

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

Document Title: Forgoing Criminal Justice Assistance: The Non-Reporting of New Incidents of Abuse in a Court Sample of Domestic Violence Victims

Author(s): Gerald T. Hotaling ; Eve S. Buzawa

Document No.: 195667

Date Received: April 2003

Award Number: 2000-WT-VX-0019

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

**Forgoing Criminal Justice Assistance:
The Non-Reporting of New Incidents of Abuse in a
Court Sample of Domestic Violence Victims**

Gerald T. Hotaling*

and

Eve S. Buziawa

**Department of Criminal Justice
University of Massachusetts - Lowell**

January, 2003

* Gerald Hotaling passed away unexpectedly on June 16, 2002. While he worked closely with Eve Buzawa at developing the conceptualization for this paper and the data set used for this research, he was unable to review this manuscript. Therefore, Eve Buzawa takes sole responsibility for any interpretations or conclusions from the data.

This project was supported by Grant # 2000-WT-VI<-0019 awarded by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Abstract

This paper is part of a series of reports generated from the study of the Quincy District Court's (QDC) response to domestic violence. The focus of this paper is to examine **the** impact of case processing in Quincy District Court on the disclosure of re-victimization. Multivariate analysis was used to control for the impact of incident, victim, offender, and case processing characteristics. Those reporting no new incidents were included as a control group to insure that variables that distinguish re-reporters from non-reporters who reported a new incident are also distinguished between those with no new incident. Findings suggest the importance of indicators of victim frustration with the criminal justice system. Offenders of women who do not report were no more violent, but had a history of drug problems as well as a history of harassment of the victim. This suggests that new approaches may be needed that target the unique characteristics of multi-problem offenders.

Background

This study includes the results of a secondary analysis of data originally collected for a recently completed National Institute of Justice (NIJ) sponsored evaluation of a "model" domestic violence program located in Quincy, Massachusetts. We originally chose the Quincy, Massachusetts site because we wanted to explore a setting in which a policy of "aggressive enforcement" was actually practiced. Our earlier research revealed that the police, district attorney's office, probation systems, and judges in Quincy shared a vision and have developed a truly integrated, system-wide strategy incorporating the "best practices" of full enforcement for a wide range of domestic violence incidents.

Beginning in 1986, the QDC initiated what has been described as one of the nation's first, and most comprehensive, pro-active domestic violence programs. The court's aggressive, pro-intervention strategy has been recognized as a national model by the United States' Violence Against Women Agency (VAWA) and the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. In recent years, the VAWA has designated the QDC as a national training site to be emulated by other jurisdictions searching for an (apparently) effective, integrated system-wide response to "domestic" incidents.

The purpose of the original project was to examine the impact of a rigorous intervention strategy upon a population of victims and perpetrators of domestic violence. That project, completed in February, 1999, analyzed the actions of the police, prosecutors, and courts upon 353 domestic violence cases seen by the QDC in

Massachusetts over a seven-month period. The QDC was chosen as the data collection site for this study because of its status as an acknowledged leader in implementing pro-intervention strategies in domestic violence cases, having been cited by the Department of Justice in the implementation of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) as a model jurisdiction.

One of the milestones of the original NIJ study was linking together eight separate data sets about the domestic violence incidents we used in that study. They included the original police incident report, prosecutorial charge data on each case, as well as initial and final case dispositions, data from batterer treatment programs on attendance and completion status offenders, data from the Registry of Civil Restraining Orders on the number and types of all prior civil orders taken out in Massachusetts against all defendants in our study, data from the Massachusetts Criminal Records System Board on all prior criminal charges accumulated by the defendants in our study, extensive interview data on 118 victims, and data from computerized files to track all 353 offenders for a 1-year period subsequent to the incident for any new criminal charges and civil restraining orders.

The original study included victim interviews containing considerable information that is not typically available, about what victims themselves have to say about the role of the police, prosecutors, victim advocates, and judges. We have always believed it critical to determine directly from victims their observations and experiences. The use of victim surveys in the study of domestic violence has certainly become more commonplace over the past 20 years. What is unusual is to have extensive information from official data sources and self-

reports on the same individuals. This allows for a fuller understanding of certain issues concerning the reporting of re-victimization. For example, some victims may not report re-victimization because of their past treatment by the criminal justice system, because they preferred to use alternate responses, and because they are intimidated by dangerous males. From the perspective of domestic violence policy and practice, it is important to know not only what victims do when they are victimized, but also why they do it. The analyses included here allow us to examine this issue directly.

The victim survey produced a re-victimization rate substantially higher than that reported in official criminal justice data. Based on victim surveys, 49.2% (58 of 118) of respondents reported that they were either assaulted by the study offender, that the study offender had violated at least one condition of an existing restraining order, or they were forced to take out another restraining order on the study offender during the 1-year study period. Compared to the estimate of 22.1% reported from official data, estimates from victim accounts is 123% higher.

Therefore, this study will examine victim re-reporting among those who reported a new incident 12 months post target incident. Our purpose to determine if we could distinguish between those who re-contacted the criminal justice system again from those who did not report new incidents. Those reporting no new incidents (in our victim survey) are included as a control group to insure that variables distinguishing re-reporters from non-reporters who reported a new incident are also distinguished between those with no new incident.

The QDC is a model court that aggressively assesses domestic violence cases. Like most other jurisdictions, it does not use victim preferences as part of the decision making process. However, empirical research rarely reports on the consequences of this practice on

the future reporting and non-reporting behavior of domestic violence victims. This is an important issue to understand for several reasons. First, since victim reporting is needed to jump-start the "proactive" criminal justice response, it can be argued that at its core, even the most aggressive criminal justice strategy is essentially a reactive response, ultimately dependent on a victim who is willing to report abusive behavior to the police. When viewed in this context, it is not surprising that the lack of victim reporting has often been a source of frustration for many criminal justice practitioners. Second, an important question for public policy is whether victim reporting or non-reporting behavior is based on rational or irrational factors. If, for example, a victim reports an offense because of her fear of an offender, this suggests a rational choice, However, if a victim chooses not to contact the police because of her (irrational) fear of retaliation by the offender, this suggests a problem that necessitates a different intervention. Third, failing to address the reasons behind victims failure to report may have serious and negative long term consequences. If the overall societal goal is to stop domestic violence and protect victims, failure to report revictimization becomes a systemic failure.

The Failure to report revictimization in the Qiiincy District Court

From the initial QDC research, we knew that many women who reported a re-victimization by the study offender did not report the criminal act to the police or criminal justice agents. Of the 58 victims who reported re-victimization in this study, 26 reported the offense to the police and 32 did not.

An obvious question was why over half of the women who re-experienced a domestic violence episode within 1-year of the original incident decided against re-involvement with the criminal justice system. There are several possible explanations. If one assumes that the non-reporting of domestic violence incidents is similar to the non-reporting of crime in general, then there are at least five separate reasons the non-reporting. First, many victims might simply not want intervention by the criminal justice system or prefer some other form of assistance. A large number of victims did not initiate the previous call leading to criminal justice intervention. Nationally, research has found the range of victim initiated calls ranging from one-third to two-thirds (Buzawa & Buzawa, 2002). These victims may not have wanted any intervention, or alternatively, may have wanted assistance (and actually would have or did) engage in alternative help-seeking behavior.

