

95-IJ-CX-0054

179968

**BEYOND ARREST: THE PORTLAND, OREGON
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE EXPERIMENT**

FINAL REPORT

PROPERTY OF
National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)
Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20849-6000

**Annette Jolin
William Feyerherm
Robert Fountain
Sharon Friedman**

May, 1998

*Appendix E -
Interviewers Manual -
Missing Pages 1-6
and 9. Authors
Contacted for missing
pages.
2 MAY 2000 P. Croxin*

Prepared under Grant No. 95-IJ-CX-0054 from the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the U. S. Department of Justice.

**BEYOND ARREST: THE PORTLAND, OREGON
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE EXPERIMENT**

FINAL REPORT

May, 1998

**Annette Jolin, Professor
Hatfield School of Government, Portland State University
William Feyerherm, Vice-Provost
Graduate Studies and Research, Portland State University
Robert Fountain, Associate Professor
Department of Mathematical Science, Portland State University
Sharon Friedman, Doctoral Candidate
Hatfield School of Government, Portland State University**

Prepared under Grant No. 95-IJ-CX-0054 from the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U. S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the U. S. Department of Justice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Portland, Oregon Domestic Violence Experiment was carried out with the assistance and expertise of many people. With gratitude we acknowledge the contributions of the following persons.

VICTIMS

More than 500 Portland women participated in this study. Despite the emotional turmoil caused by the violent event that prompted their partner's arrest these women set aside time and energy to answer our questions. It is to them that we express our deepest gratitude. While their individual identities can not be revealed, their combined individual stories bear powerful testimony to the suffering intimate violence produces in women's lives. Many of the women told us that they hoped their participation would make a difference, if not for them, then perhaps for others like them. Their generosity added a dimension to our inquiry that only they could provide.

PORTLAND POLICE BUREAU

Chief Charles Moose's acceptance of a citizen initiated proposal to create a Domestic Violence Reduction Unit (DVRU) and his strong belief in the "problem solving approach" to policing initiatives are the foundation upon which this study rests. Without his support, this study would never have been initiated. But there were many others in the Portland Police Bureau who assisted in various ways once the study was under way. DVRU Captains Robert Brooks, Marianne Heisler and Dave Butzer, Lieutenant Mike Pace, Sergeant Jim Maciag and Officers Scott Forbes, Linda Johnson, John Laws, Mike Donohue,, Rick Miller, Pam Moen, Steve Morrow, and Anne Sundstrom. We also thank police bureau staff persons Sharon Benson, Juanita Stokes, Juanita Hernandez, and Debbie Haugen.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

We are greatly indebted to the research staff who worked with us on this project. They were the ones who handled the complex as well as the mundane of the day-to-day operation. At the core of this group were three highly motivated and talented women, Sharon Friedman, Andrea U'Ren and Joy Webber. We also thank Stacey Kowalski for her willingness to help out during a staffing crisis early on. They had assistance from Brian Anderson, Karen Angeline, Jason Bush, Liz Greason, Tarisa Hopkins, Charles Murch, Joseph Rojas, April Sims, Kelly Stanway, and Suzanne Wallace. Our interviewers had the arguably most taxing job on this project. They, more than any of us, experienced the emotional strains associated with balancing the needs of victims with the requirements of the study design. Our special thanks goes to Coryll Martin and Lori Patterson who conducted the majority of the interviews. The other interviewers were Leslie Bagon, Elizabeth Burkholder, Courtney Cole, Carrie Cutler, Erin Galvin, Malaina Guzman, Elaine Inman, Rebecca Jenkins, Julie O'Donnell, Amber Raider, Alaine Toomey, Kim Van Vu, Vy Van Vu, Kristin Warden, Shaun Wardinsky, and Emmaly Williams.

MULTNOMAH COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

Sheriff Dan Noelle provided us with the needed access to his agency's data base to permit tracking our cases from street arrest to jail booking. Kristi Johnson and Sue Griffin patiently assisted us throughout this process.

MULTNOMAH COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

District Attorney Mike Schrunk was an early supporter of this project. His deputy district attorneys Helen Smith, the chief senior deputy and Rod Underhill, the senior deputy in their Domestic Violence Unit, served as valuable and patient consultants to our research team. However, it was Tom Simpson, the Senior Fiscal Specialist who bore the brunt of our requests for assistance when it came time to collect prosecution data for our nearly 1000 study cases. His expertise and willing cooperation were greatly appreciated.

STATE COURT MULTNOMAH COUNTY

Betsy Welch, the Chief, Family Law Judge and Jerry Cooper, the Court Administrator were both members of the project advisory board. Their willingness to consult directly with us and refer us to others who could be of assistance was invaluable. We are deeply grateful to Neal Jappott, the Court Administrator's Executive Assistant for helping us locate sentencing and restraining order information for our study cases.

MULTNOMAH COUNTY ADULT COMMUNITY JUSTICE SERVICES

Elyse Clawson joined our advisory board when she replaced Tamara Holden, as the agency's director. We appreciated her willingness to continue her agency's assistance with our project. Special thanks go to Rachel DeMartini and Mark Hess of the agency's domestic violence unit.

ADVISORY BOARD

Our special thanks go to the members of our project Advisory Board: Charles Moose, Chief of Police, Michael Schrunk, Multnomah County District Attorney, Betsy Welch, Chief Judge Family Court, Jerome Cooper, Trail Court Administrator, Elyse Clawson, Director Adult Community Justice Services, Judith Armatta, Esq., Dr. Chiquita Rollins, Multnomah County Family Violence Coordinator, Amazonas Olivella, Chair Women of Color Caucus-Oregon Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE

Cindy Nahabedian succeeded Stephanie Bourques as project manager about mid-way through the study. Each showed remarkable adeptness at responding to requests for guidance without impinging on the flexibility we needed to complete the project. We appreciated their trust and sensitive support.

For his technical assistance with the computerized randomization program we are indebted to Dr. George Chou and to Richard U'Ren with special gratitude for many hours of thoughtful editing.

LIST OF TABLES

| <u>Number</u> | <u>TITLE</u> | <u>PAGE</u> |
|---------------|--|-------------|
| Table 4.1 | Case Characteristics of Misdemeanor Domestic Violence Cases in which the Batterer was Arrested on the Scene: Study Sample, Initial Interview Sample, and Treatment/Control Sub-Samples. | 35 |
| Table 4.2 | Batterer Characteristics: The Study Sample, Initial Interview Sample, and Treatment/Control Sub-Samples. | 37 |
| Table 4.3 | Victim Characteristics: The Study Sample, Initial Interview Sample, and Treatment/Control Group Sub-Samples. | 39 |
| Table 4.4 | Witnessing Battering: Batterers, Victims and Children..... | 41 |
| Table 4.5 | Victim Reports of Violence Experienced Six Months Before, During, and Six Months After the Arrest..... | 43 |
| Table 4.6 | Victim Empowerment Help-Seeking Behavior During the Six Months Prior to Entry into the Study. | 44 |
| Table 4.7 | Victim Empowerment: Perception of Agency at the Time of the Initial Interview. N=478..... | 45 |
| Table 4.8 | Stake in Conformity: A Comparison of Arrested Batterers and their Victims..... | 46 |
| Table 5.1 | Study Treatment Cases: Batterer Deterrence and Victim Empowerment Treatment Provided as Reported by DVRU Officers..... | 51 |
| Table 5.2 | Victims' Reports of Services they Received from Uniformed Officers | 55 |
| Table 5.3 | Victim Assessment of Uniformed Officers' Conduct..... | 56 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|----|
| Table 6.1 | Initial Interview Completion and Non-Completion Information | 59 |
| Table 6.2 | Case Characteristics for Study Cases With and Without Initial Interviews..... | 63 |
| Table 6.3 | Characteristics for Study Cases With and Without Initial and Follow-up Interviews | 64 |
| Table 7.1 | Jail Data: Study Sample, Treatment Group, and Control Group..... | 69 |
| Table 7.2 | Prosecution Data: Study Sample, Treatment Group, and Control Group | 72 |
| Table 7.3 | Restraining Order Data: Study Sample, Treatment Group, and Control Group..... | 74 |
| Table 7.4 | OJIN Sentencing Data: Study Sample, Treatment Group, and Control Group | 75 |
| Table 7.5 | Deferred Sentencing Program Data: Study Sample, Treatment Group, and Control Group..... | 76 |
| Table 8.1 | Any Revictimizations ExperiencedùSame Offenderùby Treatment and Control Group | 79 |
| Table 8.2 | Any Revictimizations ExperiencedùAny Offender (same or different than in original arrest)ùby Treatment and Control Group..... | 79 |
| Table 8.3 | Average Number of Revictimizations Experienced by Treatment and Control Group Victims: Same Offender and Any Offender..... | 80 |
| Table 8.4 | Police Reports of Revictimizations and Reoffenses by Treatment and Control Group..... | 81 |
| Table 8.5 | Average Number of Reported Revictimizations and Reported Reoffenses by Treatment and Control Group..... | 82 |
| Table 8.6 | The Average Number of Reported Revictimizations for Those Cases Reporting Any Events by Treatment and Control Group..... | 83 |
| Table 8.7 | Police Calls to the Same Address by Treatment and Control Group..... | 84 |

| | | |
|------------|--|----|
| Table 8.8 | Restraining Orders Filed During the Six Months Following the Original Arrest by Treatment and Control Group..... | 85 |
| Table 8.9 | DVRU Interventions and Restraining Orders Filed..... | 86 |
| Table 8.10 | DVRU Interventions as Predictors of Restraining Orders Filed | 86 |
| Table 8.11 | DVRU Interventions and Prosecutions by Treatment and Control Group | 87 |
| Table 8.12 | DVRU Interventions and Cases Prosecuted..... | 88 |
| Table 8.13 | DVRU Interventions as Predictors of Prosecutions | 88 |
| Table 8.14 | DVRU Interventions and Change in Empowerment by Treatment and Control Group | 89 |
| Table 8.15 | DVRU Interventions and Changes in Empowerment | 89 |
| Table 8.16 | DVRU Interventions as Predictors of Changes in Empowerment | 90 |
| Table 8.17 | Empowerment as a Predictor of the Number of Revictimizations Experienced from the Same Batterer | 90 |
| Table 8.18 | Empowerment as a Predictor of Number of Revictimizations Experienced from Any Batterer | 91 |
| Table 8.19 | The Presence or Absence of Revictimization Experiences from the Same Batterer as a Function of Identified Predictors | 91 |
| Table 8.20 | The Presence or Absence of Revictimization Experiences from Any Batterer as a Function of Identified Predictors | 92 |
| Table 8.21 | The Presence or Absence of Reports of Revictimization as a Function of Identified Predictors..... | 92 |
| Table 8.22 | The Presence or Absence of Police Reports of Revictimization Resulting in Custody as a Function of Identified Predictors..... | 92 |
| Table 8.23 | The Presence or Absence of Reported Reoffense Allegations against the Original Batterer as a Function of Identified Predictors | 93 |

| | | |
|------------|--|----|
| Table 8.24 | The Presence or Absence of Reported Reoffense Allegations against the Original Batterer Resulting in Custody as a Function of Identified Predictors..... | 93 |
| Table 8.25 | The Number of Reported Revictimizations as a Function of the Identified Predictors..... | 93 |
| Table 8.26 | The Number of Reported Revictimizations Resulting in Custodies as a Function of the Identified Predictors..... | 94 |
| Table 8.27 | The Number of Reported Reoffenses as a Function of the Identified Predictors..... | 94 |
| Table 8.28 | The Number of Reported Reoffenses leading to Custodies as a Function of the Identified Predictors..... | 94 |
| Table 8.29 | The Number of Police Calls to the Same Address for Any Reason as a Function of the Identified Predictors..... | 95 |
| Table 8.30 | The Number of Police Calls to the Same Address for a Domestic Violence Problem as a Function of the Identified Predictors..... | 95 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| <u>Number</u> | <u>TITLE</u> | <u>PAGE</u> |
|---------------|---|-------------|
| Figure 1: | Program Logic of the Domestic Violence Reduction Unit (DVRU) | 47 |
| Figure 2: | From Arrest to Conviction | 68 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments i

List of Tables ii

List of Figures v

Table of Contents vi

Section One: Executive Summary 1

Section Two: Literature Review 10

**Section Three: Description of the Portland, Oregon
Domestic Violence Experiment 18**

Section Four: The Sample 27

Section Five: Levels of Treatment 47

Section Six: Interviews 58

Section Seven: From Arrest to Incarceration 67

Section Eight: Results 78

Section Nine: Discussion 96

Appendix A: The Police Check List (PCL)

Appendix B: Initial Interview Questionnaire

Appendix C: Follow-up Interview Questionnaire

Appendix D: Police Record Form

Appendix E: Interviewer Training Materials

Appendix F: Time to Failure Analysis

SECTION ONE

Executive Summary

The Police Response to Domestic Violence in Portland, Oregon

As part of its organization-wide transition to community policing in 1989, the Portland Police Bureau, in collaboration with the Family Violence Intervention Steering Committee of Multnomah County,¹ developed a plan to reduce domestic violence in Portland. The creation of a special police unit to focus exclusively on misdemeanor domestic crimes was the centerpiece of the plan. This police unit, the Domestic Violence Reduction Unit (DVRU), had two goals: to increase the sanctions for batterers and to empower victims. Implementation of the first goal required thorough investigation of misdemeanor domestic violence cases in order to facilitate prosecution and conviction of batterers regardless of victims' participation. Implementation of the empowerment goal involved validating the victim's experience and providing her with information about, and access to, community and criminal justice system services.

The Mandate for an Evaluation of the Domestic Violence Reduction Unit

Mindful of the police bureau's commitment to sound problem solving, the final program plan for the unit contained a mandate for an outside evaluation. In 1994, researchers from Portland State University carried out a study in order to determine if or not the DVRU had

¹ The Family Violence Intervention Steering Committee was first convened in 1987 as part of a Family Violence Intervention Project administered through the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. Its members represent a broad spectrum of domestic violence service providers. Its goal is to provide an interagency forum for developing, implementing, and assessing a coordinated response to domestic violence in Portland and Multnomah County (Hubbard, 1995).

implemented the bureau's community policing policies and if "had succeeded in improving the overall community response to domestic violence" (Jolin and Clavadetscher 1995:3). The study tentatively concluded it had but recommended a more definitive study. In 1995 the National Institute of Justice funded the work described in this report.

The Research Location

Portland is the center of a 1.6 million population metropolitan area. Nearly half a million people live within the city limits. Despite its reputation as one of the nation's most livable cities, Portland's crime rate reflects its urban status. The city's rate of violent crime is more than three times higher than the state as a whole. With 1,856 violent crimes per 100,000 population, Portland surpasses Milwaukee, Phoenix, and Denver, but ranks below Baltimore, Boston, and Kansas City (Maguire et al., 1995).

Oregon Law Pertaining To Domestic Violence

The police response to domestic violence is set forth in a 1977 statute (ORS 133.055) which states that a police officer must arrest in misdemeanor domestic violence cases when:


1. the officer is at the scene
2. the officer has probable cause to believe that an assault has occurred [or restraining order was violated]; or
3. the officer has probable cause to believe that one of the persons has placed the other in fear of imminent serious physical injury.

The Abuse Prevention Act of 1977 made Oregon the first state in the nation to mandate arrest for misdemeanor domestic crimes.

The Research Questions

The study described here was designed to see if DVRU strategies led to reductions in domestic violence. It was believed that, in the long run, increasing the cost of violence to batterers and reducing the risk of renewed violence to their victims could bring about

reductions in domestic violence. In the short run, this could be accomplished by increasing prosecutions and enhancing victim empowerment²



The questions we asked were:

1. Do DVRU interventions increase prosecutions of misdemeanor domestic violence cases?
2. Do DVRU interventions increase victim empowerment?
3. Do DVRU interventions lead to reductions in domestic violence?

In addition to answering questions about the effectiveness of a specialized police unit, this study also served to test an important research hypothesis:

Arrest followed by prosecution, trial, and sentence for the offender coupled with provisions of enhanced support services for the victim reduces the recurrence of domestic violence more effectively than arrest alone.

Study Case Eligibility Criteria

Domestic violence incidents were included in the study if they involved misdemeanor crimes between adult, heterosexual, intimate partners when the male assailant was arrested at the scene and taken to jail by the officers who responded to the call. Victims had to reside within Oregon or Southwestern Washington and be reachable by telephone. Cases in which officers arrested both parties were excluded.³

² It is important to keep in mind, however, that both the short term and the long term achievement of DVRU goals depends on others, for example the district attorney who decides to prosecute and the victim who decides to follow a safety plan. This suggests that DVRU strategies are best viewed as facilitative in nature; they open the gate making it possible for others who are part of the coordinated community response system to play their parts.

³ To the extent that the study constitutes an evaluation of the DVRU, it is an evaluation of the effectiveness of DVRU interventions applied to a sub-set, albeit the largest sub-set, of the cases the unit actually handles.

The Randomization and Double Blind Procedures

A double-blind randomization design was used to assign eligible cases to a DVRU treatment group or to a control group, i.e. one that did not receive DVRU intervention. For each eligible case, a computer program generated a random five-digit number. The last digit signified whether the case was to be classified as treatment or control.⁴ Treatment cases were then made available to DVRU officers and control cases were set apart for the duration of the study.⁵

The Sample

Data that allowed us to describe study case, victim, and batterer characteristics for our sample came from two sources: The Portland Police Data Systems (PPDS)⁶ computer files and from the interview schedules we developed for this study (see Appendices B and C). We obtained PPDS data for all 927 cases and victim interview data for 478 study cases.

Cases included in this study represented a sub-population of domestic violence cases that occurred in Portland between March and November of 1996. It is important to view descriptions of the cases in our sample in their proper context; they are domestic violence occurrences that have come to the attention of the police **and** that involve an arrest (see Section Four for a detailed discussion of case eligibility criteria).

Case Characteristics⁷

For the sample as a whole 60% of cases involved charges of misdemeanor assault. In 81% of the cases the violence consisted of slapping, pushing, kicking or hitting. Seventy-five percent of the victims had experienced similar violence from the same batterer before. Victims' children in 61% of the cases witnessed this violence. Seventy-nine percent of the alleged domestic crimes occurred in a residence and 68% occurred between a man and a

⁴ To maintain the integrity of the double blind procedure, research staff at the police department did not know the randomization codes.

⁵ No victims were denied access to DVRU services when they requested them. All victims received some services from uniformed officers, and the district attorney reviewed all cases.

⁶ See Police Record Form in Appendix D.

⁷ Tables 4.1 through 4.8 contain detailed descriptive data for our sample.

woman who were living together. In all but 13% of the cases the victim-offender relationship had lasted more than a year.

Batterers' average age was 33. Sixty-two percent were of European, 24% of African, and 9% of Hispanic descent. Forty-nine percent had been arrested at least once in the preceding five years and, according to victims' reports, 35% had assaulted persons outside the family. In 61% of the cases the women told interviewers that the men who had battered them had witnessed domestic violence during their own childhoods and 40% of them had received alcohol or drug treatment at some time. In 30% of the police reports it was noted that the batterer blamed the victim for the offense. Thirty-nine percent of the time, according to police reports, the batterer denied having committed the crime for which he was arrested.

The average age of the victims in our study was 31. Seventy-two percent were of European, 16% of African American, and 6% of Hispanic descent. Over half earned less than \$10,000 per year, 83% had children who in 33% of the cases were under the age of three. Forty percent of the victims reported having witnessed domestic violence themselves as children and 37% of them said they had been physically abused then also. Eighteen percent said that they had received alcohol or drug treatment at some point.

Apart from the finding that more victims in the treatment group than in the control group (41% vs. 28%) had children under the age of three and that treatment group victims on average were two years younger (30 vs. 32 years) than the control group victims, we found no differences between treatment and control group cases at the time of the initial interview.

Victim Empowerment: Help-Seeking Activities

In the initial interview we asked victims, 75% of whom had been abused by the batterer in the six-month period prior to the arrest, what, if any, help they had sought during that time. Thirty-eight percent said that they had asked the police to intervene prior to the present arrest and 20% had gone to court to obtain a restraining order. Aside from speaking to friends (71%) and family (63%), the next most often sought out assistance involved mental health

professionals (29%) (see Table 4.6). There were no significant differences between the treatment and control group victims.

Victim Empowerment: Perception of Agency.

We asked victims to tell us how “in control” they felt when we interviewed them shortly after the batterer’s arrest (see Appendix B Initial Interview items 131-134). Table 4.7 shows that more than half of the battered women felt their family lives were now mostly under control and stated that they thought themselves capable of handling most of their problems. Fully 70% of the victims whose assailant had been arrested said they felt “mostly” capable of keeping themselves safe. Again, there were no significant differences between the treatment and control group victims.

The Independent Variable: DVRU Intervention

Measuring Treatment: The Police Checklist

The treatment, i.e. DVRU intervention, consisted of the investigative and empowerment strategies adopted by the DVRU in 1993. Investigative strategies involved various forms of evidence collection. Victim empowerment strategies included the development of safety plans, instructions on how to access criminal justice and community victim services, and assistance with transportation when necessary.

We asked DVRU officers to provide us with an exhaustive list of the tasks they performed in the course of handling a case. The final version of this list was called *The Police Checklist (PCL)* and became the measurement tool we used to assess DVRU treatment (see Appendix A).

What DVRU Officers Provided: The Treatment Condition

DVRU officers provided treatment to 286 of the 404 randomly selected treatment group cases. DVRU officers were not successful in establishing contact with all treatment group victims. When they did reach victims (in 285/404 cases), officers were most likely (98%) to

tell them how to go about prosecuting the batterer. In 70% of the cases DVRU officers gave victims safety plan information (see Table 5.1).

What the Arresting Officers Provided: The Control Condition

Because an on-scene arrest was our control condition, both the victim and the offender had been exposed to police intervention. The majority of victims felt that the arresting officers had listened to them (79%) and were able to calm the situation (67%). About two-thirds of the victims recalled having received the legally mandated information card, remembered having been given restraining order information, and recollected having been advised to contact the district attorney's office. Other victims (42%) recalled that officers had given them information about shelters and 23% recalled being referred to a victim assistance program. Uniformed officers, according to victims, only infrequently (15%) seemed to provide 'on the spot counseling.' With one exception--the control group recalled receiving information their legal rights more often, there were no statistically significant differences between treatment and control group victim responses. When asked whether they would call the police again if needed in the future, fully 87% of all the women, 89% of those in the treatment group and 86% of those in the control group, said they would.

Results: The Intermediate Outcomes

The DVRU program plan called for the use of methods that would lead to an increase in prosecutions. We found that batterers in the treatment group were significantly more likely than their control group counterparts to be prosecuted (44% vs. 37%), convicted (24% vs. 17%) and sentenced (27% vs. 18%).

We obtained this information by following 927 cases from arrest to prosecution, from prosecution to conviction, from conviction to sentencing, and from sentencing to sanction. Obtaining the necessary data was a complex task that required the active cooperation of many criminal justice agencies. It also required to create our own criminal justice system data file by linking relevant batterer and victim information from five separate agency data-bases.

For measures of victim empowerment, our study revealed the following. Significantly more treatment group victims than control group victims (64% vs. 52%) sought assistance from the criminal justice system. Treatment group victims were more likely than control group victims (16% vs. 9%) to request batterer release information from the jail (see Table 7.1); and they were more likely to call the police upon revictimization (19% vs. 10% Table 8.4). While more treatment group (47%) than control group victims (40%) reported a sense of increased empowerment, this difference did not quite reach the commonly accepted significance threshold of $p < .05$. Still, a significantly greater percentage of treatment group victims than control group victims reported that they had terminated contact with their abusive partners (24% vs. 14% Table 8.14). Following the arrest of their violent partner treatment and control group victims were equally likely to file restraining order petitions (Table 7.3).

Results: The Final Outcomes

The unit was developed to reduce domestic violence in Portland. Our findings indicated that DVRU interventions did reduce domestic violence when we looked at the information we received from the victims directly.⁸ Significantly fewer of the treatment group victims when compared to the control group victims told our interviewers that they had experienced further violence (including verbal violence) during the six months following the arrest of the batterer (see Tables 8.1 and 8.2). This implied that, as a group, the women who had received additional police services after their batterers' arrest experienced significantly less repeat violence than those women whose only contact with the police took place during the original arrest.

⁸ There was virtually no difference in the results for revictimization and reoffending, meaning that the vast majority of events of new violence occurred between the same two people who were involved in the arrest that brought the case into our study.

When we examined police records, however, we found that the women in the treatment group called the police to report further episodes of violence significantly more often during the six-months follow-up period than did women in the control group (see Tables 8.4 to 8.7).

On the surface, this discrepancy between what the women told the interviewers and what the police reports showed looked puzzling. We did not think it was, however. It is probable that victim empowerment is responsible for both effects. Newly empowered women report domestic violence more often than women who are not and, as well, are significantly more likely to report it if it does occur again.

The following key points summarize our findings:

- Arrest plus police-initiated follow-up compared to arrest alone led to reductions in subsequent self-reported domestic violence victimizations.
- Increased victim perception of empowerment led to reductions in subsequent self-reported domestic violence victimizations.
- Arrest plus police-initiated follow-up compared to arrest alone led to increased prosecutions, convictions, and sanctions for batterers.
- Arrest plus police-initiated follow-up compared to arrest alone led to increases in subsequent police reports of domestic violence.
- Following the batterer's arrest, 89% of victims in the treatment group and 86% of victims in the control group said that they would call the police again in the event of future victimization.
- Upon revictimization, 75% of the women in the treatment group vs. 35% of the women in the control group called the police to intervene.

SECTION TWO

Review of the Literature

The Extent of Domestic Violence

Women are much more likely than men to be abused by someone they know. Women are attacked about six times more often by someone with whom they have had an intimate relationship than are male violence victims (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1995 & 1998; Messner & Tardiff, 1984). Women are 17 times more likely to be badly beaten by men than men are by women (Peterson, 1997; Zorza, 1998). More than 25% of American couples experience one or more incidents of domestic violence between them each year (Feld and Straus, 1989). Severe repeat violence occurs in one of every 14 marriages (Dutton, 1988), and physical assaults may occur even more commonly among unmarried cohabiting couples (Stets and Straus, 1989). It is estimated that an intimate partner batters about 20% of the female adult population each year (Stith, Williams, and Rosen, 1990). For women aged 15-44, domestic violence is the single most common cause of injury (Novello, Rosenberg, Saltzman, and Shosky, 1992). It is estimated that 20% of visits to emergency rooms by women result from injuries sustained in domestic violence (Tift, 1993). Domestic violence is a serious criminal justice issue as well as a costly public health problem. Medical treatments and lost income revenue from domestic violence may cost as much as ten billion dollars per year (Meyer, 1992).

Beyond the physical injuries to victims, domestic violence also contributes to child abuse and neglect (Widom, 1989; Giles-Sims, 1985; Hotaling, Straus, and Lincoln, 1989; Stark and Flitcraft, 1988; Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz, 1980; Walker, Thyfault, and

Browne, 1982; Walker, 1984; 1989). Some evidence suggests that a history of abuse and violent behavior by parents contributes to future assaultive violence by adults whose childhood was spent living in abusive homes (Fagan and Wexler, 1987; Herrenkohl, E., Herrenkohl R., and Toedter, 1983; Hotaling *et al.*, 1989; Rosenbaum and O'Leary, 1981; Simons, Wu, Johnson, and Conger, 1995; Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz, 1980; Widom, 1989). Battering, this research suggests, can be viewed as a learned behavior. Bandura (Bandura, 1973; 1986) theorizes, for example, that aggressive responses are learned through vicarious reinforcement of modeled behavior. His theory is supported by empirical evidence which shows that large numbers of assaultive men have witnessed family violence as children (Howell and Pugliesi, 1988; O'Leary and Curley, 1986; Rosenbaum and O'Leary, 1981; Simons *et al.*, 1995; Straus *et al.*, 1980). Several authors contend that children witnessing such violence may themselves be likely to experience violence in some form in future relationships (Breslin *et al.*, 1990; Davis & Carlson, 1987; Kalmuss, 1984; Suh & Abel, 1990). In one study, 70% of victims said their children witnessed domestic abuse (Hilton, 1993). Once men have learned battering behavior, they continue to batter, often because they receive positive reinforcement in the form of compliance and submission from their victims (Saunders, 1988), or because they experience the discharge of aggressive tensions from the actual battering as pleasurable (Okun, 1986). Another possible influence on batterer behavior is the cycle of violence. The cycle was conceived of by Walker (1979, 1984), and occurs in three phases. The first phase involves the build up of tension, and is often marked by particularly hurtful insults. Victims may think during this phase that they can appease the batterer (Tift, 1993). The tension then leads to the second phase, violence, which initially shocks the victim. In the third phase, batterers express remorse for their actions, and may promise to stop the violence or get help, and thus persuade victims to stay in the relationship (Steinmen, 1990; Walker, 1979, 1984). Because this cycle of violence inhibits the victim's abilities to use the criminal justice system, intervention in the cycle itself plays a central role for any successful policy response (Ford, Reichard, Goldsmith, and

Regoli, 1996), otherwise batterers receive additional support for their behavior from the system's failure to invoke criminal sanctions (Johnson, 1990).

Feminist theory also addresses the causes and consequences of domestic abuse. Feminist approaches concentrate on a sociopolitical understanding of domestic violence (MacKinnon, 1991; Morgan, 1970, Sanday, 1981). There are many perspectives and differences encompassed in the body of feminist theory. Bograd (1988) explores some commonalities in feminist perspectives on domestic violence, for example, the use of gender and power as socially constructed explanations for male violence and female victimization. Feminist theory also suggests that as women move toward a more equal stature in society they may face a backlash in the form of higher rates of domestic violence (Yllö, 1988).

The majority of victims of domestic violence are female. Upon a broad review of several research studies, Crowell & Burgess (1996) concluded that the primary risk factor for becoming a victim of domestic violence is being a woman. Qualities socially defined as positive for American women include passive selflessness, enduring patience, and altruistic nurturing behaviors (Sipe & Hall, 1996).

Other risk factors such as living in a violent society such as the United States which generates more violent crimes than other Western nations lack empirical support from cross national comparisons (Barnett and LaViolette, 1993; Reiss & Roth, 1993; Straus and Gelles, 1986). The identification of personal risk factors such as education level, age, race, income, addictions, and childhood abuse is common in this field of research (Crowell & Burgess, 1996, Mahoney, 1994; Miller, Downs, & Gondoli, 1989).

Conflicting statistics have been produced on the racial and ethnic proportions of domestic violence. Many minority groups have historically been over-represented in the criminal justice system, and rates of domestic abuse appear generally higher in this population (Straus & Gelles, 1986; Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1998). Yet there are some studies that show no differences between ethnic or racial groups (Berk, Berk, Loseke & Rauma 1983; Walker, 1979).

Alcohol abuse is cited frequently as a correlate of intimate violent behaviors, though rarely as a cause (Frieze & Browne, 1989; Leonard, 1993). Alcohol is one factor that is invoked as reason for diminishing responsibility for the batterer's violent behavior. Others include emotional factors such as intense frustration and the batterer's inability to control anger (Bograd, 1983; Gelles, 1974; Johnson, 1980; Ptacek, 1988; Deschner, 1984; Faulk, 1977; Goldberg, 1983). Treatment of offenders differs between those who propose social and psychological remedies, and those who hold that batterers are criminals who need to be punished for their violent behavior. Dutton (1995) who has provided batterer treatment for many years, nevertheless holds that it is erroneous to exonerate batterers based on psychosocial factors in that beyond absolving them of responsibility, such reactions preclude a critical look at the culture that supports their violent actions.

Restraining orders, used as one of the main deterrent measures in some states (Klein, 1996) seek to prevent continued violent conduct (Harrel and Smith, 1996) by threatening batterers with criminal intervention if they don't abide by the conditions set forth in the judicial order. Another form of deterrence--arrest--may only affect a small number of offenders. Sherman (1992) concluded from a comprehensive review of the available evidence that the deterrent effect of arrest appeared to depend upon the suspect's "stake in conformity." Sherman (1992) developed this term to capture the costs a batterer incurred from the social consequences of the arrest, i.e., the arrest of employed batterers had a greater deterrent effect than the arrest of unemployed batterers. Williams and Hawkins (1989) found that another cost, the personal humiliation associated with arrest, has a strong influence on batterer behavior.

Domestic violence intervention of any type is difficult. Partly because as a complex crime it has been notoriously difficult to define and measure (Weis, 1989; Gelles, 1998). The need for a valid, reliable tool for classification led to the creation of the Conflict Tactics Scales (Rhodes, 1992). Many studies of domestic violence use the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) as a reporting device (Comack, 1996). This scale is often used to measure reductions

in the frequency and severity of violence. It has been used in two large national surveys, and in more than 100 local research projects (Straus, 1996). Straus and Gelles (1979) developed the scale, which permits quantifying categories of abusive events. Although the CTS is the most widely used measure utilized to assess the range and frequency of abusive behaviors (Edleson & Tolman, 1992), it has been criticized for not measuring the severity of the injury or the intention of the abuse (Dobash & Dobash, 1992). A remedy for this shortcoming was developed by McFarlane, Parker, Soeken, and Bullock (1992).

