STARS

Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2015

Domestic Violence & No-Drop Policies: Doing More Harm Than Good?

Jolene Vincent
University of Central Florida

Showcase of Text, Archives, Research & Scholarship

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE & NO-DROP POLICIES:

DOING MORE HARM THAN GOOD?

by

JOLENE VINCENT
B.A. University of Central Florida, 2014

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
in the Department of Sociology
in the College of Sciences
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Summer Term
2015

Major Professor: Lin Huff-Corzine

ABSTRACT

Over the past few years, much debate has been centered on domestic violence, also known as intimate partner violence (IPV), and how it should be handled in our society and criminal justice system. In previous years, domestic violence has been seen not only as a private family matter, but a situation in which no outsiders should intrude. In 2014, the Centers for Disease Control stated that intimate partner violence is a public health problem with 27% of women and nearly 12% of men who have had some sort of experience with sexual or physical violence at the hands of an intimate partner, being stalked, or had violence impacting their lives in some way. Over the past 20 years, many policies have been enacted that attempt to not only hold offenders responsible for their actions, but also to help victims obtain the resources they so desperately need. While it may seem simple to say that police should arrest more and judges should give harsher sentences in an attempt to control domestic violence, they do need effective tools to help them achieve these results. In this paper, I analyze the satisfaction victims of intimate partner violence have with no-drop policies. These policies do not allow victims to drop charges against a perpetrator. Using data from the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), findings indicate that male victims are more likely to be satisfied with the no-drop policy than are female victims. Because victims did not want the criminal justice system response to their victimization to go beyond arrest, future research needs to focus on why victims do not support jailing or therapy for offenders.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Domestic violence could be said to be an epidemic, as people of all ages, across all races, ethnicities, and sexes are victimized by the hands of their loved ones each day. The Office for National Statistics disclosed that about 1.2 million women suffered domestic abuse in 2012-2013, with more than 330,000 women sexually assaulted (Griffith, 2014 p. 302). Just in the United States, one out of every four women will experience some form of domestic violence in her lifetime (Tsankov & McShiras, 2014, p. 617). According to Han (2003, p. 160), women are more likely to be killed, raped, and beaten by their current or former male intimate partner than by a stranger. Anywhere between 22% and 35% of emergency room visits by females are due to injuries inflicted on them by their partner (Han, 2003, p. 160). With such astonishing numbers, people are starting to question where the criminal justice system is lacking.

Domestic violence was previously believed to be such a private matter that no one outside the immediate family unit was to know any details about what happened behind closed doors. Policy makers face many challenges when attempting to construct a public policy. Although it may be difficult, it is imperative that policies are enacted to ensure safety and justice for all people, even if the offender is their beloved spouse. But, in the United States, where four women are killed every day by domestic violence, it is not an issue we can take lightly any longer (Mills, 1998, p. 306). According to Durose (2005, p. 2), roughly 60% of family violence victimizations were reported to law enforcement officials between 1998 and 2002. Surprisingly, the rate of females filing reports was not drastically higher than males reporting victimizations.

Most victims reasoned that they did not report their victimization to the police because they viewed the incident as a "private/personal matter" (34% of cases), another reason was that the victim wanted to "protect the offender" (12%) (Durose, 2005, p. 2.) Feminists, scholars, and advocacy groups are in support of a social movement in an attempt to end, or at least reduce, domestic violence. This paper will go into detail to explain domestic violence, our history of fighting for justice, the formulation of the no-drop policy, prior research on the advantages as well as the disadvantages of no-drop policies, a critique of the research, a discussion about the closeness (or lack thereof) of the relationship between research generated and the policy implemented, a proposed methodical way to evaluate the efficiency of the policy, and suggestions for how my research should inform and reform current and future policy. It is important to note that domestic violence can occur in opposite-sex, as well as same-sex relationships and can occur between intimate partners who are married, cohabitating, or dating. Therefore, only a crime that happens between immediate family or a dating couple can be coined domestic violence.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Domestic Violence

Domestic violence is a very difficult crime to prosecute as emotions can often take over the victims as well as the offenders, therefore having a huge impact on the outcome of a case. Perpetrators may promise that their criminal act of assault and battery toward the victim will "never happen again." This reasoning sounds similar to what we explain to police officers every time we get pulled over for speeding, right? As soon as we pull away and the police officer is out of sight, we push that right pedal down hard again. Interestingly enough, it is a very similar thought process for domestic violence perpetrators. No matter how often they promise to never again lay their hands on their loved one, it usually does happen again. A 2013 study in Washington found that 44% of the domestic violence perpetrators were convicted of either a felony or misdemeanor during a 36-month follow-up after a domestic assault had been reported to the police (Drake, 2013 p. 5).