Second, it may be that victims may not see the particular re-offense as serious enough warrant criminal justice system intervention. For example, victims might be more likely to report subsequent assaults, but less likely to report restraining order violations. Alternatively, victims may believe an injury is needed during an assault in order to justify police involvement.

Third, victims might not report subsequent victimizations due to fear of retaliation by the offender. This hypothesis would gain support if it were found that women who were re-victimized by offenders with extensive criminal histories or about whom the victim's fear has increased over time were those who failed to report.

Fourth, victims might be skeptical about the effectiveness of criminal justice involvement for their situation. Like other crime victims who do not report law violations, victims in this study might have felt that since they had already been involved with the criminal justice system,

it was unsuccessful at providing a remedy for the situation. Some victims might have felt that criminal justice intervention previously had, or might now exacerbate an already bad situation.

Fifth, the criminal justice system might not have followed victim preferences and therefore, this group of victims might have sought alternative sources of help or simply not seek any further assistance.

However, despite all of these factors, a victim's need for immediate assistance and the seriousness of the situation may subsume any other considerations in the mind of the victim. She may prefer alternate sources of help and/or fear the consequences of intervention, but call the police because she needs their assistance to ensure her safety and/or the safety of her children.

To date, empirical research has not examined these issues. While there is some research on what victims do on these issues. While there is some research on what victims say they will do, this does not necessarily mean that victims will act accordingly. Further, this research does not control for the actual case processing and outcome of the case in terms of re-victimization and re-offending. Victim reactions may be partially based on her prior experiences with criminal justice intervention during her last assault victimization and its subsequent consequences. This research will examine and control for the impact of incident, victim, offender, and case processing characteristics on a victim's decision to report new incidents of abuse.

Factors Related to the Non-reporting of Re-victimizations: a Review of the Evidence

It has long been known that a relatively high percentage of victims of domestic violence never report such incidents to police. For a summary of this phenomena, see Buzawa & Buzawa, (2002). In the past, many victims realistically feared that police would simply fail to

appropriately act and, at best, respond perfunctorily or even exacerbate the situation by demonstrating that the offender's conduct was tacitly condoned when no police action was taken. (Berk, et. al., 1984, Ferraro, 1989; and Radford, 1989). Others have cited the concept of "relational distance" wherein victims and offenders bound by close relational ties rarely reported incidents to police (Black, 1980).

This dynamic, however, may be changing in a manner that makes victim calls to the police even less predictable than in the past. As is well known, the police response to reported domestic violence has undergone major transformation in many, if not most, jurisdictions. Today, it simply cannot be said that police en masse trivialize domestic violence.

At times, the critique of police action is that it is too uniform, e.g. that arrests are made regardless of whether most would consider it appropriate for the situation due to overly rigid policies or even statutes mandating this action. As a result, some have surmised that a number of victims may be prospectively deterred from calling the police due to fear of further losing control of the situation (Buzawa, et. al., 1999; Mills, 1998 and 1999).

Reporting further abuse or "re-victimization" to the police becomes an extremely interesting subset of the interaction between police and victims. In such cases, by definition, the victims have already encountered the actions of the police and, at least in this jurisdiction, those of the district attorney and the courts. For this reason, our analysis of victim re-reporting behavior either reinforces or undermines an illustration of the impact of an aggressive, system-wide intervention response.

A number of studies have looked at the impact of mandatory arrest on subsequent

offender behavior (see e.g. Berk, et. al., 1992; Dunford, et. al., 1989; Garner, Fagan & Maxwell, 1995; Garner & Maxwell, 1999; Hirschel & Hutchison, 1992; Maxwell, Garner, & Fagan, 2001; Pate & Hamilton, 1992; Sherman, et. al., (1992)). As an aggregate, it appears that mandatory arrest has not had the desired effect on either offenders or victims. In terms of offenders, it was anticipated that the use of mandatory arrest strategies would act as a deterrent to subsequent violence by offenders. This has not proven to be the case.

In terms of victims, it has long been assumed that the initiation of aggressive intervention strategies such as mandatory arrest would result in increased victim participation in the criminal justice process. Specifically, victims would be empowered through intervention and therefore more likely to report subsequent problems with the offender. One criticism of the existing research on the effectiveness of mandatory arrest policies is that researchers have not addressed the factors that distinguish victims from reporting re-victimization from those that do not. In addition, previous research has failed to disentangle the effects of other criminal justice components, e.g. prosecution, sentencing, corrections, on the subsequent behavior of victims.

Sample

Data used in this report are based upon domestic violence cases that resulted in arrest and arraignment before the Quincy District Court during a 7-month study period. All consecutive arrests for domestic violence involving male defendants and female victims that occurred between June, 1995 and February, 1996 were initially examined for inclusion in our final sample. From that pool, we eliminated all cases involving defendants and primary victims who were under the age of 17, cases involving same-sex relationships, and cases involving male

victims and female defendants. The final sample was composed of 353 cases of male-to-female domestic violence. It can also be described as a population, since it included every case in this category of incidents.

Even so, the representativeness of this sample of all male-to-female domestic violence cases cannot be fully determined. First, although we have reason to believe most cases resulted in arrest, little is known about cases that may not have resulted in arrest. Second, even though cases in this sample show little variation in numbers or on key characteristics on a month-to-month basis, there may still be seasonal variations in the nature of cases. Third, and perhaps most importantly, our sample size does vary from analysis to analysis due to the availability of data from the primary sources used in this study, i.e., official records and self-report surveys. Consequently, we are often reporting results from a sub-sample of offenders and victims, raising questions about the generalizability of the study findings.

An additional concern was the generalizability of the 118 victims who were surveyed. Since we only interviewed 118 of 353 study victims, there is a distinct possibility of a skewed sample. However, we compared the characteristics of our interview sample to the total population of victims included in the original study and found no statistically significant differences between these two groups (see Buzawa, et. al., 1999). In addition, we found the sample rate for the entire 353 victims in our study was the same as for our 118 respondents using only criminal justice data - 22.0%. In other words, only 26 out of the 58 victims who reported an instance of re-victimization to us, reported the re-victimization to the police or another agent of the criminal justice system. Thus, our estimate of re-victimization of surveyed victims would have been 22.0% had we relied exclusively on official data which is exactly the same re-

offending rate as for the complete sample of 353 offenders.

In addition, such a differential between responding victims and those not available is, in theory, unlikely. Many victims who could be located left the community because they could not successfully escape abuse (or feared retaliation). We would not expect these victims to have lower rates of re-abuse than those who stayed, apart from the fact that they were successful in flight and therefore may be less likely to be found by their abuser.

This finding adds to our confidence that these estimates are reliable. A re-victimization rate based upon criminal justice reporting indicates that between 1 in every 4 or 5 victims is re-victimized in the year following coming to the attention of the criminal justice system. An estimate based on the accounts of the same individuals unmediated by reporting behavior would put the re-victimization estimate at 1 of every 2 victims.

