ser elaborado y sustentado presupuestariamente por la cartera de Estado correspondiente y aprobado por el Directorio del Organismo Técnico” (p. 13).

Which means that the treatment of inmates should cover their needs in the following areas: employment, education, culture, sports, health, family, social, and reintegration to society. Nevertheless, El Universo (2013) informed that according to a report of the Comisión Ecuémica de Derechos Humanos (CEDHU), human rights were being violated in Ecuadorian prisons and regulations are not usually followed.

Furthermore, the Reglamento del Sistema Nacional de Rehabilitación Social (2017) emphasizes the fact that familiar and social factors should be optimally treated. The Article 57 establishes that it is important to assess the individual, social, and familiar conditions of every inmate in order to identify the needs that require more attention. This article states that there are six different interventions that need to be applied for the treatment to be effective:

1. Group therapy and/or family therapy
2. Counseling
3. Legal information and capacitation
4. Execution and follow-up of plans, programs, and projects that benefit the children and family of the person deprived of liberty.
5. Information and training on mechanisms for conflict resolution.
6. Activities and programs that are in charge of other ministries.

The legal information available shows that the penitentiary system works toward an effective rehabilitation of inmates. However, there is no information to assess if their objectives are being fulfilled and to what extent.

Definition of Domestic Violence in Ecuador

First, it is important to understand what elements are necessary for an offense to be considered domestic violence in Ecuador. The Article 48 of the Código Orgánico Integral Penal of Ecuador (2014) states that: “Para las infracciones contra la integridad sexual y reproductiva, la integridad y la libertad personal, compartir o ser parte del núcleo familiar de la víctima es una circunstancia agravante”. Moreover, Article 155 specifies that every action that consists of physical, psychological, or sexual abuse against a member of the family nucleus is violence (Código Orgánico Integral Penal, 2014).

Articles 156 and 157 emphasize that if the manifestation of violence causes lesions or damage to the mental health of a family member, the offender will be sanctioned with imprisonment and the court will determine the amount of time of the sentence depending on the level of damage. Damage is defined as disturbance, threat, manipulation, blackmail, humiliation, isolation, surveillance, harassment, or control of beliefs, decisions, or actions, and it will be sanctioned depending on its level of severity (Código Orgánico Integral Penal, 2014).

Mild damage is defined as harm to any of the dimensions of the integral functioning of an individual in the cognitive, affective, and/or somatic domains without causing impediment in the performance on daily activities. It is sanctioned with a deprivation of freedom from thirty to sixty days. The damage is considered moderate when it affects a personal area, such as work, school, or family, the effects of the damage interfere with the daily activities, and the victim requires specialized treatment in mental health facility to recover. This offense will be sanctioned with a six-month to a year sentence (Código Orgánico Integral Penal, 2014).

METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

This research study addresses the question of how and to what extent applying a family reunification program during and after male imprisonment due to domestic violence can decrease recidivism in the rehabilitation center of Latacunga. The methodology applied to analyze data is a quantitative design based on former offenders' re-incarceration rates and pretest-posttest of the Conflict Tactics Scale Revised (CTS-2) Spanish Version.

Methodology Design and Justification

This investigation proposes a recidivism prevention program to find if a more exhaustive psychological intervention can effectively reduce aggression levels in Ecuadorian families with a past history of domestic violence. The Conflict Tactics Scale Revised (CTS-2) Spanish Version will be used at the beginning and at the end of the treatment process to assess the level of interfamily conflict and violence. The results of the assessment will be analyzed to evaluate if the predisposition to violence is reduced.

The quantitative methodology is considered suitable for this study because it “produces data in the form of numbers to test hypotheses” (Gabarino & Holland, 2009, p. 7). As explained above, the numeric data will be obtained by the CTS-2 results of violence severity before and after participating on the program. Additionally, the variables that will be studied are domestic violence as the independent variable and psychological interventions for family reunification as the dependent variable. With the obtained data, the results will be analyzed and conclusions are drawn in order to evaluate the validity of the hypothesis. Also, as the program is financed by the government, the effectiveness of the program will be analyzed and proved by the reduction of recidivism rates.

Participants

The participants will be families of male prisoners at the Rehabilitation Center of Latacunga that have the intention of reestablishing ties after a mild or moderate episode of domestic violence that led to imprisonment. The first sample will be twenty families which meet the criteria and will represent the test group of the study.

Inclusionary criteria:

1. It is important that the couples are still involved in a relationship and that the partner is willing to participate in the program.
2. Families will participate voluntarily in the program.
3. Agreement and signature of Informed Consent.

Exclusionary criteria include:

1. Severe domestic violence
2. Serious mental health disorders
3. Substance abuse disorder

Families may or may not have children.

Research Tools

For this research, both partners will be assessed using the CTS-2 (Spanish Version). It is necessary to apply this scale to assess the level of aggression in the relationship. This scale is a 78-item measure of aggression, 39 items for each partner, in which responders evaluate the recurrence of violence during the previous year (Simpson, Atkis, Gattis, & Christensen, 2008). Javier Barría (2014) analyzed the Spanish version of the CTS-2 with a sample of male batterers from Chile with the objective of determining its psychometric properties. The analysis found that the internal consistency for the 39 items was of .89 in Cronbach's alpha which is considered as a high coefficient of reliability. The CTS-2 has 5 subscales:

1. Physical Assault (minor and severe)
2. Sexual Coercion (minor and severe)
3. Negotiation (cognitive and emotional)
4. Psychological Aggression (minor and major)
5. Injury (minor and severe)

Each item has eight response categories that gauge frequency from “never” to “20 or more times”. The most important outcomes from the scale are frequency, prevalence, and level of violence (Barría, 2014).