According to the United States Department of Justice (n.p.), domestic violence is defined as "a pattern of abusive behavior in any relationship that is used by one partner to gain or maintain power and control over another intimate partner. Domestic violence can be physical, sexual, emotional, economic, or psychological actions or threats of actions that influence another person." This includes any "incident of threatening behavior, violence, or abuse between adults who are or have been in a relationship together, or between family members, regardless of gender or sexuality" (Heffernen, 2012, p. 699). Domestic violence cannot be accurately measured only through lethality or physical assaults involving an injury. Psychological abuse can be far more damaging and longer

lasting than a physical attack (Davis, 2010, p. 46). The psychological toll that domestic violence can produce, however, often brings many measurement problems because the observer cannot see the results; the emotional scars and bruises.

In addition to measurement issues, domestic violence being considered a Part 2 crime, rather than equivalent to a Part 1 violent act against a stranger is that the consequences and sentencing are automatically reduced. But domestic violence is a crime that must be handled for what it really is: a serious criminal act. It is imperative that the criminal justice system recognizes violence within intimate relationships as serious and holds the offender to the same accountability as if the violence occurred between strangers. Since the punishment for a domestic violence case is more lenient than a dispute between strangers, many groups have worked to change the ways laws are written and enacted.

<u>Battered Woman's Movement</u>

The Battered Woman's Movement (BWM) arose within the larger woman's feminist movement. The United States' second-wave feminist movement focused on woman's oppression within their "private" sphere of the family, blaming it as the root of women's subordination and therefore, in this view, domestic violence was not a private, but instead a public and political matter (Bush, 1992, p. 593). In the 1960s, feminists argued that "personal is political," which led the women's liberation movement to create both the framework and potential strategy for viewing battering as a political issue. In the early 1970s, the BWM defined battering as the outcome of the gendered power structure of intimidate relationships, as opposed to a private issue initiated by husbands engaging in deviant behavior or unresponsive wives. According to Bush (1992, p. 593),

4

ideological views of the BWM were that the criminal justice system failed to protect women, ignored the violence, and denied the power struggles within relationships. During the late 1970s and early 1980s, women as victims of domestic violence developed into a newsworthy social problem, because of the BWM's efforts (Bush, 1992, p. 593). The Battered Woman's Movement was the first step in providing justice to victims of intimate partner violence. More recently the struggles of men, who have been victimized, has been briefly described, but little has been done to improve their situation.

<div align="center">Is Privacy Really Worth it?</div>

The legal system's traditional reasoning behind leaving domestic violence and marital affairs out of the court system was for marital peace and privacy. According to Flannigan (2013, p. 481), the criminal justice system appeared to be shielding abusive partners from the public eye, believing that it was a family issue, which the couple should be left alone to work out their "differences" in private. If any intervention was necessary, counseling was suggested as opposed to prosecution. While the Fourth Amendment protects United States (U.S.) citizen's privacy and initially enforced the concept that "each man's home is his castle" and is secured from unreasonable searches and seizures of property by the government, there has to be a point where safety comes before privacy (Cornell University Law School, 2014). Women were expected to flee from the home to avoid assaults by the man who owns the "castle."

While privacy is important to our citizens and is protected under the Fourth Amendment as a right, we cannot turn a blind eye to victim's suffering for the sake of their marital privacy. Domestic violence cases are seen as private as opposed to public harm in the courts, and prosecutors often refuse to push cases through the courts if the

victim shows any signs of reluctance. In this situation, where the prosecutor does not want to push the case through due to hesitation from the victim or a low chance of a conviction, the victim can try to push the case through the courts themselves, which can be very difficult. According to Robbins 1999 (p. 207), courts tend to send a message "that domestic violence is a private matter between the two of them and that the state does not care to intervene." There is a basic assumption that the court system tends to hold that domestic violence matters do not need court interference. But thankfully, these attitudes are changing, and they are changing at a rapid pace with policies constantly being worked on to help reduce the stigma associated with domestic violence, provide resources to the victim, and to prosecute the offender more harshly, if necessary.