Study Design

As stated, the purpose of this research is to better understand victim re-victimization and why it is or is not reported to the police. To facilitate this design, information was needed from multiple sources and perspectives covering data from significant periods of time both before and after the occurrence of the incident that led to its inclusion in our sample. In addition to procuring these data, an additional challenge was to link together information from several sources into one coherent data file. Sources of data used in this study are first described below. They include offender criminal history data, records of civil restraining orders, probation department data on prosecutorial charges, case disposition and risk assessment, data on offender treatment program participation, police incident reports, and self-report victim survey data.

Data Sources

1. Offender's Criminal History Data. The QDC's Department of Probation, provided criminal biographies for all 353 defendants in the sample. For this research each defendant's criminal activity was analyzed both prior to the study incident and for 1-year subsequent to that incident.¹

2. Civil Restraining Order Data. In September, 1992, the State of Massachusetts implemented the Registry of Civil Restraining Orders: the first statewide, centrally computerized record keeping system on restraining orders. This registry is primarily designed to provide the police and courts with accurate and up-to-date information on the existence of active orders. The QDC Department of Probation provided information from this registry on the number and type of civil restraining orders taken out in Massachusetts against all 353 defendants both before the occurrence of the study incident and for a 1-year period following the study incident.²

3. Prosecutor's Office/District Court Data. The QDC Department of Probation also provided us with information on all 353 defendants concerning prosecutorial charges. For each defendant in our study information was provided on up to three domestic violence related charges for our study incidents and any additional non-domestic violence related charges. This information enabled us to compare police charges to prosecutor charges on their number,

¹ These records contain all criminal charges filed against a defendant by any Massachusetts Court during his lifetime, the dates of occurrence and court locations of each charged offense, as well as the defendant's age at time of first offense. These data were coded into several categories including the age of the defendant at time of first criminal charge, the overall number of prior criminal charges, the total number of prior criminal charges for crimes against a person, property crimes, public order offenses, sex offenses, motor vehicle offenses, and drug charges.

² From this data source, we were able to construct measures on 1) the number of restraining orders taken out on the study defendant prior to the study incident; 2) the number of different female victims who have taken out restraining orders against the study defendant; 3) whether a restraining order was in effect at the time of the study incident and ; 4) whether a new restraining order was taken out against the study defendant subsequent to the study incident by the same woman as in the study incident and/or by another person.

severity and type and to understand the link between prosecution charges and court handling of cases.

Data from the Quincy District Court on initial and final dispositions (and their dates) enabled a determination of the amount of elapsed time between arraignments and dispositions as well as the number of defendants who violated the conditions of their initial dispositions.

4. Data on Study Defendants and Batterer Treatment Programs. Many study defendants had to enroll in a batterer treatment program as a condition of probation. We contacted the Directors of the two batterer treatment programs that serve the QDC and received data on offenders' treatment completion status at the end of our study period.

5. Police Incident Reports. A key data source used in this study were the police reports for the study incidents from the seven departments served by the QDC. These reports were used to measure the officer's perspective and actions taken about the incident, what the call for service involved, characteristics of the incident, socio-demographics of the participants and their narrative description of the incidents and their stated response.

6. The Victim Survey. In addition to official criminal justice system data concerning our study incidents, we needed to capture the perspective of the victims on the study incidents and their handling.

The interviews had three primary goals:(1) to obtain the victim's point-of-view about what she wanted from the criminal justice system, and how the criminal justice system responded to the domestic violence incident in which she was involved; (2) to get details about the study incidents and the context of the victim-offender relationship that are not typically available in official statistics; and (3) to hear directly from victims about the defendant's re-

offending behavior.

Because one of the chief aims of the survey was to tap into the victim's perspective about experiences with the criminal justice system, victim interviews did not take place until approximately 12 months after the occurrence of the study incident. Our use of a 1-year time-frame was dictated to us by the fact that we had to wait until victims passed through contact with the prosecutor's office and court and our interest in self-reports about re-offending behavior 1-year after the study incident.

This delay clearly had a severe effect on response rates and we were able to complete usable surveys with 118 victims in this study, 35% of eligible study respondents. However, a more important question is the extent to which those who completed the survey are different from both "refusals" and those women we were unable to locate. On the basis of official record information (police incident reports and criminal history information) we compared those who completed the survey to refusals and to those we could not locate on the basis of victim, offender, and study incident characteristics. For most comparisons, there were no major differences between victims according to their status on our survey. We were originally concerned that those victims we did not interview were involved with more dangerous men or in more serious domestic violence incidents. This concern was not borne out. Those who completed the survey were, in fact, more likely to have been in incidents involving severe violence and the use or threat of guns and knives and were abused by men whose criminal histories were as extensive as offenders whose victims who did not.

We sought direct data from victims as a check on the accuracy of "official data". Respondents were asked about events that occurred at different points over the past year (i.e.,

police involvement, talking to a victim advocate, going to the prosecutor's office, going to court). The most distant event in that time span was the incident that led to their inclusion in the sample. If memory problems did affect the quality of the information gathered, we would expect that this problem would be most apparent for that event. There was a very high level of agreement between victims and the police on a number of details concerning the study incident. Victims accurately recalled specifics details about the incident in terms of participants, location, dynamics of the incident and police actions.

Statistical Procedures

For all dependant variables, bivariate analysis (chi-square, ANOVA, odds-ratios) were used to examine variations by incident, victim, offender, and case processing characteristics. In addition, we have included the results of our multivariate analysis of the characteristics that distinguish the 3 groups at the outset of this review: Group 1 (victims with no incident during the one year follow up period); Group 2 (victims who did report a new incident during the follow-up period) and Group 3 (victims who stated there was a new incident but they did not report it to the police). Finally, the analyses utilized logistic regression techniques to identify the factors that distinguish victims of new incidents who report these incidents to police to victims who decided not to report.

RESULTS

Types of New Offenses Reported

Over half of the victims in this sample who disclosed that they were re-victimized during the 1-year period following the target incident did not report the new incident to the criminal justice system. As can be seen in Table 1, only 42.5% of victims contacted the criminal justice system again about the defendant's abusive behavior. Contrary to the assumption that more serious offenses get reported to the police, while less serious incidents do not, victims in this sample were more likely to re-report violations of restraining orders and re-contact the court for new restraining orders than report actual physical assaults. Although the difference in re-reporting of restraining order violations and assaults is not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 3.47$; $df = 1$; $p = .06$), it should be noted that half of restraining order violations were reported (50.0%) compared to only 23.5% of physical assaults. (Note: Given the small sample size for these two groups, it is more appropriate to discuss the percentage differences than to focus on statistical significance).

Of course, we are assuming that physical assaults are, in fact, more serious incidents than violations of protective orders. But this may not be the case from a victim's perspective for whom either incident can be frightening and upsetting. Additionally, from the point of view of the criminal justice system, at least in the jurisdiction from which the sample was drawn, violations of court orders are handled as more serious incidents. In Massachusetts, domestic violence statutes mandate the arrest of an offender who violates one or more of the conditions of a protective order but use arrest as a preferred response to allegations of threats and violence.

Victims are typically aware of this distinction since they are informed of what will happen if a protective order is violated and several victims told us that, in practice, the criminal justice system took violations of court orders more seriously. As one victim explained why she reported a restraining order violation to the police, " I figured the police and court would be more likely to go after him if he violated a court order."