Domestic Violence and the Criminal Justice System

The criminal justice system prior to the mid 1980s practiced a lenient policy with respect to domestic violence, and, in keeping with the values of the time, was reluctant to intrude in domestic affairs (Hirschel, Hutchinson, Dean, and Kelley, 1990; Sigler, Crowley, and Johnson, 1990; Zorza and Woods, 1994). Although the violent behaviors exhibited by offenders may not have been legally sanctioned, women have historically not been protected by the criminal justice system (Ferraro, 1989b). Intervention strategies advocated by feminists during the mid- and late 1970s focused largely on helping victims of domestic violence find temporary safe housing and aiding them in gaining access to legal remedies (Ferraro, 1989a; Martin, 1976; Schechter, 1982; Tolman and Bennett, 1990; Walker, 1984). Not until the late 1970s and early 1980s was it recognized that formal criminal justice actions convey to victims, the children of victims, and to society as a whole that violence against intimates is as serious a crime as violence against strangers and should be treated as such (Ford and Regoli, 1992; Klaus and Rand, 1984; Ritmeester and Pence, 1992; U.S. Department of Justice, 1984; Zorza and Woods, 1994; Crowell and Burgess, 1996; Dutton and McGregor, 1991; Gamache, Edleson and Schock, 1988; Sherman and Berk, 1984, Stanko, 1989). Today, police response to domestic violence, and the punishment imposed as a result of police intervention, are seen by many as indispensable to lowering the prevalence of domestic violence (Stark, 1993; Zorza, 1993; Hamby, 1998).

While many jurisdictions adopted mandatory arrest policies to increase consequences to batterers, Ferraro (1989a) found that in one large metropolitan area with mandatory arrest laws in place, arrests occurred in only 18 % of the cases where police were present, and only 3 % of these were prosecuted. In jurisdictions without mandatory arrest laws, suspected batterers were arrested for assaulting their wives only three to 10 % of the time by officers at the scene (Emerson, 1979; Langley and Levy, 1977; Roy, 1977). The rare cases that did lead to conviction most often resulted in either a light sentence or no sentence at all (Dutton, 1987; Sherman, Schmidt, Rogan, and DeRiso, 1991; Sherman and Berk, 1984). By failing to impose punishment on domestic violence offenders, the criminal justice system inadvertently supports domestic abuse in our culture (Ford and Regoli, 1993; Zorza & Woods, 1994b). We now know that the majority of batterers who enter treatment do so only when mandated by the courts (Carrillo, 1988; Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Gondolf, 1991; Gruszinski and Harrell, 1991; Walker, 1984). Such dictated treatments along with mandatory sentencing for offenders in domestic violence cases has been shown to increase the penalty faced by batterers (Carlson & Nidey, 1995; Ford & Regoli, 1993).

In addition to their other functions, mandatory arrest laws also force potentially reluctant police officers to apprehend the batterers (Buzawa and Buzawa, 1990; Garner & Clemmer, 1986). Belief in the possible harm to the arresting officer may create reluctance on the part of officers to take the batterer into custody (Bard, 1969; Buzawa & Buzawa, 1990; Davis, 1983; Ferraro, 1989b).

Sherman and Berk's landmark Minneapolis experiment (1984) has been widely cited as evidence that arresting batterers is more effective than other police actions in deterring future violent behavior (Lempert, 1989). The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) provided funds for six replication studies to determine the generalizability of the Minneapolis findings. No clear mandate supporting mandatory arrest policies has emerged from these studies, however (Berk, Campbell, and Western, 1992; Dunford, 1990; Hirschel *et al.*, 1990; Pate, Hamilton, and Annan, 1991; Sherman *et al.*, 1991). In fact, three of the studies suggested that arresting

the batterer increased rather than decreased their risk of future violent behavior (Dunford, 1990; Hirschel *et al.*, 1990; Sherman *et al.*, 1991). A recent meta-analysis of these six replication studies showed that the deterrent effects of arrest were inconclusive (Garner, Fagan, and Maxwell, 1995). Richard Berk (1993) the co-author of the original Minneapolis study, analyzed the same data and in a slightly more optimistic tone concluded that the answer to the question "Does arrest work?" is most properly phrased as "it depends" but on the average we can do no better. Indeed, arresting the batterer is for the most part the necessary starting point for the kind of coordinated community response that has been touted as the most promising among new domestic violence intervention strategies.

The criminal justice system response to battering in the context of community coordinated programming enlists police, prosecutors, judges, probation officers and service agency representatives to convince batterers that sanctions are forthcoming (Tiff, 1993). So far, the findings from studies of coordinated community response systems to domestic violence in Colorado (Edleson, 1991), California (Soler, 1987), Nebraska (Steinman, 1988), and Minnesota (Gamache, Edleson, and Schock, 1988; Syers and Edleson, 1992) appear encouraging. They give at least tentative support to the hypothesis that a coordinated community response will reduce violent behavior, and encourage victims to report domestic violence to the police when it occurs (Crowell and Burgess, 1996; Syers and Edleson, 1992). Other studies have found that the *lack* of coordination in response can reduce sanctions, and, in fact, increase violence (Steinman, 1990; Jaffe *et al.*, 1993).

The present study consists of a controlled experiment that is designed to answer two broad questions. First, is a special police unit, which simultaneously aims at enhancing the criminal justice system response to batterers and at enhancing victim empowerment effective as a violence reduction strategy? Second, is arrest that leads to a coordinated criminal justice system and community agency response for batterers and victim empowerment more likely to reduce recidivism than arrest alone?

SECTION THREE

Description of the Portland, Oregon Domestic Violence Experiment

The Initial Development of the Study

The third year of the Portland Police Bureau Community Policing Transition Plan called for the implementation of bureau activities that would "Target at-risk youth for special attention" (1990:60). In the fall of 1992 the bureau assigned a captain to explore with the community what form such an effort should take. What followed were extensive discussions with a wide variety of community representatives who identified the "need to break the cycle of violence" as an immediate problem the Portland police should address (Brooks, 1992:1). In close collaboration with the Family Violence Intervention Steering Committee,⁹ the police developed a plan to reduce domestic violence in Portland. The plan had two goals: to increase the formal consequences for batterers and to empower victims.

The first goal proposed was to increase regularly prosecuting all misdemeanor domestic violence offenses. This was to be done regardless of the victim's desire to prosecute. Before, the district attorney prosecuted only those cases in which a victim signed a complaint and was willing to testify against her batterer. Because many victims did not feel safe enough to do so, charges against most batterers were dropped,¹⁰ which sent the clear message to both batterers and victims that no consequences beyond the arrest would follow when a domestic

⁹ The Family Violence Intervention Steering Committee was first convened in 1987 as part of a Family Violence Intervention Project administered through the national Council of Juvenile and Family court Judges. Its members represent a wide variety of domestic violence service providers. Its goal is to provide an interagency forum for developing, implementing, and assessing a coordinated response to domestic violence in Portland, Oregon (Hubbard, 1995).

¹⁰ Prosecution data for misdemeanor domestic violence cases were not collected until after the DVRU was created.

assault occurred. This new proposed approach would shift the responsibility for the prosecution from the victim to the district attorney's office.

The second goal was to be implemented by helping victims successfully negotiate, seek, obtain, and use the resources of the criminal justice system. The Portland City Council approved the plan. The Domestic Violence Reduction Unit (DVRU) was created and began work in July 1993.

The original DVRU proposal mandated that its activities be evaluated. In 1994, researchers from Portland State University conducted a process evaluation, funded by the National Institute of Justice (92-IJ-CX-K037), as part of a larger community policing assessment project. They concluded that the DVRU had been successful in implementing the bureau's community policing policies (Jolin and Clavadetscher 1995). Nearly all community partners of the new police unit believed that their partnership with the police "had succeeded in improving the overall community response to domestic violence" (Jolin and Clavadetscher 1995:3). These responses were encouraging but lacked empirical support.

However, attempts to obtain empirical support proved difficult. Definitions of what constituted domestic violence differed within and between agencies. Moreover, mechanisms did not exist for inter-agency tracking (Jolin and Clavadetscher, 1995). Consequently, the researchers urged caution¹¹ in interpreting the findings which showed that prosecutions, use of restraining orders and victim empowerment in fact had increased as expected (Jolin and Clavadetscher 1995). In an attempt to answer the question of whether or not the activities of the DVRU reduced domestic violence, the Portland Police Bureau and researchers at Portland State University agreed to seek NIJ funding for an experimental design outcome study. The study was funded and began in December of 1995.

¹¹ The report contains a detailed description of the methodological constraints affecting the measurement of intermediate and long-term outcomes.

The Research Location

At the time when the Portland Police Bureau revised its approach to domestic violence, nearly half a million people resided within the city limits. Portland is at the center of a 1.6 million population metropolitan area. Despite its reputation as one of the nation's most livable cities, Portland's crime rate reflects its urban status. The city's violent crime rate is more than three times that of the state as a whole. With 1,856 violent crimes per 100,000 population, Portland surpasses Milwaukee, Phoenix, and Denver, but has a lower violent crime rate than Baltimore, Boston, and Kansas City (Maguire et al 1995). In addition to 253 non-sworn personnel, the Portland Police Bureau employs about one thousand sworn police officers (Portland Police Bureau, 1996).

Oregon Law Pertaining To Domestic Violence

Defining domestic violence is not easy (Weis, 1989; Gelles, 1998). Even the legal definition varies between jurisdictions and over time. Oregon, for example, has no single definition of domestic violence. Instead, there are several statutory sources, which place parameters on the legal definitions depending on the fact situation. Definitions declare what is "family" or "domestic" and what is "violence" or "abuse." Abuse is defined in the Family Abuse Prevention Act (ORS 107.700 (1) as:

- (a) Attempting to cause or intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly causing physical injury;
- (b) Intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly placing another in fear of imminent serious physical injury; or
- (b) Committing sexual abuse in any degree as defined in ORS 163.415, 163.425 and 163.427.

"Family or household member" is defined as:

- (a) Spouses; (b) former spouses; (c) adult persons related by blood or marriage; (d) persons cohabiting with each other; (e) persons who have cohabited with each other

or who have been involved in a sexually intimate relationship with each other within two years immediately preceding the filing by one of them of a petition under ORS 107.710; (f) unmarried parents of a minor child.

The mandatory arrest provisions enacted in 1977 have governed the police response to domestic violence in the State of Oregon and Portland.

ORS 133.055 states that a police officer must arrest in domestic violence cases when:

1. The officer is at the scene;
2. The officer has probable cause to believe an assault has occurred [or restraining order was violated]; or
3. The officer has probable cause to believe one of the persons has placed the other in fear of imminent serious physical injury.

The law also provides that police officers attempt to identify the primary aggressor taking into consideration self-defense. Officers must use all reasonable means to prevent further abuse, including advising each person of the availability of a shelter or other services in the community and giving each person immediate notice of the legal rights and remedies available (Oregon Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence, 1994). These statutes made Oregon the first state in the nation to mandate arrest for misdemeanor domestic crimes and for restraining order violations. After some initial reluctance to accept a legal mandate that limits their discretion, most officers have come to accept the pro-arrest policy as the standard response to domestic violence. In Oregon in 1996,¹² police officers made 20,130 arrests representing a 61% arrest rate for domestic violence crimes (State of Oregon, 1997). In Portland in 1996, the year in which this study was conducted, police officers wrote 6177 reports documenting incidents of domestic violence. Portland officers arrested 3042 batterers, a 52% arrest rate, which is lower than that for the state.

¹² Oregon did not initiate statewide domestic violence data collection until October 1994.

The Current Study: An Outline

With respect to the DVRU, the study was designed to answer three main questions:

1. Do DVRU interventions increase prosecutions of misdemeanor domestic violence cases?
2. Do DVRU interventions increase victim empowerment?
3. Do DVRU interventions lead to reduction in domestic violence?

The study also permitted the testing of the following research hypothesis:

Arrest followed by prosecution, conviction, and sentence for the offender and support services for the victim reduces the recurrence of domestic violence more effectively than arrest alone.

Study Case Eligibility Criteria

Domestic violence incidents were eligible for inclusion in the study if they involved misdemeanor crimes between adult, heterosexual, intimate partners; and where the male assailant was arrested at the scene and taken to jail by the officers who responded to the call. Victims had to reside within Oregon or Southern Washington and be reachable by telephone. Incidents in which officers arrested both parties, even if they met all other study criteria, were excluded (a detailed description of eligibility criteria follows in Section Four of this report). All police reports forwarded to the unit were reviewed and distributed by our research staff. Cases that met the study criteria were set aside for randomization; cases that did not meet the study criteria were given to the unit.¹³ A double-blind randomization design was used to assign eligible cases to a “DVRU treatment” group or a “control” group, i.e. one that did not receive DVRU intervention.

¹³ This arrangement meant that our research team took over one of the routine functions in the unit. Once unit officers had become accustomed to our daily presence and the de facto pre-empting of their initial case review, they were able to appreciate not having to make the three daily ‘mail runs’ that were required to obtain police reports sent to them from throughout the bureau.

The DVRU Operations¹⁴

In 1993 the Domestic Violence Reduction Unit issued the following mission statement:

“ [Our mission] is to decrease the level of domestic violence in Portland by:
Investigating [misdemeanor] domestic violence cases; Assisting and promoting the
deterrence of violence through community wide education and response;
Empowering families and individuals in developing and maintaining violence free
relationships and households; and interrupting the modeling of domestic violence in
households for children” (DVRU, 1995).

The unit consisted of one captain,¹⁵ one sergeant, six officers and one Latina outreach worker. Before the unit began its operations on July 9, 1993, all unit personnel participated in a two-week training program designed to acquaint them with the DVRU program plan as it had been adopted by the city council. The training covered DVRU intervention strategies, their rationale and their expected outcomes. Near the end of the two-week training, the senior author of this study gave a two-hour presentation about the planned research evaluation.¹⁶

The daily operations of the unit entail reviewing the domestic violence misdemeanor cases that it receives from officers throughout the police bureau. In 1995, for example, the unit received 6424 misdemeanor domestic violence reports. Mindful of their limited resources, the unit gave priority to repeat domestic violence cases, cases in which weapons were used, and cases where children were present. The six DVRU officers work weekdays from eight in the morning to four o'clock in the afternoon. They frequently work in pairs and do everything from taking pictures of injuries to transporting victims to and from the courthouse. In 1995, officers worked 452 of the cases they received and categorized as priority cases (DVRU, 1996).¹⁷ The workload issue became a point of discussion in the wake of our arrival at the unit. Officers seemed to feel that the use of the computerized randomization procedure that kept 60% of all arrest cases away from them left them without

¹⁴ The 1995 publication by Jolin and Clavadetscher (see References) provides a complete and detailed description of the DVRU operations. Discussion in this paper includes funding and officer training issues.

¹⁵ In 1996 the captain was replaced by a half-time lieutenant due to budget cuts.

¹⁶ During the study only three of the original DVRU staff had remained at the unit.

¹⁷ The unit officers and sergeant also provide in-service training for bureau officers and give presentations in the community. In 1995, for example, they gave 96 domestic violence presentations to audiences outside the police bureau.

enough to do. When we analyzed the problem numerically we discovered that the presence of research staff had actually increased the number of cases they 'worked' from an average 38 to 50 cases a month. Still, this did not totally alleviate officers' understandable uneasiness about knowing that large numbers of cases were not accessible to them.¹⁸

DVRU Intervention Strategies

The treatment, i.e. DVRU intervention, consisted of the investigative and empowerment strategies¹⁹ adopted by the DVRU in 1993. Investigative strategies involved various forms of collecting evidence. Victim empowerment strategies entailed the development of safety plans, instructions on how to access criminal justice and community victim services, as well as assistance with transportation to facilitate victims' access to them. During the planning stage of the present study, DVRU officers provided us with an operational definition of what they meant by 'working a case,' or, in our language, what they meant by providing treatment. The resulting list contained every investigative and empowerment strategy they used when providing treatment. The list became the "Police Check List" and represented the measurement instrument for DVRU treatment (See Appendix A for a copy of the Police Check List).

Coordinating DVRU and Research Activities

Research requirements and service delivery requirements often have divergent priorities. Research is likely to be regarded as imposing artificial constraints on effective service delivery because such service delivery requires the kind of flexibility that is not comfortably brought in line with the standardized requirements of research. Most of the resultant impositions are identifiable but some, like the workload issue we touched on earlier, are more

¹⁸ Since only custody cases were included in our study, this left an additional 1000 or more non-custody cases at the officers' disposal.

¹⁹ Appendix A Contains the Police Check List that was created by DVRU officers to document the distinct activities they use to intervene in domestic violence misdemeanor cases.

a matter of perception than fact. Aside from accommodating each other's daily routines, it was necessary to work out formal agreements about the program plan, treatment delivery and victim safety.

The Program Plan

The first and most difficult issue was identified shortly after the unit began operations. At that time, DVRU officers used the full range of strategies to intervene in domestic violence cases. The victims who were the recipients of these services expressed great satisfaction with the services they received from the DVRU (Jolin and Clavadetscher 1995). However, it was soon recognized that if six officers provided the full range of services as dictated by the program plan only about 12% of the cases forwarded to the unit received DVRU services. This realization prompted a shift in policy. DVRU administrators decided that the 12% figure was too low. And without the possibility of an increase in resources at their disposal, it meant the unit had to dilute services. The result was a new policy. From now on, DVRU officers were instructed to make telephone contact with as many victims as possible instead of conducting full-fledged investigations and providing assistance to only a few select victims. One officer said that the original plan was like providing Cadillac service to a few whereas the new policy was like providing Volkswagen service to many. Given that the present study was designed to test the effectiveness of the original DVRU program plan, the change in policy was unwelcome to the research team. In meetings between DVRU administrators and officers and the research team it was agreed that unit officers, for the duration of the study, would conduct their work in accordance with the original program plan. This, of course, was received as an intrusion since the research not only required a change in the way in which officers selected their cases but also led to a change in DVRU policy. Officers work as front line service providers to domestic violence victims. Thus, city council concerns and research design issues are not always foremost in their minds. To ameliorate what was clearly viewed as a negative effect on the DVRU's operations, officers

were invited to meetings with research staff who listened to their concerns and attempted to provide a rationale for particular research strategies.

Treatment Delivery Issues

There was great concern among DVRU staff members about cases that were relegated to the control condition, i.e. withheld from them. An agreement was reached to override the control condition in all cases in which a third party, e.g. the uniform officer who made the arrest, or the victim, requested DVRU services. Another treatment delivery issue arose from a discrepancy in the DVRU and research team work schedules. The DVRU officers generally worked between 8 am and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday. The most common method by which officers initiated treatment in a case was by phoning the victim. Logically, this would occur during DVRU office hours. Our pilot study and pre-test experiences dissuaded us from imposing similar restrictions on our research team. Establishing contact and getting interviews with domestic violence victims was difficult enough without time-imposed impediments to completing victim interviews. Consequently, we obtained interviews with treatment group victims who did not receive treatment because the officers were unable to contact them.

Victim Safety Issues

The fact that the control condition required withholding DVRU intervention was the major safety issue that had to be resolved before the grant proposal for the present study could be submitted. The issue reemerged repeatedly during the implementation phase of our study. For example, the third party or victim request issue, we mentioned above, arose in part from victim safety concerns. Another, even more direct safety concern arose from repeat victimization reports in control cases. Discussions with the DVRU command staff resulted in a mutually agreed-upon decision to make control group cases available for DVRU intervention if two subsequent domestic violence arrests occurred before the six months follow-up interview had taken place. Additionally, the research team agreed to stress to our interviewers the need to be aware of victim safety issues, particularly in control group cases.

The need to balance safety issues with research design and information gathering requirements was emphasized in all interviewer-training sessions.

Pre-Testing Sample Selection Procedures

The pre-test was conducted between March 1st and March 18th, 1996. In the course of the pre-test we discovered that about 50% of the cases forwarded to the unit did not involve on-scene arrests. Of those that did, 60% met the eligibility criteria for the study. It was clear from these findings that the timeline for reaching a sample size of 800 cases would have to be extended beyond the three to five months time period we had planned for this task. Eligibility criteria, randomization procedures, case flow and sample characteristics are discussed in the next section of this report.

SECTION FOUR

The Sample

In this section we describe the study case selection criteria and their impact on the case flow. We also describe the randomization and double blind procedures and our study sample. Our information comes from two sources, the Portland Police Data System (PPDS) a computerized data bank maintained by the Portland Police Bureau; and from initial and follow-up interviews with victims in our study. We have PPDS data for all study cases,²⁰ and interview data for little over half of our cases.²¹

Theoretically, an experimental research design should eliminate experimental and control group differences for all but the delineated outcome variables. Whether the randomization does in fact produce what we theoretically expect must nonetheless be examined. As a consequence, we have information for many domestic violence correlates, which permit us to present an extensive description of nearly a thousand misdemeanor domestic violence cases in which the batterer was arrested. Given the scarcity of such information for domestic violence arrest cases, this in itself represents a significant contribution to our understanding of domestic violence arrest cases.

Our sample was selected from domestic violence cases that came to the attention of the Portland Police Bureau between March 18th and November 27th, 1996. All of the cases, which met the study criteria during this time period, were included in our sample.

²⁰ Referred to as the "study sample" (N=927)

²¹ Referred to as the "initial interview sample" (n=478)

Eligibility Requirements for Study Cases

Case Status Criteria

- Misdemeanor Cases

Misdemeanor cases were selected because the study was an evaluation of the Domestic Violence Reduction Unit whose function it was to conduct follow-up intervention in misdemeanor domestic violence cases. In addition, we were interested in testing the hypothesis that going “beyond arrest” would affect the reoccurrence of misdemeanor domestic violence.

- Custody Cases

The decision to limit study cases to only those in which a uniform officer had made an on-scene arrest was dictated by the study’s theoretical purpose to test the “beyond arrest” hypothesis noted above.

- No Dual Arrest

Dual arrests do occur despite a provision in the Oregon Legal Code, which requires that police officers establish the identity of the primary aggressor in a domestic violence situation. Pragmatic considerations relating to sample size and theoretical considerations relating to relationship dynamics led to our decision to exclude dual arrest cases from our study.

- Relationship Status: Intimate Partners

The Oregon Legal Code (ORS 133.055) defines “domestic” and thereby sets the parameters for cases eligible for DVRU intervention. The study’s definition of “domestic” means “intimate” and is therefore narrower than the legal definition which includes, for example crimes that occur between blood relatives. Theoretical considerations relating to the divergent dynamics of relationships among blood relatives and intimate partner relationships were of primary concern when we chose to limit our study to intimate partners.

- Gender: Male Perpetrators and Female Victims

Here too, the study definition is more restrictive than the one the DVRU uses.

Our decision in this case was governed by pragmatic considerations driven primarily by sample size requirements and resource—time and money—constraints. Female batterers are a small (about 10% to 15 %) subgroup of arrested batterers. To obtain a sub-sample large enough for analysis would not have been possible in the time frame we were allotted to conduct the study.

- Age: The Perpetrator was Between the Ages 18 and 65; The Victim was Under the Age of 65

With respect to the over 65 age group, here again, our study criteria were more restrictive than were those of the DVRU. Our primary considerations were guided by the fact that the unit handled these cases differently than it handled intimate partner abuse among other age groups.

- Case Processing Issues

- We excluded cases in which the victim's telephone number was not included on the police report.
- We excluded cases, which were marked "Confidential." Police policy dictated this exclusion.
- We excluded cases, which received DVRU intervention before they came to the attention of our research staff. This happened, for example, when a victim contacted a DVRU officer shortly after the arrest occurred but before the police report reached the DVRU. For our purposes that meant the case had received DVRU intervention prior to coming into the study.

As a brief review of the case eligibility criteria indicates, not all DVRU cases were suitable for inclusion in our study. Thus to the extent that the study constitutes an evaluation of the DVRU, it is an evaluation of the effectiveness of DVRU interventions applied to a sub-set, albeit the largest sub-set, of the cases the unit actually handles. Many of the eligibility

criteria we adopted were chosen to reflect the theoretical considerations that formed the underpinnings of the DVRU program plan and the 'beyond arrest' research hypothesis.

Case Flow

When it became evident that in fact only 60% of DVRU custody cases met our study criteria, we realized that in addition to the three to five months we had allocated to the sampling phase of the study, at least another three months would be needed to obtain a minimum of 400 cases in each group. And so it was. It took eight months and nine days to obtain the study sample. Of the 1114 cases selected for the study, 187 were eliminated: 49 cases turned out to be contaminated,²² 54 cases failed to meet the study criteria,²³ and 84 cases were removed for insufficient data, e.g. insufficient agency records. Additional cases were 'truncated' for safety reasons or because they were control cases that received treatment. Truncated cases remained in the study sample (927) but not for the duration of the six months follow-up period. This situation arose, for example, when a third arrest occurred in a control group case before the conclusion of the six months follow-up period. We had agreed in our initial negotiations with the DVRU that any control group case with three repeat arrests during the six months follow-up period would be turned over to the DVRU for treatment. We had also agreed that victim self-referrals or third party requests for DVRU services would supersede a control group case assignment. For these reasons we had expected more attrition in the control group. We compensated for the expected disproportionate attrition from the control group by adopting a 60/40 sampling ratio for our

²² We removed a number of cases from the study when we discovered that one of the original research staff persons who was located at the DVRU offices obliged officers' requests to release to them police reports of certain control group study cases. We considered these cases to have been contaminated.

²³ Some case eligibility criteria were more difficult to discern than others were. For example, police reports did not always provide the kind of information that allowed our research staff to determine whether the relationship between the victim and the batterer was indeed an intimate relationship. Likewise, it was not always possible to ascertain whether a case was to be considered a misdemeanor or felony offense. As a result our research staff would discover information that determined its ineligibility after the case had been entered into the study.

randomization program. The obtained distribution of 404 (44%) treatment and 523 (56%) control group cases meant we did not lose as many control group cases as we had anticipated.

Sampling Design and Randomization Procedures

Computer generated random assignment

For each eligible case, a computer program generated a five-digit number. The first four digits were used for tracking purposes, and to help disguise the treatment cases. The last digit signified whether the case was to be classified as treatment or control (digits 1,2,3,4 indicated "treatment," digits 5,6,7,8,9,0 indicated "control"). The program contained over a thousand numbers grouped according to their last digit in blocks of ten. The grouping of numbers in this manner eliminated the possibility of long runs of assignments made exclusively to one group. Due to the possibility of computer malfunction, we created back up disks of the entire database on a daily basis. This program not only assigned random numbers, but also served as a database for case tracking and querying.

Sample size and statistical power

The number of cases in the treatment and control groups was constrained by the need to limit 1) the costs of data collection and 2) the imposition on the police agency during the time the project staff was actively involved in running the experiment.

Initial treatment and control group sizes of about four hundred each were determined to yield adequate sampling precision and statistical power for the project purposes. The power curve was examined for the test of difference in treatment-control victimization rates. This curve represents the probability of correctly rejecting the null-hypothesis of *no difference* when there is in fact a treatment effect. The calculations were based on a type I error rate (alpha) of 5% and sample sizes of 400 in each of the two groups. We exceed these sample sizes, with a total of 523 cases in the control group and 404 cases in the treatment group. Studies have shown revictimization rates between 50% and 80% (see Edleson and Tolman, 1992). The formula used for the power calculations was:

$$1 - F\left(\frac{d}{\sqrt{(.8)(.2)(27400)}}\right)$$

Where d is the true control-treatment difference and F is the cumulative standard normal distribution function.

The curve showed that for treatment effects of 7% the power would exceed .8, and for treatment effects of 10% the power would exceed .97. In the worst case, if the 50% revictimization rate is used, the power to detect differences of 7% and 10%, respectively, was reduced to 63% and 88%.

Case Assignment Procedure

The research staff housed at the DVRU was responsible for the randomization of our case materials. The police themselves knew the codes, and were trained in the assignment procedure. They assisted in upholding the integrity of the double blind. The research staff picked up the police reports three times a day from the depository, so that the DVRU officers never saw a case until after it had been entered into the study by our research staff. With each case, staff checked the database to see if the victim had already been assigned a case number. If the case already existed in the database, the research assistant assigned the report the same case number. If not, it was assigned the next available case number on the list. The information was then recorded in the police report (such as address, phone number and birthdate of the victim, and name and birthdate of the offender) on a face sheet devised by the research team. The police report and the police intervention checklist (PCL) went into a manila envelope with the case number printed on the outside. The research assistant then gave the stack of sealed envelopes to the DVRU sergeant, who then divided the cases into treatment and control sets based on the last digit of the code.²⁴

²⁴ Our research staff was able to identify miss-assignments by comparing police checklist records against our list of control group cases. If a control group case had a police check list, we knew that this case had been mistakenly assigned to receive DVRU treatment.

At this point, treatment cases were made available to the DVRU officers for intervention. Control were filed in a cabinet, and not touched²⁵ until the cessation of the study.²⁶ Research staff constrained by the double blind design contacted the victims in both groups and scheduled initial interviews. If the victim refused an interview, then the staff attempted another call after approximately one week. If the victim still refused to be interviewed, her case was omitted from the interview phase of the data collection but it was retained for agency data collection purposes.

Double Blind

All research staff members at the DVRU who were involved in randomization were kept ignorant of the treatment code. This created numerous situations where complicated procedures were necessary in order to uphold the integrity of our study design, consonant with the constraints of the double-blind procedures. Once the interviews were scheduled, the research staff member faxed a copy of the victim's face sheet to a Portland State University (PSU) research facility, where the rest of the research staff was housed. The PSU research staff was in contact with the DVRU sergeant about contaminated control cases, safety concerns, and other issues. Additionally, from this facility, the interview packets were assembled, and picked up by interviewers. If interviewers had questions about the nature of a case, they were to speak only to the PSU staff so not to possibly let slip any information about the case to the staff at the DVRU. If a victim called a DVRU officer on her own initiative, the officer provided our research staff with an 'orange slip' denoting victim contact. The DVRU research staff would fax the information to PSU on a follow-up sheet, where, if the case were determined to be a control case, it would be marked "received treatment," dated, and separated from the rest of the cases. If an interview was already

²⁵ Control group case envelopes were considered contaminated if the seal of the envelope was broken during the study period.

²⁶ Research staff took a weekly list of cases to the DVRU once the follow-up interview was completed. This meant that cases which had been set aside as control group cases were now released to the DVRU.

arranged, the PSU research staff conducted the interview to avoid breaking an engagement with a victim who had agreed to participate in our study. These kinds of situations contributed to case attrition.²⁷

The Sample

Information about sample characteristics came from two sources, the Portland Police Data Systems (PPDS)²⁸ computer files and the interview schedules we developed for this study.²⁹ We obtained PPDS data for all 927 cases in the study. For just over half of the study sample (N=478) we also obtained interview data.

²⁷ We had to remove several Hispanic victims from the study because we discovered they were control cases that had received treatment. This was largely due to 'orange slip' problems that were related to language and organizational issues between our research staff and the police unit. This is the reason we 'lost' many of the Spanish-speaking victims.

²⁸ See Police Record Form (PRF) in Appendix D.

²⁹ See Appendix B and Appendix C.

Table 4.1: Case Characteristics of Misdemeanor Domestic violence Cases in which the Batterer was Arrested on the Scene: Study Sample,³⁰ Initial Interview Sample, and Treatment/Control Sub-Samples³¹

| Characteristics | Study Sample ³² (SS) N=927 | | Treatment Group | Control Group |
|--|---|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | Initial Interview Sample ³³ (IIS) n=478 | | SS n=404 IIS n=211 | SS n=523 IIS n=267 |
| Crime Type Involved* ORS Codes | 163.160 Assault IV: | 60% | 60% | 61% |
| | 163.190 Menacing | 13% | 12% | 14% |
| | 133.310 VRO | 9% | 11% | 8% |
| | 166.065 Harassment | 3% | 2% | 3% |
| | Other & Missing | 13% | 16% | 15% |
| Number of Charges* | 1 Charge: | 82% | 83% | 82% |
| Type of Residence Where the Arrest Occurred* | Single Family Residence | 42% | 41% | 43% |
| | Apt Bldg. Or Condo | 37% | 39% | 35% |
| | Other | 21% | 4% | 5% |
| Victim-Offender Relationship | Married living together | 29% | 24% | 33% |
| | Not married living together | 39% | 42% | 37% |
| | Not living together | 32% | 35% | 29% |
| Duration of Relationship | less than one year | 13% | 16% | 11% |
| | one to five years | 50% | 50% | 48% |
| | more than five years | 38% | 34% | 41% |
| Who called the Police | Victim | 54% | 55% | 52% |
| | Friend | 22% | 21% | 23% |
| | Family | 14% | 15% | 12% |
| | Don't Know/Other | 11% | 10% | 13% |
| Type of Violence Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) | Verbal Violence ³⁴ | 93% | 95% | 91% |
| | Object Violence | 49% | 48% | 49% |
| | Moderate Violence | 81% | 82% | 81% |
| | Severe Violence | 43% | 41% | 45% |
| | Sexual Violence | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| Injuries Police Report* | Yes | 59% | 56% | 62% |
| Instrument/Force Used as Noted in the Police Report* | Hands/Feet | 79% | 78% | 81% |
| | Other ³⁵ | 7% | 8% | 6% |
| | Unknown | 14% | 15% | 13% |
| Children Present* as Noted in Police Report | Yes | 24% | 23% | 25% |
| | Not Mentioned in Report | 75% | 75% | 75% |
| A & D Involved | Noted on Police Report* | | | |
| | Yes (927) | 43% | 43% | 43% |
| | Partner (as Reported by Victim) (440) ³⁶ | 72% | 72% (n=195) | 71% (n=245) |
| Victim (as Reported by Self) (461) ³⁷ | 22% | 18% (n=203) | 25% (n=258) | |
| Witnesses Present* as noted in Police Report | Yes | 38% | 34% | 41% |

³⁰ An asterisk identifies information available for the Study Sample: N=927

³¹ Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to 100.