<div align="center">Legal Action</div>

Domestic violence policies and laws have been passed at both the federal and state levels that include services for victims, as well as treatment etc. for perpetrators (Zosky, 2010, p. 359). Serious attention was placed on police reactions in domestic violence cases, as they do have the control over whether the cases enter the criminal justice system initially. According to Buzawa (2009, p. 673), it was the police, through their street-level policies, that would often disfavor efficient intervention. Fortunately, documented improvements in responses by police have been noted due to political pressure, legal liability, public opinion, highly publicized research, and improved police training. Although, the police have made serious improvements in dealing with domestic violence cases and arresting more offenders, the next question is, "What happens next?" Research has shown that simply making an arrest is inadequate to discourage reoffending (Buzawa, 2009, p. 673). Police were now seen as "gatekeepers" for a court process that

would hopefully result in effective intervention. The police began arresting domestic violence offenders, but the prosecutors were noted to give domestic violence cases a lower priority than other cases. Because of this, new statutory revisions to state domestic violence statues started focusing on the inadequacies in the prosecution of domestic violence cases (Buzawa, 2009, p. 673).

A number of laws have recently been enacted to battle domestic violence in the U.S. The laws gave police officers more power to make warrantless arrests and expanded the circumstances for when an arrest can occur (Storm, 2010, p. 430). Some of them include warrantless misdemeanor arrest statutes, anti-stalking legislation, and specialized domestic abuse laws that have helped the criminal justice system in an attempt to get the worst batterers off the streets (Corsilles, 1994, p. 853).

Since the mid-1970s, in New York, more specifically in the Bronx borough, the criminal justice system has received the prosecutor's support in the prosecution of misdemeanor domestic violence cases.   According to Buzawa (2009 p. 671), the victim of domestic violence in the Bronx is pushed to sign a complaint, but if the victim refuses, then the case is dropped. Forcing the victim to make the decision to arrest or not resulted in one in five domestic violence cases being declined prosecution.

Movements are still in the works to not only hold the offender responsible, but also to prevent domestic violence and deaths from domestic disputes. In 1996, federal law enacted the "Gun Ban for Individuals Convicted of a Misdemeanor Crime of Domestic Violence" amendment (Crasso, 2014, p. 3). The ideology behind this amendment was to prohibit gun possession by anybody who has been convicted of domestic violence (Crasso, 2014, p. 3). Despite the development of legal actions to

combat domestic violence, there is still much more improvement needed. According to

Corsilles (1994, p. 854), few cases are formally adjudicated. This can be a result of

police failure to arrest offenders, prosecutors declining to file charges, undercharging if

they do file charges, or recommending dismissal of the charges. The police officer's

perception of domestic violence can affect their response to enforcing the laws

(Eshareturi et al. 2014, p. 377). For example, if some police officers believe that

domestic violence should be kept a private matter, they may not arrest the primary

physical aggressor at the crime scene. But, officers' discretion does become limited

when mandatory arrest and no-drop policies exist.

WHAT IS A NO-DROP POLICY?

With many new policies being put into place to help protect victims of domestic violence and to prosecute offenders, research needs to be conducted on the outcomes of the policy. Previously, the choice to prosecute the offender was up to the preferences of the victim. However, many jurisdictions now prosecute domestic violence offenders in the interest of society; a fact that presumably also considers the victim's safety (Davis et al., 2009, p. 634). No-drop policies do not give prosecutors, or victims, the right to dismiss the charges, but instead require following through with prosecuting the offender and actively involving the victims' cooperation (Nichols, 2014, p. 2117). No-drop policies can have many variations depending on the stage of the prosecution where the policy is applied. Other agencies require that prosecutors file cases without considering the victim's thoughts or even whether they support taking the case to trial (Davis et al., 2009, p. 634).