Families participating in the project will be treated for a year with family reunification interventions. For the treatment to be optimal, it should cover the male offender’s last six months of incarceration (depending on the duration of the sentence) and the first six months after release. If the sentence is less than 6 months, the treatment time after the release will be extended to complete a year. The professional must document and justify every action during the therapeutic process. The long-term objectives are: eradication of violence in the family nucleus, reestablishing relationships with the spouse and children if children are involved, impulse control, better communication, respect, resentment, conflict management, and dealing with negative emotions. The main short-time objectives are that the family relates without violence and follows visitation protocols during each session (Herman-Stahl, Kan, & McKay, 2008).

Recruitment of Participants and Data Analysis

As the program focuses on working with a specific population, the recruitment will be coordinated with the Ministry of Justice and it will follow its protocols. A detailed timetable will be established in order to assess suitable candidates for the program, the program professionals will socialize and clarify any doubts, the inmates

will be able to evaluate the process with their families and, if they agree on the conditions, they will accept to participate by signing the informed consent form approved by the Ethics Committee of Universidad San Francisco de Quito (USFQ). Next, the recruited offender and his partner will be administered the CTS-2 to assess the aggression level within the relationship in order to categorize the level of violence as mild or moderate. Then, the family will start the reunification interventions with controlled visitations during a six-month period. After the release, a three-month intervention will facilitate and consolidate the process of transition of the former offender from prison to community. After six months of therapy, the CTS-2 will be given again to evaluate the differences with the previous results.

Ethical Considerations

Before beginning the intervention, each family must agree and sign an informed consent with the specifics of every factor implicated on the research. This informed consent will be approved by the Ethics Committee of USFQ and will follow the 8.02 standard of the Ethics Code by Celia Fisher (2016), which states that psychologists must inform purpose, duration, and procedures of the research. Also, participants have the right to abandon the program at any time. It is fundamental that the researcher informs participants about any possible adverse effects and the limits of confidentiality. The results of the study and assessment measures will be used for research purposes only. Considering that this research is an experimental project, psychologists have to clarify the nature of the study to the participants (p. 10). It is important to consider that the research tools that are planned to be used are standardized and have empirical evidence of effectiveness and validity.

PROBABLE RESULTS

The aggression within the participants before the program is expected to be high and consistent with others investigations that conclude having good outcomes reducing violence (Simpson, et al. 2008). Considering the information presented in the Literature Review, it is expected that most of the objectives of this study with the participating families will be fulfilled. It is also predicted that the data of this quantitative investigation will, on average, confirm more frequent and severe episodes of aggression prior to the interventions. It is expected that, at the end of the program, the severity levels of violence will diminish and the episodes of aggression will decrease or completely cease.

According to Herman-Stahl, Kan & McKay (2008), psychological interventions with families that have gone through domestic violence are effective mainly because these interventions are based on cognitive behavioral and relaxation techniques that address power, impulsivity, and control issues. In this case, the degree in which couples engage in psychological and physical attacks against each other will be assessed by the pretest-posttest results of the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS-2). Also, for the program to be considered effective, it is projected that recidivism rates due to domestic violence will diminish in the families that follow the program's interventions.

During the first phase of the program, the mental health professional will provide the family with enough strategies to accomplish the short-term goals of the project, which are that the couple will be able to control their aggressiveness and follow visitation protocols during the therapeutic sessions (Herman-Stahl, Kan, & McKay, 2008). Likewise, it is contemplated that the therapist will help the family identify and develop positive behavioral patterns during family visitation before the offender is

released. It is assumed that these interventions will help reduce the frequency and severity of violence from frequent/moderate to rarely/mild, and from rarely/mild to null.

It is fundamental that the therapeutic sessions after the release emphasize the consolidation of positive conduct within the family towards achieving and maintaining long-term goals, which are: eradication of violence in the family nucleus, reestablishing relationships with the spouse and children (if involved), impulse control, better communication, conflict management, respect, and effectively dealing with resentment and negative emotions. Similarly, as Miller, et al. (2013) explains, these family interventions focus on promoting “child social-emotional growth, family communication, and social support by increasing protective factors and reducing risk factors” (p. 3). If this program is properly implemented, it is predicted that the participating families will be able to merge into a strong nucleus and towards recovery.

These outcomes could benefit all the family members but especially the former offender. Western (2015) stated that family intervention programs may be the most effective tool for positive reinsertion to the community and a protective factor against recidivism. Surveys have shown that if there is fluidity during the post-incarceration period and motivation for criminal withdrawal, there are strong probabilities of good outcomes. Additionally, family support increases the possibilities of finding and maintain a job (Western, 2015).

It is important to consider that the participants of this program are a vulnerable population and that the government would expect this project to be financially sustainable. For this reason, this program is projected to work as a prevention measure that would diminish the rates of recidivism, which would result in a financial benefit for the Ecuadorian Rehabilitation System. Moreover, it would benefit the well-being of several Ecuadorian families and communities.

Discussion

To finalize the investigation, the research question: *“How and to what extent applying a family reunification program during and after male imprisonment for domestic violence can decrease recidivism rates at the rehabilitation center of Latacunga?”* will be answered considering every aspect stated above.