³² Variations in sample size are indicated for each variable.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ See Table 4.5 in this section for definitions of these categories.

³⁵ Seven cases involved the use of a firearm, 13 cases the use of a knife, 6 the use of a club, and in 16 cases an object was thrown at the victim.

³⁶ 38 victims in the initial interview sample gave 'Don't Know' as an answer, in the treatment group the number was 16, in the Control Group it was 22. 'Don't Knows' were excluded from the percentage calculations.

³⁷ 17 victims in the initial interview sample gave 'No answer' as an answer, in the Treatment Group the number was 8, in the Control Group it was 9. 'No Answer' responses were excluded from the percentage calculations.

As we expected, successful randomization enabled us to conclude there were no significant differences in case characteristics between treatment and control groups in either the study sample or the initial interview sample.

Batterer Characteristics

Our study design, for economic reasons, did not include interviews with batterers. Rather than settling for no information about batterers at all, we asked victims to answer questions about their batterers, cognizant that our batterer data derived from interviews reflect the victim's view and not that of the batterer.

On the whole, the data presented in Table 4.2, suggest that, as a group, the batterers in our study resemble batterers in other studies (Choi, 1990; Ford & Regoli, 1993; Gelles & Cornell, 1985; Straus, 1996), and men who are arrested for other violent offenses (Dutton, 1995). We found that a substantial percentage are not fully employed (44%); 35% earn less than \$ 10,000 annually, 32% have not completed high school, 40% have received treatment for substance abuse problems, 45% were abused as children, and 61% witnessed violence in their family of origin.

.c. Table 4.2: Batterer Characteristics: The Study Sample,³⁸ Initial Interview Sample, and Treatment/Control Sub-Samples.³⁹;

| Characteristics | Study Sample * (SS) N=927 Initial Interview Sample (IIS) v=478 | Treatment Group SS=404 IIS=211 | Control Group SS=523 IIS=267 |
|-----------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Average Age* | 33 years (n=906) | 33 years (393) | 34 years (513) |
| Race* | European American | 62% | 62% |
| | African American | 24% | 22% |
| | Hispanic | 9% | 10% |
| | Asian | 4% | 5% |
| | Native American | 1% | 1% |
| Education | Some HS or less (n=461) | 32% | 34% (n=202) |
| | HS or GED | 41% | 41% |
| | Some college or more | 26% | 25% |
| Employment | Full time employment (n=469) | 56% | 55% (n=206) |
| | Part time employment | 10% | 12% |
| | Not employed-No government assistance | 23% | 22% |
| | Not employed-Receives government assistance | 11% | 11% |
| Annual Income | \$ 10,000 or less | 35% | 36% |
| | \$ 10,001 to 30,000 | 34% | 33% |
| | Over \$ 30,000 | 13% | 13% |
| | Don't know | 18% | 19% |
| General Violence | Reported by Victim ⁴⁰ | 35% (n=389) | 36% (n=174) |
| | Reported by Victim Received Treatment (n=441) ⁴² A&D is Problem (n=461) ⁴³ | 40% 72% | 38% (n=194) 75% (n=204) |
| Criminal History * | Any Arrest 5 years prior | 49% | 51% |
| Childhood Experiences | Batterer felt not at all cared for by parents ⁴⁴ | 37% | 40% |
| | Batterer witnessed domestic violence as a child | 61% ⁴⁵ | 59% |
| | Batterer was abused as a child | 45% ⁴⁶ | 47% |
| Blames Victim* | Yes | 30% | 29% |
| Denies Incident* | Yes | 39% | 36% |

³⁸ An asterisk identifies information available for the Study Sample: N=927

³⁹ Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to 100.

⁴⁰ 89 'Don't Know' answers in the Interview Sample, 37 in the Treatment Group, and 52 in the Control Group were excluded from the percentage calculations.

⁴² 77 'Don't Know' answers in the Interview Sample, 17 in the Treatment Group and 20 in the Control Group were excluded from the percentage calculations.

⁴³ 17 Victims in the Interview Sample responded with 'Don't Know,' 7 in the Treatment Group and 10 in the Control Group. These responses were excluded from the percentage calculations.

⁴⁴ Seventy victims in the Interview Sample, 34 in the Treatment Group, and 36 in the Control Group did not know this information. Percentages were calculated without the 'Don't Know' responses.

⁴⁵ 118 victims in the Interview Sample, 49 in the Treatment Group, and 69 in the Control Group did not know this information. Percentages were calculated without the 'Don't Know' responses.

⁴⁶ 123 victims in the Interview Sample, 54 in the Treatment Group, and 69 in the Control Group did not know this information. Percentages were calculated without the 'Don't Know' responses.

The randomization allowed us to conclude that no significant differences in batterer characteristics between treatment and control groups existed in either the study sample or in the initial interview sample.

Victim Characteristics

Battered women who come to the attention of the criminal justice authorities, like their batterers, share certain characteristics with other victims whose records are available from police files. This was true for the women in our study as well. As Table 4.3 shows, on average they were 31 years old, 72% were European American, 16% were African American, and 6% were of Hispanic descent. While almost half (45%) the women we interviewed had some college education, fully 95% earned less than \$30,000 a year. Comparing them to batterers, we found that almost twice as many victims had some college education (45% vs. 26%) but were less than half (5% vs. 13%) as likely to have earned more than \$ 30,000 per year. This may be related to the fact that more of the batterers than the victims (56% vs. 45%) were employed full time, and that of the 83% of the victims who had children, one third had children under the age of three (See Table 4.4).

Prior Domestic Violence

We used a modified version of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979, 1990b) to measure the existence of different types of violence before, during, and after the event that led to the batterer's arrest.⁴⁷ Prior violence, i.e. violence that occurred between the study victim and batterer during the six months before the study arrest, involved verbal violence in 90%⁴⁸ of the cases, moderate violence in 75%, object violence in 63%, severe violence in 36%, and sexual violence in 14% of the cases. In 48% of the cases the violence led to injuries which in decreasing order of frequency involved cuts or bruises (47%), damage to eyes, ears, or teeth (11%), internal injuries (5%) (see Table 4.5).

⁴⁷ We discuss the limitations of the CTS in Section Two of this report.

⁴⁸ Table 4.5 identifies the items included in this category.

.c. Table 4.3: Victim Characteristics: The Study Sample,⁴⁹ Initial Interview Sample, and Treatment/Control Group Sub-Samples.⁵⁰

| Characteristics | Study Sample (SS) N=927 Initial Interview Sample (IIS) n=478 | Treatment Group SS 404 IIS 211 | Control Group SS 523 IIS 267 |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Average Age* | 31 (906) | 30 (393) | 32 (513) p. 02 |
| Race* | European American 72% | 73% | 72% |
| | African American 16% | 16% | 16% |
| | Latin American 6% | 5% | 6% |
| | Native American 3% | 2% | 3% |
| | Asian 4% | 4% | 4% |
| Education | n=475 | n=211 | N=264 |
| | Some High School 22% | 25% | 19% |
| | High School or GED 34% | 32% | 35% |
| | Some College or more 45% | 43% | 46% |
| Annual Income | N=475 | n=210 | n=265 |
| | \$ 10,000 or less 54% | 56% | 52% |
| | \$ 10,001 to 30,000 41% | 40% | 42% |
| | Over \$ 30,000 5% | 4% | 6% |
| Employment | N= 475 | n=210 | n=265 |
| | Full Time 42% | 41% | 43% |
| | Part Time 19% | 21% | 18% |
| | Unemployed-No Government Assistance 16% | 13% | 18% |
| | Unemployed-Government Assistance 23% | 25% | 22% |
| Alcohol and Drug Problems | Victim Self Report | | |
| | Received Treatment 18% | 18% (n=206) | 19% (n=260) |
| | A & D is a Problem 11% | 13% (n=206) | 10% (n=258) |
| Victimization by Same Batterer during Six Months before Arrest | N=478 | n=211 | n=267 |
| | Verbal Violence 90% | 92% | 89% |
| | Moderate Violence 75% | 76% | 74% |
| | Severe Violence 36% | 37% | 36% |
| | Sexual Violence 14% | 15% | 14% |
| Injury from Prior Victimization | N=478 | (n=211) | (n=267) |
| | Yes 48% | 51% | 46% |
| Official Record of Prior Victimization | Yes 15% | 17% | 14% |
| Childhood Experiences | N=475 | n=211 | v=264 |
| | Victim felt not cared for by parents 13% | 10% | 16% |
| | Victim witnessed domestic violence 40% | 43% (n=210) | 38% (n=265) |
| | Victim was abused as child 37% | 41% (n=210) | 34% (n=265) |

⁴⁹ An asterisk identifies information available for the Study Sample.

⁵⁰ Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to 100.

Victim characteristics in the study sample as depicted in Table 4.3 did show one significant difference at the time of the initial interview: the mean age of the treatment group was younger (30 vs. 32) than the control group.

Victim and Batterer Childhood Experiences

The data in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 lend empirical support to the coexistence of adult and childhood experiences of domestic violence (Fantuzzo & Lindquist, 1989; Simons et al., 1995). This association is viewed as having causal significance in the cycle of violence literature (Campbell et al., 1994; Simons et al., 1995). As we noted in Section Three, the impetus for the creation of the Police Domestic Violence Reduction Unit was its potential to interrupt this very cycle. Again, it is important to remember that our findings are derived from a sub-population of domestic violence occurrences — those in which the batterer was arrested.

Our initial interview contained questions that inquired about victim and batterer childhood experiences. The victim answered three questions about her own experiences and was then asked to answer those same questions for the batterer. For all three questions batterers' childhood experiences, according to their victims, were considerably more negative than their own. While 13% of victims reported they felt not at all cared for by their parents, they reported this to have been the case for 37% of the batterers. Likewise, while 40% of the victims said they had witnessed domestic violence while growing up, they said the same was the case for 61% of their batterers. The difference was less pronounced for childhood experiences involving physical or sexual abuse (37% of victims vs. 45% of batterers).⁵¹

⁵¹ There were no statistically significant differences between the Treatment and Control Group responses for either victims or batterers.

Table 4.4: Witnessing Battering: Batterers, Victims and Children.

| | Interview Sample n=478⁵² | Treatment n=211 | Control n=267 |
|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Victim has children | 83% | 81% | 83% |
| Average Number of Children | 2.12 | 2.2 | 2.12 |
| Children are under Age 3 | 33% | 41% | 28% p.018 |
| Children are 13 to 18 years | 24% | 23% | 25% |
| Children Witnessed Violence between Batterer and Victim | 61% | 61% | 61% |
| Police Report notes Child Witnesses | 24% (927) | 23% (404) | 25% (523) |
| Victim Witnessed Violence during Childhood | 40% | 43% | 38% |
| Batterer Witnessed Violence during Childhood ⁵³ | 61% | 59% | 60% |
| Batterer was Abused as Child | 45% | 47% | 43% |
| Victim was Abused as Child | 37% | 41% | 34% |

We show a significant difference⁵⁴ in the initial interview sample group in whether the victim has children under age three between the treatment and control groups at the time of the initial interview.

Alcohol and Drug

Alcohol and Drug use are frequently noted correlates of domestic violence (Dutton, 1995; Gelles & Straus, 1979; Burgess & Draper, 1989; Tiftt, 1993;). We asked victims whether they considered Alcohol and Drugs (A&D) to be a problem for them or their batterers and whether either had ever received A&D treatment. Batterers, according to their victims, had more problems than their victims did. Eleven percent of the victims compared to 72% of the batterers are reported to have A&D problems. This difference is reflected in reports of who has undergone treatment for this problem-18% of victims vs. 40% of batterers.

⁵² Missing cases are excluded from the percentage calculations.

⁵³ As reported by victims: 118 victims gave 'Don't Know' as a response for the Interview Sample as a whole, 49 in the Treatment Group, 69 in the Control Group. Missing cases were omitted from the percentage calculations.

⁵⁴ We expected that about 5% of the variables we had included in our analyses would show significant differences by chance. Such findings do not necessarily show a flaw in the randomization design.

We also tried to establish whether Alcohol and Drugs were a factor in the violent event that led to the batterer's arrest. Here we have two sources of information, the report written by the arresting officer and the victim interview (see Table 4.1). According to the responses obtained during the interview, 72% of batterers and 22% of victims had used alcohol or drugs prior to the violent event that resulted in the arrest.

Prior Violence and Changes After the Arrest

Multiple and prolonged experiences of violence affect victims differently than one-time violent experiences (Stets & Straus, 1989). Ninety percent of the women we interviewed reported that they had experienced verbal violence. In 63% of the cases the batterer had "thrown, smashed, hit or kicked something" at least once during the six months prior to the arrest. Victims reported having experienced moderate physical violence such as being pushed, kicked or bitten, in 75%, and severe violence, such as being choked, beaten up or having a gun or knife used against them, in 36% of the cases. In 48% of the cases these violent events resulted in injuries to victims. As expected we found no significant differences between treatment and control group victims in the type and degree of violence they experienced prior to and at entry into the study. According to the data in Table 4.5 victim reports of whether or not they experienced various types of violence showed that what they experienced during the six months leading up to the arrest and during the event that led to the arrest was not very different. This picture changed dramatically for the time period after the arrest. Victims reported fewer revictimizations for all types of violence. Treatment group victims as compared to control group victims reported significantly fewer revictimizations during the six months' follow-up period (refer to Section Eight for a detailed discussion of these results).

Table 4.5: Victim Reports of Violence Experienced Six Months Before, During, and Six Months After the Arrest.

| Violence as Measured with the CTS ⁵⁵ | During the Six Months Prior to the Arrest ⁵⁶ IIS n=478 | During the Event that Led to the Arrest ⁵⁷ IIS n=478 | During the Six Months After the Arrest ⁵⁸ |
|---|---|---|--|
| Verbal Violence ⁵⁹ (17,18,19,20) | 90% | 93% | 56% |
| Violence Directed at Object (21) | 63% | 49% | 25% |
| Moderate Physical Violence (22,23,24, 25,26) | 75% | 81% | 26% |
| Severe Physical Violence (27,28,29) | 36% | 43% | 10% |
| Sexual Violence (30) | 14% | 3% | 6% |
| Violence Caused Injury | 48% | 59% ⁶⁰ | 14% (380) |

Victim Empowerment: Help-Seeking Activities

Several DVRU victim interventions were aimed at victim empowerment. The Initial Interview (See Appendix B) contained two sets of questions addressing empowerment issues. The first set of 13 questions asked victims to tell us about help-seeking activities they pursued during the six months before their batterer's arrest. Table 4.6 summarizes victim responses.⁶¹ We grouped the items into three categories: Seeking Criminal Justice Support, Seeking Non-Criminal Justice Support, and Seeking Informal Support. Nearly twice as many

⁵⁵ The limitations of using the CTS as violence measurement tool were discussed in Section Two.

⁵⁶ There were no statistically significant differences between the Treatment and Control Group responses.

⁵⁷ There were no statistically significant differences between the Treatment and Control Group responses.

⁵⁸ Significantly fewer Treatment Group victims than Control Group victims reported revictimizations during this time period.

⁵⁹ These categories represent composites of questions (identified by numbers) in the Initial Victim Questionnaire in Appendix B.

⁶⁰ As noted in the police report N=927.

⁶¹ The 13th question was an open-ended 'Other' category, 17% of the victims marked this response. Some examples of such 'other' help-seeking behaviors were: talked to children, talked to the batterer's family or the batterer himself, talked to coworkers or boss, called suicide hotline, or went to a support group.

victims sought informal support from family and friends (81%), as sought professional help (44%) or the assistance of the criminal justice system (47%). Prior to the violence that led to their partner's arrest, 38% of victims had asked the police to intervene, and 20% had gone to court to obtain a restraining order. Aside from speaking to friends (71%) and family (63%) the next most often sought out assistance involved mental health professionals (29%). It should be noted that a very small number of victims (3%) indicated that they either went to a shelter for counseling or stayed overnight there.

.c. Table 4.6: Victim Empowerment Help-Seeking Behavior During the Six Months Prior to Entry into the Study.

| Victim Help-Seeking Behaviors | Interview Sample n=478 | Treatment Group n=211 | Control Group n=267 |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Talked to Minister | Yes: 13% | 11% | 15% |
| 2. Saw a Doctor | Yes: 16% | 18% | 14% |
| 3. Talked to a Family Member | Yes: 63% | 65% | 62% |
| 4. Talked to a Friend | Yes: 71% | 72% | 70% |
| 5. Talked to a Mental Health Professional | Yes: 29% | 30% | 28% |
| 6. Talked to the District Attorney | Yes: 14% | 17% | 12% |
| 7. Attempted to get a Warrant | Yes: 12% | 11% | 12% |
| 8. Went to a Shelter for Counseling | Yes: 3% | 3% | 2% |
| 9. Stayed Overnight at Shelter | Yes: 3% | 2% | 3% |
| 10. Asked Police to Intervene | Yes: 38% | 40% | 36% |
| 11. Went to Court to get a Restraining Order | Yes: 20% | 21% | 20% |
| 12. Talked to an Attorney | Yes: 9% | 9% | 9% |
| Total: Criminal Justice System Support Items 6, 7, 10, 11, 12 | 47% | 50% | 45% |
| Total: Non-CJ Professional Support Items 1, 2, 5, 8, 9 | 44% | 45% | 43% |
| Total: Informal Support Items 3, 4 | 81% | 81% | 81% |

There were no significant differences in the study interview sample between the treatment and control groups at the time of the initial interview with respect to victim empowerment help-seeking behaviors.

Victim Empowerment: Perception of Agency

A set of four questions asked victims to tell us how “in control” they felt in their present circumstances (See Appendix B Initial Interview items 131-1134). Table 4.7 shows that half or more than half of the battered women gave no indication of being or feeling unable to help themselves. Fully 70% of women feel capable of keeping themselves safe.

Table 4.7: Victim Empowerment: Perception of Agency at the Time of the Initial Interview.⁶²

| | Interview Sample n=478 | | Treatment Group n=211 | Control Group n=267 |
|--|---------------------------|-----|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Victim is Confident that she can keep herself safe | Not true ⁶³ | 9% | 12% | 8% |
| | Somewhat true | 20% | 20% | 21% |
| | Mostly true | 70% | 69% | 72% |
| Victim feels her Family Life is under Control | Not true | 21% | 31% | 20% |
| | Somewhat true | 32% | 22% | 30% |
| | Mostly true | 52% | 55% | 50% |
| Victim Believes she can Solve her Problems | Not true | 11% | 10% | 12% |
| | Somewhat true | 36% | 36% | 37% |
| | Mostly true | 53% | 54% | 52% |
| Victim Feels she is doing all she can to get Help from the CJ system | Not true | 23% | 22% | 24% |
| | Somewhat true | 23% | 25% | 21% |
| | Mostly true | 54% | 53% | 55% |

None of the differences in the interview sample regarding the victim’s perception of agency were found to be significant at the time of the initial interview between the treatment and control groups.

Stake In Conformity

⁶² Due to rounding percentages may not add up to 100.

⁶³ Response categories 'Not true at all' and 'Mostly not true' were combined into 'Not true.' Response categories 'Mostly true' and 'Very true' were combined into 'Mostly true.'

This concept which attempts to measure the degree to which an individual is integrated into society (see Table 4.8), was originally used to explain variations in the deterrent effect of arrest for sub-populations in some of the Minneapolis replication studies. Sherman (1992) found support for stake in conformity as an important measure leading to deterrence in the data from Milwaukee, Omaha, and Colorado Springs, especially when employment was the unit of analysis. He found that in all three studies arrest of unemployed batterers (low stake in conformity) was associated with increased violence. The implication was that criminal justice interventions in domestic violence situations had a greater deterrent effect for batterers who were employed, had families and were otherwise tied to the *status quo* in some fashion. For purposes of this study, it would mean that offenders, who had *more to lose* rather than *less to lose*, would be less likely to become repeat offenders. Table 4.8 provides information about batterers' and victims' stake in conformity. Each item (See Appendix B) represents an indicator of conformity. It is reasoned that a batterer with more years of formal education, a greater degree of employment, higher income, who owns a home and car, interacts regularly with his extended family, belongs to a club or professional organization, and is married and has children has *more to lose* than someone with fewer of these attributes.

.c. Table 4.8: Stake in Conformity: A Comparison of Arrested Batterers and their Victims
Interview Sample n=478

| Stake in Conformity Items | Arrested Batterer⁶⁴ | His Victim⁶⁵ |
|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Education: High School or More | 68% | 79% |
| Employment: Full Time | 56% | 42% |
| Income: \$ 20,000 Year or More | 35% | 19% |
| Owns Own Home | 9% | 12% |
| Owns Own Car | 54% | 65% |
| Regularly Interacts with His or Her Extended Family | 64% | 81% |
| Is an Active Member in a Club or Social Organization | 14% | 22% |
| Belongs to Professional Organization | 14% | 12% |
| Average Stake in Conformity Score | 4.47 | 5.43 ⁶⁶ |
| Has Children | N/A | 83% |
| Married to Victim/Batterer | 29% | 29% |
| Batterer and Victim Own Home Together | 13% | 13% |
| Relationship Duration greater than 1 Year | 87% | 87% |

In conclusion, given the randomization design, we did not expect to find significant differences in case, batterer or victim characteristics. The fact that we did find differences in treatment and control group 'victim age' and 'children under 3' was congruent with the expectation that about 5% of the variables would show significant differences by chance, and does not necessarily show a flaw in our randomization design.

⁶⁴ The information for batterers was obtained from victim interviews. 'Don't know' responses and missing values were excluded from the percentage calculations.

⁶⁵ 'Don't know' responses were excluded from the percentage calculations.

⁶⁶ We obtained one statistically significant difference (p .026) for Treatment and Control Group responses to the item 'Batterer and Victim Own Home Together.'

SECTION FIVE

Levels Of Treatment

Treatment as Designed

The specific elements that comprise the DVRU intervention are set forth in the original program plan that was presented to the Portland City Council in the spring of 1993. The DVRU itself, as well as its intervention strategies, owe their existence to the collaborative efforts between the Portland Police Bureau and the Family Violence Intervention Steering Committee. The influences of community policing on the one hand and the community domestic violence service providers on the other hand contributed to an intervention plan based on a combination of social learning theory, feminist theory, and deterrence theory. The overall goal of the combined DVRU strategies was to interrupt the cycle of violence that occurs among some couples. Learning theory principles and deterrence theory principles were reflected in the DVRU strategies that sought to bring about sanctions for batterers. Feminist principles were expressed in those DVRU strategies that sought to empower victims.


Batterers are assumed to use violence to maintain a pattern of control over their partners (Mahoney, 1991; Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Schechter, 1982; Martin, 1976; Yllo, 1993; Wilson and Daly, 1992; Jones, 1994). The punishment inherent in criminal justice system interventions serves to counteract the rewards the batterers get from controlling their partners. As a corollary, batterers can be assumed to perceive as a threat any intervention that seeks to enhance their partner's control in the relationship. If we assume for a moment that actual batterers conform their conduct to these theoretically expected patterns then we would

anticipate outcomes that potentially negate each other. In other words, one has created a situation in which the batterer faces sanctions for his use of violence while feeling an increased need to use it, thereby negating any deterrent effect that might have been gained from the experience of criminal justice system interventions. Mahoney (1991) coined the term *Separation Aggression* to identify the violence batterers direct at their intimate partners when they take control of the situation by leaving their abusers. Other researchers have pointed to escalations in violence when women have taken steps to leave their assailants (Campbell, 1992; Hart, 1988; Browne, 1987). Of course, not all violent relationships have equally firmly established power and control patterns. It is likely that the above noted effect is less applicable to relationships of shorter duration, or to relationships where victims are more rather than less empowered prior to the violent conduct that led to the DVRU intervention. Nonetheless, DVRU strategies (hereafter referred to as “treatments”) have potentially complex effects on expected outcomes.

The DVRU Program Logic

The program logic suggests that the DVRU engage in two types of activities that combine to reduce repeat violence between intimate partners. One set of strategies is investigative in nature and seeks to increase the likelihood that batterers are prosecuted, convicted and sentenced. The other set of strategies is intended to empower victims. Victims who are empowered, it is reasoned, are more likely to participate in the prosecution of their batterers and are more likely to engage in conduct that avoids repeat victimization. Thus the combined expected effect of these strategies, mediated by the interim outcome measures of prosecutions, convictions, sentences and empowerment, is a reduction in repeated intimate violence.

.c. Figure 1: Program Logic of the Domestic Violence Reduction Unit (DVRU)



Levels of Treatment

By 1995, almost two years after the DVRU began its work, findings from a National Institute of Justice funded process evaluation confirmed that the original program plan had been implemented as intended (Jolin and Clavadetscher, 1995). Six officers worked in teams of two to provide the full range of interventions in selected priority cases. Priority status meant that one of four conditions pertained to a given case: a history of violence; the victim was injured; the violence involved the use of a weapon; or children had witnessed the violence. This approach to treatment delivery was highly labor intensive with the consequence that, numerically speaking, the vast majority of cases sent to the DVRU remained essentially untouched. Still, as the process evaluation revealed, victims with whom DVRU officers had contact gave high praise to their efforts. Likewise, DVRU partners, within as well as outside the criminal justice system, were highly complimentary in their

assessment of the unit. Still, as we mentioned in Section Three of this report, in the time between the conclusion of the process evaluation and the beginning of the present study, the new DVRU leadership had implemented a thoroughly revised program. The centerpiece of the new DVRU program plan was to provide information to as many victims as possible by telephone. One of the DVRU officers described the change: "We used to provide Cadillac service to a few; now we give Volkswagen service to many."

Since the research design for this study was based on the original DVRU program plan, our first task involved a series of discussions with the new DVRU leadership in which we stressed the need to return to the unit's original program plan. Ultimately the DVRU command staff and its officers agreed to provide treatment as set forth in the original DVRU program plan *for the duration of our study*. The officers were given to understand that they could switch back to the victim phone call approach as soon as the researchers were gone. This did little to enhance our already precarious status as outsiders in a police operations unit, but by the time we began with the sample selection a spirit of goodwill, with just a hint of an acceptance of the inevitable prevailed⁶⁷

Measuring Treatment: The Police Check List

We had asked DVRU officers to provide us with an exhaustive list of the tasks they performed in the course of "working a case." We compiled their responses in a list and asked DVRU officers as well as command staff whether this list was an accurate representation of the original DVRU program plan. The final version of this list was named *The Police Check List* (PCL) and became the measurement tool we used to assess DVRU treatment (see Appendix A for a copy).

Aside from the first four items on the PCL, there were 17 items, which represented a specific action an officer might undertake in the course of "working" a study treatment case.

⁶⁷ A detailed discussion of these and other study implementation issues can be found in an article by Jolin and Moose (1997) listed in the Reference section of this report.

There are two ways to represent the concepts underlying DVRU treatment. First, treatment activities can be viewed as representing the offender deterrence and victim empowerment concepts specified in the theoretical model of the program plan. Second, DVRU interventions can also be viewed as level of engagement, making distinctions, for example, between calling a victim on the telephone and going to the victim's house to take pictures of her injuries.

.c. Table 5.1: Study Treatment Cases: Batterer Deterrence and Victim Empowerment Treatment Provided⁶⁸ as Reported by DVRU Officers⁶⁹;

| Types Of Treatments Used As Part Of The DVRU Intervention Program | Treatment Received |
|---|-------------------------|
| DVRU Provided Any Treatment | 71% (286) |
| DVRU Provided No Treatment | 29% (118) |
| DVRU Established Telephone Contact with Victim | 67% ⁷⁰ (270) |
| DVRU Delivered Any Type of Treatment ⁷¹ | 100% (286) |
| <i>Any Batterer Deterrence Treatments</i> | 100% (285) |
| Took Photographs etc. to Assist Prosecution | 12% (35) |
| Served Restraining Order | 4% (11) |
| Helped Victim Get Appointment with District Attorney | 41% (116) |
| Helped Victim with Transport to and from Court | 2% (5) |
| Helped Victim get Restraining Order | 13% (37) |
| Provided Victim with Prosecution Information | 98% (280) |
| Provided Victim with Restraining Order Information | 74% (211) |
| <i>Any Victim Empowerment Treatment</i> | 79% (226) |
| Transported Victim to Shelter | None |
| Gave Victim Motel Vouchers | None |
| Gave Victim Food Basket | None |
| Referred Victim to Advocacy Program | 26% (73) |
| Provided Information on Safety Planning | 70% (200) |
| Provided Information on Getting Access to Safe Housing | 50% (144) |
| Provided Information on How to Get Counseling | 59% (168) |
| Provided Information on Batterer Counseling | 56% (161) |
| Other ⁷² | 56% (160) |

Of the 404 study cases that were randomly assigned to the treatment group, DVRU officers indicated having provided treatment to 286 cases. They submitted PCLs for another

⁶⁸ DVRU officers submitted PCLs for 394 of the 404 cases that had been randomly assigned to the Treatment Group.

⁶⁹ It was our intent to ask Treatment Group victims about the treatment they had received from the DVRU officers. The research design provided for a 36-hour window before we made any attempt to contact Treatment Group victims. Still, our interviewers discovered that many victims had had no DVRU contact before the initial victim interview. Because our questionnaires had no provisions for this occurrence, we were unable to get reliable victim information for DVRU services.

⁷⁰ DVRU officers were unable to establish telephone contact with 124 of the 394 cases for which they submitted PCLs.

⁷¹ In 286 cases PCLs indicated that DVRU officers had used at least one type of intervention.

⁷² Comments associated with the category 'Other' most often entailed details on interventions or victims' responses to them and accounts of phone contact attempts.

108⁷³ treatment group cases for which they were unable to provide treatment. The most common 'batterer deterrence' strategy was providing prosecution information to victims (98%). The most common 'empowerment' strategy was providing safety plan information to victims (70%). Some form of 'batterer deterrence' intervention was provided in 71% (285 of 404) of treatment group cases. Some form of 'empowerment' intervention was provided in 56% (226 of 404) of treatment group cases in the study.

If one looks at treatment provided from the "level of engagement" perspective, three distinct levels are apparent. One level consists of providing information, a second level consists of providing assistance to those involved in the case, a third level entails personal contact with either the batterer (restraining order service), the victim (taking photographs of her injuries), or witnesses (taking statements). The pattern that emerged indicated that DVRU officers engaged in personal contact (level three activities) least often, and in providing information (level one activities) most often. The rate at which they provided assistance to victims (level two activities) fell in between. When we looked at the personal contact level, DVRU officers reported having "taken photographs or witness statements" in 12% (35), and having "served restraining orders" in 4% (11) of treatment group cases. Two other activities "Helping victims with transport to/from court" (2% or 5) and "Helping victims get restraining orders," (13% or 37) can involve personal contact and have therefore been considered level three activities. Other level three treatments-transported victim to shelter, gave victim motel vouchers, gave victim food baskets-were not used at all. The officers indicated that they had 'provided assistance' (level two) to victims by helping them get an appointment with the district attorney in 116 cases (41%), and by referring them to a victim advocacy program in 73 cases (26%). DVRU officers said that the treatments they delivered most often involved providing information (level one). For example, they provided victims with prosecution information in 280 of the 286 cases that received any treatment at all. In 200

⁷³ We received no PCLs for 10 Treatment Group cases. These were treated as missing cases for purposes of the analysis.

(70%) cases victims received information about safety planning and requesting a restraining order. In other words, nearly every case received treatment if that treatment could be provided by telephone. It appears that the “victim call back policy” may have retained its preeminent status after all.

What the Arresting Officers Provide: The Control Condition

In our particular study, arresting the batterer constitutes the baseline intervention. Given the history of criminal justice intervention, Oregon provides a fairly high level of intervention by criminal justice agencies even in the absence of treatment as defined in our study. In many communities around the country, arresting batterers for misdemeanor domestic violence crimes is considered a strong government response in and of itself. In fact, there are those (Sherman, 1992) who suggest that arresting batterers represents an unwarranted degree of formal intervention. Still, for us this is the starting point.

The treatment, as discussed above, and as the title of this project suggests, aims to go beyond arrest. While it is the case that DVRU intervention strategies are aimed at increasing the likelihood that batterers are prosecuted, this does not mean that men are not prosecuted if no DVRU intervention occurs. Because an on-scene arrest is our control condition, both the victim and the offender have been exposed to police intervention. As Table 5.2 shows, uniformed officers provide information and assistance to victims that differs little from some of the information DVRU officers provide a day or two later (See Table 5.1). It is conceivable then that a control group victim who received information from the arresting officer about initiating the prosecution in her case did indeed contact the district attorney’s office, hence we have a control group case with prosecution. The same scenario applies to obtaining restraining orders, seeking shelter or other assistance.

We asked treatment and control group victims to tell us what assistance they received from the uniformed officers who arrested their batterers. We asked, for example (See Appendix B for Initial Interview Questionnaire items 91 through 102) whether the officers

provided the legally mandated Information Card. Oregon law (ORS 133.055) requires that patrol officers give to domestic violence victims a card which contains victim services and referral information. Clearly, victims who receive this card will be more readily able to gain access to available services than victims who do not. It removes obstacles and thus enables victims to take actions to prevent further victimizations. Officers may also provide victims with verbal instructions about safety plans, how to prosecute, and/or get a restraining order. We asked victims whether or not they received this type of information from the officers. For example, we asked: "...[Did the officers] recommend that you go to the District Attorney's office?" This, as can be seen from the DVRU program plan, is also part of the DVRU intervention. Thus control group and treatment group victims receive similar information. The difference lies in how often and when this information is given to victims. Control group victims, for example get referral information from the "Information Card," and they may get additional verbal instructions from the arresting officers. Treatment group victims get this information twice, when the batterer is arrested and later when DVRU officers contact them. Table 5.2 shows what victim's remembered from their encounter with the arresting officers. There were no statistically significant differences between treatment and control group victim responses with one exception. More control group (48%) than treatment group victims (40%) recalled that the arresting officers had "Provided information on legal rights or assistance." The majority of victims felt that the arresting officers listened to them (79%) and were able to calm the situation (67%). About two thirds of the victims recalled receiving the legally mandated "Information Card," having been given restraining order information and been advised to contact the district attorney's office. Fewer victims recalled that uniformed officers related information about non-criminal justice system services. For example, 42% of victims remembered officers giving them information about shelters, and 23% recalled being referred to a victim assistance program. Uniformed officers, according to victims, only infrequently (15%) seemed to provide 'on the spot counseling.'