No-drop prosecutions require the state to prosecute offenders even if the victim does not wish to pursue the case (Kuennen, 2007, p. 40). There are two types of no-drop polices that many jurisdictions may adapt. A "soft" no-drop policy includes prosecuting, but recognizes the risk factor assessment and contextual concerns. The contextual concerns may include hearing the voice of the victim and their wishes, and legal ramifications will not be pressed against victims who are not cooperative. On the other hand, a "hard" no-drop policy orders prosecution and cooperation from the victim without regard to what the victim wants. This "hard" version of the no-drop policy can even go as far as holding victims accountable for non-compliance and they can receive a jail sentence for non-compliance (Nichols, 2014, p. 2117). A consequence of "hard" no

9

drop policies was the increase in prosecutions and convictions of violent offenders. Between 1989 and 1996, in Washington, D.C., the number of domestic violence cases increased from 40 to 4,500 with the enactment of a no-drop policy (Nichols, 2014, p. 2117).

The no-drop policy has been the center of much controversy over the years, as there are many positive aspects as well as negative sides to the policy. A no-drop policy essentially does not offer the domestic violence victim the choice of easily extracting a complaint once formal charges are filed through the courts (Corsilles, 1994, p. 857). With the no-drop prosecution rule, the criminal justice system's initial reaction to the domestic violence case is that they are not only imposing a criminal law, but they are also successfully ending what is seemed to be a dangerous relationship between the victim and their offender. The current legal routine, as well as our social prejudgments, recommends that the best outcome is to terminate the relationship (Kuennen, 2010, p. 516). Prosecutors are limited in their discretion to drop a case exclusively if the victim is being uncooperative. In many areas, prosecutors often drop domestic violence cases by request of the victim, if the victim fails to testify, withdraws, or fails to appear in court (Corsilles, 1994, p. 857). Because of these situations, prosecutors drop about 50% to 80% of domestic violence cases. On the other hand, where no-drop polices have been instituted, early reports reveal case attrition rates ranging from 10% to 34% (Corsilles, 1994, p. 857). With no-drop policies, every domestic violence offender will be prosecuted, even if it is against the victim's wishes; this seemingly harsh, but important policy has many people questioning who is really benefitting from the policy.

<u>The Controversy</u>

Over thirty-five years have passed since battered shelters for women opened their doors in the United States (Sack, 2009, p. 31). In the decades following the shelters first opening their doors, there has been a social movement working toward providing victims with services, reforming domestic violence laws, and making changes about the social issues of such violence. More recently, shelters provide space for male victims as well. There have been drastic efforts to address domestic violence as a serious social issue to the criminal justice system as well as the public. But, like with any social movement, several concerns arise about policy changes and implementations. The no-drop policies have been under debate about whether they actually benefit the victim (Corsilles, 1994, p. 857). The debate centers on the prosecutors' and victims' dissatisfaction to regain control of their cases. Feminist groups and scholars have been debating the morals and restrictions of the no-drop prosecution law for years (Corsilles, 1994, p. 857). The conversation is centered upon two distinct interests: safety and autonomy. People who support the no-drop prosecution believe that like assault and battery between non-domestic partners, it is fair to remove the decision making from the victims, since the policy puts the victim's safety as a priority, as well as the requirement to prosecute and thus deter the offender. On the other hand, people who are against the no-drop rules find that the criminal justice system should not enforce criminal statutes without paying attention to what the victim desires, because it is damages their autonomy (Kuennen, 2010, p. 517).

Some prosecutors dislike the idea that their scarce resources may be used over their limits on cases that are not winnable because of victim nonparticipation (Corsilles, 1994, p. 857). Victim advocates do not like the notion that no-drop policies may further

victimize domestic violence victims and do not give the victim empowerment to make decisions for their case on their own (Corsilles, 1994, p. 857). There is argument that victims of domestic violence have no voice when a no-drop policy is in place. Other people, without the victim's consent or contribution, make the decisions that could have serious repercussions on their lives, especially with mandatory arrest associated with no-drop policies (Chiu, 2009, p. 4). Victims are asked in court to "recount a violent episode" in front of a defense attorney whose primary responsibility is to question not only their reliability, but also question their memory, or even to challenge whether they are speaking truthfully about the incident (Jordan, 2004, p. 1413). The victims are already hurting and are perhaps frightened for their safety so the court proceedings could be viewed as their second victimization, especially given the way the cases are handled in court. On top of the often-mortifying court experience the victim has to go through, they also have to deal with many personal problems. Victims who go to the criminal justice system for protection may have some hesitation about having their partner arrested, especially if they are the main financial provider for the family. Some critics argue that no-drop policies may cause other unnecessary complications that increase risks of retaliation by the perpetrator therefore discouraging victims from reporting domestic violence all together (Corsilles, 1994, p. 857).