The greater tendency to re-contact the criminal justice system for violations of protective orders may also reflect the fact that women who were no longer in a relationship with the offender were much more likely to have taken out a restraining order following the target incident (90% vs. 10%) and to report those violations than women still in a relationship with the offender (57.1% vs. 33.3%).

Still, some victims did report new violations, whether new assaults or of conditions of restraining orders, and others did not. Data in Tables 2 through 7 attempt to explore on the bi-variate level, some of the factors associated with non-reporting.

Prior Criminal Justice Action, Victim Appraisal of Criminal Justice Action and Non-reporting of New Incidents

It has been hypothesized earlier that victims may decide not to report new offenses to the criminal justice based on their experiences with that system (see e.g. Buzawa, et. al., 1999). There are at least three ways in which prior contact with the criminal justice system might discourage a person from turning to it again for assistance. First, it may be due to the failure of that system to take action against the offender in prior domestic violence incidents. For example, women who don't report new offenses may have been treated differently than others in terms of

how their cases were handled or how the offender was dealt with. Second, some victims may have found the criminal justice process too burdensome to return. That is, this form of help may have been found to be confusing in terms of the legal language used and steps to be taken and too time-consuming. Third, some victims may have found the system to be arbitrary and out of step with their wishes and preferences in terms of case handling. Data in Tables 2 and 3 address each of these issues.

Data in Table 2 show that actions taken by the criminal justice system in the target incident failed to differentiate between the three victim groups. Offenders across the groups were roughly equally likely to have been charged with a serious crime, to have been successfully prosecuted, and to have been placed under criminal justice surveillance. In fact, the offenders of victims who did not report a new incident to the criminal justice system were somewhat more likely to have been mandated to attend batterer treatment and to have been incarcerated.

It also does not appear that victims who did not report new offenses were concerned about the time-consuming or confusing nature of the criminal justice system response. Data in Table 3 show that victims in Group 111 were actually the least likely to have found the system troublesome in this sense. In fact, those victims who did report new offenses were the most likely to depict the criminal justice response as confusing and time-consuming, but obviously this did not discourage them from re-reporting.

Data in Table 3 does show, however, that victims who did not report new offenses (Group 3) were significantly more likely than victims in the other groups (Group 2) to depict the criminal justice system as unresponsive to their preferences. Over 55% of victims who did not report new offenses during the 1-year study period said they had no voice or rights with criminal

justice officials compared only 12% of victims who did re-report new offenses (Group II) and 18.3% of victims who reported no subsequent re-victimizations (Group I). Group III (failure to report) victims also differed significantly from Group II victims in overall levels of dissatisfaction with the criminal justice system (25% vs. 7.4%) and in feeling that a "more therapeutic approach should have been taken toward offenders" (58.8% vs. 36.0%).

Group III (failure to report) victim appraisals of their contact with various components of the criminal justice system in the target incident were diverse and did not follow a consistent pattern. For example, victims who did not report new offenses were the least likely group of victims to resist the arrest of the offender in the target incident and the least likely to be dissatisfied with the police handling of the incident. But at the same time, they were the most likely to feel that the actions of the police negatively affected their safety. They were less likely than victims in other groups to have wanted the offender prosecuted but most likely to report that they wanted the prosecutor to make charges against the offender more severe and just as likely as others to have wanted charges lowered or dropped. Additionally, Group III victims did not differ from the other groups on the extent to which the threat of prosecution angered or frightened the offender.

Overall, Group III (failure to report) victims were dissatisfied with the actions taken by the prosecutor (compared to Group II) and felt the prosecutor's actions decreased their safety (compared to Group I victims). Victims across all three groups did not significantly differ from one another in their appraisal of the impact of court actions on their safety or on their level of satisfaction with the court.

Data in Table 3 implies that regardless of the specific preferences Group III (failure to

report) victims may have had about actions taken by criminal justice personnel, the perception that their preferences were ignored most distinguished Group III victims from victims in Groups I and II. The perception of having no voice or no rights may have been most acute in their dealings with the prosecutor's office with whom non-reporters were most dissatisfied.

Offender Dangerousness and Non-Reporting of New Incidents

An alternate hypothesis to account for the decision to not report new incidents of abuse to the criminal justice system may have to do the fear of reprisal from dangerous offenders. There are at least two ways to assess offender dangerousness in this regard. First, through the seriousness and danger posed to the victim in the target incident itself and, second, through the past criminal histories of offenders.

Data in Tables 4 and 5 examine these facets of offender dangerousness. Table 4 displays characteristics of the target incident by reporting status. As would be expected from a court sample, these are serious domestic abuse incidents, especially for victims who disclosed subsequent incidents to us. However, there are a number of important differences across groups and most are between those victims who experienced a new incident and those who did not (Group I vs. Groups II and III). There are very few factors that distinguish those who reported a new incident from those who did not. One exception is the escalation in the pattern of violence exhibited by the offender. Group II (new incident reported)victims were more likely than victims in the other groups to report that the offender's abuse was becoming more serious prior to the target incident (72% Group 2 vs. 58% Group 3 and 45% Group 1). We suspect that may be an important factor in accounting for why this group reported new incidents to the police.

It appears that the dangerousness of the offender in terms of the severity of violence used and the fear that is generated by his actions is a correlation element across the sample, especially among victims who experience new incidents of abuse. However, an escalation in offender dangerousness does not appear to discourage the reporting of new incidents but rather may be a factor promoting the reporting of new incidents to the authorities.

Data in Table 5 also addresses offender dangerousness by examining a number of indicators of prior criminal involvement. Overall, this sample of offenders was very criminally active, with 81% having at least one prior criminal charge of any kind and 54.6% having at least one prior criminal charge involving a crime against a person. Even though the sample as a whole was quite criminally active, there were some differences across groups. Offenders of Group III (failure to report) victims had a significantly greater average number of restraining orders taken out against them by others (0.88) than Group I victims (0.25), but not a significantly greater number than those in Group II (0.52). Offenders of women who were re-victimized and reported the new incident (Group 2) had a greater number of prior crimes of violence (4.80) as compared to Group 1 offenders (1.50), but not significantly different from offenders of women who did not report a new incident (3.47).

Only one variable differentiated between all groups and that was the proportion of offenders with at least one prior controlled substance abuse criminal charge. Almost a quarter of offenders of women who did not report new incidents (Group 3) had prior drug charges compared to less than 7% of Group I (no new incident) and only 4% of Group II (new incident) offenders.

Victim Characteristics and the Non-Reporting of New Incidents

It is certainly possible that women forego additional criminal justice assistance because of their past life experiences or victimizations. Women who are still with their offenders may not want to jeopardize their relationship and so not call the police when new incidents occur. It has been hypothesized that a subgroup of victims may forego additional criminal justice involvement because of their current life situation or past victimization experiences (see Buzawa, et al., 1999). Variations in reporting behavior may also be due to the type and extent of past victimization experiences. For example, women with multiple victimizations may grow increasingly skeptical about the system's effectiveness in protecting them and forego additional assistance.