.c. Table 5.2: Victims' Reports Of Services⁷⁴ They Received From Uniformed Officers

| Police Services Provided by the Officers Who Made the Original On-Scene Arrest | Initial Interview Sample n=478 | Treatment Group n=267 | Control Group n=211 |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Information Card Given to Victim | 76% | 78% | 74% |
| Listened to Victim | 79% | 78% | 80% |
| Officers Calmed Things Down | 67% | 66% | 69% |
| Provided Restraining Order Information | 72% | 72% | 72% |
| Recommended Contacting DA | 70% | 67% | 72% |
| Provided Information about Shelters | 42% | 43% | 40% |
| Provided Information about Legal Rights/Assistance | 44% | 48% | 40% p< .04 |
| Recommended Contacting a Shelter | 18% | 19% | 16% |
| Recommended Counseling | 15% | 14% | 17% |
| Referred Victim to Victim's Assistance Program | 23% | 24% | 22% |
| Provided 'On-The-Spot-Counseling' | 15% | 16% | 13% |

Victims' Assessment of Arresting Officers' Conduct

An arrest represents a significant intervention for the parties to the incident. Victims as well as offenders tend to pay close attention to police officers' conduct. We have learned that whether or not victims are satisfied with the officers' handling of their situation affects their willingness to participate in further formal intervention strategies (Carlson & Nidey, 1995). It is also reasonable to suspect that the arresting officer's interaction with the victim can strengthen or undermine the victim's resolve to help herself, i.e. it can bolster or diminish her sense of empowerment. Insofar as victim empowerment and batterer deterrence are central to

⁷⁴ We asked a question about 'Transport to hospital or shelter,' only one percent of the victims in our study indicated receiving this service from uniformed officers. This is likely to reflect study design and shelter policy provisions rather than officer conduct. Misdemeanor crimes rarely involve serious physical injury and some local shelters do not reveal their location to police officers.

the hoped for change in recidivism, determining the extent to which the arresting officer's conduct may have contributed to these factors is of interest. A set of questions in the Initial Victim Interview (See Appendix B. Questions 90 through 110) asks victims to assess their experience with the arresting officers. Table 5.3 summarizes how victims' felt about the arresting officers who intervened.

.c. Table 5.3: Victim Assessment of Uniformed Officers' Conduct⁷⁵

| Victim Assessment of Specific Officer Actions ⁷⁶ | Initial Interview Sample n=478 | | Treatment Group n=211 | | Control Group n=267 | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|---------------------|-----|
| Officers Were Concerned About Me | Very Much So | 49% | Very Much So | 49% | Very Much So | 48% |
| | Somewhat | 38% | Somewhat | 37% | Somewhat | 39% |
| | Not At All | 14% | Not At All | 14% | Not At All | 13% |
| Officers Were Respectful | Very Much So | 68% | Very Much So | 74% | Very Much So | 64% |
| | Somewhat | 21% | Somewhat | 17% | Somewhat | 24% |
| | Not At All | 11% | Not At All | 9% | Not At All | 12% |
| Officers Were Objective and Businesslike | Very Much So | 58% | Very Much So | 61% | Very Much So | 56% |
| | Somewhat | 28% | Somewhat | 27% | Somewhat | 29% |
| | Not At All | 14% | Not At All | 12% | Not At All | 16% |
| Officers Treated Me Like I was Lying or Crazy | Very Much So | 9% | Very Much So | 6% | Very Much So * | 13% |
| | Somewhat | 11% | Somewhat | 10% | Somewhat | 11% |
| | Not At All | 80% | Not At All | 84% | Not At All | 77% |
| Officers Were Hostile | Very Much So | 4% | Very Much So | 2% | Very Much So | 5% |
| | Somewhat | 9% | Somewhat | 8% | Somewhat | 10% |
| | Not At All | 87% | Not At All | 90% | Not At All | 85% |
| Victim's Overall Satisfaction with Officers | Very Satisfied | 47% | Very Satisfied | 48% | Very Satisfied | 46% |
| | Satisfied | 34% | Satisfied | 34% | Satisfied | 34% |
| | Dissatisfied | 10% | Dissatisfied | 9% | Dissatisfied | 10% |
| | Very Dissatisfied | 10% | Very Dissatisfied | 10% | Very Dissatisfied | 10% |
| Victim Would Want the Police Involved in Future | Yes | 87% | Yes | 89% | Yes | 86% |
| Victim's Satisfaction With 911 Operator | Very Satisfied | 38% | Very Satisfied | 39% | Very Satisfied | 40% |
| | Satisfied | 43% | Satisfied | 41% | Satisfied | 45% |
| | Dissatisfied | 19% | Dissatisfied | 19% | Dissatisfied | 18% |

* The difference between Treatment and Control responses was statistically significant at the .04 level.

Often the tone for an interaction with the police is influenced by the police emergency telephone experience, i.e. the 911 call. We asked victims who had called the police to tell us how satisfied they were with the response they received from the operator. Of the 56%

⁷⁵ Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to 100.

⁷⁶ One of the questions asked victims to recall how 'helpful' they thought the officers were. A scanning problem resulted in a large number of missing answers casting doubt on the reliability of responses to this question.

percent of the victims in our study who called the police emergency number more than two thirds reported being satisfied or very satisfied with the encounter. Similarly, 81% of the victims we interviewed said they were satisfied with the way the arresting officers handled their situation, and 47% said they were very satisfied. Their overall assessment of the patrol officers who came to their house is captured by the fact that 87% of the victims said “Yes” when we asked “If you’re ever assaulted again by an intimate partner, would you want law enforcement to get involved again?”

SECTION SIX

Interviews

The research design called for two in-person interviews with all victims in the study. The initial victim interview was to take place within one week of her partner's arrest. The follow-up interview was to occur six months after that. We expected initial interviews to conclude shortly after reaching 800 study cases, with follow-up interviews to conclude six months thereafter. Portland State University students were trained to conduct the one-hour interviews using specially developed questionnaires (see Appendices B and C). Interviews were to take place at victims' homes. Victims received eight dollars cash per interview in partial, though largely symbolic, compensation for giving their time to the study. Confidentiality and safety provisions were an integral part of the interviewing process. Victim interviews began in March 1996 and ended in July 1997.

Scheduling Interviews

Research staff at the DVRU offices scheduled all initial victim interviews. Since research staff were blind to the randomization codes, the initial victim phone contact involved reading from a script (see Appendix E) so as not to inadvertently provide contaminating information to control group victims. To avoid other possible sources of contaminating the double-blind design, interview schedules for the treatment and control groups had different color codes and were assembled and tracked at a different location.

Establishing contact with victims and conducting the actual interviews proved more difficult than anticipated. The reasons for interview non-completion rates and associated final counts for each category are shown in Table 6.1.

.c. Table 6.1: Initial Interview Completion and Non-Completion Information

| Victim Contact and Non-Contact Information | Study Sample N=930 ⁷⁷ | Treatment Group n=406 | Control Group n=523 |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Interviews Completed | 512 | 216 | 296 ⁷⁸ |
| Interviews Not Completed ⁷⁹ | 418 | | |
| Telephone Disconnected | 55 | 18 | 37 |
| Unable to Contact-Ever | 187 | 78 | 109 |
| Victim Refusal | 202 | 89 | 113 |
| Interview Scheduled but not Completed | 128 | 59 | 69 |
| Language Problems ⁸⁰ | 18 | 8 | 10 |
| Past Cut-Off Date | 54 | 20 | 34 |

Several problems prevented the research staff from establishing contact with victims or carrying out a scheduled interview. Many of the victims had unlisted phone numbers, for example. In other cases, batterers would not allow their partners to answer the phone. Since it was our policy not to speak to the batterer about the purpose of the call, it became impossible to set up an interview without placing the victim at risk. In other cases victims said that they would rather be interviewed at the police station than at their homes. We decided not to do this for fear of contaminating the control condition by bringing the victims to the DVRU for an interview.

Some victim refusals may have been due to the telephone identifier our research staff used when they called victims to set up the initial interview. The caller identified herself as calling from 'family services,' the name of the organizational division within which the DVRU was housed.⁸¹ Some victims may have identified this with the Children's Services

⁷⁷ We obtained interviews for three cases for which we did not obtain official records. Because we have official records data for almost twice as many cases as cases for which we have interview data we have adopted 927 as the study sample size elsewhere.

⁷⁸ 34 completed interviews were not included in this analysis due to contamination.

⁷⁹ It was possible that more than one reason for non-completion applied to a case. For example, a case could have been coded as both 'past the cut-off date' and 'unable to speak the language' because we were not able to converse with a Korean victim for example.

⁸⁰ We only completed 5 interviews in a language other than English-4 in Spanish and 1 in Vietnamese. Thus 13 of the 18 were not completed.

⁸¹ We had adopted this identifier to avoid using the term Domestic Violence Reduction Unit with control group victims.

Department and associated the call with losing their children. One of the more common reasons for an interviewer's inability to complete an interview, once it was scheduled or already begun, came from an interviewer safety policy we had adopted. According to this policy an interview could only be conducted if the victim was the only adult in the house. As many victims were staying with friends or family members, it was not always possible for victims to actually produce an 'empty' house in which case our interviewer was instructed to cancel and reschedule the interview. Such difficulties in obtaining victim interviews prompted us to make several adjustments in our interviewing procedures.

First, the initial policy to call victims only during DVRU operating hours was reconsidered. We had adopted this plan to achieve greater concordance between DVRU officer and study victim contacts. We had hoped to avoid creating a sub-group of treatment group victims who never had any contact with unit officers because they were not reachable between 8 am and 4 p.m. Mondays through Fridays. Immediately after the policy was changed and victims were called during evening hours and on weekends, we were much more successful in establishing contact with victims.

Second, we adjusted the 10-day rule for the initial interview. The original plan had called for each initial interview to be completed within one week to ten days of the arrest that brought the case into the study. As it became evident that scheduling and adhering to an agreed upon schedule proved difficult with our group of victims, we relaxed the 10-day rule. The 10-day provision became the preferred option but researchers recorded the time that had elapsed between the arrest and initial interview so it could be used later as a variable in the data analysis.

Third, we included telephone interviews. The initial interview plan stipulated in-person interviews for all cases. When it became obvious that it was difficult for some victims to make and keep appointments with us they were offered a phone interview at their earliest convenience. Though in-person interviews remained the preferred mode, a telephone interview was considered preferable to none.

Fourth, estimates of sample size for completed interviews had to be revised. After three months into the study we realized that case-flow and victim contact-rate realities, together with time and resource limitations, put our original goal of 800 victim interviews out of reach. The revised goal was to aim for 800 study cases and work hard to get the greatest possible number of interviews within that sample.

In fact, we ultimately obtained initial interviews for 478 study cases, representing a 52% completion rate. The follow-up interview completion rate was 81% (386/478). Clearly, the retention rate for victims once they were part of our study was markedly higher than the rate at which we were able to bring them into the study initially. This may have been attributable to a procedural change in the scheduling of follow-up interviews which was possible only because the double blind provisions ceased to apply once the study sample was in place. Now, instead of the research staff attempting coordination between interviewers and victims, each interviewer was given a caseload and allowed to contact the victim and conduct the interview at her convenience. Research staff was in contact with the interviewers, and took care of making sure each victim was paid. Also, if the interviewer was unable to complete an interview for any reason, the research staff 'worked' the case until the interview was completed. Research staff carried out random checks to insure interview completion and accuracy. Progress was reviewed at weekly staff meetings.

What exactly brought about the relatively low completion rate for the initial interviews is difficult to ascertain. Indisputably, women who have been victimized by their partners to the extent that it leads to their batterer's arrest experience significant upheaval in their lives. They are forced to consider whether or not to press charges, obtain a restraining order and relocate themselves and their children while attempting to deal with the emotional dynamics of a violent intimate relationship that has now become a public event involving criminal justice authorities. In the midst of this turmoil participation in a research study has low priority.

The Effect of Interview Procedure Changes on the Distribution of Sample

Characteristics

The randomization procedure, as described in Section Four, produced essentially⁸² equal and equivalent treatment and control samples. Had we been able to interview everyone, perhaps the same could have been said about our interview sub-samples. But, as mentioned, this was not the case. Completed victim interviews were obtained for about half the cases in the study. Whether or not differences existed between **cases with** and **cases without** interviews was examined. Tables 6.2 and 6.3 show the differences between the two groups. In Table 6.2 the distribution of case characteristics for study cases with an initial interview is compared to study cases with no interview. Statistically significant differences for three variables were found: Crime Involved, Offender Race and Victim Race. As the "Crime Involved" category shows, we were more successful at obtaining interviews with victims whose case involved an arrest for a restraining order violation than other types of offenses. This makes sense, for a victim who has a restraining order when she enters the study is likely to have a stable residence (and phone number), and is accustomed to dealing with representatives of the criminal justice system. These are all factors that increase chances of obtaining an interview with her. Resource limitations, namely difficulties finding qualified Spanish speaking student interviewers, seem to have been responsible for the lower than expected number of interviews with Hispanic women. As Table 6.3 shows the was true when we examined cases with both, the initial and the follow-up interview, and compared them to study cases with no interviews.

⁸² There were two statistically significant differences: 'Victim Age' and 'Victim has Children under Age 3'.

Table 6.2: Case Characteristics⁸³ for Study Cases With and Without Initial Interviews

| CASE CHARACTERISTICS | INITIAL VICTIM INTERVIEW | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------|----------|
| | YES N=478 | NO N=552 | |
| Crime Involved | 163.160 Assault IV | 58% | 52% |
| | 163.190 Menacing | 12% | 9% |
| | 133.310 VRO | 12% | 5% <.005 |
| | 166.065 Harassment | 3% | 3% |
| | Other/Missing | 12% | 14% |
| Children Present - Police Report | Yes: | 25% | 20% |
| Witnesses Present - Police Report | Yes: | 35% | 33% |
| Injury Involved - Police Report | Yes: | 55% | 51% |
| Instrument/Weapon Used - Police Report | Hands/Feet: | 76% | 67% |
| | Other ⁸⁴ | 9% | 5% |
| | Unknown | 15% | 9% |
| A & D - Police Report | Yes: | 41% | 36% |
| Offender with Prior Criminal Record | Yes: | 48% | 41% |
| Offender Race | White | 65% | 68% |
| | Black | 24% | 19% |
| | Hispanic | 7% | 9% <.04 |
| | Other | 4% | 5% |
| Offender Age: Average in Years | | 33 | 33 |
| Victim Race | White | 73% | 58% |
| | Black | 14% | 12% |
| | Hispanic | 4% | 7% <.04 |
| | Other | 5% | 5% |
| Victim Age: Average in Years | | 32 | 31 |
| Repeat Violence - Police Report | Yes: | 26% | 23% |

⁸³ All of the data in this table are based upon information as provided in the original police reports.

⁸⁴ This category includes knives, guns, bludgeoning instruments and thrown objects.

Table 6.3: Characteristics for Study Cases With and Without Initial and Follow-Up Interviews.

| <i>Case Characteristics</i> | <i>Initial and Six-Months Follow-Up Interview</i> | | |
|--|---|-------------|-----------|
| | YES N = 386 | NO N=544 | |
| Crime Involved | 163.160 Assault IV | 55% | 52% |
| | 163.190 Menacing | 12% | 12% |
| | 133.310 Restraining Order Violation (VRO) | 12% | 6% < .01 |
| | 166.065 Harassment | 3% | 3% |
| | Other/Missing | 12% | 15% |
| Children Present - Police Report | Yes | 26% | 22% |
| Witnesses Present - Police Report | Yes | 35% | 40% |
| Injury Involved - Police Report | Yes | 53% | 63% |
| Instruments/Weapons Used - Police Report | Hands/Feet | 74% | 83% |
| | Other ⁸⁵ | 10% | 6% |
| | Unknown | 17% | 11% |
| Offender with Prior Criminal Record | Yes | 46% | 50% |
| A & D - Police Report | Yes | 40% | 44% |
| Offender Race - Police Report | White | 64% | 61% |
| | Black | 25% | 23% |
| | Hispanic | 6% | 11% |
| | Other | 5% | 6% |
| Offender Age: Average in Years | | 33 | 33 |
| Victim Race - Police Report | White | 59% | 71% |
| | Black | 14% | 14% |
| | Hispanic | 2% | 8% < .005 |
| | Other | 5% | 7% |
| Victim Age: Average in Years | | 32 | 31 |
| Repeat Violence - Police Report | Yes | 25% | 28% |

The Interviewers and Interviewer Training

Interviewers were Portland State University graduate and undergraduate students. Many of them were social work graduate students. The two men in the initial interviewer pool remained for only a short while, leaving an all-female interview staff for the remainder of the study. Some of the initial interviewers remained with us from March 1996 until July 1997. One of the interviewers who joined our study at the outset and remained until the end of the interviewing phase conducted 329 interviews. In order to accommodate victim scheduling needs and student class schedules we had to maintain a pool of about 10 to 14 interviewers at

⁸⁵ Ibid.

all times, including one who spoke Spanish and one who spoke Vietnamese. The administrative resources needed to maintain this pool of available student interviewers were greater than anticipated. The most taxing task was to hire and train new interviewers as others left the study. Students rather than professional interviewers were chosen because of the opportunity that it gave them to work on a research project. While this may have been a laudable policy, it was one that placed strain on the research team.

The initial interviewer training was a daylong affair that included presentations by research team members; the DVRU sergeant and officers; a representative from *Women's Strength*, a women's self-defense program; and the project manager. Topics ranged from an overview of the study to interviewing and role-playing. Each interviewer received a copy of the *Interviewer Manual* which contained copies of the questionnaire, informed consent letters, victim re-contact sheet, and so on (see Appendix F). Ongoing training sessions were held at the principal investigator's home on a monthly basis. Interviewers who joined the study once it had begun received a shortened version of the original daylong training session, augmented by on-the-job instruction from more experienced interviewers.

Conducting Interviews Safely

Contacting domestic violence victims by telephone mere hours after their partner's arrest raised a variety of safety issues. Our research staff who called victims shortly after the arrest was carefully trained to avoid any possibility that our phone-call could jeopardize the victim's safety. A complete copy of the telephone script is in the *Interviewer Manual* (see Appendix E). Phone-calls, as we discovered, could present safety issues for our research staff as well. One staff member's experience reminded us of the fact that batterers can use caller identification features to obtain names and phone numbers. In this case, the batterer, suspicious and angry, called the interviewer at home and demanded to know the purpose of the call to his house. The staff member had to notify the Telephone Company to change her

phone number. We immediately notified our interviewers instructing them to use the *67 feature⁸⁶ when calling victims from their homes.

The research design, as noted above, called for in-person interviews to be conducted in the victim's home if possible. A significant portion of the interviewer-training program addressed safety relating to victim home visits. Prior to arriving at the victim's house, for example, interviewers were instructed to reconfirm the interview with the victim by calling her house. As part of this phone call, the interviewer reiterated that she would only be able to conduct the interview if the batterer was neither in nor near the house. If this could not be arranged, the interviewer was to reschedule the interview. Aware of the possibility that the victim might not be able to control the interview circumstances, interviewers were told to be alert at all times once they had entered the house. In the event that they felt "something was not right," they were free to discontinue the interview. Interviewers were also instructed to not leave behind any materials that could endanger the victim's safety. If in the course of conducting the interview, an interviewer felt that the victim's safety was in jeopardy right then, as when the angry batterer entered the home during the interview, the interviewer was instructed to notify either the principal investigator or the police. In this study safety was paramount for victims and interviewers. Carefully delineated procedures as well as a measure of luck were necessary to achieve this goal.

⁸⁶ This feature blocks the outgoing number from appearing on Caller Identification. Some phones will not accept blocked calls. For these cases, the interviewers called from a phone at the Portland State University research facility.

SECTION SEVEN

From Arrest To Incarceration

On several occasions in this report we have referred to the 1995 process evaluation of the DVRU (Jolin and Clavadetscher, 1995). We commented that tracking domestic violence crimes through the criminal justice system was not only a complex task but also one that was impossible to carry out in any routine way. It was not possible then, nor was it possible at the time of this study, to discern which domestic violence arrests lead to what types of prosecution and/or sentencing outcomes. We concluded then that this was due to the fact that


Each justice agency has created a system which tracks its own workload or fulfills its own communication needs best. The computerized information at each agency has been designed as if the important "story" about a case begins and ends within that agency's oversight. For example, each agency typically creates a new, unique "case number" for what are really the same characteristics of an event or person moving through the chain of agencies which form the criminal justice "system" (Jolin and Clavadetscher, 1995:41).

Our recommendation in 1995 that each agency make a small sacrifice of convenience and either agree to use one case number, assigned when the emergency call is logged, i.e. at the 9-1-1 stage, or agree to track the previous agency's case number alongside their own was not implemented.

The present study gives some insight into what we may learn about the criminal justice response to domestic violence when agency databases are linked by a common number. We followed 927 cases from arrest to prosecution, from prosecution to conviction, from conviction to sentencing, and from sentencing to sanction. Getting the necessary data was a complex task that required the active cooperation of many criminal justice agency

representatives. It required locating “our” batterers and “our” victims in each agency data base,⁸⁷ identifying and extracting the relevant data,⁸⁸ and then creating our version of a coordinated justice system data file based on a case identification number. Once this task was completed, we were able to follow domestic violence cases through the criminal justice system following a misdemeanor arrest. The following graph depicts the intermediate outcomes in our study:

.c. Figure 2. From Arrest to Conviction



⁸⁷ Many of the problems we encountered were related to the use of aliases by batterers as well as victims. In one case the batterer and the victim each had more than 10 recorded aliases as well as variations in birth dates.

⁸⁸ This was particularly challenging for sentencing and restraining order information. The court database is a relational database that contains records of all court actions relating to a particular case. However, if a case involves criminal as well as civil court actions, the activities are recorded in the respective criminal and civil database subsystems. Given the fact that domestic violence cases often involve both the criminal and the civil court system we spent many hours sifting through seemingly endless records of judicial orders.

District Attorney Case Tracking System (DACTS)

The District Attorney Case Tracking System (DACTS) became operational in June 1993. The database could flag domestic violence cases,⁹⁴ thus enabling us to identify which arrest cases were prosecuted and with what results. In addition to its own case number, DACTS carried forward the police report number thereby creating a link⁹⁵ between the police and district attorney data bases.

Because our study involved only cases in which the batterer was arrested, and because police arrest reports were routinely forwarded to the district attorney's office, we expected to find DACTS records for all⁹⁶ study cases.⁹⁷ One of the intermediate outcome goals for the DVRU program plan was to increase prosecutions for misdemeanor domestic crimes, based on the expectation that DVRU investigations would produce prosecutable cases. Thus a deputy district attorney who screened cases for prosecution⁹⁸ was presumably less likely to decline prosecuting a DVRU, i.e. treatment group case, than a non-DVRU, i.e. control group case, mainly because the treatment group case provided more of the needed evidence to prosecute. Table 7.2 shows that this was the case: the district attorney's office initiated prosecutions in treatment group cases significantly more often than in control group cases. This difference carried through to convictions. Batterers in the treatment group were significantly more likely to be convicted of at least one of the charges they faced than batterers in the control group. We also found that the district attorney up-graded misdemeanors to felonies more often when treatment group than when control group cases were involved.

⁹⁴ This requires a special designation because the crimes themselves, e.g. Assault IV, give no indication of the victim-offender relationship status.

⁹⁵ DACTS also contains the DA Case Court Number, which in theory can provide a useful link to the court database.

⁹⁶ Nevertheless, we were unable to obtain DACTS case disposition information for 45 study cases.

⁹⁷ The police report distribution process provides that one copy of a domestic violence arrest report is sent to the District Attorney's office and another one to the DVRU. Only those sent to the DVRU were subject to the randomization procedures used in this study.

⁹⁸ The Multnomah County District Attorney's Office uses written guidelines for the screening of criminal cases.

Thirty five percent of the 927 batterers in our study were prosecuted for at least one of the offenses they had been charged with. Twenty percent were convicted and 22 percent of the 927 men in our study had a sentence imposed.⁸⁹ Batterers in the treatment group were more likely than their control group counterparts to be prosecuted, convicted and sentenced. An equal number (20%) of victims in each group filed restraining orders against their batterers. We now take a closer look at our data for each component of the criminal justice system.

The Portland Police Data System (PPDS)

As dictated by the study's eligibility criteria, cases considered for tracking had to have entered the criminal justice system via an on-scene arrest for a misdemeanor domestic crime. The police bureau maintains computerized records of such arrests in the PPDS. Arrest records were available for each of the 927 study cases in the sample.

Multnomah County Sheriff's Warrant and Inmate System (SWIS)

Oregon law (ORS 133.310) mandates that a defendant is booked into jail upon a probable cause arrest for a domestic crime. Assuming the law was implemented as ordered we expected to find electronic booking records for all cases in our study. Jail data were found for all but nine batterers in our study.⁹⁰

⁸⁹ For sentencing records we used the OJIN records as the most proximate data source to the event.

⁹⁰ The Sheriff's Department underwent a major computer system conversion during the course of our study. Our efforts to collect data for nearly one thousand cases only added to an already difficult situation. We appreciated the kindness and understanding we were shown by the people in the record division.

.c. Table 7.1: Jail Data: Study Sample, Treatment Group, and Control Group

| | Study Sample N=927 ⁹¹ | Treatment Group n=404 | Control Group n=523 |
|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Jail Time Prior to Release on Bail or Own Recognizance ⁹² | Average: 64 hrs 2 days 16 hrs | 70 hours 2 days 22 hours | 57 hours 2 days 9 hours |
| Jail Time Prior to Any form of Release | Average: 126 hrs 5 days 2 hours | 139 hours 5 days 19 hours | 112 hours 4 days 16 hrs |
| Type of Release ⁹³ | | | |
| • Own Recognizance | 55% | 57% >than expected | 54% <than expected |
| • Released on Bail | 36% | 32% <than expected | 39% >than expected |
| • Released to Third Party | 4% | 5% >than expected | 3% <than expected |
| • Released upon Sentence Completion | 4% | 5% >than expected | 3% <than expected |
| Victim Requested Release Notification | 13% | 16% | 9% p.001 |

Release decisions in domestic violence cases in Portland are guided by a 1993 judicial order specifying that in matters of pretrial release of defendants for offenses involving family members “any release decision, other than security release [i.e. bail], shall be deferred until the first appearance of the defendant before a magistrate” (Londer, 1993). Thus batterers remained in jail until arraignment unless they were able to post bail. If they did post bail they were required to sign a release agreement stating that they would have no contact with the victim in the offense unless specifically authorized by the court.

As Table 7.1 shows, there were statistically significant differences in the type of release for treatment and control group offenders. It is not clear what might have produced these differences. The other significant finding—that more treatment group victims requested to be notified of the batterer’s release from jail—may reflect differences in victim empowerment between the two groups.

⁹¹ There were nine study cases we were unable to find in the jail database.

⁹² The number of missing cases varied by category.

⁹³ The difference between treatment and control group release type was statistically significant at the p < .04 level.

Table 7.2: Prosecution Data: Study Sample, Treatment Group, and Control Group

| Prosecutorial Action | Study Sample N=927 ⁹⁹ | Treatment Group n=404 | Control Group n=523 |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Cases Issued | 37% (325) | 44% (179) | 37% (191) p.008 |
| Cases Rejected ¹⁰⁰ | 63% | 56% | 63% |
| Convictions | 20% (189) | 24% ¹⁰¹ | 17% ¹⁰² p.002 |
| Case Dispositions | | | |
| • Case Dismissed ¹⁰³ | 37% | 31% | 34% |
| • Not Guilty by Trial | 5% | 3% | 5% |
| • Guilty by Trial | 8% | 8% | 6% |
| • Guilty Plea | 50% | 46% | 42% |
| Average Number of Charges per Case | 1.58 | 1.6 S.D. .99 | 1.56 S.D. 1.05 |
| Convictions on Felony Charges | 9% | 14% | 4% |

A Conditional 'No Drop' Policy

The district attorney 's policy about victim participation in misdemeanor domestic violence cases stipulates that the decision to prosecute not depend upon the victim's willingness to proceed with the case so long as at least one priority criterion is met. Priority criteria are: 1. The case involves a weapon; 2. The case involves children; 3. The offender has a history of domestic violence; and 4. The offender confessed. If none of these exist then the victim's participation becomes necessary for the case to proceed (Underhill, 1997).¹⁰⁴

Deferred Sentencing Program

Batterers without a criminal history were generally eligible to enter the deferred sentencing program. If they chose to participate they had to enter a plea of guilty at arraignment. If they successfully completed the six months treatment program administered through the Adult Community Justice Services Department (Community Corrections), their

⁹⁹ Forty-five cases in the DACTS have unknown dispositions. Unknowns are excluded from the percentage calculations.

¹⁰⁰ A case is 'Rejected' if the evidence provided in the police report is not enough to meet the probable cause test necessary for prosecution.

¹⁰¹ The treatment and control group percentages are based upon the aggregate of 'guilty pleas' and 'found guilty' divided by 927.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Dismissal means a case is selected for prosecution, but for some reason the district attorney is unable to proceed with the case from that point on. For example, the case has proceeded to trial and the main witness fails to testify.

¹⁰⁴ Underhill Rocerick. 1997. Senior Deputy District Attorney for Domestic Violence Cases in the Multnomah County District Attorney's Office. Personal communication. Portland, Oregon.

plea was withdrawn and criminal charges dismissed. If the batterer failed to complete the program, he was sentenced in conjunction with the original charges. We present deferred sentencing data in the last part of this section.

Oregon Judicial Information Network (OJIN)

OJIN was our data source for sentencing and restraining order information. OJIN is a relational database, i.e. it records in (mostly) chronological order all legal actions pertaining to each case under its jurisdiction. Criminal and civil case records are maintained separately. While some OJIN data were accessible via public computer terminals at the courthouse, extracting case specific information from the database required skill. Without assistance from the Court Administrator's staff, it would not have been feasible to collect the necessary data for this case-tracking task.

Restraining Order Information

Whether or not a victim had a restraining order against her batterer was important for two reasons. One, it served as baseline indicator of victim empowerment if a victim upon entry into the study already had a restraining order against her batterer. Two, it served as an indicator of newly acquired victim empowerment if she filed a restraining order petition after she came into the study.

The Court Administrator's office provided us with records of all restraining order petitions that were filed in Multnomah County between March 18, 1995 and May 27, 1997. From these records we were able to establish the existence of a restraining order at the time of the batterer's arrest as well as the filing of a petition during the six months following the arrest. According to the information in Table 7.3 eleven percent of study cases had restraining orders in place when they entered the study. After entry into the study an additional 185 restraining order petitions were filed. There were no statistically significant differences between treatment and control group cases.

.c. Table 7.3: Restraining Order Data: Study Sample, Treatment Group, and Control Group.

| | Study Sample N=927 | Treatment Group n=404 | Control Group n=523 |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Study Cases with Restraining Orders | 30% ¹⁰⁵ (276) | 32% (129) | 28% (147) |
| Restraining Order was in effect prior to entry into the study | 11% | 13% | 9% |
| Victim Filed Restraining Order after entry into the study | 20% (185) | 20% (82) | 20% (103) |
| Restraining Order was Served | 85% | 83% | 87% |
| Restraining Order was Contested by batterer | 27% | 22% | 30% |
| Restraining Order was Vacated upon Victim's Request | 13% | 12% | 14% |

According to Oregon law, the respondent, i.e. the batterer, can request a hearing as soon as he has been served with the restraining order. The court must hold such hearings within five days of the request when child visitation is involved and within 21 days if other provisions are contested. The results in Table 7.3 show that restraining orders filed by treatment and control group victims were equally likely to be served, contested and vacated.

Sentencing Information

OJIN was also the database from which we extracted batterer sentencing data. The study cases which could logically be expected to have sentencing records were cases identified in the district attorney data files by “guilty by trial” or “guilty by plea” dispositions. According to the district attorney records, 189 study cases had such dispositions. Of these we were able to locate 176 in OJIN.¹⁰⁶

While it was reasonable for us to expect a treatment effect for ‘sentence imposed,’ it is difficult to make a straightforward case for treatment effects influencing the type of sentence

¹⁰⁵ Due to rounding percentages may not add to 100.

¹⁰⁶ Despite our expectations that only cases with ‘guilty plea’ and ‘guilty by trial’ i.e. convictions in DACTS would be in OJIN, we found 20 cases in OJIN which DACTS had identified as having an ‘unknown’ disposition, and 11 cases which DACTS had identified as ‘dismissed.’ Conversely, 13 of the cases we expected to be in OJIN because DACTS had listed them as ‘guilty plea’ or ‘guilty by trial’ were not in OJIN.

given. For example, greater investigative thoroughness could lead to indictments on more serious charges and with it more severe sentences. Or, greater investigative thoroughness could persuade otherwise reluctant batterers to enter into plea bargains for lighter sentences. As Table 7.4 shows, there were no differences between the two groups in the types of sentences batterers received. However, there was a statistically significant difference in whether or not a sentence was imposed. More treatment group batterers were sentenced than control group batterers.