First, it is important to take into account that the main goal of this project is to decrease recidivism rates in cases of imprisonment for domestic violence. Several studies have shown that family therapy could be a good option for this population. Western (2015) informs that imprisonment segregates, but family support and social integration can have a positive impact in reducing the rates of recidivism, particularly when the cause for imprisonment is closely related to family problems. It is important to emphasize that the Spanish Version of the Conflict Tactics Scale Revised (CTS-2) is considered a good measurement tool to assess the degree in which couples engage in psychological and physical attacks against each other and to statistically evaluate the rates of aggression.

The extent to which family reunification programs can effectively reduce the frequency of domestic violence has been examined in multiple research studies. Simpson, et al. (2008) states that treatment with couples' therapy decreases the frequency of psychological low-level aggression. It is important that the therapist develops the skills to properly assess the family and to identify the goals and challenges of every treatment phase. For example, it is imperative that the professional focus on adherence to treatment because maintaining a follow-up, especially after prison release, tends to be complicated (Simpson, et al. 2008). Moreover, Friedman et al. (2014) emphasized the fact that every family has different dynamics and that especially in the case of disrupted environments, it is essential to consider the specific situation between

the members of the family to identify what factors to contemplate when drafting therapeutic interventions (p. 3).

It is important to take into account that the interventions during and after imprisonment must have the objective of maintaining family stability during the process of change. This is described by Duwe & Clark (2011) as a continuum of care from the institution to the community in order to effectively achieve a general sense of well-being and safety for the families that are involved (p. 292).

Conclusions

In conclusion, a family reunification program can be expected to have positive outcomes in reducing the frequency of low-level (mild or moderate damage) episodes of domestic violence in Ecuadorian Families. The Conflict Tactics Scale Revised (CTS-2) results and rates of recidivism can produce statistically significant data to assess the effectiveness of the family interventions from a methodological perspective.

It is expected that applying a family reunification program during and after male imprisonment for domestic violence will decrease the rates of recidivism at the Rehabilitation Center of Latacunga. For this reason, the outcomes of this program will likely benefit all the participant families and particularly the offenders. The hypothesis of this research study can be helpful to reveal the need for the Ecuadorian government to develop prevention programs and psychological interventions that can assist vulnerable communities and prevent recidivism, which can be regarded as a social investment.

Limitations

There are some primary limitations to this study that can impact the validity of the results. First, education level was not considered, and it would have been important to evaluate if every participant had the same capacity to answer the CTS-2

appropriately, with a full understanding of its items. This could affect the results regarding interfamilial violence and aggression levels.

Second, because the study is based on a specific population and strict exclusionary criteria were implemented to reject offenders that were convicted of severe domestic violence, the sample of participants is small. Additionally, due to the fact that the resources to finance this kind of programs are limited, it is better to work with a small sample in order to confirm its effectiveness. However, a larger sample would be necessary for the conclusions of this study to be statistically significant.

A limitation regarding the methodology of this study is that other scales that are not limited to measure the levels and frequency of aggression should have been used to assess behavioral patterns. In families, there are lots of factors that could influence aggressive behavior, and the lack of other measurements that could have given a broader idea about the family dynamics and individual characteristics of each family member can be considered a limiting factor.

It is also important to contemplate the fact that the Ecuadorian Ministry of Justice does not investigate recidivism rates, which are essential to assess the effectiveness of prevention programs. The lack of information regarding recidivism rates is another important limiting factor of this study.

Future Implications

For future studies, it would be important to have a better understanding of the participant families' dynamics. It could be helpful to test the families every two months during the program with the CTS-2 to have a better idea of the frequency and severity of violence within the relationship before, during, and after the program. Also, it could be appropriate to analyze the level of satisfaction in the relationship and the sense of individual well-being to have a broader perspective about each member of the family.

REFERENCES

- Berg, M. & Huebner, B. (2011). Reentry and the ties that bind: An examination of social ties, employment, and recidivism. *Justice Quarterly*, 28 382 – 410
- CEDHU. (2008). El Sistema Penitenciario Ecuatoriano, [Ecuadorian Penitentiary System]. *United Nations Human Rights* 1 – 16
- Celi, E. (2014). Más de 24000 familias separadas por los barrotes. [More than 24000 families separated by bars]. *El Comercio: Ecuador*
- Clarke, P. (2018, March 3). What is felony domestic violence? *LegalMatch*. Retrieved from <https://www.legalmatch.com/law-library/article/felony-domestic-violence.html>
- Código Orgánico Integral Penal. Artículo 48. Registro Oficial No. 180 de 10 de febrero de 2014
- Código Orgánico Integral Penal. Artículo 155. Registro Oficial No. 180 de 10 de febrero de 2014
- Código Orgánico Integral Penal. Artículo 156. Registro Oficial No. 180 de 10 de febrero de 2014
- Código Orgánico Integral Penal. Artículo 157. Registro Oficial No. 180 de 10 de febrero de 2014
- Cornejo, J. (2017). El encarcelamiento. [The imprisonment]. *Revista Judicial Derecho Ecuador* 2(5) 2 – 5
- Consejo Nacional de Rehabilitación Social. (2009). Código de ejecución de penas y de rehabilitación social. [Penalties and Social Rehabilitation Reforms].
- Cunneen, C. & Luke, G. (2007). Recidivism and the Effectiveness of Criminal Justice Interventions: Juvenile Offenders and Post Release Support, *Current Issues in Criminal Justice* 19(2) 197 – 210