Data in Table 6 examines group differences by demographic characteristics of victims and their assailants. There are no group differences by the race or age of victim or offender, educational attainment or household income. There were also no differences across groups in the percentage of women who were living with the offender at the time of the incident,

Groups varied by employment status (Group I 56.7%, Group II 80%, Group III 79.4%) and whether women were still with offenders (Group I 36.7%, Group II 92%, Group III 81.8%). However, these factors differentiated those who experienced a new incident from those who didn't and non-reporting behavior. Women who reported a new incident of abuse were more likely to have been in the labor force and were not in a relationship with the offender at the time of the new incident, whether they reported the new incident or not. Of course, it is certainly possible that the reason women fail to disclose a new incident to this is directly related to their ongoing relationship with the offender.

Table 7 shows an extensive pattern of past victimizations. For many women in this

sample, especially those who were re-victimized, re-victimized women (Groups II and III) were significantly more likely than Group I victims to have taken out 3 or more restraining orders against the study offender and to have made multiple prior calls to police about his abusiveness. Equivalent proportions of each group reported multiple adult violent relationships and severe parental violence while growing up.

Women in all groups reported a high involvement of child sexual abuse. Over 38% of all women in the sample reported sexual assault, a rate almost twice as high as the 20% estimates derived from general populations of women (Finkelhor, 1994). Almost 56% of women who did not report a new incident of domestic violence reported child sexual abuse, a proportion significantly higher than found for any woman who reported new incidents to the police (28.0%) or for the group of women reporting no new incidents (32.8%). It is certainly possible that there is a link between the abuse history of domestic violence victims and their likelihood of reporting revictimization to police. For an individual who has experienced abuse throughout the "life-course", reporting this latest incident to the police may be viewed as useless ritualism.

Predictors of Non-Reporting

An attempt to separate out the indirect effects of important factors in cases of non-reporting is shown in Table 8. A logistic regression comparing women who experienced a new incident and either reported it or not to the criminal justice system includes the predictors that differentiated groups at the bi-variate level.³

³The number of prior CAPS was included in the model even though it was not significantly different across all 3 groups. There were large between group differences and reported the most direct indicator of offender

The model can be interpreted to point to the importance of indicators of frustration with the criminal justice system. The offenders of women who do not report are no more violent, but have had drug problems and a history of harassment of the victim. It is certainly possible that the offenders represent a subgroup of "multiple problem" domestic violence offenders who may require a different criminal justice intervention strategy.

In addition, a victim's past history of victimization also influences her decision to report with sexual abuse prior to the age of 18 significantly impacting the decision to report. These victims may see new incidents of re-abuse as part of a lifetime history of abuse. They may be discouraged by the failure of the criminal justice system to effectively intervene and believe it is unable to provide needed assistance.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

1. Many victims did not report re-victimization to the criminal justice system

- A comparison of victim data to official data revealed that more than half of victims did not report new offenses (49.2% vs. 22.1 %).
- Half (50%) of restraining order violations were reported compared to only 23.5% of physical assaults
- Women continuing in a relationship with the offender were much less likely to get a restraining order against an offender than those no longer living with the offender (90% vs. 10%) and report a restraining order violation (57% vs. 33%).

2. The decision to report re-victimization was not related to actions taken by the criminal justice system.

- Victims who did not report new offenses were not likely to be concerned about future time dangerousness and its possible importance on non-reporting new incidents of abuse.

⁴Several variables that differentiated the 3 groups at the bivariate level were highly correlated with one another. In these instances, the variable with the strongest bivariate correlation was selected for inclusion in the models used here.

consuming or future nature of the criminal justice response.

- Victims who did report new offenses were most likely to be concerned about the time consuming or future nature of the criminal justice response

3. Victim reporting was significantly related to their depiction of the criminal justice system as responsive to their preferences.

- Over 55% of victims who did not report new offenses said they had no voice or rights with criminal justice officials compared to only 12% of victims who did re-report new offenses and 18% of victims who were not re-victimized.
- "Failure to report" victims were significantly more likely to express dissatisfaction with the criminal justice system, particularly with the actions taken by the prosecutor.

4. "Failure to report" victims were significantly related to the belief that prosecutor actions decreased their safety than those who re-reported or were no re-victimized

- "Failure to report victims" were less likely than victims in other groups to have wanted the offender prosecuted.
- They were equally likely to report they wanted the charges more severe OR they wanted the charges dropped altogether.

5. An escalation in offender dangerousness increased the likelihood of victim reporting

6. For victims who were re-abused, offender dangerousness was similar.

- The only offender variable that distinguished victim re-reporting was the history of drug charges against the offender and a history of harassment of the victim.

7. Failure to report was significantly related to childhood sexual abuse

- Over 56% of women who did not report a new incident reported child sexual abuse compared to 28% who did report new incidents

DISCUSSION

Quincy's system of aggressively responding to domestic violence certainly should be complimented. It provides a comprehensive system-wide effort for intervention with what had

largely been an intractable crime. In fact, the response of many victims has been positive. Many offenders, while noticeably less enthusiastic, have modified their behavior to prevent being arrested and convicted of future assaults. However, our gratitude toward these agencies and appreciation for their work does not mean that all victims of domestic violence are being served equally well by the application of these facially neutral, and proactive policies. Unfortunately, there is a fairly large group of victims who have reported dissatisfaction with the process (covered in a companion paper) and other that have simply disengaged, by not reporting reabuse. This latter fact is a serious problem since to the extent police do not receive calls from abused women; the criminal justice system is of only marginal relevance. We have long known that many cases of domestic assault never reach the criminal justice system. For example, Rennison (2001) reported that only 54% of women reported a domestic assault to the police in 1998. Straus (2000) believes this figure to be much higher with more than 100 conflict studies examining reports to the police find a reporting rate of less than 20%.

Many studies have examined differences between victims who report crimes and those that do not (see Buzawa and Buzawa, 2003 for a detailed discussion). Far fewer studies provide insight as to whether reporting rates differ among first time victims, repeat victims who have never called the police in the past, and those who have reported earlier offenses. This has made it difficult to address the problem of unreported offenses. This research focused specifically on reporting by repeat victims who had reported an earlier offense and whose case was processed through disposition. Further, this research not only reports what happened to the victims of domestic violence but also why victims responded to re-victimization as they did by either reporting to the police or not reporting).

Past policy analysts assumed that the failure of the criminal justice to aggressively intervene had discouraged victim reporting (Buzam & Buzawa, 1990; Hamilton & Coates, 1993; Dobash & Dobash, 1992; Frieze & Browne, 1989). This assumption can no longer be made in the many jurisdictions where an aggressive police response to the problem has been coupled with enhanced prosecutions and stiff sentencing of repeat offenders. Therefore, this research was significant in focusing on the continued problem of non-reporting in the context of a pro-active criminal justice jurisdiction that aggressively enforces criminal justice statutes. What is troublesome is that this research has found that *despite the victim's experience with a "model" intervention program, rereporting was still a major concern as the majority of victims did not report subsequent offenses to the police.* In fact, this research adds credence to earlier expressed fears that **a too aggressive criminal justice response that did not reflect diversity of victim desires might have had the unintended effect of detering future reporting.**

Our findings suggest that a latent outcome of aggressive law enforcement and court response that includes the dismissal of victim preferences may be to discourage the future use of the system by both victims who wanted the system to do more (those who wanted more severe criminal charges brought against the offender) as well as those who wanted it to do less (those who felt taking the case forward would decrease their safety). It is apparent from our victim interviews that official records of re-victimization significantly under report this behavior. Based on official records, only 22.1% of victims in our sample were re-victimized. This, if taken at face value, this suggests the program is successful., especially when compared to national estimates that over 50% of victims are re-victimized. However, the results of our victim interviews showed a high number of cases that did nor enter into the official statistics resulting in

a population in which 49.2% were re-victimized.