.c. Table 7. 4: OJIN Sentencing Data:¹⁰⁷ Study Sample, Treatment Group, and Control Group;

| | Study Sample N=927 | Treatment Group n=404 | Control Group n=523 |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| OJIN Records Sentence Imposed | 22% (207) | 27% (108) | 19% (99) p.003 |
| Sentence Type | | | |
| • Jail | 32% | 29% | 35% |
| • Probation | 70% | 69% | 71% |
| • Fine | 70% | 68% | 73% |
| • Diversion | 21% | 19% | 22% |
| • Prison | 3 batterers | 1 | 2 |
| • None of the Above ¹⁰⁸ | 52% | 57% | 47% |
| • Felony Sentences | 9% | 13% | 4% |

Corrections Data: Adult Community Justice Services Domestic Violence Unit Data Base

Batterers with sentences to probation were under the supervision of the Adult Community Justice Services Division. It was not possible to obtain electronic data for batterers who were maintained on general probation caseloads. However, we were able to obtain some data for batterers in the Deferred Sentencing Program, i.e. Diversion. The batterer's decision to enter the Deferred Sentencing Program occurred at the prosecution stage of the criminal process. The six-month program was administered by probation officers

¹⁰⁷ Sentences typically involve more than one of the above categories, e.g. probation plus fine. Hence percentages can not be summed by column.

¹⁰⁸ This category includes sentences to community service, A&D counseling, batterer counseling etc.

that were assigned to this special unit. The program dictated no contact with the victim for the first 30 days, participation in a 24-week domestic violence education program, participation in alcohol/drug treatment if necessary, and so on. Non-compliance, depending on the seriousness of the violation, could lead to expulsion from the program and to criminal sanctions.

Determining the exact deferred sentencing program status of batterers in our study was possible only to the extent of locating 'our' batterers in the Deferred Sentencing Unit database. We were able to follow a batterer from the DACTS disposition to an OJIN sentence and subsequent interactions with the Deferred Sentencing Program with only a limited degree of reliability because of the complexity of exchanging information across three agencies with three separate databases. The district attorney's office, which initiated the batterer's program participation and entered this information into its DACTS database; the courts, which provided the judicial order making the batterer's decision legally binding and entered the information into OJIN; the Deferred Sentencing Program, which oversaw batterers' compliance and entered this information into their program's data base. In the course of tracking study cases through the criminal justice system we learned that crossing institutional boundaries can be analogous to the kiss of death for the data involved. For this reason we are least confident about the accuracy of our data at this step in our tracking procedure.

.c. Table 7.5: Deferred Sentencing Program Data: Study Sample, Treatment Group, and Control Group.

| | Study Sample N=927 | Treatment Group n=404 | Control Group n=523 |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Batterers sentenced to Deferred Sentencing Program ¹⁰⁹ | 12% (110) | 14% (57) | 10% (53) |
| Batterers still in Program at 6-month check | 37% (41) | 42% (24) | 32% (17) |
| Batterers no longer in Program at 6-months check | 63% (69) | 59% (33) | 68% (36) |
| Successful Completion | 40% (28/69) | 42% (14/33) | 39% (14/36) |
| Removed from Program | 29% (20/69) | 27% (9/33) | 31% (11/36) |

The category Program Participation in Table 7.5 illustrates one problem with a six-months follow-up study design. Twenty-four treatment group batterers and 17 control group batterers were still undergoing court mandated counseling when our study concluded. Any questions about treatment impact on future violence by these batterers must remain unanswered.

¹⁰⁹ We were not able to determine case dispositions for 21 cases with a program completion date, 10 in the treatment group and 11 in the control group.

SECTION EIGHT

Results

In this section we examine the outcome data we collected six months after the domestic violence arrest that brought the case into study. These data came from two sources, follow-up interviews with victims and police reports. In Part 1, we will report the behavior of 14 outcome variables with respect to “intent to treat.” That is, their values will be compared between our treatment and control groups, disregarding the fact that not all members of the treatment group received treatment and that the most common type of treatment entailed providing information to victims (see Section Five). In Parts 2 and 3, the control and treatment groups were pooled, and the effects of various predictors¹¹⁰ on the outcome variables are shown. In Part 2, their effect on the number of restraining orders, number of prosecutions, and change in empowerment from the initial to the follow-up interview were studied. Finally, in Part 3, the effect of the police checklist predictors and these intermediate outcomes were used as predictors of our fourteen outcome variables.

Part 1: Treatment and Control Group Outcomes

First we examined treatment and control group differences for victims who experienced¹¹¹ new violence from the same offender involved in the original arrest, any offender, or both based on interviews with the victims. Then we looked at treatment/control

¹¹⁰ Fourteen items from the police checklist.

¹¹¹ We chose the terms 'experienced' new violence or 'experienced' revictimization to refer to self-reports of victimization and 'reported' revictimization to refer to official data or revictimization or reoffending.

group differences for reported revictimization--reports of incidents as well as reports of custodies in the police records.

Any Revictimizations Experienced from the Same Offender and From Any Offender

The information in this section is based upon follow-up interviews with treatment and control group victims in our study (N=396). We asked victims how many separate disputes they had had with their partner during the six months following his arrest. First we considered the issue of whether there was any difference in the prevalence of revictimization, i.e. if a different proportion of victims in the treatment vs. control group had experienced any victimization at all.

In each case, Fisher's Exact test was performed on the two-way cross tabulation table.

.c. Table 8.1: Any Revictimizations Experienced—Same Offender—by Treatment and Control Group

| | | | Treatment | Control | Total |
|-------------------------------|-----|----------------|-----------|---------|-------|
| Revictimization Same Batterer | No | Count | 86 | 69 | 155 |
| | | Expected Count | 73.4 | 81.6 | |
| | Yes | Count | 101 | 139 | 240 |
| | | Expected Count | 113.6 | 126.4 | |
| Total | | Count | 187 | 208 | 395 |

The exact two-sided significance was .010. There were more victim events in the control group than expected under the hypothesis of no difference between groups.

.c. Table 8.2: Any Revictimizations Experienced—Any Offender (same or different than in original arrest)—by Treatment and Control Group

| | | | Treatment | Control | Total |
|------------------------------|-----|----------------|-----------|---------|-------|
| Revictimization any batterer | No | Count | 86 | 67 | 153 |
| | | Expected Count | 72.4 | 80.6 | |
| | Yes | Count | 101 | 141 | 242 |
| | | Expected Count | 114.6 | 127.4 | |
| Total | | Count | 187 | 208 | 395 |

The exact two-sided significance was .005. There were more victim events in the control group than expected under the hypothesis of no difference between groups.

Turning to the average number of subsequent incidents, independent samples t-tests were performed to compare group means.

.c. Table 8.3: Average Number of Revictimizations Experienced by Treatment and Control Group Victims: Same Offender and Any Offender

| | Code | N | Mean | S.D. | t | Sig. |
|---------------|-----------|-----|------|------|--------|------|
| Same Offender | Treatment | 187 | 3.08 | 3.87 | -.979 | .328 |
| | Control | 208 | 3.46 | 3.76 | | |
| Any Offender | Treatment | N | 3.15 | 4.04 | -1.227 | .221 |
| | Control | 208 | 3.64 | 3.89 | | |

Although the average number of self-reported victimizations is higher in the control group, the differences are not statistically significant.

Police Reports of Revictimizations, Reoffenses and Repeat Calls to the Original Address

In examining the police records of the offender and the victim, we have identified fourteen outcome variables that will be investigated in this section and four variables reflecting survival times that are presented in Appendix F.

We began by examining the differences in the official records of justice events following the entry event. The groups compared were those for whom treatment was intended (cases randomly assigned to the DVRU) and those for whom DVRU treatment was not intended (cases randomly not assigned to the DVRU).

First, we looked at indicators of presence or absence of reported revictimization, reported revictimization resulting in custody, reported reoffenses, and reported reoffenses resulting in custody during the six-month observation period. Second, we examined the four variables which were the frequencies (within the six months following the initial incident) of reported revictimizations, reported revictimizations resulting in custody, reported reoffenses, and those resulting in custody. Following these are the numbers of repeat calls to police to the original address for any incident and domestic violence incidents. The information on these fourteen variables was obtained from PPDS and compiled on the police record form (see Appendix D).

Proportions with Police Records of New Events

The first question was simply whether a greater proportion of the treatment or control group cases had police records of any subsequent justice events. The four events we chose to compare were two pertaining to revictimization and two related to the alleged offender's subsequent allegations. In each instance we were interested in both whether an event was reported to the police and whether it had resulted in a physical custody. In each instance, Fisher's Exact test was performed on the two-way cross-tabulation table to determine if the differences were statistically significant.

.c. Table 8.4: Police Reports of Revictimizations and Reoffenses by Treatment and Control Group.

| | GROUP | | | | TOTAL | | Sig. |
|--|-----------|--------|---------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
| | Treatment | | Control | | N | % | |
| Reported Event | N | % | N | % | N | % | |
| Report of Any Victimization | 76 | 19.1% | 48 | 9.9% | 124 | 14.0% | 0.000 |
| Reported Victimization resulting in Arrest | 44 | 11.1% | 25 | 5.1% | 69 | 7.8% | 0.000 |
| Report of Any Reoffense | 83 | 20.9% | 47 | 9.7% | 130 | 14.7% | 0.000 |
| Reported Reoffense Resulting in Arrest | 47 | 11.8% | 24 | 4.9% | 71 | 8.0% | 0.000 |
| Total | 397 | 100.0% | 486 | 100.0% | 883 | 100.0% | |

Clearly the victims who were assigned to the treatment group were more likely have a police record of a subsequent revictimization, and more likely to have had a record of such an event which involved the arrest of the offender. It was also clear that the alleged offenders whose cases were in the treatment group were more likely to have a reported subsequent allegation, and a reported subsequent allegation that resulted in an arrest.

Average Number of Reported Revictimizations and Reoffenses

In the preceding sections we focused on the first recorded event of each of four types (victimization and reoffense, both any and those involving custody). While we found differences in reporting rates of the treatment and control groups, this did not tell the entire story for the six months that we followed them subsequent to the entry event. In some instances the records indicated the presence of multiple subsequent victimization reports to the police, as well as reports of multiple subsequent allegations of offenses. In the preceding analyses, these multiple events were ignored, as the focus was on whether an event had occurred or not. In the following section we extend the analysis to include all subsequent recorded events, not just the first one. In order to do so, we examine the mean number of

events reported by each group. These are summarized in the Table 8.5, in which the “mean” is the average number of reported events. This might be more easily understood if expressed as a rate; for example the mean of .29 for reported revictimizations by the treatment group would indicate that for every 100 victims in this group, we would expect a total of 29 reported revictimizations. From the earlier table, we would expect that 19 of those 100 victims would report this total of 29 revictimizations. In each case, independent samples t-tests were performed to compare group means.

.c. Table 8.5: Average Number of Reported Revictimizations and Reported Reoffenses by Treatment and Control Group

| Variable | | N | Mean | S.D. | t | Sig. |
|---|-----------|-----|------|------|-------|------|
| Reported Revictimizations | Treatment | 397 | .29 | .71 | 3.918 | .000 |
| | Control | 486 | .13 | .46 | | |
| Reported Revictimizations leading to Arrest | Treatment | 397 | .12 | .34 | 3.285 | .001 |
| | Control | 486 | .05 | .22 | | |
| Reported Reoffenses | Treatment | 397 | .32 | .74 | 4.491 | .000 |
| | Control | 486 | .13 | .46 | | |
| Reported Reoffenses leading to Arrest | Treatment | 397 | .12 | .34 | 3.723 | .000 |
| | Control | 486 | .05 | .22 | | |

In all four cases, the means were significantly higher in the treatment group, confirming the earlier pattern, that the total numbers of reported events are higher in the treatment group. While we did not compute tests of significance, it was also the case that the average number of reported events, *for those who had any reported event*, was higher in the treatment group. For example, the treatment group had a rate of 29 reported events per 100 persons, and 19 persons per 100 who had any reported event. The average was therefore 1.51 reported events per person for whom official records of revictimizations existed (29/19). These averages are

presented in the table below, only in the case of reoffense reports resulting in custody is there no appreciable difference in the groups.

.c. Table 8.6: The Average Number of Reported Revictimizations for Those Cases Reporting Any Events by Treatment and Control Group.

| Reported Revictimization | Treatment | Control |
|---|-----------|---------|
| Reports of Any Revictimization | 1.51 | 1.32 |
| Reported Revictimization Resulting in an Arrest | 1.08 | 0.97 |
| Any Reported Reoffense | 1.53 | 1.34 |
| Reported Reoffense Resulting in an Arrest | 1.01 | 1.01 |

Police Calls to the Same Address

Before leaving the analysis of the officially recorded subsequent experiences, we provide one additional analysis. It examined not the victim or the offender, but the location of the event. We searched the police database for any events reported within the six months following the entry event *at the same address*, regardless if the same parties were involved. While there were more calls to the same address for the treatment group involving any event, this difference was not statistically significant. The differences in repeat calls for domestic violence incidents were significant, with a higher average number of calls for the addresses involving the treatment group. In each case, independent samples t-tests were performed to compare group means.

.c. Table 8.7: Repeat Police Calls to the Same Address by Treatment and Control Group;

| Variable | Code | N | Mean | S.D. | t | Sig. |
|--|-----------|-----|------|------|-------|------|
| Repeat Police Call for Any Reason | Treatment | 397 | .52 | .99 | 1.680 | .093 |
| | Control | 486 | .41 | .96 | | |
| Repeat Police Call for Domestic Violence | Treatment | 397 | .17 | .45 | 2.360 | .019 |
| | Control | 486 | .11 | .38 | | |

On the whole, the police report results appear to contradict those we obtained from victim interviews. Several plausible explanations may be explored. First, the sample responding to the follow-up interview may be different from the non-respondents. Second, there may be a relationship between the activities of the DVRU and increased reporting of incidents to the police, operating through increased sense of empowerment. With respect to the first possibility, we examined the officially recorded information about the revictimization of both those who responded to follow-up interview questions and those who did not. Of those who responded, 15.4% had a police recorded victim event compared to 14.5% of those who did not respond in the follow-up interviews. The probability of such a difference occurring by chance is .71 (Fisher Exact Test). It therefore appears that the two groups are not significantly different with respect to their officially recorded victimization status. Since we know that there are differences in the perceived empowerment, and that self reported revictimization is lower in the treatment group, it is reasonable to conclude that the apparently higher rate of officially recorded victimization among the treatment group is likely the function of increased rates of reporting and not of a higher rate of actual revictimization.

Part 2: Intermediate Outcomes and Final Outcomes for the Total Sample

In Parts 2 and 3, the control and treatment groups were pooled, and the effects of various predictors (fourteen items from the police checklist) on the outcome variables are shown. In Part 2, their effect on the number of restraining orders, number of prosecutions, and change in empowerment from the initial to the follow-up interview were studied. Finally, in Part 3, the effect of the police checklist predictors and these intermediate outcomes were used as predictors of our eighteen outcome variables.

Part 2: Intermediate Outcomes

The three intermediate outcome variables were (1) restraining orders filed, (2) cases prosecuted, and (3) change in empowerment from initial to follow-up interview. Fourteen items from the police checklist were used as predictors: victim contacted, victim agreed to services, took photos and/or statements, provided information on safety planning, provided information on pursuing prosecution, provided information on obtaining a restraining order, provided information on safe housing, provided information on victim counseling, provided information on offender counseling, referred victim to advocacy program, helped set up appointment with DA, helped get restraining order, served restraining order, and helped transport victim to court (see Appendix A).

(1) Restraining Orders Filed

Before investigating the effect of the predictors, a cross tabulation was performed on this variable and treatment/control group.

.c. Table 8.8: Restraining Orders Filed During the Six Months Following the Original Arrest by Treatment and Control Group

| | | | Treatment | Control | Total |
|--------------------------|-----|----------------|-----------|---------|-------|
| Restraining Orders Filed | No | Count | 315 | 386 | 701 |
| | Yes | Expected Count | 315.2 | 385.8 | |
| | No | Count | 82 | 100 | 182 |

| | | | | | |
|-------|-----|----------------|------|-------|-----|
| | Yes | Expected Count | 81.8 | 100.2 | |
| Total | | Count | 397 | 486 | 883 |

The exact two-sided significance was 1.000. There was not a significant difference between groups. Therefore, we combined the treatment and control groups in an effort to understand what factors contributed to the filing of a restraining order following the batterer's arrest (all cases in this study).

Cross-tabulations were performed for each of the fourteen items on the police checklist. These reflect the activities of DVRU officers in each case. Only the results that were significant at the 5% level are presented here.

.c. Table 8.9: DVRU Interventions and Restraining Orders Filed

| | | Group | | | | Total | | Sig. |
|--------------------------------|-----|----------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| | | RO Filed | | No RO Filed | | N | % | |
| <i>DVRU Intervention</i> | | N | % | N | % | N | % | |
| Victim Accepted Services | Yes | 56 | 27.3% | 149 | 72.7% | 205 | 23.2% | 0.008 |
| | No | 552 | 81.4% | 126 | 18.6% | 678 | 76.8% | |
| Photos or Statement Taken | Yes | 18 | 51.4% | 17 | 48.6% | 35 | 4.0% | 0.000 |
| | No | 164 | 19.3% | 684 | 80.7% | 848 | 96.0% | |
| Helped Victim set appt with DA | Yes | 36 | 31.0% | 80 | 69.0% | 116 | 13.1% | 0.004 |
| | No | 146 | 19.0% | 621 | 81.0% | 767 | 86.9% | |
| Helped Victim with RO | Yes | 18 | 48.6% | 19 | 51.4% | 37 | 4.2% | 0.000 |
| | No | 164 | 19.4% | 682 | 80.6% | 846 | 95.8% | |
| Served RO | Yes | 8 | 72.7% | 3 | 27.3% | 11 | 1.2% | 0.000 |
| | No | 174 | 20.0% | 698 | 80.0% | 872 | 98.8% | |
| Total | | 182 | 20.6% | 701 | 79.4% | 883 | 100.0% | |

As a summary of these results, restraining orders were more likely to follow a domestic violence arrest if 1) the victim agreed to receive DVRU services 2) the DVRU took steps to collect such evidence as photographs or statements, 3) the DVRU helped to set up an appointment with the District Attorney's office, 4) the DVRU officers helped victims get a restraining order and 5) the DVRU officers actually served the restraining order.

In an effort to learn more about the factors contributing to the filing of a restraining order, a stepwise logistic regression was performed, using all of the predictors. In this way, the combination of predictors can be found which best anticipates whether a restraining order will be filed.

.c. Table 8.10: DVRU Interventions as Predictors of Restraining Orders Filed;

Only two variables remained in the model:

| <i>DVRU Interventions</i> | Coefficient | Significance |
|---|-------------|--------------|
| DVRU Officers Took Photos or Witness Statements | 1.1942 | .0015 |
| DVRU Officers served the Restraining Order | 1.7323 | .0174 |

The suggestion is that encouraging these activities would increase the use of restraining orders in cases such as those in this study.

(2) Prosecutions

In addition to the filing of a restraining order, a significant step in the handling of a domestic violence case is the decision to prosecute the case. Before investigating the effect of the predictors, a cross tabulation was performed on this variable and treatment/control group.

.c. Table 8.11: DVRU Interventions and Prosecutions by Treatment and Control Group

| | | | Treatment | Control | Total |
|---------------------|-----|----------------|-----------|---------|-------|
| Case was Prosecuted | Yes | Count | 101 | 88 | 189 |
| | | Expected Count | 85 | 104 | |
| | No | Count | 296 | 398 | 694 |
| | | Expected Count | 312 | 382 | |
| Total | | Count | 397 | 486 | 883 |

The exact two-sided significance was .010. There were more cases prosecuted in the treatment group than expected under the hypothesis of no difference between groups.

Cross tabulations were performed for each of the fourteen items on the police checklist, as well as the Cases Prosecuted variable. Only the results that were significant at the 5% level will be shown.

.c.Table 8.12: DVRU Interventions and Cases Prosecuted

| <i>DVRU Interventions</i> | | Group | | | | Total | | Sig. |
|-----------------------------|-----|------------------|-------|----------------------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| | | Cases Prosecuted | | Cases Not Prosecuted | | N | % | |
| | | N | % | N | % | | | |
| • Contacted Victim | Yes | 73 | 27.1% | 196 | 72.9% | 269 | 30.5% | 0.007 |
| | No | 116 | 18.9% | 498 | 81.1% | 614 | 69.5% | |
| • Victim Accepted Services | Yes | 63 | 30.7% | 142 | 69.3% | 205 | 23.2% | 0.000 |
| | No | 126 | 18.6% | 552 | 81.4% | 678 | 76.8% | |
| • Provided Prosecution Info | Yes | 77 | 27.5% | 203 | 72.5% | 280 | 31.7% | 0.004 |
| | No | 112 | 18.6% | 491 | 81.4% | 603 | 68.3% | |
| • Helped with appt for DA | Yes | 36 | 31.0% | 80 | 69.0% | 116 | 13.1% | 0.010 |
| | No | 153 | 19.9% | 614 | 80.1% | 767 | 86.9% | |
| • Served RO | Yes | 7 | 63.6% | 4 | 36.4% | 11 | 1.2% | 0.003 |
| | No | 182 | 20.9% | 690 | 79.1% | 872 | 98.8% | |
| • RO was filed | Yes | 55 | 30.2% | 127 | 69.8% | 182 | 20.6% | 0.002 |
| | No | 134 | 19.1% | 567 | 80.9% | 701 | 79.4% | |
| Total | | 182 | 20.6% | 701 | 79.4% | 883 | 100.0% | |

Next, a stepwise logistic regression was performed, using all of the predictors. In this way, the combination of predictors can be found which best anticipates whether the case was prosecuted.

.c.Table 8.13: DVRU Interventions as Predictors of Prosecutions

Only three variables remained in the model:

| <i>DVRU Interventions</i> | Coefficient | Significance |
|-------------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| Victim Accepted DVRU Services | .5471 | .0036 |
| DVRU Served RO | 1.2365 | .0592 |
| RO was Filed | .5011 | .0095 |

These factors may explain the increased likelihood of prosecution for the cases in the treatment group, and provide indicators for activities, which might increase the rate of prosecution of such cases.

(3) Change in Empowerment

In addition to the system variables of filing a restraining order and increased prosecution of cases, it was expected that a significant benefit of the DVRU would be an increased sense of empowerment among victims. Thus we seek to identify those specific DVRU activities that lead to an increased sense of empowerment. We assessed empowerment by calculating the change from the initial to the follow-up interview in the empowerment scales embedded in the interview protocol.

Before investigating the effect of the predictors, a t-test was performed to compare the control and treatment means.

.c. Table 8.14: DVRU Interventions and Change in Empowerment by Treatment and Control Group

| Variable | Code | N | Mean | S.D. | t | Sig. |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----|------|------|-------|------|
| Change in Empowerment | Treatment | 174 | 1.28 | 3.65 | 1.848 | .065 |
| | Control | 190 | .59 | 3.38 | | |

Although the average change was higher in the treatment group, the difference was not significant at the 5% level.

Next, t-tests were performed for each of the fourteen items on the police checklist, as well as the "RO filed" and "Case prosecuted" variables. Only the results that were significant at the 5% level are shown.

.c. Table 8.15: DVRU Interventions and Changes in Empowerment

| <i>DVRU Interventions</i> | Code | N | Mean | S.D. | t | Sig. |
|-----------------------------|------|-----|------|------|-------|------|
| Victim Accepted Services | No | 251 | .67 | 3.51 | 2.001 | .046 |
| | Yes | 113 | 1.47 | 3.51 | | |
| Photos and Statements Taken | No | 347 | .84 | 3.46 | 2.078 | .038 |
| | Yes | 17 | 2.65 | 4.40 | | |
| Provided Safety Plan Info | No | 262 | .63 | 3.44 | 2.539 | .012 |
| | Yes | 102 | 1.67 | 3.64 | | |
| Provided RO Information | No | 261 | .67 | 3.25 | 1.993 | .048 |
| | Yes | 103 | 1.56 | 4.08 | | |
| Helped Victim Get RO | No | 346 | .83 | 3.53 | 2.237 | .026 |
| | Yes | 18 | 2.72 | 3.06 | | |
| Served RO | No | 356 | .84 | 3.48 | 2.935 | .004 |
| | Yes | 8 | 4.50 | 3.96 | | |

It appears that victim empowerment is likely to be increased when victims accept DVRU services, when DVRU officers take photos or witness' statements, when the officers provide information on both safety planning and the process of obtaining a restraining order, and when the DVRU officers actually assist in obtaining and serving the restraining order.

Next, a stepwise regression was performed, using all of the predictors. In this way, the combination of predictors can be found which best predicts change in empowerment. Only two variables remained in the model, provision of information on safety planning and the action of the officers in actually serving a restraining order:

.c. Table 8.16: DVRU Interventions as Predictors of Changes in Empowerment

| <i>DVRU Interventions</i> | Coefficient | Significance |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| DVRU Served RO | 3.154 | .013 |
| DVRU Gave Safety Plan Information | .832 | .045 |

Part 3: Final Outcomes

The fourteen outcome variables from Part 1 will now be revisited. The effects of the police checklist items and the intermediate predictors will be shown. These analyses were conducted across the entire set of cases in the study and were designed to identify specific actions that appeared to increase the odds of the outcome variables occurring, independent of the treatment / control status of the case.

Each of the first four analyses was conducted using the data from both victim interviews - the initial and follow-up interview. Additional information was gleaned from the interview process, as well as the information from the police checklist and the official records.

.c. Table 8.17: Empowerment as a Predictor of the Number of Revictimizations Experienced from the Same Batterer

When a stepwise regression was performed, using all of the predictors, the only variable remaining in the model was:

| Variable | Coefficient | Significance |
|-----------------------|-------------|--------------|
| Change In Empowerment | -.255 | .000 |

An increase in empowerment leads to the decrease in number of self-reported revictimizations committed by the same batterer.

.c. Table 8.18: Empowerment as a Predictor of Number of Revictimizations Experienced from Any Batterer

A stepwise regression was performed, using all of the predictors. The only variable remaining in the model was:

| Variable | Coefficient | Significance |
|-----------------------|-------------|--------------|
| Change In Empowerment | -.275 | .000 |

An increase in empowerment leads to a decrease in number of self-reported revictimizations by any offender. This finding has positive implications for efforts to increase a sense of empowerment among victims.

.c. Table 8.19: The Presence or Absence of Revictimization Experiences from the Same Batterer as a Function of Identified Predictors

A stepwise regression was performed, using all of the identified predictor variables. The variables remaining in the model were:

| <i>DVRU Interventions and Intermediate Outcome Variable</i> | Coefficient | Significance |
|---|-------------|--------------|
| Provided Information on Offender Counseling | -.7269 | .0074 |
| DVRU Served RO | 2.0971 | .0201 |
| RO was Filed | -.5098 | .0510 |
| Case was Prosecuted | -.6852 | .0069 |
| Change in Empowerment | -.1104 | .0010 |

Making batterer counseling information available to victims, filing of a restraining order, and prosecution of the case decrease the probability of new victimizations experienced during the six months following the original arrest. An increase in empowerment also decreases the probability of a self-reported revictimization. Serving a restraining order, on the other hand, increases the probability of a self-reported revictimization by the same offender.

.c. Table 8.20: The Presence or Absence of Revictimization Experiences from Any Batterer as a Function of Identified Predictors

A stepwise regression was performed, using all of the predictors. The variables remaining in the model were:

| <i>DVRU Interventions and Intermediate Outcomes</i> | Coefficient | Significance |
|---|-------------|--------------|
| DVRU Succeeded in Contacting Victim | -.4920 | .0317 |
| Case was Prosecuted | -.5533 | .0271 |
| Change in Empowerment | -.1123 | .0007 |

Contacting the victim and prosecuting the case decrease the probability of a self-reported revictimization by any offender. An increase in empowerment also decreases that probability.

It is worth pointing out that an increase in empowerment has an effect on each of these last four analyses. Increased empowerment reduces each of the indicators of the probability of revictimization and reoffense. The basic message then is that efforts to increase the sense of empowerment should have a beneficial effect on the odds of continued domestic violence.

.c. Table 8.21: The Presence or Absence of Reports of Revictimization as a Function of Identified Predictors

In the initial analyses of presence or absence of a reported event, a stepwise logistic regression was performed, using all of the predictors. The variables remaining in the model were:

| <i>DVRU Interventions and Intermediate Outcomes</i> | Coefficient | Significance |
|---|-------------|--------------|
| Helped with appt for DA | 1.2950 | .0001 |
| RO was Filed | 1.0428 | .0009 |
| Case was Prosecuted | .6901 | .0293 |

All three of the variables *increased* the probability of police reports of revictimization.

.c. Table 8.22: The Presence or Absence of Police Reports of Revictimization Resulting in Arrest as a Function of Identified Predictors

The variables remaining in the model were:

| <i>DVRU Interventions and Intermediate Outcomes</i> | Coefficient | Significance |
|---|-------------|--------------|
| Provided RO Information | -1.3557 | .0130 |
| Helped with appt for DA | 2.0277 | .0000 |
| DVRU served RO | 2.6065 | .0038 |

Providing information on restraining orders *reduces* the probability of a reported revictimization resulting in custody. The other two variables *increase* the probability.

.c. Table 8.23: The Presence or Absence of Reported Reoffense Allegations against the Original Batterer as a Function of Identified Predictors

The variables remaining in the model were:

| <i>DVRU Interventions and Intermediate Outcomes</i> | Coefficient | Significance |
|---|-------------|--------------|
| Helped with appt for DA | 1.2448 | .0001 |
| RO was Filed | 1.0470 | .0006 |
| Case was Prosecuted | .7106 | .0207 |

All three variables *increase* the probability of police reports of reoffending.

.c. Table 8.24: The Presence or Absence of Reported Reoffense Allegations against the Original Batterer Resulting in Custody as a Function of Identified Predictors

The variables remaining in the model were:

| <i>DVRU Interventions and Intermediate Outcomes</i> | Coefficient | Significance |
|---|-------------|--------------|
| Helped with appt for DA | 1.6102 | .0000 |
| RO was Filed | .9139 | .0131 |

Both variables *increase* the probability of a reported reoffense resulting in custody.

.c. Table 8.25: The Number of Reported Revictimizations as a Function of Identified Predictors

Since we are here dealing with the total number of reported revictimizations, a stepwise regression was performed, using all of the predictors. The variables remaining in the model were:

| <i>DVRU Interventions and Intermediate Outcomes</i> | Coefficient | Significance |
|---|-------------|--------------|
| Helped with appt for DA | .455 | .000 |
| RO was Filed | .220 | .004 |
| Referred to Victim Advocacy Group | -.381 | .006 |
| Provided RO Information | .350 | .042 |

Referral to a victim advocacy program reduces the number of reported revictimizations, while the other three variables increase the number.

.c. Table 8.26: The Number of Reported Revictimizations Resulting in Arrests as a Function of Identified Predictors

The variables remaining in the stepwise regression model were:

| <i>DVRU Interventions and Intermediate Outcomes</i> | Coefficient | Significance |
|---|-------------|--------------|
| Helped with appt for DA | .167 | .000 |
| DVRU served RO | .417 | .000 |
| Provided RO Information | -.163 | .001 |
| DVRU Succeeded in Contacting Victim | .102 | .032 |

Providing the victim information on restraining orders reduces the number of reported revictimizations resulting in custody, while the other three variables increase the number.

.c. Table 8.27: The Number of Reported Reoffenses as a Function of Identified Predictors

The variables remaining in the stepwise regression model were:

| <i>DVRU Interventions and Intermediate Outcomes</i> | Coefficient | Significance |
|---|-------------|--------------|
| Helped with appt for DA | .360 | .000 |
| RO was filed | .242 | .002 |

Both of the variables increase the number of reported reoffenses.

.c. Table 8.28: The Number of Reported Reoffenses leading to Arrest as a Function of Identified Predictors

The variables remaining in the stepwise regression model were:

| <i>DVRU Interventions and Intermediate Outcomes</i> | Coefficient | Significance |
|---|-------------|--------------|
| Helped with appt for DA | .219 | .000 |
| Helped with appt for DA | .375 | .001 |
| Provided RO Information | -.098 | .010 |

Providing information on restraining orders decreases the number of reported reoffense arrests. The other two variables increase the number.

.c. Table 8.29: The Number of Repeat Police Calls to the Same Address--For Any Reason-- as a Function of Identified Predictors

A stepwise regression was performed, using all of the predictors. The only variable remaining in the model was:

| <i>DVRU Interventions and Intermediate Outcomes</i> | Coefficient | Significance |
|---|-------------|--------------|
| RO was filed | .282 | .022 |

Filing a restraining order increases the number of repeat calls.

.c. Table 8.30: Police Calls to the Same Address for a Domestic Violence Problem as a Function of Identified Predictors

A stepwise regression was performed, using all of the predictors. The variables remaining in the model were:

| <i>DVRU Interventions and Intermediate Outcomes</i> | Coefficient | Significance |
|---|-------------|--------------|
| RO was filed | .174 | .002 |
| Case was Prosecuted | .116 | .036 |

Both variables increase the number of repeat calls for domestic violence to the address of the original arrest.