- Duwe, G. & Clark, V. (2011). Blessed Be the Social Tie That Binds: The Effects of Prison Visitation on Offender Recidivism, *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 24(3) 271 – 296
- El Universo. (2013, December, 10). Cedhu denuncia violaciones a Derechos Humanos en Ecuador. [Cedhu reports human rights violations in Ecuador]. *El Universo*, Retrieved from <https://www.eluniverso.com/noticias/2013/12/10/nota/1898796/cedhu-denuncia-violaciones-derechos-humanos>
- Fisher, C. (2016). *Decoding the ethics code: A practical guide for psychologists* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE
- Font, N., Fernández, C., Escuriol, R., Roig, A., Leyton, H. & Moreno, M. (2006). La Cárcel en el Entorno Familiar, Estudio de las repercusiones del encarcelamiento sobre las familias: problemáticas y necesidades. [Prison in the family environment, Study of the incarceration repercussions on families: problems and needs]. Barcelona: OSPDH
- Friedman, D., Bradshaw, C., King, H., Warshak, R. & Webb, B. (2014). A systematic Approach to Reunification Therapy. *Continuing Legal Education* Retrieved from <http://www.texas counseling.org/articles/ASystematicApproachtoReunificationTherapy.pdf>
- Garbarino, S. & Holland, J. (2009). Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in Impact Evaluation and Measuring Results. *Governance and Social Development Resource Centre* Retrieved from <http://www.gsdr.org/docs/open/eirs4.pdf>
- Hairston, C. & Oliver, W. (2006). *Safe return: Domestic violence and prisoner reentry: Experience of black women and men*. New York: Vera Institute of Justice

- Herman-Stahl, M., Kan, M. & McKay, T. (2008). *Incarceration and the family: A Review of Research and Promising Approaches for Serving Fathers and Families*. United States: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
- Marti, J. & Cid, J. (2013). Imprisonment, family ties and recidivism. Exploring the limits of familism, *Revista Internacional de Sociología* 73(1) 1 – 14
- Miller, A., Perryman, J., Markovitz, L., Frazen, S., Cochran, S. & Brown, S. (2013). Strengthening incarcerated families: evaluating a pilot program for children of incarcerated parents and their caregivers. *Family Relations* 62(4) 1- 16
- Pollock, J. (2009). *Prisons Today and Tomorrow*. Ontario, Canada: Jones & Bartlett Publisher
- Reglamento del Sistema de Rehabilitación Social. Artículo 51. Registro Oficial No. 003 de 7 de noviembre de 2017
- Reglamento del Sistema de Rehabilitación Social. Artículo 57. Registro Oficial No. 003 de 7 de noviembre de 2017
- Simpson, L., Atkis, D., Gattis, K. & Christensen, A. (2008). Low-Level Relationship Aggression and Couple Therapy Outcomes, *Journal of Family Psychology* 22(1) 102 – 111
- Solis, G. & Vivanco, R. (2016). Cambios que se producen en la familia al tener a un integrante encarcelado [Changes that happen in families that have an incarcerated member]. *Pensamiento y Acción Interdisciplinaria* 1(1) 45 – 58
- The Connecticut Statistical Analysis Center. (2010). Incarceration History & Age. *Research, Analysis & Evaluation*. Retrieved from http://www.ct.gov/opm/lib/opm/cjppd/cjresearch/recidivismstudy/incarceration_history_and_age.pdf

- Visher, C & Travis, J. (2003). Transitions from prison to community: Understanding Individual Pathways, *Annual Review of Sociology* 29(1) 89 – 133
- Walmsley, R. (2016). World Prison Population List. *World Prison Brief*. Retrieved from http://www.prisonstudies.org/sites/default/files/resources/downloads/world_prison_population_list_11th_edition_0.pdf
- Western, B., Braga, A., Davis, J. & Sirois, C. (2015). Stress and Hardship after Prison, *American Journal of Sociology* 120(5) 1512 – 1547

ANNEXED A: APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF THE STUDY AND INFORMED CONSENT FORM



Comité de Ética de Investigación en Seres Humanos
Universidad San Francisco de Quito
El Comité de Revisión Institucional de la USFQ
The Institutional Review Board of the USFQ

SOLICITUD PARA APROBACION DE UN ESTUDIO DE INVESTIGACION

INSTRUCCIONES:

1. Antes de remitir este formulario al CBE, se debe solicitar vía electrónica un código para incluirlo, a comitebioetica@usfq.edu.ec
2. Enviar solo archivos digitales. Esta solicitud será firmada en su versión final, sea de manera presencial o enviando un documento escaneado.
3. Este documento debe completarse con la información del protocolo del estudio que debe servir al investigador como respaldo.
4. Favor leer cada uno de los parámetros verificando que se ha completado toda la información que se solicita antes de enviarla.