If prevention of re-victimization is the goal of policy makers, new strategies must be developed simultaneously in three areas:

First, new methods need to be utilized to persuade victims to report subsequent victimizations to police. As we have reported in other summaries (see Buzawa & Buzawa, 2003 for a summary), many victims are very dissatisfied when the case actions are taken out of their hands and decisions are, in effect, the mechanical result of standard operating procedures that mandate arrest and later case processing through conviction, regardless of the woman's needs. Fundamentally, it should not surprise researchers or even passionate advocates of the rights of battered women that when victims lose control of a process, many will simply "opt out" the next time, leaving the cycle of violence and its myriad effects on themselves, minor children, and society as a whole, fundamentally unchanged. This suggests the significance of victim empowerment and the importance of its integration into the current goals of the criminal justice system. A critical policy question is how this should impact the criminal justice response to domestic violence—should it mean that offenders whose cases could clearly be successfully prosecuted are not charged when the victim has made an informed decision not to proceed? To the extent that we seek a credible chance at serving victim needs while preventing as much revictimization as possible, we need to focus on the subset of the victims who are far less likely to report revictimization. It is recognized, however, that there may be a dilemma when an equally important societal goal may contradict victims interests, that of identifying and prosecuting offenders.

Second, this research suggests that the identification of non reporting victims is not difficult. Instead, they largely appear related to several factors: logical *indicators of victim frustration* with the criminal justice system and a victim's commitment to seeking criminal justice involvement in the first place.

The issue of victim past frustrations with the criminal justice system is demonstrated by the fact that re-victimized victims were far more likely to have taken out prior restraining orders and/or repetitively contacted the police about the offender in the past. Such efforts obviously did not work in preventing the violence that led to the incident that caused her inclusion in this study. It is certainly plausible that victims that have repeatedly contacted the criminal justice system in the past, with no major positive result may become discouraged with the efficacy of current intervention strategies which tend to be intrusive into her family life, demanding of her time and in many cases may have her risking future retaliation by the offender to deter her assistance with case prosecution.

One subset of this group would be victims who have experienced a lifetime of abuse, without effective criminal justice intervention. Findings from this research suggest that re-victimized women were far more likely to have endured childhood sexual abuse and have been subjected to serial victimizations throughout their lives. Many of these victims might benefit less from a criminal justice system that to her may seem to be repeating past failed strategies, as from the development of a broad range of community resources to address the consequences of this history of prior victimization.

One avenue of research that has been particularly fruitful over the past decade is the discussion and an exploration of crimes through a life-course. Equally compelling is the notion

of victims through a life course. Isn't this paragraph actually restated in more detail in the next paragraph?

While we have given considerable attention to offender careers in crime, less research by far has been spent on helping this subclass of repeat victims. It seems difficult to expect victims who have endured a lifetime of violence to enter into a criminal justice process that, by definition, is offender oriented and is not constructed to address her needs- or her past adverse outcomes with the criminal justice system. For some victims, there may be a belief that violence is an inevitable part of their life and that outside intervention cannot help. However, there are also many victims who choose to leave their current violent relationship only to enter a new violent relationship. Assisting such woman in long term strategies to make her less likely to enter into and remain in abusive relationships would seem to be a far more effective way of helping her and her family than mechanistic application of arrest and prosecution policies that largely have not worked for the victim in the past.

Similarly, what appears to be another critical factor is the victim's decision to stay with an offender. Only 36.7% of Group I offenders (women not in a relationship with the offender after one year) were re-victimized compared to 92.0% for Group II and 81.8% for Group III. Despite this comparatively few of the women who stayed with the offender were later found to report revictimization, strongly suggesting that different "treatment" modalities need to be tried for that group.

Third, new strategies need to be developed which make the identification of subsequent re-victimization a community concern rather than a problem of victim

notification. In terms of this latter point, it certainly seems possible that the strategies employed vis a vis the federal government's recent re-entry partner initiatives could be applied directly to the problem of domestic violence.

Specifically, we could envision a system where local community police are proactive, in conjunction with the courts and corrections system, as part of a pro-active system wide re-victimization prevention and detection strategy. In this new system wide strategy, the system would respond pro-actively to the problem of **potential** re-victimization by maintaining contact with offenders of domestic violence, talking directly with them about the implications of re-offending on their liberty and lifestyle, and on directly monitoring their behavior toward the victim in particular, other potential victims, and the community in general.

REFERENCES

Berk, R. A., Berk, S. F., Newton, P. J., & Loseke, D. R. (1984). Cops on call: Summoning the police to the scene of spousal violence. *Law and Society Review*, 28(3), 479-498.

Berk, S. F., Campbell, A., Klap, R., & Western, B. (1992). Bayesian analysis of the Colorado Springs spouse abuse experiment. *Criminal Law and Criminology*, 83, 170-200.

Black, D. (1980). *The manners and customs of the police*. New York: Academic Press.

Buzawa, E. S. & Buzawa, C. G. (2002). *Domestic Violence: The Criminal Justice Response* 3rd.ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Buzawa, E., Pomeroy, S., & Latham, X., & Byrnes, T. (July 1999). *Response to domestic violence in a pro-active court setting: Final Report*, Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

Dunford, F. W., Huizinga, D., & Elliott, D. (1989). *The Omaha domestic violence police experiment: Final report to the National Institute of Justice and the City of Omaha*. Boulder, CO: Institute of Behavioral Science.

Ferraro, K. (1989). Policing women battering. *Social Problems*, 36(1), 61-74.

Garner, J., Fagan, J., and Maxwell, C. (1995). Published findings from the spouse assault replication program: A critical review. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 11(1)3-28.

Garner, J. & Maxwell C. (1999). What are the Lessons of the Police Arrest Studies? In Sally Ward & David Finkelhor (Eds.), *Program Evaluation and Family Violence Research*. New York: Haworth, pp. 83-114.

Hirschel, J. D. & Hutchison I.W. (1992). Female Spouse Abuse and the Police Response: The Charlotte, North Carolina, Experiment, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 83,73-119.

Maxwell, C., Garner, J. and Fagan, J. (2001). *The effects of arrest on intimate partner violence: New evidence from the spouse assault replication program*. Research in Brief Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

Mills, L.G. (1998). Mandatory arrest and prosecution policies for domestic violence: A critical literature review and the case for more research to test victim empowerment approaches. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 25, 306-318.

Mills, L.G. (1999). Killing her softly: Intimate abuse and the violence of state

interventions. *Haward Law Review*, 113, 551-613.

Pate, A., & Hamilton, E. (1992). Formal and informal deterrents to domestic violence: The Dade County Spouse Assault Experiment. *American Sociological Review*, 57, 691-697.

Radford, J. (1989). Women and policing: Contradictions old and new. In J. Hanmer, J. Radford, & B. Stanko (Eds.), *Women, policing and male violence* (pp. 13-45). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Sherman, L. W., Schmidt, J. D., Rogan, D. P., Smith, D. A., Gartin, P. R., Cohn, E. G., Collins, D. J., & Bacich, A. R. (1992). The variable effects of arrest on crime control: The Milwaukee Domestic Violence Experiment. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 83, 137-169.