In summary, these results show that fewer treatment group victims than control group victims experienced revictimizations during the six-month follow-up period. The results also show that treatment group victims, not control group victims, are more likely to have police records of revictimizations; and that treatment group cases have a greater number of repeat calls to the original address than control group cases. Using DVRU activities and intermediate outcome data as predictors of revictimizations for study cases no longer divided into treatment and control subgroups, the results show that certain DVRU activities are significant predictors of increased victim empowerment, and increased victim empowerment in turn is a significant predictor of reduced revictimization.

SECTION NINE

Discussion

Violence between intimate partners is a crime embedded in a complicated web of social, cultural and interpersonal dynamics. Our findings reflect some of these complexities. We attempted to determine whether police initiated interventions in the context of a coordinated community response system worked to reduce domestic violence. The opportunity to examine this question arose when the Portland Police Department launched its Domestic Violence Reduction Unit (DVRU) in partnership with the Family Violence Intervention Steering Committee in 1993. The work of this specialized police unit was to bring batterers, once they had been arrested, further into the criminal justice system so that they might either be sanctioned or treated for their battering conduct. Simultaneously, unit officers worked with the batterers' partners. For victims they provided safety plan information and concrete assistance in how to gain access to available criminal justice and community victim services. In carrying out these tasks the unit officers worked in close cooperation with other members of the local coordinated domestic violence response system. The initial impetus for this research project came from the police department's desire to know whether the work of this specific police unit would lead to reductions in domestic crime in Portland. Our study was designed to answer this question. But in addition, and perhaps more importantly, the police unit represented from a policy perspective an important next step in approaches to domestic violence in our society. The existence of this innovative police unit permitted us to examine whether police responses that go beyond arrest are more effective in reducing domestic violence than arrest alone.

The strategy to reduce violence involved increasing the cost of violence to batterers and reducing the risk of renewed violence for their victims. The former objective was to be accomplished through DVRU activities that increased the likelihood of prosecutions, the latter through DVRU activities that served to enhance victim empowerment. As a result of this strategy we expected as interim outcome measures to find more prosecuted batterers and more empowered victims in the DVRU treatment group than the control group.

Indeed we found that cases with DVRU treatment resulted in prosecutions of batterers significantly more often (44 % vs. 37%) than cases without DVRU intervention. In addition to more prosecutions, treatment group batterers were significantly more likely than control group batterers to be convicted (24% vs. 17%) and sentenced (27% vs. 18%).¹¹² Several DVRU activities were associated with the increased likelihood of prosecution (See Table 8.12). Among them were whether the officers provided prosecution information to the victim, helped her set up an appointment with the district attorney, or encouraged her to obtain a temporary restraining order against the batterer.

The majority of empowerment data came from comparisons of the initial and follow-up interviews with victims. Although the average change in empowerment measurements for the treatment group was twice as large as the change in empowerment for the control group, the difference was not quite statistically significant ($p .065$). Still, we identified several individual DVRU interventions (Table 8.15) that were significant predictors of overall enhanced victim empowerment. Among them were whether DVRU officers took photographs to collect evidence from the victim, whether they provided the victim with safety plan information, helped her to obtain a temporary restraining order, or actually served the order. Section Five (Table 5.1) and Section Eight (Tables 8.9 and 8.12) show that not all treatment group cases actually received treatment. The type of treatment our analyses identified as significant predictors of empowerment, such as "Helped victim get a restraining

¹¹² We were unable to ascertain the disposition status for 45 study cases in the district attorney database, which is the reason for the conviction and sentence discrepancy.

order” was provided in relatively few (13%) of the cases. Whether this is the reason for the lack of difference in empowerment between the treatment and control groups or whether our measures of empowerment are not sufficiently sensitive to detect changes remains an open question.

In addition to measuring changes in victim empowerment by means of questions contained in the initial and follow-up interview, we collected information about whether or not victims filed restraining orders against their batterers. We reasoned that the more empowered the victim felt, the more likely she would be to file a restraining order. Treatment group victims were no more or less likely than control group victims to have filed restraining orders against their batterers. While certain DVRU activities were related to the increased likelihood of treatment group victims filing restraining orders, control group victims filed these orders just as often but without the help of the DVRU. One of the reasons for this finding may be related to the fact that domestic violence victim advocacy groups in the community were engaged simultaneously in efforts to assist victims with restraining orders. One such effort was a Legal Access Project in which student volunteers helped victims complete the necessary restraining order forms at the courthouse.

The DVRU model led us to expect that prosecuting the batterer and empowering the victim would reduce the risk to the victim and would result in measurable reductions in the occurrence of misdemeanor domestic violence. We used two sources of information to assess whether this was so, police records and victim interviews. Victim interview data showed reductions in revictimizations for the treatment group (Tables 8.1 and 8.2). Significantly fewer treatment group than control group victims told our interviewers that they had experienced any new violence from any intimate partner during the six months following the arrest of the batterer. As a group, those women who received additional police services after their batterer’s arrest experienced significantly less repeat violence than those women whose only contact with the police took place during the original arrest. We also found that six months after the original arrest, significantly more treatment group women than control

group women (24% vs. 14% p) reported that they had ended their relationship with the batterer. Women who end relationships with batterers are often at heightened risk of repeat battering (Mahoney, 1991; Brown, 1990; Campbell, 1992; Jones, 1994). In our study, however, the prevalence of revictimization for the group with more separations, i.e. the treatment group, was less than it was for the group with fewer separations i.e. the control group. In other words fewer women in the group with the greater number of those who were leaving their batterers reported revictimization. However, the smaller number of women who were revictimized in the treatment group reported on average as many incidents of revictimization as the larger group of revictimized women in the control group. This may mean that some measure of *separation aggression* (Mahoney, 1991) may have been at work after all. Whether this was indeed the case will have to be addressed in subsequent analyses of these data.

When we analyzed police records the results were different. Police reports of further victimizations and reports of alleged reoffending during the six-month follow-up period were associated significantly more often with the treatment group than the control group (see Tables 8.4 through 8.7). On the surface, this discrepancy between what the women told the interviewers and what the police reports show may seem puzzling. However, we reasoned that it was possible that victim empowerment might be responsible for these seemingly contradictory effects on our two measures of recidivism. We hypothesized that empowerment may be responsible for both, reductions in the occurrence of revictimization, and for victims' increased help seeking activities. A newly empowered woman, for example, may be more inclined to enlist outside help, in this case from the police, than a woman who is less sure of herself and the legitimacy of her case.

If we assume that batterers use violence to maintain a pattern of control over their partners (Mahoney, 1991; Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Schechter, 1982; Martin, 1976; Yllo, 1993; Wilson and Daly, 1992; Jones, 1994) then the punishment inherent in criminal justice system interventions may counteract the rewards batterers get from controlling their partners.

As batterers become less able to exercise control, their victims are more likely to undertake activities designed to reduce their risk of revictimization. Hence the finding that women whose battering partners are subject to criminal justice sanctions that go beyond arrest experience fewer revictimizations than the control group but are more likely to seek outside help if they do.

Empowerment, regardless of how victims acquired it, was a significant predictor of lower self-reported revictimization in our study. Other studies have provided some support for a relationship between victim empowerment and reduction in domestic violence. Dugan et al., (1997) have found an empirical link between the increased availability of domestic violence victim services and reductions in fatal partner violence. Jacobson and Gottman (1998:223), conclude from their extensive observations of batterers and their women partners, that victim empowerment is an important preventative byproduct of criminal justice interventions.

The present study has several limitations. First, we had interview data for only half of the 927 study cases, which restricts the generalizability of our self-report data. Second, the six-month follow-up design was probably too short a time period in which to assess the impact of court imposed sanctions. Third, the treatment as it was designed differed from the treatment as it was implemented. We have discussed these limitations in various sections of this report.

We have speculated about possible reasons for the differences in self-reported revictimizations for treatment and control group women in conjunction with the opposite finding for police reports of revictimizations. We suggested that differences in victim empowerment might explain both findings. There are other possibilities as well. One of these is that the mere existence of enhanced police services produces more calls to the police. A study by Davis and Taylor (1997), for example, suggests that citizens who are confident in the police handling of domestic violence situations are more likely to report new violence than citizens with less confidence in the police.

If there is one thing our findings emphasize, it is that police activities on behalf of domestic violence misdemeanor crimes are a crucial element in community-wide efforts to reduce violence. With respect to batterers, the police hold the key to whether or not batterers will be held accountable for their criminal conduct; with respect to victims, the police confirm the reality of battering and help provide the legitimacy and the support needed to disengage from or change a violent relationship. Our data show that police activities on behalf of victims reduce violence more effectively than interventions that are only directed at batterers. Nevertheless, continuing attention will have to be paid to both victims and batterers, since strong interaction effects, such as the affirmation of a woman's suffering that comes from convicting her assailant, will no doubt always remain operative

REFERENCES

- Adams, D. (1988). Treatment Models of Men who Batter. In Yllö, K. and Bograd, M. (Eds.) *Feminist Perspectives On Wife Abuse*. Beverly hills, CA: Sage.
- Bandura, A.J. (1973). *Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A.J. (1986). *Social Foundations Of Thought And Action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bard, M. (1969). Family intervention police teams as a community mental health resource. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 60 (2): 247-50.
- Barnett, O.W., & LaViolette, A.D. (1993). *It Could Happen to Anyone: Why Battered Women Stay*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Berk, R. A. (1993). What the scientific evidence shows: on the average we can do no better than arrest. In R. J.Gelles and D.R. Loseke (Eds.) *Current Controversies on Family Violence* (pp.323-336). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Berk, R.A.; Berk, S.F.; Loseke, D.R. & Rauma, D. (1983). Mutual combat and other family violence myths. In Finkelhor *et al* (Eds.), *The Dark Side of Families: Current Family Violence Research*, Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Berk, R.A., Campbell, R.K. and Western, B. (1992). A Bayesian analysis of the Colorado Springs spouse abuse experiment. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*.
- Bograd, M. (1983). Domestic violence: Perceptions of battered women, abusive men, and non-violent men and women. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.

- Bograd, M. (1988). Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse: An Introduction. 11-27. In Yellö and Bograd (Eds.) *Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bowker, L.H. (1988). On the relationship between wife-beating and child abuse. In Yllo, K. and Bograd, M. (Eds.) *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse*. Beverly hills, CA: Sage.
- Breslin, F.C.; Riggs, D.S.; O'Leary, K.I.; & Aruasm I. (1990). Family Precursors; expected and actual consequences of dating aggression. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 5. 247-258.
- Brooks, R. (1992). Concept Document. Unpublished manuscript, Family Services Division, Portland Police Bureau.
- Browne A. and D.G. Dutton. 1990. Escape from Violence: Risks and alternatives for abused women-what do we currently know? In R. Roesch, D. G. Dutton, and V.F. Sacco (Eds.) *Family Violence: Perspectives on Treatment, Research and Policy* (pp.65-91) Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada: British Columbia Institute on Family Violence.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (August, 1995). National Crime Victimization Survey.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (March, 1998) *Violence by intimates*. Office of Justice Programs. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Burgess, R.L. & Draper, P. (1989) The explanation of family violence: the role of biological, behavioral, and cultural selection. In Ohlin & Tonry (Eds.). *Family Violence*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Buzawa, E., and Buzawa, C. (1990). *Domestic Violence: The Criminal Justice Response*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Campbell, J.C. (1992). If I Can't Have You, No One Can" : Power and Control in Homicide of Female Partners. In J.Radford and D.E.H. Russell (Eds.) *Femicide* (99-113). New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Campbell, J.C.; Miller, P.; Cardwell, M.M. & Belknap, R.A. (1994). Relationship Status of Battered Women Over Time. *Journal of Family Violence*, 9 (2). 99-111.

- Carlson, C. And Nidey, F.J. (1995). Mandatory penalties, victim cooperation, and the judicial processing of domestic abuse assault cases. *Crime & Delinquency*, 41 (1), 132-149.
- Choi, A. (1990). A critique on Brown's 'Police Responses to Wife Beating: Neglect of a Crime of Violence.' *Journal of Criminal Justice* 18. 455-458.
- Comack, E., (1996). *Women in Trouble*. Halifax, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing.
- Crowell, N.A., and Burgess, A.W. (Eds.). (1996). *Understanding Violence Against Women*. Washington D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Davis, L.V. & Carlson, B.E. (1987). Observation of spouse abuse: what happened to the children? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 2. 278-291.
- Davis, R.C. and Taylor, B.G. (1997). A Proactive Response to Family Violence: The Results of a Randomized Experiment. *Criminology* (35) 2. 307-333.
- Davis, P.W. (1983). Restoring the semblance of order: police strategies in the domestic disturbance. *Symbolic Interaction*, 6 (2): 216-74.
- Deschner, J. (1984). *The Hitting Habit: Anger Control For Battering Couples*. New York: Free Press.
- Dobash, R., and Dobash, R., (1979). *Violence Against Wives*, New York: The Free Press.
- Dobash, R., and Dobash, R., (1981). Research as social action. *Journal of Family Issues*, 2 (4). 439-470.
- Dobash, R., and Dobash, R., (1992). *Women, Violence, and Social Change*. New York: Routledge.
- Domestic Violence Reduction Unit. (1996) DVRU Statistics FY 1994/1995. Portland, OR: Portland Police Bureau.
- Domestic Violence Reduction Unit. (1995) DVRU Statistics FY 1993/1994. Portland, OR: Portland Police Bureau.

- Dugan, L., D. Nagin and R. Rosenfeld. (1996). *Explaining the Decline in Intimate Partner Homicide: The Effects of Changing Domesticity, Women's Status, and Domestic Violence Resources*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Chicago, Illinois.
- Dunford, F. (1990). The role of arrest in domestic assault: The Omaha police experiment. *Criminology*, 28(2), 183-206.
- Dutton, D.G. (1987). The criminal justice response to wife assault. *Law and Human Behavior*, 11, 189-206.
- Dutton, D.G. (1988). *The Domestic Assault of Women: Psychological and Criminological Perspectives*. Toronto: Allen and Bacon.
- Dutton, D.G. (1995). *The Batterer: A Psychological Profile*. New York: Basic Books.
- Dutton, D.G. and McGregor, (1991). The symbiosis of arrest and treatment for wife assault: The case for combined intervention. In M. Steinman (Ed), *Woman battering: Policy responses* (pp. 131-154). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Edleson, J., and Tolman, R. (1992). *Intervention for men who batter: An ecological approach*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Edleson, J.L. (1991). Coordinated community responses to woman battering. In M. Steinman (ed.) *Woman Battering: Policy Responses* (pp. 203-219). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Press.
- Emerson, C. D. (1979). Family violence: a study by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. *Police Chief* 46 (6): 48-50.
- Fagan, J. and Wexler, S. (1987). Family origins of violent delinquents. *Criminology*, XXV pp. 643-669.
- Fantuzzo, J.W. and Lindquist, C.V. (1989). The effects of observing conjugal violence on Children: a review and analysis of research methodology. *Journal of Family Violence* 4 (1) 77-93.

- Faulk, M. (1977). Men who assault their wives. In M. Roy (Ed.) *Battered Women: A Psycho-Sociological Study Of Domestic Violence*.
- Feld, L.S. and Straus , M.A. (1989). Escalation and desistance of wife assault in marriage. *Criminology*, XXVII(1). pp. 141-161.
- Ferraro, K. (1989a). The legal response to woman battering in the United States. In Hanmer *et al* (Eds.) *Women, Policing and Male Violence*. New York: Routledge.
- Ferraro, K. (1989b). Policing woman battering. *Social Problems*, 36(1), 61-74.
- Ford, D.A. and Regoli, M.J. (1993). The Criminal Prosecution of Wife Assaulters. In Zoe Hilton (ed.) *Legal Responses to Wife Assault*, Newbury Park: Sage.
- Ford, D.A., and Regoli, M.J. (1992). The preventive impacts of policies for prosecuting wife batterers. In E.S. Buzawa and C.G.Buzawa (Eds.), *Domestic Violence: The Changing Criminal Justice Response* (pp. 181-208). Dover, MA: Auburn House.
- Ford, D.A., Reichard, R., Goldsmith, S. And Regoli, M.J. (1996). Future Directions for Criminal Justice Policy on Domestic Violence. In E.S. Buzawa and G.G. Buzawa (Eds.), *Do Arrests and Restraining Orders Work?* (pp. 243-265). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Frieze, I.H. & Browne, A. (1989). Violence in Marriage. In Ohlin & Tonry (Eds.). *Family Violence*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Gamache, D., Edleson, J., and Schock, M. (1988). Coordinated police, judicial, and social service response to woman battering: A multiple-baseline evaluation across three communities. In G. Hotaling, D. Finkelhor, J. Kirkpatrick, & M. Straus (Eds.). *Coping with Family Violence: Research and Policy Perspectives*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Garner, J. & Clemmer, E. (1986 Nov). Danger to Police in Domestic Disturbances- A New Look. Research In Brief. National Institute of Justice.
- Garner, J., Fagan, J. And Maxwell, C. (1995). Published findings from the spouse abuse replication project: a critical review. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 11, 3-28.

- Gelles, R.J. (1974). *The Violent Home: A Study Of Physical Aggression Between Husbands And Wives*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gelles, R. J. (1998). Family violence. In *The Handbook of Crime and Punishment* (pp: 178-206) M. Tonry (Ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gelles, R.J. & Straus, M.A. (1979). Determinants of violence in the family. In Burr, Hill, Nye & Reiss (Eds.). *Contemporary Theories About the Family*. New York: Free Press.
- Gelles, R.J.; Cornell, C.P. (1985). *Intimate Violence in Families*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Giles-Sims, J. (1985). A longitudinal study of battered children of battered wives. *Family Relations*, XXXIV, April, 332-338.
- Goldberg, H. (1983). *The New Male-Female Relationship*. New York: Signet.
- Gondolf, E.W. and Foster, R. (1991). Pre-program attrition in batterers programs, *Journal of Family Violence* 6 (4), 337-350.
- Grusznski, R. J., and Carrillo, T.P. (1988). Who completes batterers' treatment group? An empirical investigation. *Journal of Family Violence*, 3, 141-150.
- Hamby, S.L. 1998. Partner Violence Prevention and Intervention. J.L.Jasinski and L.M.Williams (Eds.) *Partner Violence* (pp: 210-258). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Harrell, Adele (1991). *Evaluation of court-ordered treatment for domestic violence offenders: Final report*. The Urban Institute. Washington D.C.
- Hart, B. 1988. Beyond the "Duty to Warn": a therapist's "Duty to Protect" battered women and children. In K.Yllö and M.Bogard (Eds.) *Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse* (pp: 234-248). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Healey, K. C.Smith and C.O'Sullivan. 1998. *Batterer Intervention: Program Approaches and Criminal Justice Strategies*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice Department of Justice Programs.
- Herrenkohl, E.C., Herrenkohl, R.C. and Toedter, L.J. (1983). Perspective on the intergeneration transmission of abuse, in Finkelhor, D. and R. Gelles, (Eds.), *The Dark Side of Families*, Beverly Hills, CA:Sage Publications, pp. 306-316.

- Hilton, N.Z. (1993). Battered women's concerns about their children witnessing wife assault. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 7 77-86.
- Hirschel, J., Hutchinson, I., Dean, C., Kelley, J. (1990). *Charlotte spouse assault replication project: Final report*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- Hotaling, G.T., and Sugarman, D.B. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of knowledge. *Violence and Victims 1*. 101-124. As cited in Crowell, N.A., and Burgess, A.W. (Eds.). (1996). *Understanding Violence Against Women*. Washington D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Hotaling, G.T., Straus, M.A., Lincoln, A. (1989). Intrafamily violence and crime and violence outside the family. In L. Ohlin and M. Tonry (Eds.), *Family Violence*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. pp. 315-376.
- Howell, M., and Pugliesi, K. (1988). Husbands who harm: Predicting spousal violence by men. *Journal of Family Violence*, 3(1), 15-27.
- Hubbard, L. (1995), Safety and Justice: Community Intervention in Domestic Violence- The Multnomah County Model. State of Oregon Criminal Justice Services Division.
- Jaffe, P., Hastings, E., Reitzel, D., and Austin, G. (1993). The impact of police laying charges. In Zoe Hilton (ed) *Legal Responses to Wife Assault*, Newbury Park: Sage.
- Johnson, Ida M. (1990). A loglinear analysis of abused wives' decisions to call the police in domestic-violence disputes. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 18, 147-159.
- Johnson, V. (1980). *I'll Quit Tomorrow: A Practical Guide To Alcoholism Treatment*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Jolin, A. (1995). The Domestic Violence Reduction Unit: An Evaluation of a Community Policing Project in Portland, Oregon. Unpublished Report. Funded under NIJ grant #92-IJ-CX-K037.
- Jolin, A. and Clavadetscher, M. (1995). *Assessment of Community Policing Performance within the Portland Police Bureau Domestic Violence Reduction Unit*. Portland, Oregon: Portland State University, School of Urban and Public Affairs.

- Jolin, A. and Moose, C.A. (1997). Evaluating a domestic violence program in a community policing environment: research implementation issues. *Crime & Delinquency*, 43 (3). 279-297.
- Jones, Ann. 1994. *Next Time She'll Be Dead*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Kalmus, D. (1984). The intergenerational transmission of marital aggression. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 46. 11-19.
- Klaus, P.A. and Rand, M.R. (1984). *Family Violence, Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, April.
- Klein, A.R. (1996). Re-Abuse in a population of court-restrained male batterers. In Buzawa and Buzawa (Eds.) *Do Arrests and Restraining Orders Work?* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Langley, R., & Levy, R. (1977). *Wife Beating: The Silent Crisis*. New York: Dutton.
- Lempert, R. (1989). Humility is a virtue: on the publicization of policy-relevant research. *Law & Society Review*, 23 (1) 145-161.
- Leonard, K.E. (1993) Drinking patterns and interaction in marital violence: Review, critique, and future directions for research. *Alcohol and Interpersonal Violence*. 253-280.
- Londer, D.H. (1993) In the Matter of the Pretrial Release of Defendants for Offenses Involving Family Members. Multnomah County, Oregon. Order No. (9301-00000 #C93-09.
- Lloyd, S., G. Farrell, and K.Pease. 1994. *Preventing Repeat Comestic Violence: A Demonstration Project on Merseyside*. Police Research Group, Crime Prevention Unit Paper 49. London, England: Home Office.
- MacKinnon, C. (1991). *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Maguire, K; Pastore, A.L., and Flanagan, T.J. (1995). *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics-1995*. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

- Mahoney, M.R. (1991) Legal Images of Battered Women: Redefining the Issues of Separation. *Michigan Law Review* 90: 2-94/
- Mahoney, M.R. (1994). Women's Lives, Violence, and Agency. In Fineman, M.A. & Mykitiuk, R. (Eds.) *The Public Nature of Private Violence*. New York: Routledge.
- Martin, D. (1976). *Battered Wives*. New York: Pocket Books.
- McFarlane, J.; Parker, B.; Soeken, K.; & Bullock, L. (1992). Assessing abuse during pregnancy: Severity and frequency of injuries and associated entry into prenatal care. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 267. 3176-3178.
- Messner, F., & Tardiff, K. (1984). The social and ecology of urban homicide. Paper delivered at American Criminology annual meeting, Cincinnati, OH.
- Meyer, H. (1992, January 6). The billion-dollar epidemic. *American Medical News*.
- Miller, B.A.; Downs, W.R., and Gondoli, D.M. (1989). Spousal Violence among alcoholic women as compared to a random household sample of women. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 50 (6). 533-539.
- Morgan, R. (1970). *Sisterhood is Powerful*. New York: Random House.
- Novello, A., Rosenberg, M, Saltzman, L, and Shosky, J. (1992). From the Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 267(23) , 3132.
- Okun, L. (1986). *Woman Abuse: Facts Replacing Myths*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- O'Leary, K.D., and Curley, A.D. (1986). Assertion and family violence: Correlates of spouse abuse, *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 12, 281-289.
- Oregon Coalition Against Sexual and Domestic Violence (1990). Domestic Violence Survey of OCADSV Programs, 2.
- Pate, A., Hamilton, E., and Annan, S. (1991). Metro-Dade spouse abuse replication project final report. Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.

- Pease, K. and G. Laycock. 1996. *Revictimization: Reducing the Heat on Hot Victims*. Washington D.C.: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Peterson, K.S. (1997, 11/18) Partners unequal in abuse study: Women's risk is greater. *USA Today*, p 1D.
- Portland Police Bureau (1990). *Community Policing Transition Plan*, Portland: City of Portland.
- Portland Police Bureau (1996). Annual Report 1995. Portland, OR: Portland Police Bureau.
- Ptacek, J. (1988). Why do men batter their wives? In Yellö and Bograd (Eds.) *Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Reiss, A.J., Jr., & Roth, J.A. (1993). *Understanding and Preventing Violence*. National Research Council. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Rhodes, N.R. (1992). The Assessment of Spousal abuse: An alternative to the Conflict Tactics Scale. In Viano (ed.) *Intimate Violence*. (pp. 27-35) Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.
- Ritmeester, T. and Pence, E. (1992). A cynical twist of fate: how processes of ruling in the criminal justice system and the social sciences impede justice for battered women. *Review of Law and Women's Studies*. Vol. 2.
- Rosenbaum, A. and O'Leary, S. (1981a). Children, the unintended victims of marital violence. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 51, 692-699.
- Sanday, P.R., (1981). *Female Power and Male Dominance: On the Origins of Sexual Inequality*. Cambridge University Press.
- Saunders, D.G. (1988). Issues in conducting treatment research with men who batter. In Gerald Holtaling, David Finkelhor, John Kirkpatrick and Murray Straus (Eds.). *Coping with Family Violence*. CA: Sage.
- Schechter, S. (1982). *Women and male violence*. Boston: South End Press.
- Sherman, L.W. (1992). *Policing Domestic Violence: Experiments And Dilemmas*. New York: The Free Press.

- Sherman, L.W., and Berk, R.A. (1984). The specific deterrent effects of arrest for domestic assault. *American Sociological Review*, 49(2), 261-272.
- Sherman, L.W., and Berk, R.A. (1988). Police Responses to Family Violence Incidents. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 83 (401), 70-76).
- Sherman, L.W., Schmidt, J., Rogan, D., and DeRiso, C. (1991). Predicting domestic homicide: Prior police contact and gun threats. In Michael Steinman (Ed.), *Woman Battering: Policy Responses*, 73-93. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing.
- Sigler, R.T., Crowley, J.M., and Johnson, I. (1990). Judicial and Prosecutorial Endorsement of Innovative Techniques in the Trial of Domestic Abuse Cases. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 18, 443-453.
- Simons, R.L., Wu, C., Johnson, C., and Conger, R.D. (1995). A Test of Various Perspectives on the Intergenerational Transmission of Domestic Violence. *Criminology*, 33, 141-171.
- Sipe, B. & Hall, E.G. (1996). *I am not your Victim: Anatomy of Domestic Violence*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Soler, E. (1987). Domestic violence is a crime: a case study--San Francisco Family Violence Project. In D.J.Sonkin(Ed.), *Domestic Violence on Trial* (pp. 21-35). New York: Springer.
- Stanko, E.A. (1989). Missing the mark? Police Battering. In Hanmer, Radford & Stanko (Eds.) *Women, Policing and Male Violence* (46-49). London: Routledge.
- Stark, E. (1993).Mandatory Arrest of Batterers. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 36(5) 651-680.
- Stark, E. and Flitcraft, A. (1988). Violence among intimates: An epidemiological review. In Hasselt VN *et al.*, (Ed.) *Handbook of Family Violence*. 293-318. New York: Plenum.
- State of Oregon (1997) *Report of Criminal Offenses and Arrests, 1996*. Salem, Oregon: Law Enforcement Data System.

- Steinman, M. (1990). Lowering recidivism among men who batter women. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 17, 124-132.
- Stets, J.E., and Straus, M.A. (1989). The Marriage License as a Hitting License: A Comparison of Assaults in Dating, Cohabiting, and Married Couples. *Journal of Family Violence*, 41 (2).
- Stith, S.K., Williams, M., and Rosen, K. (1990). *Violence Hits Home*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Straus, M. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactics (CT) scales. *Journal of Marriage Family*, 41, 75-88.
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R., and Steinmetz, S. (1980). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family*. Garden City, NY: Anchor/Doubleday.
- Straus, M.A. & Gelles, R.J. (1986). Societal Changes and change in family violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48. 465-480.
- Straus, M.A. (1990). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict Tactics Scales. In Straus & Gelles (Eds.) *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
- Straus, M.A. (1996). Identifying Offenders in Criminal Justice Research on Domestic Assault. In E.S. Buzawa and G.G. Buszawa (Eds.), *Do Arrests and Restraining Orders Work?* (pp. 14-29). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Suh, E.k. & Abel, E.M. (1990). The impact of spousal violence on the children of the abused. *Journal of Independent Social Work*, 4. (4). 27-34.
- Syers, M. and Edleson, J.L. (1992). The combined effects of coordinated criminal justice intervention in woman abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 7(4):490-502.
- Tift, L.L. (1993). *Battering of Women: The Failure of Intervention and the Case for Prevention*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Tolman, R., and Bennett, L.W. (1990). A review of quantitative research on men who batter. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5, 87-118.
- U.S. Department of Justice. (1984). Final Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Attorney General's Task Force on Family Violence.
- Walker, L. (1979). *The Battered Woman*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Walker, L. (1984). *The Battered Woman Syndrome*. New York: Springer Publications.
- Walker, L. (1989). *Terrifying Love: Why Battered Women Kill And How Society Responds*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Walker, L., Thyfault, R. and Browne, A. (1982). Beyond the juror's ken: battered women, *Vermont Law Review*, VII, pp. 1.
- Weis, J.G. (1989). Family violence research methodology and design. In Ohlin & Tonry (Eds.) *Family Violence*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Widom, C.S. 1989. Child Abuse, neglect, and violent criminal behavior. *Criminology*, 27, 251-271.
- Williams, K.R. & Hawkins, R. The meaning of arrest for wife assault. *Criminology* 27, (1). 163-181.
- Wilson, M. and M. Daly.1992. Till Death us do Part. J. Radford and D. E.H. Russell (Eds.) *Femicide* (pp: 83-98). New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Yllö, K. (1993). Through a feminist lense: gender, power and violence. R.J. Gelles and D.R.Loseke (Eds.). *Current Controversies on Family Violence* (pp: 47-62). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yllö, K. (1988). Political and Methodological Debates in Wife Abuse Research. In Yellö and Bograd (Eds.) *Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Zorza, J. (Ed.). (1998, Feb/Mar). *Domestic Violence Report*, 3 (3).
- Zorza, J. and Woods, L. (1994). *Analysis and Policy Implications of the New Domestic Violence Police Studies*. National Center on Women and Family Law.

Zorza, J. (1993). Mandatory Arrest for Domestic Violence: Why it May Prove the Best First Step in Curbing Repeat Abuse. *Criminal Justice (3)* 51-54.

appendix A

POSSIBLE POLICE INTERVENTIONS
(POLICE CHECK LIST)

POSSIBLE POLICE INTERVENTIONS (Police Check List)

PLEASE USE NO. 2 PENCIL

| | |
|--|--|
| RIGHT | WRONG |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |

CASE ID

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

FOR
RESEARCH
STAFF
USE
ONLY

Date of Birth

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

Arrest Date

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

Answer the questions on this form by completely filling in the "bubbles" which correspond to your responses. Use only a #2 pencil. Ink marks may not be "seen" by the scanner.

Victim's name _____

Record the victim's date of birth and the date of arrest by filling in the boxes and the corresponding "bubbles" above. Enter the dates as mmddyy (i.e. Jan. 23, 1996 is 012396).

- | | Yes | No |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Is the victim's phone number available? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Which of the following activities did you do when you contacted the victim of a domestic assault? | | |
| First call to victim - spoke to victim | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Second call to victim - spoke to victim | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Third call to victim - spoke to victim | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Contacted victim by phone, victim agreed to accept DVRU services | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Took photographs and/or victim statements to assist DA with prosecution | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provided information on safety planning (i.e. call 911, escape route, etc.) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provided information on how to pursue prosecution of perpetrator | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provided victim with information of how to obtain a restraining order | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provided information on how to access safe housing or women's shelters | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provided information on how to get counseling for victim | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provided information on how to get perpetrator counseling | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Referred victim to a victim advocacy program | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Helped victim set up appointment with district attorney | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Helped victim get a restraining order | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Served restraining order | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Transported victim to a shelter | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Helped victim with transportation to/from court | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Gave victim motel vouchers | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Gave victim food basket | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Other (explain on back of form) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

appendix B

INITIAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULES:
TREATMENT AND CONTROL

I WOULD LIKE TO BEGIN BY ASKING YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOURSELF:

1. When were you born?

MM-DD-YY

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

ID Number

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

2. How do you describe yourself? Would you say you are:

- Hispanic
- African American
- White
- Native American
- Pacific Islander
- Asian
- Other

3. What is the highest grade you completed in school?

- Some High School
- High School
- GED
- Some College
- College
- Post Graduate

4. What is your current employment situation? Are you:

- Employed full time
- Employed part time
- Not employed: No government assistance
- Not employed: Receive govt. assistance

5. What is your own personal annual income?

- \$0 - 5000
- \$5001 - 10,000
- \$10,001 - 20,000
- \$20,001 - 30,000
- \$30,001 - 40,000
- Over \$40,000

6. What is your relationship to the man who was arrested because he abused you? Are you:

- Married, living together
- Married, not living together
- Divorced, living together
- Divorced, not living together
- Not married, living together
- Not married, not living together

7. How long have you been in a relationship with this man?

- Less than one month
- 1 - 2 months
- 3 - 4 months
- 5 - 6 months
- More than 6 months but less than a year
- 1 - 5 years
- More than 5 years

8. Do you and he own a home together?

YES NO

9. Do you own your own home?

10. Do you own your own car?

11. Do you interact regularly with members of your extended family (parents, in-laws, uncles, aunts, brothers/sisters etc.)