DATOS DE IDENTIFICACIÓN
Título de la Investigación
Family Reunification Program at the Rehabilitation Center of Latacunga to Reduce Recidivism in Male Prisoners Convicted of Domestic Violence
Investigador Principal <i>Nombre completo, afiliación institucional y dirección electrónica</i>
Rafaela Joyce Lepoutre Rose, Universidad San Francisco de Quito, rafaellalepoutre@hotmail.com
Co-investigadores <i>Nombres completos, afiliación institucional y dirección electrónica. Especificar si no lo hubiera</i>
No aplica.
Persona de contacto <i>Nombre y datos de contacto incluyendo teléfonos fijo, celular y dirección electrónica</i>
Dominique Elizabeth Dobronski Pombo, 022794127, 0995617076, dedobronski@gmail.com
Nombre de director de tesis y correo electrónico <i>Solo si es que aplica</i>
Mariel Paz y Miño, mpazymino@usfq.edu.ec
Fecha de inicio de la investigación <i>Enero 2018</i>
Fecha de término de la investigación <i>Mayo 2018</i>
Financiamiento <i>No aplica.</i>

DESCRIPCIÓN DEL ESTUDIO
Objetivo General <i>Se debe responder tres preguntas: qué? cómo? y para qué?</i>
Analizar el efecto que tiene un programa de reunificación de un año en familias de presos sentenciados por violencia doméstica. Se evaluará con el Conflict Tactics Scale Revised (CTS-2) Spanish Version antes y después de la intervención psicoterapéutica para medir el efecto del programa en la frecuencia, prevalencia y nivel de violencia en las familias de presos por violencia doméstica del Centro de Rehabilitación de Latacunga con la intención de disminuir los niveles de reinserción.
Objetivos Específicos
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluar el nivel de violencia con el Conflict Tactics Scale Revised (CTS-2) Spanish Version. • Intervenir por una duración de un año, seis meses durante el encarcelamiento y seis meses después dependiendo de la duración de la sentencia. • Evaluar nuevamente con el Conflict Tactics Scale Revised (CTS-2) Spanish Version. • Analizar los cambios en los resultados de la evaluación antes y después de la intervención con los

<p>niveles de reinserción.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analizar el efecto de un programa de reunificación familiar en las familias ecuatorianas afectadas por violencia doméstica.
<p>Diseño y Metodología del estudio <i>Explicar el tipo de estudio (por ejemplo cualitativo, cuantitativo, con enfoque experimental, cuasi-experimental, pre-experimental; estudio descriptivo, transversal, de caso, in-vitro...) Explicar además el universo, la muestra, cómo se la calculó y un breve resumen de cómo se realizará el análisis de los datos, incluyendo las variables primarias y secundarias..</i></p>
<p>El estudio es de tipo cuantitativo con un diseño de pre prueba-post prueba. Para el propósito de esta investigación se requiere que participen 20 familias de presos encarcelados por violencia doméstica en el Centro de Rehabilitación de Latacunga. A estas familias, se les aplicará el Conflict Tactics Scale Revised (CTS-2) Spanish Version para definir la situación de violencia y se excluirán familias con violencia doméstica severa, fuertes trastornos psiquiátricos, y abuso de sustancias. Se intervendrá por un año durante y después de la sentencia y al culminar, se analizará si existe una diferencia en frecuencia, prevalencia y nivel de violencia con el post prueba, así como los índices de reinserción.</p>
<p>Procedimientos <i>Los pasos a seguir desde el primer contacto con los sujetos participantes, su reclutamiento o contacto con la muestra/datos.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contactar a los presos por violencia doméstica e informar sobre el programa. 2. Contactar a las familias de los voluntarios, explicara en detalle el estudio para confirmar su participación y definir la aptitud de la familia al programa con los criterios de inclusión y exclusión. 3. Firmar consentimiento informado. 4. Evaluar a las familias que aceptaron ser participantes con el Conflict Tactics Scale Revised (CTS-2) Spanish Version 5. Intervenir con las intervenciones del programa de reunificación durante y después de la terminación de la sentencia por una duración de un año. 6. Al culminar la intervención, evaluar nuevamente con el Conflict Tactics Scale Revised (CTS-2) Spanish Version 7. Analizar si existe una diferencia entre los puntajes antes y después de la intervención así como en los puntajes de reinserción al Centro de Rehabilitación.
<p>Recolección y almacenamiento de los datos <i>Para garantizar la confidencialidad y privacidad, de quién y donde se recolectarán datos; almacenamiento de datos—donde y por cuánto tiempo; quienes tendrán acceso a los datos, qué se hará con los datos cuando termine la investigación</i></p>
<p>Dentro del programa se respetarán todas las consideraciones éticas relacionadas a un estudio con individuos en este caso familias. Todos los participantes deberán encontrarse en nivel de voluntarios firmarán un consentimiento informado antes de la evaluación e intervención. En este se establecerán especificaciones sobre los objetivos del estudio y se confirmará que la participación es completamente voluntaria sin repercusiones negativas en ámbitos laborales o personales si deciden no participar o retirarse en cualquier momento del estudio y todas las implicaciones que este conlleva como los límites de confidencialidad y tipos de intervenciones. Todas las evaluaciones que se tomen a los participantes serán utilizadas solo para términos de la investigación y destruidas tan pronto termine el estudio.</p>
<p>Herramientas y equipos <i>Incluyendo cuestionarios y bases de datos, descripción de equipos</i></p>
<p>Conflict Tactics Scale Revised (CTS-2) Spanish Version</p>

JUSTIFICACIÓN CIENTÍFICA DEL ESTUDIO

Se debe demostrar con suficiente evidencia por qué es importante este estudio y qué tipo de aporte ofrecerá a la comunidad científica.

Este tipo de programas de reunificación familiar tienen poca investigación en Ecuador, y dentro de la información pública no se conoce que tipo de intervenciones psicológicas se realizan dentro de los Centros de Rehabilitación. Es por eso y con la intención de mejorar la situación en muchas familias ecuatorianas se considera importante proponer un programa de intervención para disminuir la violencia doméstica y fomentar la reunificación de presos a sus familias. Aparte, este proyecto

tiene como objetivo disminuir los índices de reinserción a las cárceles por violencia doméstica.