Table 1: Percentage of Cases in Which a New Incident of Abuse^a Was Reported in Victim Interview During 1-Year Study Period and Percentage of Those Cases Reported to the Criminal Justice System and Involving Either a Restraining Order Violation or a New Physical Assault (N=119)

| | % | <u>(N event / N total cases)</u> |
|---|------|----------------------------------|
| New incident of abuse reported in victim interview | 49.6 | (59/119) |
| New incident of abuse reported to criminal justice system | 2.5 | (25 / 59) |
| New incident of restraining order violation reported to criminal justice system | 50.0 | (21/42) |
| New incident of physical assault reported to criminal justice system | 23.5 | (4/17) |

^a New incidents included either violations of one or more of the conditions of an existing restraining order, physical assaults, and eight cases in which a victim denied an abusive incident but took out a restraining order against a defendant because of increasing fear of the defendant.

Table 2: Criminal Justice System Actions Taken in Target incident and Victim Appraisal of Actions by Re-Reporting Status (N= 119)

| Characteristic | No New Incident (Group I) (N=60) | New Incident Reported (Group II) (N=25) | New Incident Not reported (Group III) (N=34) | χ^2 | p |
|---|----------------------------------|---|--|----------|------|
| Prosecutor filed serious criminal charge(s) against offender ^a | 21.7% | 20.0% | 14.7 | 0.68 | .711 |
| Offender "successfully prosecuted" ^b | 66.7 | 84.0 | 82.4 | 4.26 | .119 |
| Offender mandated to attend batterer treatment | 11.7 | 16.0 | 23.5 | 2.28 | .320 |
| Offender completed batterer treatment | 42.9 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.90 | .956 |
| Offender placed on probation | 21.7 | 40.0 | 26.5 | 3.02 | .221 |
| Offender incarcerated | 8.8 | 8.0 | 16.1 | 1.21 | .546 |

^a Serious crime charges in this sample were attempted murder, rape, aggravated assault, kidnapping, robbery, assault and battery with a dangerous weapon, stalking and civil rights violations.

^b "Successful prosecutions" refer to those cases that were continued without a finding, filed or in which a defendant pled or was found guilty, received a suspended sentence, probation, a stay, a split sentence or was committed to a house of correction. "Unsuccessful prosecutions" refer to cases that were dismissed at arraignment, nolle prossed ,or in which the defendant was found not guilty.

^c 2x2 cross-tabulation between this category and the "New Incident, Not Reported" category reveals a statistically significant association between not reporting and this factor.

^d Analysis of residuals indicates that the significant association between the variables is due to a higher than expected number of cases in this cell.

^e Analysis of residuals indicates that the significant association between the variables is due to a lower than expected number of cases in this cell.

Table 3: Victim Preferences About and Evaluation of Criminal Justice Response in Tiiiget Incident, by Re-reporting Status

| Characteristic | No New Incident (Group I) (N=60) | New Incident Reported (Group II) (N=25) | New Incident Not Reported (Group III) (N=34) | χ^2 | P |
|---|----------------------------------|---|--|----------|------|
| Victim Appraisal of Police Contact: | | | | | |
| Victim did not want police to arrest defendant | 41.7% ^a | 28.0% | 11.8% ^c | 9.27 | .010 |
| Felt that police actions decreased her safety | 26.7 | 12.0 ^{a,c} | 36.4 | 4.37 | .113 |
| Dissatisfied with police response | 23.3 | 12.0 | 11.8 | 2.69 | .260 |
| Victim Appraisal of Prosecutor Contact: | | | | | |
| Victim did not want prosecution of defendant | 36.7 | 24.0 | 42.4 | 2.17 | .338 |
| Felt prosecutor's actions decreased her safety | 1.7 ^{a,c} | 12.0 | 17.6 | 7.44 | .024 |
| Wanted charges against defendant to be more severe | 11.9 | 8.0 | 14.7 | 0.65 | .724 |
| Wanted charges against defendant dropped/lowered | 60.0 | 44.0 | 48.5 | 2.26 | .223 |
| Victim felt the threat of prosecution made offender angry | 25.0 | 18.0 | 29.4 | 0.24 | .889 |
| Victim felt threat of prosecution scared the offender | 51.7 | 40.0 | 38.2 | 1.95 | .377 |
| Dissatisfied with actions of prosecutor | 26.7 | 24.0 | 44.1 | 3.83 | .148 |

Table 3 continued

| Characteristic | No New Incident (Group I) | New Incident Reported (Group II) | New Incident Not Reported (Group III) | χ^2 | p |
|--|---------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|------|
| Victim Appraisal of Court Contact: | | | | | |
| Victim felt actions of court decreased their safety | 5.1a | 20.0 | 17.2 | 3.56 | .168 |
| Dissatisfied with actions of court | 21.3 | 30.4 | 33.3 | 1.58 | .453 |
| Victim Appraisal of Overall Criminal Justice System Contact: | | | | | |
| Criminal justice intervention was confusing and difficult to understand ^d | 63.0 | 85.7 | 55.6 | 1.73 | .422 |
| Criminal justice intervention was too time-consuming ^d | 37.0 | 57.1 | 33.3 | 1.12 | .570 |
| Criminal justice system should take a more therapeutic approach toward offender | 38.3 | 36.0a | 58.8 | 4.47 | .107 |
| Victim has no say/rights in criminal justice process | 18.3a | 12.0a | 55.9b | 19.18 | .001 |
| Victim dissatisfied with overall criminal justice response | 18.3 | 7.4a,c | 25.0 | 3.12 | .076 |

^a 2x2 cross-tabulation between this category and the "New Incident, Not Reported" category reveals a statistically significant association between not reporting and this factor.

^b Analysis of residuals indicates that the significant association between the variables is due to a higher than expected number of cases in this cell.

^c Analysis of residuals indicates that the significant association between the variables is due to a lower than expected number of cases in this cell.

^d These questions from a random sample (N=43) of victim interviews which were administered to obtain greater detail about victim preferences and evaluations of contact with various sectors of the criminal justice system.

Table 4: Target Incident Characteristics, by Re-Reporting Status

| Characteristic | No New Incident (Group I) (N=60) | New Incident Reported (Group II) (N=25) | New Incident Not Reported (Group 111) (N=34) | x ² /F | P |
|---|----------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|------|
| Victim initiated police call for assistance | 60.0% ^{ac} | 88.0% | 85.3% | 10.63 | .005 |
| Victim thought she would be seriously injured in target incident | 53.3 ^{ac} | 80.0 | 90.9 | 15.83 | .001 |
| Victim sustained injury | 41.7 | 32.0 | 29.4 | 1.65 | .439 |
| Weapon used in incident | 18.3 | 16.0 | 8.8 | 1.55 | .461 |
| Severe violence used in incident (beat-up, kicked, choked, threatened or assaulted with weapon) | 2.5 | 44.0 | 45.5 | 0.71 | .702 |
| Victim was threatened with harm | 71.7 | 72.0 | 64.7 | 0.57 | .750 |
| Victim's fear of defendant had increased over time | 35.6 ^{ac} | 64.0 | 61.8 | 8.71 | .013 |
| Pattern of abuse was becoming more severe and/or frequent | 45.0 | 72.0 | 58.8 | 5.53 | .063 |
| Victim was stalked prior to target incident | 10.0 | 24.0 | 14.7 | 2.83 | .243 |
| Restraining order in effect | 16.7 ^{ac} | 40.0 | 41.2 | 8.41 | .015 |
| Number of children present | 1.33 | 1.14 | 1.11 | 0.13 | .879 |

^a 2x2 cross-tabulation between this category and the "New Incident, Not Reported" category reveals a statistically significant association between not reporting and this factor.