12. Are you an active member in any club or social organization?

13. Do you belong to any professional organizations (for example: employee union, local, state or national professional organization)

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR CHILDHOOD:

14. As a child, did you feel emotionally cared for by your parents? Very much so
 Somewhat
 Not at all
15. As a child, did you ever witness your parents hitting each other or throwing things at each other? Yes
 No
16. Were you physically or sexually abused by a close family member as a child? Yes
 No

FOR THE NEXT SET OF QUESTIONS, I ASK THAT YOU PLEASE THINK ONLY ABOUT THE 6 MONTHS BEFORE THE DISPUTE ON _____ THAT LEAD TO THE ARREST OF YOUR PARTNER.

PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ABUSIVE EVENTS HAPPENED BETWEEN YOU AND YOUR PARTNER.

AGAIN, THESE ARE QUESTIONS ONLY ABOUT THE 6 MONTHS BEFORE THE CURRENT ARREST OF YOUR PARTNER.

TELL ME HOW MANY TIMES HE....

| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10-20 |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 17. Threatened to hit or throw something at you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 18. Threatened you with a knife or gun | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 19. Threatened to kill you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 20. Swore at, screamed at or insulted you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 21. Threw, smashed, hit, or kicked something | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 22. Threw something at you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 23. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved you. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 24. Slapped or spanked you with an open hand | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 25. Kicked, bit, or hit you with his fist | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 26. Hit or tried to hit you with something | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 27. Choked or strangled you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 28. Beat you up | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 29. Used a gun, knife, or other weapon against you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 30. Forced you to have sex with him | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

DID ANY OF THE ABUSE YOU DESCRIBED LEAD TO INJURIES THAT INCLUDED:

31. Cuts or Bruises Yes
 No
32. Broken bones Yes
 No
33. Burns Yes
 No
34. Internal injuries Yes
 No
35. Damage to eyes, ears or teeth Yes
 No
36. Other _____ Yes
 No

37. As far as you know, in the 6 months BEFORE the current arrest, did your partner have a physical fight with someone who does not belong to your household?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

WE WOULD STILL LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE 6 MONTHS BEFORE THE CURRENT ARREST OF YOUR PARTNER. DURING THAT TIME YOU MAY HAVE TRIED TO GET HELP FOR THE PROBLEMS WITH YOUR PARTNER. HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU DONE THE FOLLOWING?

| | Never | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12+ |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 38. Talked to a minister, priest or rabbi | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 39. Saw a doctor, nurse or gone to an emergency room | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 40. Talked to a family member about your partner's violence | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 41. Talked to a friend or neighbor about your partner's violence | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 42. Talked to a mental health professional or counselor | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 43. Talked to the district attorney | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 44. Attempted to get a warrant for your partner's arrest | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 45. Gone to a shelter just to talk | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 46. Stayed overnight at a battered woman's shelter | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 47. Asked the police to intervene between you and your partner | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 48. Gone to court to obtain a restraining order | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 49. Talked to an attorney about your partner's violence | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 50. Other _____ | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

NOW I'M GOING TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR PARTNER.

51. What is the highest grade he completed in school?

- Some high school
- High school
- GED
- Some college
- College
- Postgraduate

52. What is the current employment situation of your partner? Is he:

- Employed full time
- Employed part time
- Not employed: No government assistance
- Not employed: receives govt. assistance

53. What is your partner's annual income?

- 0-\$5,000
- \$5,001-10,000
- \$10,001-20,000
- \$20,001-30,000
- \$30,001-40,000
- Over \$40,000
- Don't know

54. Does your partner own his own home?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

55. Does he own his own car?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

56. Does he interact regularly with members of his extended family?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

57. Is he an active member in a club or social organization?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

58. Does he belong to any professional organizations (for example: employee union, local, state or national professional organization)?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

NOW I'M GOING TO ASK YOU A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR PARTNER'S CHILDHOOD

59. As a child, did your partner feel emotionally cared for by his parents?
 Very much so Somewhat cared for Not at all cared for Don't know
60. As a child, did your partner ever witness his parents hitting each other or throwing things at each other?
 Yes No Don't know
61. Was your partner physically or sexually abused by a close family member as a child?
 Yes No Don't know

NOW I'M GOING TO READ A LIST OF THINGS THAT CAN HAPPEN DURING ARGUMENTS. PLEASE TELL ME WHICH OF THEM YOUR PARTNER DID DURING THE DISPUTE THAT BROUGHT THE POLICE TO YOUR HOUSE ON _____.

- | DID HE: | Yes | No |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 62. Threaten to hit or throw something at you | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y | <input checked="" type="radio"/> N |
| 63. Threaten you with a knife or gun | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y | <input checked="" type="radio"/> N |
| 64. Threaten to kill you | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y | <input checked="" type="radio"/> N |
| 65. Swear at, scream at or insult you | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y | <input checked="" type="radio"/> N |
| 66. Throw, smash, hit or kick something | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y | <input checked="" type="radio"/> N |
| 67. Throw something at you | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y | <input checked="" type="radio"/> N |
| 68. Push, grab or shove you | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y | <input checked="" type="radio"/> N |
| 69. Slap or spank you with an open hand | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y | <input checked="" type="radio"/> N |
| 70. Kick, bite or hit you with his fist | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y | <input checked="" type="radio"/> N |
| 71. Hit or try to hit you with something | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y | <input checked="" type="radio"/> N |
| 72. Choke or strangle you | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y | <input checked="" type="radio"/> N |
| 73. Beat you up | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y | <input checked="" type="radio"/> N |
| 74. Use a gun, knife or other weapon against you | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y | <input checked="" type="radio"/> N |
| 75. Force you to have sex with him | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y | <input checked="" type="radio"/> N |

DID ANY OF THE ABUSE YOU JUST DESCRIBED LEAD TO INJURIES THAT INCLUDED:

- | | Yes | No |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 76. Cuts or bruises | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y | <input checked="" type="radio"/> N |
| 77. Broken bones | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y | <input checked="" type="radio"/> N |
| 78. Burns | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y | <input checked="" type="radio"/> N |
| 79. Internal injuries | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y | <input checked="" type="radio"/> N |
| 80. Damage to eyes, ears or teeth | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y | <input checked="" type="radio"/> N |
| 81. Other | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y | <input checked="" type="radio"/> N |

82. Were you given medical attention for any of these injuries? Yes No

We've asked about the injuries that may have occurred during the dispute that lead to the arrest of your partner. Now I'd like to ask you a few questions about alcohol or drug issues.

83. When the dispute occurred, had your partner been using alcohol or drugs? Yes No Don't Know
84. When the dispute occurred, had you been using alcohol or drugs? Yes No NA
85. Has your partner ever received treatment for a drug or alcohol problem? Yes No Don't Know
86. Have you ever received treatment for a drug or alcohol problem? Yes No NA

87. Do you think that alcohol or drugs are a problem for you? Yes No NA

Yes No NA

88. Do you think alcohol or drugs are a problem for your partner? Yes No Don't Know

Yes No Don't Know

THE NEXT SET OF QUESTIONS IS ABOUT YOUR EXPERIENCES WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS. WE NEED TO FIND OUT WHAT YOUR CONTACTS WITH THE LAW HAVE BEEN, WHAT ACTIONS THE OFFICERS HAVE TAKEN, AND WHAT THEIR ATTITUDES WERE LIKE. YOUR INPUT WILL BE VERY USEFUL IN HELPING LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES TO IMPROVE HANDLING OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SITUATIONS. YOUR RESPONSES WILL BE COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL.

89. Going back to the incident when your partner was arrested on _____, do you remember who called the police?

You
 A friend

Your child
 Another family member

A neighbor
 Other

Your partner
 Don't know

NOTE: If other than "You", skip to question 91.

90. If you called the police yourself, how satisfied were you with the response you got from the person who answered the phone?

Very unsatisfied

Unsatisfied

Satisfied

Very satisfied

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT A NUMBER OF THINGS THAT THE POLICE SOMETIMES DO.

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS DID THE POLICE DO WHEN THEY ARRIVED ON _____ AT YOUR HOUSE? DID THEY:

- | | Yes | No |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 91. Give you an information card? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 92. Calm things down? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 93. Provide advice on how to get along with your partner? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 94. Recommend that you go to the District Attorney's office? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 95. Provide information on women's shelters and support groups? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 96. Provide information on legal rights or assistance? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 97. Recommend or help you contact a women's shelter or support group? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 98. Recommend or refer you to counseling? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 99. Transport you to a hospital or a shelter? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 100. Refer you to a victim assistance program? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 101. Listen to what you had to say? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 102. Give you information about getting a restraining order? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

103. Overall how concerned would you say the officers were about you? Very much Somewhat Not at all

104. Overall how helpful would you say the officers were? Very helpful Somewhat Not at all

105. Did the officers treat you with respect? Very much so Somewhat Not at all

106. Did the officers treat you like you were lying or crazy or getting upset over nothing? Very much so Somewhat Not at all

107. Would you say they were objective and business-like? Very much so Somewhat Not at all

108. Would you say they were hostile and nasty toward you? Very much so Somewhat Not at all

109. Overall, how satisfied were you with the attitudes of the uniformed officers who arrested your partner?
 Very satisfied Satisfied Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied

110. If you're ever assaulted again by an intimate partner, would you want law enforcement to get involved again?
 Yes No

YOU HAVE GIVEN US A GOOD IDEA OF THE DIFFERENT WAYS THE POLICE OFFICERS TRIED TO HELP YOU WITH THIS SITUATION. NEXT I WILL READ TO YOU A NUMBER OF STATEMENTS THAT MAY DESCRIBE HOW A WOMAN IN THIS SITUATION MIGHT FEEL. FOR EACH STATEMENT, PLEASE CHOOSE THE RESPONSE THAT BEST DESCRIBES HOW THE STATEMENT APPLIES TO YOU.

111. I feel confident in my abilities to keep myself safe.

- Not true at all
- Mostly not true
- Somewhat true
- Mostly true
- Very true

112. I feel my family life is under control.

- Not true at all
- Mostly not true
- Somewhat true
- Mostly true
- Very true

113. I believe that I can solve problems when they happen.

- Not true at all
- Mostly not true
- Somewhat true
- Mostly true
- Very true

114. I feel I am doing all I can to get help from the criminal justice system.

- Not true at all
- Mostly not true
- Somewhat true
- Mostly true
- Very true

NOW I'M GOING TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR CHILDREN.

115. How many children do you have? (IF NONE, THIS IS THE LAST QUESTION. SKIP TO RECONTACT SHEET)

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

116. How many children do you have under 3 years of age?

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

117. How many children do you have between the ages of 3 and 6?

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

118. How many children do you have between the ages of 7 and 12 years?

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

119. How many children do you have between 13 and 18 years?

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

120. Have any of your children seen your partner be violent with you?

- Yes No

If none of your children have seen your partner be violent with you, I am going to ask you to report on your oldest child whose age falls between 4 and 16. If one or more of your children have seen your partner be violent with you, I want you to report on your oldest child, whose age falls between 4 and 16, who saw your partner being violent with you.

What is the first name of the child you have in mind as you answer the next set of questions? _____

I am going to hand you a set of questions about your child that I'd like you to answer by marking the correct "bubble" with this number 2 pencil. After you have finished answering these questions please place the answer sheet in this envelope and then seal the envelope shut. I will never see your answers. This envelope will be given to a researcher who will put the information into the computer. Your name will never be linked with your answers. The information that you and many others will give us about children who grow up in violent homes will be consolidated so that there is no way for anyone to be able to identify individual children. Your answers will be used to help other children who grow up in similar situations.

appendix C

FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

I WOULD LIKE TO BEGIN BY ASKING YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOURSELF:

ID Number

MM-DD-YY

| | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |

| | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |

1. What is the highest grade you completed in school?

- Less than High School
- Some High School
- High School
- GED
- Some College
- College
- Post Graduate

2. What is your current employment situation? Are you:

- Employed full time
- Employed part time
- Not employed: No government assistance
- Not employed: Receive govt. assistance

3. What is your own personal annual income?

- \$0 - 5000
- \$5001 - 10,000
- \$10,001 - 20,000
- \$20,001 - 30,000
- \$30,001 - 40,000
- Over \$40,000

Now I'm going to ask you some questions about the man who was arrested six months ago because he abused you.

4. What is the highest grade he completed in school?

- Less than High School
- Some High School
- High School
- GED
- Some College
- College
- Post Graduate
- Don't know

5. What is his current employment situation?

- Employed full time
- Employed part time
- Not employed: No government assistance
- Not employed: Receives govt. assistance
- Don't know

6. What is his annual income?

- \$0 - 5000
- \$5001 - 10,000
- \$10,001 - 20,000
- \$20,001 - 30,000
- \$30,001 - 40,000
- Over \$40,000
- Don't know

7. Does he own his own home?

- Yes No Don't Know
-

8. Do you own your own home?

-

9. Do you and he own a home together?

-

10. Does he own his own car?

-

11. Do you own your own car?

-

12. Does he interact regularly with members of his extended family (parents, in-laws, uncles, aunts, brothers/sisters etc.)?

-

13. Do you interact regularly with members of your extended family (parents, in-laws, uncles, aunts, brothers/sisters etc.)?

-

14. Is he an active member in a club or social organization?

-

- | | Yes | No | Don't Know |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| 15. Are you an active member in a club or social organization? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | |
| 16. Does he belong to any professional organizations (for example: employee union, local, state or national professional organization) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 17. Do you belong to any professional organizations (for example: employee union, local, state or national professional organization) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | |
| 18. Do you think alcohol or drugs are a problem for the man who was arrested six months ago because he abused you? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 19. Has he received treatment for a drug or alcohol problem in the last 6 months? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | |
| 20. Have you received treatment for a drug or alcohol problem in the last 6 months? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> (NA) |
| 21. Do you think that alcohol or drugs are a problem for you? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 22. As far as you know, in the 6 months after the arrest on _____, did he have a physical fight with someone who does not belong to your household? | | | |

23. What is your current relationship to the man who was arrested six months ago for abusing you? Are you:

- Married, living together
- Married, not living together
- Divorced, living together
- Divorced, not living together
- Not married, living together
- Not married, not living together
- Relationship has ended

24. Have you had any contact with this man in the last six months?

Yes No (if no, skip to 28)

25. If yes, did you agree to this contact?

Yes No

26. If yes, the purpose of the contact involved:

- Dating
- Legal matters
- Child care arrangements
- Money/property matters
- Living together, married
- Other _____

27. Approximately how many times did you have contact with him in the last six months?

- None
- 1-5
- 6-10
- More than 10

28. During the last 6 months, have you had any contact with uniformed police officers about domestic violence issues?

Yes No (if no, skip to 48)

If Yes:

The next set of questions is about your experiences with law enforcement officers. Your input will be very useful in helping law enforcement agencies improve handling of domestic violence situations. Your responses will be completely confidential.

I would like to talk to you about a number of things that the police sometimes do. Which of the following things did the uniformed officers do when they responded to the dispute(s) during the last six months?

- | | Yes | No | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 29. Give you an information card? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | | |
| 30. Calm things down? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | | |
| 31. Recommend that you go to the District Attorney's office? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | | |
| 32. Provide information on women's shelters and support groups? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | | |
| 33. Provide information on legal rights or assistance? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | | |
| 34. Recommend or help you contact a women's shelter or support group? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | | |
| 35. Recommend or refer you to counseling? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | | |
| 36. Transport you to a hospital or a shelter? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | | |
| 37. Refer you to a victim assistance program? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | | |
| 38. Listen to what you had to say? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | | |
| 39. Give you information about getting a restraining order? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | | |
| 40. Overall how concerned would you say the officers were about you? | <input type="radio"/> Very much | <input type="radio"/> Somewhat | <input type="radio"/> Not at all | | |
| 41. Overall how helpful would you say the officers were? | <input type="radio"/> Very helpful | <input type="radio"/> Somewhat | <input type="radio"/> Not at all | | |
| 42. Did the officers treat you with respect? | <input type="radio"/> Very much so | <input type="radio"/> Somewhat | <input type="radio"/> Not at all | | |
| 43. Did the officers treat you like you were lying or crazy or getting upset over nothing? | <input type="radio"/> Very much so | <input type="radio"/> Somewhat | <input type="radio"/> Not at all | | |
| 44. Would you say they were objective and business-like? | <input type="radio"/> Very much so | <input type="radio"/> Somewhat | <input type="radio"/> Not at all | | |
| 45. Would you say they were hostile and nasty toward you? | <input type="radio"/> Very much so | <input type="radio"/> Somewhat | <input type="radio"/> Not at all | | |
| 46. Overall, how satisfied were you with the attitudes of the uniformed officers who responded to the dispute(s) during the past six months? | | | | | |
| | <input type="radio"/> Very satisfied | <input type="radio"/> Satisfied | <input type="radio"/> Dissatisfied | <input type="radio"/> Very Dissatisfied | |
| 47. If you're ever assaulted again by an intimate partner, would you want law enforcement to get involved again? | | | | | |
| | | | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | |

For the next set of questions, I ask that you please think only about the six months after the dispute on _____ that lead to the arrest of that partner.

48. How many separate disputes did you and your partner have in the last 6 months?
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or more

Please tell me how often each of the following abusive events have happened between you and this partner. Again, these are questions only about the 6 months after the arrest of your partner. Tell me how many times he...

- | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10+ |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 49. Threatened to hit or throw something at you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 50. Threatened you with a knife or gun | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 51. Threatened to kill you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 52. Swore at, screamed at or insulted you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 53. Threw, smashed, hit or kicked something | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 54. Threw something at you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 55. Pushed, grabbed or shoved you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 56. Slapped or spanked you with an open hand | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10+ |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 57. Kicked, bit or hit you with his fist | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 58. Hit or tried to hit you with something | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 59. Choked or strangled you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 60. Beat you up | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 61. Used a gun, knife or other weapon against you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 62. Forced you to have sex with him | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 63. Violated a restraining order | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 64. Violated a stalking order | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

DID ANY OF THE ABUSE YOU DESCRIBED LEAD TO INJURIES THAT INCLUDED:

| | Yes | No |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 65. Cuts or bruises | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 66. Broken bones (including jaw) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 67. Burns | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 68. Internal injuries | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 69. Damage to eyes, ears or teeth | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 70. Back injury | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 71. Dislocated joint (arm, hip, shoulder) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 72. Mental or emotional problems | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 73. Other _____ | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Still thinking about the 6 months after the arrest of your partner on _____. You may have tried to get help for the problems with your partner. How many times have you done the following?

| | Never | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 74. Talked to a minister, priest or rabbi | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 75. Saw a doctor, nurse or gone to an emergency room | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 76. Talked to a family member about your partner's violence | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 77. Talked to a friend or neighbor about your partner's violence | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 78. Talked to a mental health professional or counselor | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 79. Talked to the district attorney | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 80. Attempted to get a warrant for your partner's arrest | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 81. Gone to a shelter just to talk | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 82. Stayed overnight at a battered woman's shelter | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 83. Asked the police to intervene between you and your partner | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 84. Gone to court to obtain a restraining order | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 85. Talked to an attorney about your partner's violence | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 86. Attended a Twelve-step program (Al-Anon, AA, NA) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 87. Temporarily stayed with a friend or family member | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 88. Spoke with Parole Office about your partner's violence | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 89. Spoke to a co-worker or someone at school | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 90. Called a crisis line | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 91. Other _____ | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Six months ago we talked to you about the dispute that lead to your partner's arrest. Did any of the following happen as a result of this arrest?

92. Did someone other than the arresting officer contact you from the police department? (And other than someone from this study.) Yes No

If no, skip to question #108

If yes:

93. Was this officer from the Domestic Violence Reduction Unit, also sometimes called the Family Services Division? Yes No Don't know

(Clarify: the DVRU officers are plain clothes police officers, who would have contacted you in the days after your partner's arrest). If no, or still don't know, skip to question #108.

94. How many times did you have contact with the Unit? Once 2-3 4-7 8+ Yes No

95. Did the officer(s) who contacted you after your partner was arrested take pictures of your injuries? Yes No

96. Did they help you make a safety plan? Yes No

97. Did they tell you how to help with the prosecution of your case? Yes No

98. Did they tell you how to get a restraining order against your partner? Yes No

99. Did they tell you how to get into a shelter or other safe housing? Yes No

100. Did they tell you how to get counseling for yourself? Yes No

101. Did they tell you how your partner might get counseling? Yes No

102. Did they refer you to a victim's assistance program? Yes No

103. Did they give you a motel voucher? Yes No

104. Did they help you set up an appointment with the district attorney's office? Yes No

105. Did they help you get a restraining order? Yes No

106. Did they provide transportation for you? Yes No

107. If you were ever involved in another dispute, would you want this unit to be involved? Yes No Don't know

108. Did the District Attorney's office talk to you about this case? Yes No Don't know
If no, skip to #110

109. Did you help the DA with the prosecution of your case? Yes No

110. How satisfied were you with their involvement or noninvolvement? Very satisfied Satisfied Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied

111. Did you get a restraining order? Yes No

112. Do you know the outcome of your case? Yes No

113. Did you appear in court in connection with this case? Yes No

If no, skip to #117. If yes, continue with #114 on next page.

114. Was this appearance related to the criminal prosecution of your case? Yes
115. Was this appearance related to a restraining order?
116. Was this appearance related to some other legal matter concerning you and your partner?

Now I would like to talk to you about any disputes with any other intimate male partners you may have been involved with in the past six months.

117. How many, if any, other male intimate male partners have abused you in the last six months?
If none, skip to #181 None 1 2 3 4 5 or more
118. How many abusive events with other partners were you involved in?
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 More than

Tell me how many total times he/they... (each event may have included one or more of the following):

| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 119. Threatened to hit or throw something at you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 120. Threatened you with a knife or gun | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 121. Threatened to kill you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 122. Swore at, screamed at or insulted you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 123. Threw, smashed, hit or kicked something | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 124. Threw something at you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 125. Pushed, grabbed or shoved you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 126. Slapped or spanked you with an open hand | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 127. Kicked, bit or hit you with his fist | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 128. Hit or tried to hit you with something | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 129. Choked or strangled you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 130. Beat you up | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 131. Used a gun, knife or other weapon against you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 132. Forced you to have sex with him | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

- | | Yes | No |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 133. Violated a restraining order | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 134. Violated a stalking order | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Did any of the abuse you described lead to injuries that included:

| | Yes | No |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 135. Cuts or bruises | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 136. Broken bones (including jaw) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 137. Burns | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 138. Internal injuries | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 139. Damage to eyes, ears or teeth | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 140. Back injury | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 141. Dislocated joint (arm, hip, shoulder) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 142. Mental or emotional problems | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 143. Other _____ | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

144. Did law enforcement get involved in any of these disputes?

Yes No

Still thinking about any disputes with other male intimate partners, how many times have you done any of the following to get help with these problems?

| | Never | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 1 |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 145. Talked to a minister, priest or rabbi | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 146. Saw a doctor, nurse or gone to an emergency room | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 147. Talked to a family member about your partner's violence | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 148. Talked to a friend or neighbor about your partner's violence | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 149. Talked to a mental health professional or counselor | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 150. Talked to the district attorney | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 151. Attempted to get a warrant for your partner's arrest | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 152. Gone to a shelter just to talk | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 153. Stayed overnight at a battered woman's shelter | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 154. Asked the police to intervene between you and your partner | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 155. Gone to court to obtain a restraining order | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 156. Talked to an attorney about your partner's violence | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 157. Attended a Twelve-step program (Al-Anon, AA, NA) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 158. Temporarily stayed with a friend or family member | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 159. Spoke with Parole Office about his violence | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 160. Spoke to a co-worker or someone at school | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 161. Called a crisis line | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 162. Other _____ | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

163. Concerning the abusive events you experienced with these other intimate partners during the past six months did the police Domestic Violence Reduction Unit (family services) get involved?

Clarification: This is the same unit we referred to earlier. They are the plain clothed officers who would have contacted you in the days following the arrest. If no, go to 181. Yes No

164. Did you ask members of this unit to get involved? Yes No

165. Did members of this unit call you and offer their assistance? Yes No

166. Did you receive service from this unit? Yes No

167. How many times did you receive services from members of this unit? 1 2 3 4 More than 4

168. Did the officer(s) from this unit take pictures of your injuries? Yes No

169. Did they help you make a safety plan?

170. Did they tell you how to help with the prosecution of your case?

171. Did they tell you how to get a restraining order against your partner?

172. Did they tell you how to get into a shelter or other safe housing?

173. Did they tell you how to get counseling for yourself?

174. Did they tell you how your partner might get counseling?

appendix D

POLICE RECORD FORMS

SECTION 1: THE STUDY CASE (from the incident and custody report)

(Not for coding)

Time Frame: 12 months with study incident report date as midpoint:

Incident Date ___/___/___

End date for six months after case came into study: ___/___/___

Start date for six months before case came into study: ___/___/___

Check relationship (Box 9a): ___

PPDS # exactly as printed on incident report: _____

1. Study Case ID: _____
2. Police Report Number: _____
3. Reported date of incident: ___/___/___
4. Reported time of incident: _____
5. Type of premises where incident occurred (refer to Box 1 PPB Incident Report Coding Sheet)
Code: ___
6. Address where the study case incident occurred (location of incident)
Exact residence address = 1
Other address = 2
If Exact residence, the address is:

7. Classification of Offense (from incident report)
Code: (refer to PPB offense codes, omit code 673)

- a. _____
- b. _____
- c. _____

8. Charge from actual custody report (list first three)

(NOTE: Enter 133.310 for ORS/ORD no. if 789 code listed on offense classification from incident report)

ORS/ORD No: (refer to 1996 Oregon Penal Code) **Charge Code:** (refer to PPDS codes master listing)

- | | |
|----------------|----------|
| a. ____ . ____ | d. _____ |
| b. ____ . ____ | e. _____ |
| c. ____ . ____ | f. _____ |

9. Witnesses listed on police report or mentioned in narrative:

Yes = 1 No = 2 Unk = 3

SECTION 1: (continued)

10. If Yes, how many: __ or Unk = 88 (number of witnesses)
11. Children present:
Yes = 1 No = 2 Unk = 3
12. Physical injury noted for the victim:
Yes = 1 No = 2 Unk = 3
13. Weapon used (refer to Box 3 PPB incident report coding sheet, no weapon used = 888)
Code: a. ---
b. ---
c. ---
14. Drug/ Alcohol use indicated:
Yes = 1 No = 2 Unk = 3
15. Victim Race:
1 = A - Other Asian, Pacific islander 5 = J - Japanese
2 = C - Chinese 6 = B - Black
3 = H - Hispanic 7 = W - White
4 = I - American Indian 8 = V - Vietnamese,
Cambodian, Thai, Laotian
9 = U - Unknown
16. Offender Race:
1 = A - Other Asian, Pacific islander 5 = J - Japanese
2 = C - Chinese 6 = B - Black
3 = H - Hispanic 7 = W - White
4 = I - American Indian 8 = V - Vietnamese,
Cambodian, Thai, Laotian
9 = U - Unknown
17. Assailant denies physical abuse directed at victim:
Yes=1 No=2 Unable to determine=3
18. Assailant blames victim for the incident:
Yes=1 No=2 Unable to determine=3

SECTION 2: REPEAT VIOLENCE AT ORIGINAL RESIDENCE

(Not for coding)

Study date: ___/___/___

12 month time frame: ___/___/___ to: ___/___/___

Exact Residence Address: _____

PPDS: _____

Criminal activity level at address (from PPDS):

1. Police district where incident occurred: ___
NOTE: If the address is not an exact residence address or "Other," skip the rest of this page and go to "Section 3: Victimization Records."
2. ___ Total number of reported incidents within the 6 months after the study incident
If there were NO incidents for this time, skip to question 5 (below)
3. ___ Total number of DV related incidents
(List the actual number in each category)
 - a. ___ Violent offense
 - b. ___ Property offense
 - c. ___ Drug offense
 - d. ___ Public-order offense
 - e. ___ Restraining order violation
4. ___ Total number of Non-DV related incidents
(List the actual number in each category)
 - a. ___ Violent offense
 - b. ___ Property offense
 - c. ___ Drug offense
 - d. ___ Public-order offense
 - e. ___ Restraining order violation
5. ___ Total number of reported incidents within the 6 months before the study incident
If there were NO incidents for this time, skip the rest of this page and go to "Section 3: Victimization Records"
6. ___ Total number of DV related incidents
(List the actual number in each category)
 - a. ___ Violent offense
 - b. ___ Property offense
 - c. ___ Drug offense
 - d. ___ Public-order offense
 - e. ___ Restraining order violation
7. ___ Total number of Non-DV related incidents
(List the actual number in each category)
 - a. ___ Violent offense
 - b. ___ Property offense

- c. __ Drug offense
- d. __ Public-order offense
- e. __ Restraining order violation

SECTION 3: VICTIMIZATION RECORDS

(Not for coding)

Study date: ___/___/___

12 month time frame: ___/___/___ to: ___/___/___

Victim Name: _____

Victim CRN: _____

PPDS Victimization record- Only include DV victimizations that fit the study's definition of intimate. Begin by checking the relationship (Suspect Description, DOB or Incident Report from Records)

1. VICTIM - Additional (to study date) DV non-custody and custody victimizations for this victim, during the 12 month time frame?:

Yes = 1 No = 2

If No, skip the rest of this page and section 3a and go to Section 4: Offender Records

2. Total number of DV victimizations by any offender, that resulted in an arrest within the 6 months after the study incident:

-- Actual number of custodies

3. Total number of DV victimizations by any offender, that did not result in an arrest, but did result in a non-custody incident report within the 6 months after the study incident:

-- Actual number of non-custody incident reports

4. Total number of DV victimizations by any offender, that resulted in an arrest within the 6 months before the study incident reported:

-- Actual number of custodies

5. Total number of DV victimizations by any offender, that did not result in arrest but did result in a non-custody incident report within the 6 months before the study incident reported:

-- Actual number of non-custody incident reports

SECTION 3a: INDIVIDUAL VICTIMIZATION RECORDS

(Not for coding)
 Study date: ___ / ___ / ___
 12 month time frame: ___ / ___ / ___ to: ___ / ___ / ___
 Study Victim Name: _____
 Study Assailant Name: _____

DV Victimization, 6 months after and 6 months before the study incident, where the victim was neither charged/arrested nor was the suspect/subject of the report from PPDS. In order for any victimization to be recorded as a DV victimization, the relationship must meet the study's definition of intimate. Begin by checking the relationship between the complainant and the assailant. (Suspect Description, DOB or Incident Report from Records)

1. DV Incident identification number (most recent first, circle one only):
01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20
2. Reported Incident Date: __ / __ / __
3. Is this incident's reported date after or before the study incident reported?:
After = 2
Before = 1

4. Same assailant as in study case: Yes = 1 No = 2

- If No,*
 5. Assailant's date of birth: __ / __ / __

6. Type of report: Non-Custody = 1 Custody = 2

- If Non-Custody,*
 7. Classification of Offense (list first all)
 PPDS Codes Master Listing:
 a. _____
 b. _____
 c. _____

- If Custody,*
 8. Charge from custody report (list first three)

(NOTE: Enter 133.310 for ORS/ORD no. if 789 code listed on offense classification)

ORS/ORD No: (refer to 1996 Oregon Penal Code)
Charge Code: (refer to PPDS codes master listing)
 a. _____ d. _____
 b. _____ e. _____
 c. _____ f. _____

(not for coding) This is incident/page # __ of __ incidents/pages

SECTION 4: OFFENDER RECORDS DURING STUDY PERIOD

(Not for coding)

Study date: ___ / ___ / ___

12 month time frame: ___ / ___ / ___ to: ___ / ___ / ___

Study Victim Name: _____

Study Assailant Name: _____

Study Assailant CRN (Very important!): _____

DV incidents and custodies for the study offender from PPDS, 6 months after and 6 months before the study incident report date. In order for any offense to be recorded as a DV offense, the relationship must meet the study's definition of intimate. Begin by checking the relationship between the complainant and the assailant. (Suspect Description, DOB or Incident Report from Records)

1. ASSAILANT - Additional (to study date) DV non-custody and custody offenses for this assailant during the 12 month time frame?:

Yes = 1 No = 2

If No, skip the rest of this page and go to Section 4a: Offender Criminal History from LEDSO

2. DV Incident identification number (most recent first, circle one only):
01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20

3. Reported Incident Date: ___ / ___ / ___

4. Is this incident's reported date after or before the study incident reported?:
After = 2
Before = 1

5. Same victim as in study case: Yes = 1 No = 2

If No,
6. Victim's date of birth: ___ / ___ / ___

7. Type of report: Non-Custody = 1 Custody = 2

If Non-Custody,
8. Classification of Offense (list first three)
PPDS Codes Master Listing:

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

If Custody,
9. Charge from custody report (list first three from PPDS)

(NOTE: Enter 133.310 for ORS/ORD no. if 789 code listed on offense classification)

ORS/ORD No: (refer to 1996 Oregon Penal Code)

Charge Code: (refer to PPDS codes master listing)

a. _____ d. _____

b. _____ e. _____

c. _____ f. _____

(not for coding) This is incident/page # ___ of ___ incidents/pages.

appendix E

INTERVIEWER MANUAL

taken. Data on assaultive behavior by offenders before and after arrest and intervention period will be gathered from face-to-face interviews with victims. Interviews will be conducted within one week of the batterer's arrest and then 6 months later. Corroborating evidence regarding subsequent arrests and/or other police contacts by perpetrators will be obtained from police computer records.