Referencias bibliográficas completas en formato APA

Berg, M. & Huebner, B. (2011). Reentry and the ties that bind: An examination of social ties, employment, and recidivism. *Justice Quarterly*, 28 382 – 410

CEDHU. (2008). El Sistema Penitenciario Ecuatoriano, [Ecuadorian Penitentiary System]. *United Nations Human Rights* 1 – 16

Celi, E. (2014). Más de 24000 familias separadas por los barrotes. [More than 24000 families separated by bars]. *El Comercio*: Ecuador

Clarke, P. (2018, March 3). What is felony domestic violence? *LegalMatch*. Retrieved from <https://www.legalmatch.com/law-library/article/felony-domestic-violence.html>

Código Orgánico Integral Penal. Artículo 48. Registro Oficial No. 180 de 10 de febrero de 2014

Código Orgánico Integral Penal. Artículo 155. Registro Oficial No. 180 de 10 de febrero de 2014

Código Orgánico Integral Penal. Artículo 156. Registro Oficial No. 180 de 10 de febrero de 2014

Código Orgánico Integral Penal. Artículo 157. Registro Oficial No. 180 de 10 de febrero de 2014

Cornejo, J. (2017). El encarcelamiento. [The imprisonment]. *Revista Judicial Derecho Ecuador* 2(5) 2 – 5

Consejo Nacional de Rehabilitación Social. (2009). Código de ejecución de penas y de rehabilitación social. [Penalties and Social Rehabilitation Reforms].

Cunneen, C. & Luke, G. (2007). Recidivism and the Effectiveness of Criminal Justice Interventions: Juvenile Offenders and Post Release Support, *Current Issues in Criminal Justice* 19(2) 197 – 210

Duwe, G. & Clark, V. (2011). Blessed Be the Social Tie That Binds: The Effects of Prison Visitation on Offender Recidivism, *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 24(3) 271 – 296

El Universo. (2013, December, 10). Cedhu denuncia violaciones a Derechos Humanos en Ecuador. [Cedhu reports human rights violations in Ecuador]. *El Universo*, Retrieved from <https://www.eluniverso.com/noticias/2013/12/10/nota/1898796/cedhu-denuncia-violaciones-derechos-humanos>

Fisher, C. (2016). *Decoding the ethics code: A practical guide for psychologists* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE

Font, N., Fernández, C., Escurriol, R., Roig, A., Leyton, H. & Moreno, M. (2006). La Cárcel en el Entorno Familiar, Estudio de las repercusiones del encarcelamiento sobre las familias: problemáticas y necesidades. [Prison in the family environment, Study of the incarceration repercussions on families: problems and needs]. Barcelona: OSPDH

Friedman, D., Bradshaw, C., King, H., Warshak, R. & Webb, B. (2014). A systematic Approach to

- Reunification Therapy. *Continuing Legal Education* Retrieved from <http://www.texasounseling.org/articles/ASystematicApproachtoReunificationTherapy.pdf>
- Garbarino, S. & Holland, J. (2009). Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in Impact Evaluation and Measuring Results. *Governance and Social Development Resource Centre* Retrieved from <http://www.gsdr.org/docs/open/eirs4.pdf>
- Hairston, C. & Oliver, W. (2006). *Safe return: Domestic violence and prisoner reentry: Experience of black women and men*. New York: Vera Institute of Justice
- Herman-Stahl, M., Kan, M. & McKay, T. (2008). *Incarceration and the family: A Review of Research and Promising Approaches for Serving Fathers and Families*. United States: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
- Marti, J. & Cid, J. (2013). Imprisonment, family ties and recidivism. Exploring the limits of familism, *Revista Internacional de Sociología* 73(1) 1 – 14
- Miller, A., Perryman, J., Markovitz, L., Frazen, S., Cochran, S. & Brown, S. (2013). Strengthening incarcerated families: evaluating a pilot program for children of incarcerated parents and their caregivers. *Family Relations* 62(4) 1- 16
- Pollock, J. (2009). *Prisons Today and Tomorrow*. Ontario, Canada: Jones & Bartlett Publisher
- Reglamento del Sistema de Rehabilitación Social. Artículo 51. Registro Oficial No. 003 de 7 de noviembre de 2017
- Reglamento del Sistema de Rehabilitación Social. Artículo 57. Registro Oficial No. 003 de 7 de noviembre de 2017
- Simpson, L., Atkis, D., Gattis, K. & Christensen, A. (2008). Low-Level Relationship Aggression and Couple Therapy Outcomes, *Journal of Family Psychology* 22(1) 102 – 111
- Solis, G. & Vivanco, R. (2016). Cambios que se producen en la familia al tener a un integrante encarcelado [Changes that happen in families that have an incarcerated member]. *Pensamiento y Acción Interdisciplinaria* 1(1) 45 – 58
- The Connecticut Statistical Analysis Center. (2010). Incarceration History & Age. *Research, Analysis & Evaluation*. Retrieved from http://www.ct.gov/opm/lib/opm/cjppd/cjresearch/recidivismstudy/incarceration_history_and_age.pdf
- Visher, C & Travis, J. (2003). Transitions from prison to community: Understanding Individual Pathways, *Annual Review of Sociology* 29(1) 89 – 133
- Walmsley, R. (2016). World Prison Population List. *World Prison Brief*. Retrieved from http://www.prisonstudies.org/sites/default/files/resources/downloads/world_prison_population_list_11th_edition_0.pdf
- Western, B., Braga, A., Davis, J. & Sirois, C. (2015). Stress and Hardship after Prison, *American Journal of Sociology* 120(5) 1512 – 1547