^b Analysis of residuals indicates that the significant association between the variables is due to a higher than expected number of cases in this cell.

^c Analysis of residuals indicates that the significant association between the variables is due to a lower than expected number of cases in this cell.

Table 5: Offender Criminal Histories, by Re-Reporting Status

| Characteristic | No New Incident (Group I) (N=60) | New Incident Reported (Group II) (N=27) | New Incident Not Reported (Group III) (N=32) | F | p | |
|--|--|---|--|------|------|------|
| Prior restraining orders taken out against offender by anyone | | 0.25 ^a | 0.52 | 0.88 | 5.81 | .004 |
| Age at first criminal charge | 24.6 | 19.4 | 22.0 | 2.77 | .067 | |
| Prior property crime charges | 3.51 | 3.84 | 5.38 | 0.47 | .629 | |
| Prior public order crime charges | 0.60 | 1.12 | 0.65 | 1.14 | .324 | |
| Number of prior major motor vehicle crime charges | 2.70 | 3.04 | | 2.18 | 0.23 | .793 |
| Prior alcohol-related crime charges | 1.57 | 2.50 | 1.36 | 1.33 | .273 | |
| Any controlled substance criminal charge (excluding marijuana) | 6.7% ^b | 4.0% ^b | 23.5 | 7.90 | .019 | |
| Two or more female victims | 5.0% ^b | 12.0% | 20.6% | 5.46 | .065 | |
| Prior crimes against a person charges | 1.88 | 4.80 | 3.47 | 3.43 | .036 | |
| Total prior criminal charges | 10.88 | 16.00 | 14.12 | 0.97 | .384 | |
| Prior sexual offense criminal charges | 0.15 | 0.12 | 0.24 | 0.29 | .750 | |
| Prior periods of probation or incarceration | 2.00 | 3.36 | 1.97 | 1.63 | .200 | |

^a Post-hoc (Scheffe) analyses indicate statistically significant differences in means between this category and the "New Incident, No New Report" category.

^b 2x2 cross-tabulation between this Group and Group II1 reveals 3 statistically significant association between reporting status and this factor.

Table 6: Demographic Characteristics at Time of Target Incident, By New Incident Reporting Status

| Characteristic | No New Incident (Group I) (N=60) | New Incident, Reported (Group II) (N=25) | New Incident Not Reported (Group III) (N=34) | χ^2 | P |
|---|----------------------------------|--|--|----------|------|
| Non-white victim | 11.7% | 16.0% | 20.6% | 1.36 | .506 |
| Non-white offender | 13.3 | 12.0 | 14.7 | 0.09 | .955 |
| Victim in labor force | 56.7 ^{be} | 80.0 | 79.4 | 7.24 | .027 |
| Household income < \$30K | 69.1 | 81.8 | 83.9 | 2.89 | .235 |
| Victim completed high school or more | 88.1 | 73.9 | 88.2 | 3.00 | .223 |
| Victim and offender were married/co-habiting | 55.0 | 44.0 | 61.8 | 1.84 | .398 |
| Age of victim (x) | 37.0 | 35.5 | 32.9 | 1.01 | .369 |
| Age of offender (x) | 35.0 | 34.2 | 32.6 | 0.56 | .573 |
| Victim not in relationship with offender 1-year after target incident | 36.7 ^{be} | 92.0 | 81.8 | 31.0 | .001 |

^a Statistical significance based on chi-square tests of association for categorical variables and ANOVAS for variables where means are reported.

^b 2 X 2 cross-tabulation between this category and the "New Incident, Not Reported" category reveals a statistically significant association between reporting status and this factor.

^c Post-hoc (Scheffe) analyses indicate statistically significant differences between this category and the "New Incident, Not Reported" category.

^d Analysis of residuals indicates that the significant association between the variables is attributable to a higher than expected number of cases in this cell.

^e Analysis of residuals indicates that the significant association between the variables is attributable to the lower than expected number of cases in this cell.

Table 7: Patterns of Violence in Victim's Adult Relationships, by Re-Reporting Status

| Characteristic | No New Incident (Group I) (N=60) | New Incident, Reported (Group II) (N=25) | New Incident Not Reported (Group III) (N=34) | χ^2/F^a | p |
|--|----------------------------------|--|--|--------------|------|
| Victim had taken out 3 or more restraining orders prior to target incident on offender | 3.3 | 20.0 | 20.6 | 8.29 | .016 |
| Prior calls to police by victim about defendant | 2.01 ^b | 3.95 | 3.38 | 4.95 | .014 |
| Number of adult violent relationships | 2.62 | 2.56 | 2.38 | 1.51 | .225 |
| Victim reported severe physical punishment by parent(s) while growing-up | 43.3 | 48.0 | 44.1 | 0.16 | .924 |
| Victim reported sexual abuse before age 18 years | 32.8 ^b | 28.0 ^b | 55.9 | 6.31 | .043 |

^a Statistical significance based on chi-square tests of association for categorical variables and ANOVAS for variables where means are reported.

^b 2 X 2 cross-tabulation between this category and the "New Incident, Not Reported" category reveals a statistically significant association between reporting status and this factor.

^c Post-hoc (Scheffe) analyses indicate statistically significant differences between this category and the "New Incident, Not Reported" category.

^d Analysis of residuals indicates that the significant association between the variables is attributable to a higher than expected number of cases in this cell.

^e Analysis of residuals indicates that the significant association between the variables is attributable to the lower than expected number of cases in this cell.

Table 8: Logistic Regression of Reporting versus Non-Reporting of New Incidents of Abuse to Criminal Justice System (N=59)

| Variable | B | S.E. | Wald | df. | Rel. Odds |
|--|--------|-------|--------|-----|-----------|
| Victim has no sayrights in criminal justice intervention | 2.531 | .841 | 9.052 | 1 | 12.571*** |
| Victim reported sexual abuse prior to age 18 | 1.884 | .785 | 5.764 | 1 | 6.577 ** |
| Offender had 1 or more controlled substance criminal charges | 3.149 | 1.248 | 6.365 | 1 | 16.314** |
| Number of prior restraining orders taken out on offender | .790 | .402 | 3.859 | 1 | 2.204 ** |
| Number of prior violent-related criminal charges | -.109 | .064 | 2.8981 | | .897 * |
| Constant | -3.620 | 1.320 | 7.5161 | | .027*** |

*** p<.01; ** p<.05; * p<.10

Model $\chi^2 = 28.867$; df = 5; p = .000

Percent of cases correctly classified = 83.1

Improvement in case classification: 44.3%

Nagelkerke $R^2 = .520$