Study Auspices

The study is being conducted by researchers from Portland State University.

The research is supported by Grant No. 95-IJ-CX-0054 which was awarded by the National Institute of Justice. The National Institute of Justice was established to support research and development to improve the functioning of criminal justice departments around the country. Reports on the findings of the study will be sent to the National Institute of Justice which will make the results of this study available to justice departments in all 50 states.

Victim Protection and Compensation

Victim participation is voluntary. Each time victims are contacted, they will be informed about the purpose of the research and told that participation is totally voluntary. Refusal to participate will not affect their standing with criminal justice agencies or any community support program.

The interviews will be private and confidential. The interview procedures will be designed to protect the victims' interests and privacy. Questionnaires are identified by case number only. Interviewers must assure victims that no information on individual cases or responses to questions will be provided to anyone or any agency; only aggregate statistics are included in the reports.

Interviewers are expected to keep any information they receive in complete confidence. For safety and confidentiality reasons victims will not be interviewed in the presence of the offender or other adults or teenage children.

Victims will be paid \$8 for each interview.

OVERVIEW OF THE FIELD WORK PROCEDURES

Sample Selection

A random sample of 800 female victims of misdemeanor domestic assault will make up the study sample. The partners of all victims will have been arrested and booked into Multnomah County jail. Four hundred victims will have received follow-up police services from the Domestic Violence Reduction Unit (DVRU). The other four hundred victims will have received treatment as usual (no follow up after their partner was arrested).

Approximately 10 new custody cases are sent to the DVRU each day. Each morning, the project manager will use a randomization procedure to assign cases to either

the intervention or control group. The victims' names, addresses, phone numbers, as well as arrest and intervention dates, and assigned case number will be recorded daily by the project manager. These cases will be assigned to an interviewer by the project manager. The interviewer is expected to meet with the victim as soon as possible after the case is assigned.

Advance phone calls

The project manager will make an initial contact with all victims the day following their partners' arrest. The project manager will explain to the victim that she has been selected for a study that examines the way the Portland Police Bureau handles domestic violence. The project manager informs victims that their participation is voluntary, that their answers are private and confidential, and that they will be paid \$8.00 for participating in the study.

Assignments

The project manager will fill out the **Face Sheet** and assign the case to an interviewer. The interviewers will be alerted that they have been assigned a case by a phone call from the project manager. The **Face Sheet** for each victim, among others, will list: the victim's name, address, phone number, case number, victim date of birth, arrest date, and assignment date. It will also contain any additional information that relates to contacting the victim, e.g. directions to her house, etc. The Face Sheet will be faxed to Diane Mikkelson at the Regional Research Institute. Diane will make up each case packet and place the packet in a manila envelope with the interviewers' name written on the envelope. The envelopes will be placed in the appropriate out-basket at the RRI for pick-up by the interviewer. The interviewer should contact the victim by phone as soon as possible after s/he has received the assignment to reconfirm the appointment time with the victim. If the appointment time must be changed, it is important for the interviewer to be sensitive to selecting a time and place for the interview that makes the victim feel safe. The interviewer must always ask the victim if it is a safe time to talk. If the interviewer hears any hesitancy on the victim's part when making the follow-up phone call or regarding the appointment time that might indicate she does not feel safe, the interviewer should call back at a more convenient time for the victim. The interviewer must notify the project manager of the change in appointment time. If the interviewer needs assistance in locating an address, s/he should call the project manager at 636-2053 or pager # 903-2481.

The interviewer is to record each time an attempt is made to contact the victim on the **Face Sheet** – the date, time, and outcome of the effort. The **Face Sheet** will be returned with the completed interview so they can be used to assist in contacting the victim for the second interview.

If the interviewer is unable to complete an interview assignment, the **Face Sheet** must be returned to the project manager with the whole package of materials included in

3. Have positive feelings about yourself as an interviewer and the study. The research is extremely important and will probably be engrossing to most victims.
4. Take a genuine interest in victims and let them know that their participation, opinions, and attitudes are valued.
5. The questionnaire directions, this manual, and the training conference will provide answers to most questions that may arise. Familiarize yourself with the questions and the associated instructions so that you can comfortably respond to queries about the study and the interviewer role in it.
6. People that answer the door or victims may ask questions not only to gather information, but to reassure themselves that they are not being subject to a sales pitch. The interviewer may tell victims that they can call our office and ask to speak with Dr. Annette Jolin, the study's principal investigator or Evelyn Morley, the project manager.

Victims are most likely to raise questions prior to the interview, but they may also ask during it. Regardless of when questions are posed, answer them courteously, honestly, and as briefly as possible. Don't over-explain, you may introduce bias by providing more information than is necessary or you may confuse the victim.

You don't have to memorize response categories, but you must become familiar enough with them to feel confident that you, the interviewer, can respond to inquiries in a convincing and conversational way.

Remember that your best chance to be successful in obtaining the interview is on the first contact with the victim. Your enthusiasm and attitude will make a difference in how the victim will respond to you.

IMPORTANT REMINDERS:

Do not discuss eligibility criteria with the person who answers the door

Do not answer questions that are not asked, i.e. do not volunteer information unless asked.

Do not leave behind copies of questionnaires or answer sheets with anyone!

Answering Victims' Questions

Question: Who wants this information?

Answer: The survey is carried out by Portland State University for the National Institute of Justice

Question: What's it all about?

Answer: We are gathering information on ways the Portland Police Bureau can better handle cases involving family disputes.

Question: Why me?

Answer: Your name was selected from a list of people who have recently used the Portland Police Department as a result of a family dispute. The answers will help plan how these cases can best be handled in the future.

Question: Can my answers be used against me?

Answer: The answers are completely private and confidential. No information will be provided to any person or agency - not the police, your partner, a treatment agency, or any other person. Your answers, together with those from all victims who were selected for the study, are grouped and presented as summaries only. Your name will not be on the form that we use for the interview. Many of the questions you answer are on a form that even I will never see.

Question: I'm too busy. Why don't you interview someone else who has time?

Answer: The opinions of busy people like you are just as important as the opinions of people who are not as busy. I'll come back tomorrow or this evening if that is more convenient. Or, I could wait while you finish what you're doing and conduct the interview then.

Question: How do I know that you're not selling something?

Answer: Here is my identification badge and a consent form from Portland State University which describes the study. You can call Evelyn Morley, the project manager, who will vouch for me. Also, you will be paid for your participation.

Question: What if I don't want to be interviewed?

Answer: The interview is voluntary and you may refuse if you wish. We hope that you won't. For the results of this study to be accurate and representative, it is very important that we talk to every person who was selected. I am not permitted to substitute any other person for you. We can start the interview and if the you don't want to answer a question, just tell me.

Question: What happens to the information?

Answer: As soon as we finish the interview, all of the forms will be put in an envelope and sealed. Your name is not on the forms when we process the information. When the data are analyzed, your answers will be combined with everyone else's so that no individual answers can ever be identified.

Question: May I have the results from this study?

Answer: Yes, certainly. The results of the study will be available in the fall of 1997. To get the results you would need to contact Annette Jolin, the principal investigator, at 725-5166, and let her know how we can get the results to you.

REDUCING NON-RESPONSE

It is expected that the majority of interviewer contacts will result in completed interviews. However, there may be times when victims are either not at home or not cooperative. Obviously, if only the most available and willing people are interviewed, they will not be representative of the total population being studied and the study results may be different from those that would be obtained if every selected victim participated. Our goal, therefore, is to interview every person selected to be in this study. The interviewer has a vital role in this shared effort.

Contact at the Door

To gain cooperation, these are some of the things the interviewer should do:

... approach each interview with a positive attitude, confident that (s)he will successfully conduct the interview;

... be familiar with the instructions described in the section on Getting the Interview;

... present her/himself in a professional manner, appropriately dressed, and well-organized; i.e. as someone victims will welcome into their homes;

... if there is more than one door, go to the one that most logically would be used by visitors;

... show regard for peoples' property and homes;

... tell victims how important they are and that no one can be substituted for them;

... be flexible and show a willingness to reschedule to suite the victim's schedule;

[If the interviewer senses that the victim will refuse]... try to end the interaction before the victim firmly refuses. Pave the way for a future contact that may be more successful;

... maintain a pleasant, courteous manner and thank the victim for whatever time she has given the interviewer.

To gain cooperation, these are some things the interviewer should avoid doing:

Do not wear dark glasses- they are a barrier between the interviewer and the victim. They may also arouse suspicion.

Do not chew gum- it will affect the way an interviewer sounds and detracts from the interviewer's professional appearance.

Do not wear visible jewelry that symbolizes a political or religious affiliation- it may offend some people and be the cause for refusals.

Do not smoke while you are interviewing.

Do not attempt to sell anything or conduct any other business while you are at the assigned household.

Do not discuss anything that happens in one household with people in any other household. Both the interview and the interviewing situation are to be confidential.

Refusals

Even the best interviewers may get an occasional refusal despite their experience and skill. Some of those refusals will be converted by having a different interviewer go back on a different day when the victim is in a better frame of mind. Other refusals will be converted after the coordinator calls the household. For this study, a high response rate is essential so we will employ all of those tactics and any others that may prove fruitful. Every interviewer will probably be reassigned other interviewers' refusals - they are part of the interviewer assignment. The project manager is an excellent resource for suggestions about refusal conversions. In addition, the interviewer's motivation, belief in the study's value and persuasive skills should increase the interviewer success at this task.

In general, interviewers should listen carefully to what the hesitant victim is saying and then respond to her concerns. Some of the most common reasons victims give for refusing - and some suggested responses -- are:

"I'm too busy. I don't have the time."

"I understand how valuable your time is. I'll be glad to wait until you finish what you're doing." Or say, "I can come later or tomorrow. Which would you prefer?"

Note: Always suggest more than one possible re-scheduling time so the victim can choose one of them or suggest another that is more convenient.

“I’m not interested in the study” or “I don’t want to be bothered”

“I can understand how you might feel that way. Perhaps I haven’t explained how important the study is, and how important you are to the study’s success”

“What’s in it for me?”

“You will receive \$8 for your participation. You will also have the satisfaction of making an important contribution in a study that helps other families. I really hope you will participate. It is important to me and I think you will find it interesting.”

“I don’t feel well enough to do this”

“I’m sorry. Of course I understand that you wouldn’t want to be interviewed now. Shall I call you in a day or two?”

Victim Does Not Keep an Appointment

You may arrive at the victim’s home at the appointed time and find that she is not there. It’s a good idea to wait at least 15 minutes, since she may have been unavoidably delayed. If the victim is not there, phone later and mention that you were sorry to miss her when you were there and assume responsibility for any misunderstanding about the time. Set up another appointment.

If the victim continues to break appointments, and you feel she is deliberately avoiding you, consider it a refusal, describe the situation on the Assignment Sheet and discuss the case with the project manager.

CONDUCTING THE INTERVIEW

Materials for the Interview

You will need the following materials to conduct the interview:

- the Face Sheet;
- the Introduction to questionnaire;
- the Questionnaire (have an extra copy in case there is a printer’s error);
- Answer Sheets;
- Informed consent;
- Victim information card;

- two number 2 pencils (you need one; the victim will need the other, which you should take back at the end of the interview). Having extras is essential, since all scanning sheets must be done in pencil;
- one very large return envelope in which to place all the information from one completed case;
- another large envelope where the confidential answers that are completed by the victim will be placed and sealed by the victim;
- a Recontact Sheet;
- \$8 and a Receipt Pad;
- Interviewer Manual (to use as a reference)

Starting the Interview

Find or suggest a comfortable place, preferably at a table or desk, opposite the victim, so that you will have space for your materials and a surface to write on. It is important that the interview be conducted in private, so that the victim can answer candidly and not be influenced by the presence of any other household member. Remember - the interview is not to take place if there is a teenage child or any other adult present. Conduct yourself in a relaxed manner, remembering at all times that you are a guest in the victim's home. Also remember that you are trained to conduct the interview, while the victim has not been trained to be a victim. You must be the one who is in control of the entire interviewing situation.

Marking the questionnaire

IMPORTANT

Before you begin, please enter the case number in the upper right hand corner of the answer sheet. This is the only way the responses from the interview can be linked to any other data - such as the responses from the next interview or data from the other criminal justice agencies. Please make sure these numbers are on each answer sheet before you start.

At the same time, please mark your name below the case number and enter the date on the first page.

Confidentiality

Keeping all information on victims confidential is a must! Nothing about any specific family is to be discussed with anyone other than the research staff. Documents

that have family names on them should be carefully guarded and secured at all times. Confidentiality, however, will not be maintained in the event you learn of child abuse, if a family member intends to harm her/himself or others, or if information is subpoenaed by a court of law.

Abuse reporting requirements and protocol

The need for reporting suspected child abuse or neglect should be minimal. But in the event you suspect or witness the occurrence of child abuse or that child neglect poses an imminent danger to the child's well being the State Offices for Services to Children and Families (SCF) in Multnomah county must be contacted at (503) 731-3100. The protocol we will follow for reporting suspected abuse or neglect includes these steps:

1. Contact the project manager immediately after the interview when you suspect a need to report. If the project manager is not available, contact the principal investigator. During the evenings, or weekends, the project manager can be contacted at home at 903-2481 or the principal investigator at 228-5194
2. We will discuss your concerns and determine whether or not a report should be made.
3. If after discussing your concerns with the project manager it is determined necessary to make a report, call the intake worker on duty at SCF. The best approach is to describe the situation as a "hypothetical" case, allowing the SCF personnel to decide whether or not the situation is reportable. If it is reportable, provide the information requested by SCF.
4. The principal investigator will be informed about any concerns or reports made to SCF. Please read the Oregon Child Abuse Reporting Law provided in the Appendix of this manual.

Keeping participants on track and dealing with emotional issues

When you are interviewing victims, remember to keep their perspective in mind. Some people will be nervous, might feel they need to lead the conversation, or may need someone to talk to and will want to tell you all about their situation. You want to let each participant tell some of their story, but you will need to prevent the victim from going on a tangent after each question.

A common problem of the interview process occurs when there is conflict between social/emotional issues which arise during the interview, and the need to conduct the interview. While you want to be sensitive to the victim, you are there to collect data. Because of the data collection role, the nature of the interviewer-victim relationship is somewhat professionally distant. You should try to approach the relationship building process in the same way with each victim while of course taking into account their individual differences.

Safety issues

A SPECIAL NOTE OF CAUTION: If, at any time, you encounter a situation in which you do not feel safe being in a victim's home, do not hesitate to end your conversation with her and leave immediately. Tell the victim that you would like to reschedule the interview for another day or that you will be contacting her at a later time. This may become necessary if the victim responds in a hostile manner or is under the influence of alcohol or drugs or if someone comes into the interview situation. The interview must be carried on in private. We do not want anyone feeling compelled to remain in a dangerous situation in order to collect data or continue to meet the needs of the research project. **Your safety comes first!** If you feel threatened, you should review the situation with the project manager so the next step can be decided.

Interviewing Techniques

- Interview in privacy.
- Interviewer instructions on the questionnaire are in italics. They are not to be read to victims.
- Read each question slowly and distinctly, exactly as it is worded and in the order in which it appears in the questionnaire.
- When the stem or lead-in to a question ends with a colon or dots, read all the answer categories up to the question mark, pausing briefly after each one.
- When a question ends with a question mark, stop at that point, without reading any categories that might follow unless directed to read in italics.
- Fill in the correct bubble on the answer sheet, being careful not to create lines outside of the correct bubble.
- When a response does not fit into any category given and an "other" category has not been provided, the question is to be answered in terms of the categories given. If necessary, repeat the categories and encourage the victim to choose one of them.
- Record everything in the questionnaire at the time of the interview and don't wait until later to mark any information. When the interview is concluded, briefly check the questionnaire to make sure you have asked and recorded answers to all appropriate questions. This can be done while the victim is filling out the last answer sheet on her child. Try to get any items that are skipped or incomplete.

- Be sure to have the victim put the answer sheet that she filled out on her own in an envelope and have her seal it.

The Re-contact Sheet

At the end of the interview, explain that the study design calls for a second interview with the victim. Then complete the Re-contact Sheet. Verify the victim's current address and phone number, and then ask the victim to give you the names, addresses and phone numbers of two persons who would know how to reach her if she moves. If asked, you can assure the victim that the study will not be discussed with the persons listed.

Place the Re-contact Sheet in your file.

Victim Payments

Give the victim the \$8 payment and ask her to sign a receipt. Be sure to list the case # from the top of the interview on the receipt. Attach the receipt to the completed questionnaire.

At the end

This is how things should be:

- Victim has the large, sealed envelope. In the envelope are the answer sheets to the child questions, which have been completed and put in the envelope one at a time.
- You should have the Face Sheet, the filled-out interview form, the recontact sheet, and the receipt.
- Note: Be sure you have written the case number on the first page, in the upper left-hand corner.

This is how you finish up:

Ask the victim to give you the large sealed envelope with the child answer sheet inside.

Attach the payment receipt to the Re-contact Sheet.

Put the interview form which you are holding into the second, larger envelope with the answer sheets. Seal the second envelope in the presence of the victim.

Put the Re-contact Sheet in your file next to the Face Sheet.

After leaving the household:

Attach the Re-contact Sheet to the back of the Face Sheet with a paper clip.
Record your time spent and the case number of the completed interview on your
current **Time Sheet**.

Questions about the interview

1. While a victim is filling out the self-administered questionnaire on one of her children, what if she has a question about it? Can I help?

Yes, you can help, but only if the victim requests help. However, **stay on your side of the room and do not look** at the victim's copy. Be sure to have an extra copy for yourself, so you can find the place that the victim has a question about.

2. Is it possible to leave the self-administered answer sheets or anything else with the victim to fill out by herself and then come back for it?

No. **No exceptions.** An identical procedure has to be followed with every victim in order to get reliable results. You have to be present while all parts of the interview are being completed.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

Time Sheets:

Your total hours for the month include time spent scheduling interviews, traveling to and from interviews, conducting interviews, completing paperwork, and participating in trainings and meetings. Hours should be recorded on a daily basis, rounded off to the nearest quarter of an hour. Signed time sheets are due in the project manager's mailbox by the 15th of each month. Payday is the last working day of each month.

Interviewer Evaluations

After completing your 5th interview, the project manager will discuss your progress in conducting interviews and following the research and scheduling protocols. This will be an informal opportunity to give and receive feedback.

References

- Elliott, Debra (1992). Interviewer training manual used for the Family Connections Project. Regional Research Institute, Portland State University. Portland, Oregon.
- Harrell, Adele (1991). Interviewer manual used for the Evaluation of court-ordered treatment for domestic violence offenders. The Urban Institute. Washington, DC.
- Sherman, Lawrence, and Berk, Richard (1984). The specific deterrent effects of arrest for domestic assault. American Sociological Review, 49 (2); 261-272.
- Sherman, Lawrence (1992). Policing domestic violence: experiments and dilemmas. New York: The Free Press.
- U.S. Department of Justice (1984). U.S. Attorney General's Task Force on Family Violence. Office of Justice Programs. Washington, D.C. 20531
- Zorza, Joan and Woods, Lauri (1994). Analysis and Policy Implications of the New Domestic Violence Police Studies. National Center on Women and Family Law.

Appendices

Script for initial telephone contact

Informed consent - English

Informed consent - Spanish

Face Sheet

Recontact Sheet

Payment Receipt Form - English

Payment Receipt Form - Spanish

Information Form

Oregon child abuse reporting laws

(Directions are in italics and are not to be read allowed)

SCRIPT FOR INITIAL TELEPHONE CONTACT (Initial interview)

Can I please speak with [victim first name]. [*When victim identifies herself on the phone*] My name is [schedulers first name]. I am calling on behalf of Portland State University to talk to you about a research project on how domestic violence is being handled by the Portland Police Bureau. This will help us improve the quality of police services to victims of domestic violence.

ASK: "Is this a safe time for you to talk with me" YES=[1] NO=[2]

If NO, ask "When would be a good time for me to call you back? _____"

ASK: "Do you need an excuse for this call?" YES=[1] NO=[2]

If YES, say "We are were doing a survey on women's cosmetics".

If it is a safe time for the victim to talk now, proceed.....

Our records show that you were the victim in a recent domestic conflict and that your partner was arrested on _____ as a result of that conflict. As I mentioned a moment ago, we are trying to find out what the police can do to help women who are victims of domestic violence. Because you have had a recent experience with the police when they arrested your partner, we believe that your opinion on how police can best help victims can be very important in helping us help other women who are in similar situations.

As part of this study we are interviewing 800 women who have had a partner arrested for domestic assault. We want to know how you are doing and we want your view of what happened. Your answers will be completely private and confidential. They will be combined with the answers of other women to provide an understanding of how women feel. As thanks for your help in this important project, you will be given \$8.00 at the end of the interview. Would you be willing to have an interviewer come to your home at your convenience, or you may chose to come to Portland State and talk with an interviewer, for about an hour?

YES=[1] NO=[2]

If NO say: "I understand how you might feel that way. I know this must be an upsetting time for you right now and I don't want to make it any more difficult. Would it be all right if I called you back in a few day to see how you are doing?"

YES=[1] NO=[2]

If *NO* say: "Thank you for your time", and hang up
If *YES* say: Great, I'll call you back in a few days to see how you are doing. Is there a good time for me to call? _____

If the respondent agrees to be interviewed say: "I'm pleased that you are willing to be apart of this project. It's important that when you talk with an interviewer that no other adults or teenage children are present. This is to insure that you can speak freely. Is there a time this week that would be most convenient for you to have an interviewer meet with you privately? _____

I would like to ask you just a few questions now to verify your address and any other phone numbers where we might be able to reach you. What is your address? _____

Do you have a work phone where it would be O.K. for me to call you? _____
If you decide that you need to leave home to keep yourself safe, is there a friend or relative that I might be able to call so that I can still reach you?
Phone _____

Thank you again for your willingness to be apart of this research. An interviewer will call you in a few days to confirm that the appointment time is still convenient for you. In the mean time, you can reach me by calling my pager at 903-2481, and I will call you right back. Again, my name is _____.

Please don't hesitate to call if you think of any questions you might have before the interview.

Good by

INFORMED CONSENT

My name is _____, and I am one of the interviewers with the Portland State University Domestic Violence Study. If you have any questions about the study, you may call Dr. Annette Jolin at PSU. Her number is 725-5166.

The purpose of this research is to talk to women who have been involved in domestic disputes where the police have gotten involved. We are trying to find out if what the police do helps reduce further disputes and assaults. This research may not be of help to you personally at this time, but hopefully it will help us find ways to cut down on the problem of domestic violence in the future.

Your part in the study involves an interview now and another interview in six months. A different person may call you for the second interview. This interview will last about an hour, and you will be paid \$8.00 for your time. Your participation in the interview is completely voluntary. If any of the questions or the interview itself make you uncomfortable, please tell me; you are free to skip any questions you don't like or even to cancel the interview after we have started.

The interview includes questions about the time the police were here, how they may have tried to help you, your experiences with the man who was arrested when the police were here, and your experiences with other agencies that you may have contacted to get help for problems with your partner.

Whatever you tell me will be held in total confidence. After I turn in this interview to the researchers, the cover sheet with your name is torn off and kept in a locked file. Your answers are then assigned a number. As a result your answers are no longer connected to your name. If you choose not to participate in this study, your decision will not affect the services you receive from the Portland Police Bureau. When reports are written, your answers will be combined with those of lots of people so it is not possible to know who gave what answers. We can guarantee the confidentiality of your answers except for the following information which by law must be reported to the proper authorities:

- (1) Information subpoenaed by a court of law (i.e., demanded by a court of law).
- (2) Suspected cases of abuse or neglect under Oregon law.
- (3) Information that individuals intend to harm themselves or others.

I have read and understand this information and agree to participate in the Portland State University Domestic Violence Study. I have a right to have a copy of this form, but can get a copy of it at the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects at PSU.

DATE _____

SIGNATURE _____

I waive (give up) my right to keep a copy of the informed consent. Signature _____
For concerns about your treatment as a research participant, you may phone the Chairperson of the Human Subjects Research Review Committee, Portland State University, 725-3417. If you would like to speak with a counselor, please call the Portland Women's Crisis Line at (503) 232-9751.

Consentimiento Informado

Mi nombre es _____, y soy uno/a de los que van a conducir las entrevistas en el estudio de violencia domestica en la Universidad Estatal de Portland. Si Ud. tiene preguntas sobre el estudio, se puede llamar Dr. Annette Jolin. Su numero de telefono es 725-5166.

El objetivo de esta investigacion es hablar con mujeres que han estado envueltas en disputas domesticas donde se ha envuelto la policia. Estamos tratando de aprender si lo que hace la policia ayuda a reducir otras disputas y ataques. Esta investigacion talvez no ayudara personalmente en este tiempo, pero con optimismo va a ayudarnos a encontrar maneras en disminuir el problema, y el problema de abuso domestico en el futuro.

Su parte en la investigacion incluye una entrevista ahora y otra entrevista en seis meses. Una persona diferente talvez le llamara para la segunda entrevista. Esta entrevista durara una hora, y Ud. recibira \$8.00 por su tiempo. Su participacion en la entrevista es completamente voluntaria.

Si algunas de las preguntas o la entrevista se hace sentir incomoda, por favor digamelo y Ud. es libre de saltar preguntas que no le guste o tambien se puede cancelar la entrevista inmediatamente.

La entrevista incluye preguntas sobre el tiempo que la policia estuvo alli, como trataban a ayudarle, sus experiencias con el hombre que estaba detenido cuando la policia estuvo alli, y sus experiencias con otras agencias que, talvez Ud. ha contactado por ayuda con los problemas con su pareja.

Todo lo que me dice sera en total confianza. Despues que entregue esta entrevista a los investigadores, la copia con su nombre sera quitada y mantenida en un archivo cerrado. Entonces, sus respuestas estan asignadas con un numero. Como consecuencia, sus respuestas ya no estaran conectadas a su nombre. Si Ud. elige a no participar en este estudio, su decision no afectara los servicios que recibe del Buro de la Policia de Portland. Cuando los reportes esten escritos sus respuestas seran combinadas con las de muchas personas, entonces no sera posible saber quien dio tales respuestas.

Podemos garantizar la confianza de sus respuestas con la excepcion de la siguiente informacion que por ley es absolutamente necesario reportar a las autoridades apropiadas.

(1) Informacion citada a orden judicial.

(2) Casos sospechados de abuso o negligencia bajo la ley de Oregon.

(3) Informacion que alguien se quiere hacer dano a si mismo o a otros.

He leído y entiendo esta informacion y consiento a participar en el estudio de violencia domestica de la Universidad Estatal de Portland. Yo tengo el derecho de tener una copia de este formulario, y puedo obtener una copia en la Office of Research and Sponsored Projects at PSU.

FECHA: _____

FIRMA: _____

Yo renuncio mi derecho a tener una copia del consentimiento informado.

FIRMA _____ . Para preocupaciones acerca de su tratamiento como participante de dicho estudio se puede llamar al presidente del Human Subjects Research Review Committee, Portland State University, 725-3417. Si aUd. le gustaria hablar con un consejero, por favor llame a la linea de crisis de Mujeres en Portland (503) 232-4448. Se habla espanol.

FACE SHEET

Victim name _____ Case ID # _____

DOB _____

Offender name _____ Offender DOB _____

Address _____

Victim Home phone number _____ Victim Work phone _____

Phone number of victim's friend/family member _____

Arrest date _____

Interviewer name _____ Assignment date _____

Interview completion date _____

Additional information _____

Attempted contact by interviewer

| | | |
|------------|------------|---------------|
| Date _____ | Time _____ | Outcome _____ |
| Date _____ | Time _____ | Outcome _____ |
| Date _____ | Time _____ | Outcome _____ |

Footnote:

1. Face sheet given to interviewer _____ (date).
2. Face sheet returned to RRI and checked _____ (date)
3. Face sheet given to PI _____ (date)
4. Face sheet given to data collection person _____ (date).
5. Face sheet returned to P/I _____ (date).

Victim name _____

Case ID # _____

Interviewer's name _____

RE-CONTACT SHEET

CLOSING SUMMARY FOR INITIAL INTERVIEW

Thank you very much for participating in this interview. You have helped us a lot and we appreciate your time. Here is a small token of our appreciation for your help. Please sign this receipt to show that you have received the \$8 for this initial interview.

Someone from the research project will be contacting you in about six months to schedule a follow-up interview. It is important to us to know how you are doing. We will need to know if there are any changes in your name, address or phone number during these six months. You can call Evelyn Morley, the project manager, at the phone number listed on this referral form if there are any changes. She can also answer any questions you may have about the interviews or the research project. In case we have any trouble getting in touch with you, is there a family member and perhaps a friend who would always know where you are living whom we could call?

Name _____ Relationship _____

Telephone # _____ (Home) _____ (Work)

Name _____ Relationship _____

Telephone # _____ (Home) _____ (Work)

Again, thank you for your time. I have enjoyed talking with you.

Payment Receipt Form
Domestic Violence Research Project
Regional Research Institute
Portland State University

Initials _____

ID # _____

I Have received \$8.00 for doing an initial / follow-up (circle one) interview with the Domestic Violence Research Project.

Research Interviewer

Date

FORMA DE RECIBO DE PAGO

Domestic Violence Research Project

Instituto regional de Investigaciones

Universidad Estatal de Portland

Initials _____

ID # _____

He recibido \$8 por hacer una entrevista inicial/consiguiente (encirre Ud. Con ciculo cual corresponde) con la Proyecto Domestic Violence Research.

Entrevistador Investigativo

Fecha

Information Form

| | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Women's Crisis Line 232-9751 | Restraining Order Information |
| Metro Crisis Line 223-6161 | Domestic Violence Unit |
| PSU connection 903-2481 | Multnomah County Courthouse |
| District Attorney-Intake | 1921 SW3rd, |
| Multnomah County Courthouse | Portland, Or. |
| 1021 SW4th, Room 211B | 2483943 |
| 2483860 | |

appendix F

TIME TO FAILURE ANALYSIS

TIME UNTIL REPORTED REVICTIMIZATION


We examined four variables that represented the elapsed time from the entry event to a subsequent officially recorded criminal event. These are the times until the first reported revictimization incident, the first recorded revictimization custody, the first reported reoffense, and the first recorded reoffense custody.

Given the differences between the treatment and control group in reported revictimizations and reported reoffenses, we were interested in whether other differences would be exhibited in the subsequent (6 months) recorded criminal events of the two groups. Of particular interest to us was the issue of timing — how quickly these subsequent events occurred. In order to address such issues, we chose to utilize Kaplan-Meier survival analysis. The data for the analysis came from our compilation of relevant police data (see Appendix D for a copy of the Police Record Form). In this analysis, victims who were removed from the study during the six-month observation period were retained for this part of the analysis if their first reported revictimization occurred prior to their removal. The “number censored” refers to the number of victims who had no records of revictimization within the six-month observation period. The Log Rank statistic was used to test the hypothesis of no difference between groups. In addition to the statistical tests, graphic results are displayed which show the cumulative experiences of each group over time, known as the cumulative survival rate. In this instance, the notion of survival refers to absence of either reported revictimization or absence of another recorded allegation.

| | Total | Number Events | Number Censored | Percent Censored |
|-----------|-------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Treatment | 400 | 79 | 321 | 80.25 |
| Control | 497 | 59 | 438 | 88.13 |
| Overall | 897 | 138 | 759 | 84.62 |

| | Statistic | df | Significance |
|----------|-----------|----|--------------|
| Log Rank | 11.65 | 1 | .0006 |

There was a significant difference between the treatment and control groups, with the treatment group having a higher and more rapid revictimization reporting rate. That is, the time until reported revictimization was shorter in the treatment group.




Time until reported revictimization involving custody of alleged offender

| | Total | Number Events | Number Censored | Percent Censored |
|-----------|-------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Treatment | 399 | 46 | 353 | 88.47 |
| Control | 497 | 35 | 462 | 92.96 |
| Overall | 896 | 81 | 815 | 90.96 |

| | Statistic | Df | Significance |
|----------|-----------|----|--------------|
| Log Rank | 5.62 | 1 | .0178 |

There was a significant difference between the treatment and control groups, with the treatment group having both a higher rate of reported revictimization which involved custody, and those events occurring more rapidly following the entry event.




Time until any recorded reoffense by alleged offender

| | Total | Number Events | Number Censored | Percent Censored |
|-----------|-------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Treatment | 400 | 86 | 314 | 78.50 |
| Control | 497 | 58 | 439 | 88.33 |
| Overall | 897 | 144 | 753 | 83.95 |

| | Statistic | Df | Significance |
|----------|-----------|----|--------------|
| Log Rank | 17.23 | 1 | .0000 |

There was a significant difference between the treatment and control groups, with the treatment group having both a higher percent with a recorded reoffense and having a more rapid occurrence of the recorded reoffense.

Survival Functions




Time until any recorded reoffense by alleged offender that resulted in physical custody

| | Total | Number Events | Number Censored | Percent Censored |
|-----------|-------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Treatment | 399 | 49 | 350 | 87.72 |
| Control | 497 | 34 | 463 | 93.16 |
| Overall | 896 | 83 | 813 | 90.74 |

| | Statistic | Df | Significance |
|----------|-----------|----|--------------|
| Log Rank | 8.00 | 1 | .0047 |

There was a significant difference between the treatment and control groups, with the treatment group having a lower survival rate.

Survival Functions



PROPERTY OF
National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)
Box 6030
Rockville, MD 20849-5000