DESCRIPCIÓN DE LOS ASPECTOS ÉTICOS DEL ESTUDIO	
Criterios para la selección de los participantes	<i>Tomando en cuenta los principios de beneficencia, equidad, justicia y respeto</i>
Los criterios de inclusión para familias son que la pareja tenga la intención de mantenerse junta, participación voluntaria, firma del consentimiento informado, sentencia por violencia doméstica leve o moderada. Puede o no haber presencia de hijos.	
Riesgos	<i>Describir los riesgos para los participantes en el estudio, incluyendo riesgos físico, emocionales y psicológicos aunque sean mínimos y cómo se los minimizará</i>
Uno de los mayores riesgos para la familia es que ciertas intervenciones del programa sean altamente confrontativas hacia ellos mismos u otros miembros lo que podría llevar a sensaciones fuertes y abrumadoras. Otro posible riesgo es que exista aumento de la violencia lo que podría poner a la familia en situaciones de peligro y alejamiento por seguridad. Es importante recalcar que las intervenciones que se realizarían son estandarizadas y con evidencia empírica de su eficacia.	
Beneficios para los participantes	<i>Incluyendo resultados de exámenes y otros; solo de este estudio y cómo los recibirán</i>
El óptimo y principal beneficio para la familia es la terminación de la violencia intrafamiliar; si no sería la disminución en nivel, prevalencia y frecuencia de la misma. Aparte, con la erradicación de la violencia se considera que no existiría otra sentencia por esta causa.	
Ventajas potenciales a la sociedad	<i>Incluir solo ventajas que puedan medirse o a lo que se pueda tener acceso</i>
La mayor ventaja para la sociedad sería un mejor ambiente para las familias ecuatorianas que sufren de violencia doméstica, así como disminución de la cantidad de presos por la reducción esperada de los índices de reinserción.	
Derechos y opciones de los participantes del estudio	<i>Incluyendo la opción de no participar o retirarse del estudio a pesar de haber aceptado participar en un inicio.</i>
Las participantes pueden decidir no participar o retirarse en cualquier momento del estudio sin ningún tipo de repercusión negativa.	
Seguridad y Confidencialidad de los datos	<i>Describir de manera detallada y explícita como va a proteger los derechos de participantes</i>
Dentro del programa se respetarán todas las consideraciones éticas relacionadas a un estudio con individuos en este caso familias. Todos los participantes deberán encontrarse en nivel de voluntarios firmarán un consentimiento informado antes de la evaluación e intervención. En este se establecerán especificaciones sobre los objetivos del estudio y se confirmará que la participación es completamente voluntaria sin repercusiones negativas en ámbitos laborales o personales si deciden no participar o retirarse en cualquier momento del estudio y todas las implicaciones que este conlleva como los límites de confidencialidad y tipos de intervenciones. Todas las evaluaciones que se tomen a los participantes serán utilizadas solo para términos de la investigación y destruidas tan pronto termine el estudio. Aparte, se garantiza que todas las herramientas que se utilizarían son estandarizadas y con evidencia empírica de su eficacia.	
Consentimiento informado	<i>Quién, cómo y dónde se explicará el formulario/estudio. Ajustar el formulario o en su defecto el formulario de no aplicación o modificación del formulario</i>
Cada participante deberá firmar un consentimiento informado antes del estudio.	
Responsabilidades del investigador y co-investigadores dentro de este estudio.	
El investigador tiene la responsabilidad de respetar a todas las familias participantes de estudio y deberá respetar las consideraciones éticas establecidas anteriormente.	

Analizar si existe una diferencia entre los puntajes antes y después de la intervención.									
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

CERTIFICACIÓN:

1. Certifico no haber recolectado ningún dato ni haber realizado ninguna intervención con sujetos humanos, muestras o datos. Sí () No ()
2. Certifico que los documentos adjuntos a esta solicitud han sido revisados y aprobados por mi director de tesis. Sí () No () No Aplica ()

Firma del investigador: _____ (con tinta azul)

Fecha de envío al Comité de Bioética de la USFQ: _____



Comité de Ética de Investigación en Seres Humanos
Universidad San Francisco de Quito
 El Comité de Revisión Institucional de la USFQ
 The Institutional Review Board of the USFQ

Formulario Consentimiento Informado

Título de la investigación: Family Reunification Program at the Rehabilitation Center of Latacunga to Reduce Recidivism in Male Prisoners Convicted of Domestic Violence

Organización del investigador *Universidad San Francisco de Quito*

Nombre del investigador principal *Dominique Elizabeth Dobronski Pombo*

Datos de localización del investigador principal *022794127, 0995617076, dedobronski@gmail.com*

DESCRIPCIÓN DEL ESTUDIO

Introducción (Se incluye un ejemplo de texto. Debe tomarse en cuenta que el lenguaje que se utilice en este documento no puede ser subjetivo; debe ser lo más claro, conciso y sencillo posible; deben evitarse términos técnicos y en lo posible se los debe reemplazar con una explicación)

Este formulario incluye un resumen del propósito de este estudio. Usted puede hacer todas las preguntas que quiera para entender claramente su participación y despejar sus dudas. Para participar puede tomarse el tiempo que necesite para consultar con su familia y/o amigos si desea participar o no. Usted junto a su familia ha sido invitado a participar en una investigación sobre el efecto de un programa de reunificación para disminuir la violencia doméstica y ayudar a su reinserción a la familia.

Propósito del estudio (incluir una breve descripción del estudio, incluyendo el número de participantes, evitando términos técnicos e incluyendo solo información que el participante necesita conocer para decidirse a participar o no en el estudio)

El estudio consta de 20 participantes que son familias de presos del Centro de Rehabilitación de Latacunga que tiene como propósito erradicar o disminuir la violencia en estas familias por medio intervenciones psicológicas y así disminuir los índices de reinserción a las cárceles por este delito.

Descripción de los procedimientos (breve descripción de los pasos a seguir en cada etapa y el tiempo que tomará cada intervención en que participará el sujeto)

1. Contactar a los presos por violencia doméstica e informar sobre el programa.
2. Contactar a las familias de los voluntarios, explicara en detalle el estudio para confirmar su participación y definir la aptitud de la familia al programa con los criterios de inclusión y exclusión.
3. Firmar consentimiento informado.
4. Evaluar a las familias que aceptaron ser participantes con el Conflict Tactics Scale Revised (CTS-2) Spanish Version
5. Intervenir con las intervenciones del programa de reunificación durante y después de la terminación de la sentencia por una duración de un año.
6. Al culminar la intervención, evaluar nuevamente con el Conflict Tactics Scale Revised (CTS-2) Spanish Version
7. Analizar si existe una diferencia entre los puntajes antes y después de la intervención así como en los puntajes de reinserción al Centro de Rehabilitación.

Riesgos y beneficios (explicar los riesgos para los participantes en detalle, aunque sean mínimos, incluyendo riesgos físicos, emocionales y/o psicológicos a corto y/o largo plazo, detallando cómo el investigador minimizará estos riesgos; incluir además los beneficios tanto para los participantes como para la sociedad, siendo explícito en cuanto a cómo y cuándo recibirán estos beneficios)

Uno de los mayores riesgos para la familia es que ciertas intervenciones del programa sean altamente confrontativas hacia ellos mismos u otros miembros lo que podría llevar a sensaciones fuertes y abrumadoras. Otro posible riesgo es que exista aumento de la violencia lo que podría poner a la familia en situaciones de peligro y alejamiento por seguridad.

El óptimo y principal beneficio para la familia es la terminación de la violencia intrafamiliar; si no sería la disminución en nivel, prevalencia y frecuencia de la misma. Aparte, con la erradicación de la violencia se considera que no existiría otra sentencia por esta causa.

Confidencialidad de los datos <i>(se incluyen algunos ejemplos de texto)</i>	
Para nosotros es muy importante mantener su privacidad, por lo cual aplicaremos las medidas necesarias para que nadie conozca su identidad ni tenga acceso a sus datos personales:	
1A) Si se toman muestras de su persona estas muestras serán utilizadas solo para esta investigación y destruidas tan pronto termine el estudio <i>(si aplica)</i> ó	
1B) Si usted está de acuerdo, las muestras que se tomen de su persona serán utilizadas para esta investigación y luego se las guardarán para futuras investigaciones removiendo cualquier información que pueda identificarlo <i>(si aplica)</i>	
3) Su nombre no será mencionado en los reportes o publicaciones.	
4) El Comité de Bioética de la USFQ podrá tener acceso a sus datos en caso de que surgieran problemas en cuando a la seguridad y confidencialidad de la información o de la ética en el estudio.	
Derechos y opciones del participante <i>(se incluye un ejemplo de texto)</i>	
Usted puede decidir no participar y si decide no participar solo debe decírselo al investigador principal o a la persona que le explica este documento. Además aunque decida participar puede retirarse del estudio cuando lo desee, sin que ello afecte los beneficios de los que goza en este momento.	
Usted no recibirá ningún pago ni tendrá que pagar absolutamente nada por participar en este estudio.	
Información de contacto	
Si usted tiene alguna pregunta sobre el estudio por favor llame al siguiente teléfono 0995617076 que pertenece a Dominique Dobronski, o envíe un correo electrónico a dedobronski@gmail.com	
Si usted tiene preguntas sobre este formulario puede contactar al Dr. William F. Waters, Presidente del Comité de Bioética de la USFQ, al siguiente correo electrónico: comitebioetica@usfq.edu.ec	

Consentimiento informado <i>(Es responsabilidad del investigador verificar que los participantes tengan un nivel de comprensión lectora adecuado para entender este documento. En caso de que no lo tuvieran el documento debe ser leído y explicado frente a un testigo, que corroborará con su firma que lo que se dice de manera oral es lo mismo que dice el documento escrito)</i>	
Comprendo mi participación en este estudio. Me han explicado los riesgos y beneficios de participar en un lenguaje claro y sencillo. Todas mis preguntas fueron contestadas. Me permitieron contar con tiempo suficiente para tomar la decisión de participar y me entregaron una copia de este formulario de consentimiento informado. Acepto voluntariamente participar en esta investigación.	
Firma del participante	Fecha
Firma del testigo <i>(si aplica)</i>	Fecha
Nombre del investigador que obtiene el consentimiento informado	
Firma del investigador	Fecha