<div align="center">Consequences For The Victim</div>

Gauthier (2010, p. 1381) states that victims who drop the charges after filing them may lose credibility with judicial professions, family, and friends, which could damage their reputation and may hurt any future domestic violence cases they may choose to file. The continuation of domestic violence against the victim does have negative

<div align="center">12</div>

consequences for the victims' career as well. Research has shown that domestic violence can impact victims' employment, a common problem for domestic violence victims. Among employed adults from 10% to 21% have their job sabotaged by their offender (Swanber, et al., 2014, p. 2014). The violent perpetrator may show up at the victim's work place, harass them, threaten their safety as well as the safety of those with whom they work, causing the victim to be unproductive, which could cause them to be terminated. From another viewpoint, Gauthier (2010, p. 1380), states that dropping the charges could actually benefit the victim because they do not have to testify in court and they may feel more empowered in their decision for the outcome of their domestic violence case.

Consequences For The Accused

If the filed charges against the offender are dropped, the offender can walk away without a criminal record. Gauthier (2010, p. 1381) finds this a positive effect because it benefits the victim and their family by not impacting a career that the offender may have. But, dropping the charges sends a negative message. The offender may feel s/he won against not only their partner, but also the criminal justice system. This also results in a lot of missing data on recidivism rates, if the charges are dropped.

Consequences For The Criminal Justice System

Dropped domestic violence charges effect more than the victim, offender, their family and friends. It can impact police officers, judges, prosecutors, and defense attorneys. According to Gauthier (2010, p. 1382), defense attorneys were the only group of professionals in the criminal justice system to experience positive outcomes from dropped charges. All other categories of personnel reported negative outcomes including

feeling discouraged, unmotivated, frustrated, and powerless in their positions. They also

felt worried for the victim and their future well-being. On a positive note, dropping the

charges left some professionals content that the victim ultimately got to make their own

decision for themselves (Gauthier, 2010, p. 1385), but there is always the fear that the

victim made the decision to drop only because of assumed retaliation if any other

decision was made.

<div align="center">Consequences For Society</div>

The courts dropping domestic violence charges can also impact society. Gauthier

(2010, p. 1385) wrote that society was worried about what messages the criminal justice

system is sending about domestic violence. People may view domestic violence as a

trivial subject and believe it is not serious enough to fully prosecute offenders. Views

that the criminal justice system does not take adequate steps to deal with domestic

violence cases, perpetrators win and get off easy, victims are left helpless, and that justice

is not served are often found in studies asking about reactions to domestic violence. It is

important to note that many members of society are unaware of what really goes on in

court and how terrifying it can be for a victim to testify in a domestic violence case.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESEARCH & POLICY

The research on the impact of the no-drop policy is very mixed, as the debate over no-drop policies often seems never-ending. The no-drop policy can save lives by prosecuting and holding the offender accountable for his/her actions, but it has also been found to deter victims from calling the police in future incidents. By not allowing victims to exercise their own autonomy, some argue that their rights are being infringed. On the other hand, if a friend physically assaults a person, would we ask if the case should go through the CJ system? No, of course not. There is no no-drop policy except for domestic cases. Yet, the no-drop policy continues to be a subject under much scrutiny. The criminal justice system's main priority is to protect the safety and well-being of citizens, so should victims make decisions for themselves and their personal lives in some cases, but not others? The criminal justice system also has a strong interest in prosecuting violent offenders, getting them off of the streets, and giving them a punitive sentence. The policy does help many victims, even if they are unaware, because by their offender being incarcerated, it could have saved their life. But, if victims fear calling the police in the first place, the policy may be actually hurting domestic violence victims more than protecting them. More research certainly needs to be done on the effects of no-drop policies. Because different jurisdictions have different degrees of the no-drop policy, such as being "hard" or "soft," research examining the influence of each type may prove useful. A "soft" no-drop policy includes prosecuting, but recognizes the risk factor assessment and contextual concerns. The contextual concerns may include hearing the voice of the victim and their wishes, and legal ramifications will not be pressed against offenders if victims are not cooperative. On the other hand, a "hard" no-

drop policy orders prosecution and cooperation from the victim. This "hard" version of the no-drop policy can even go as far as holding victims accountable for non-compliance and they can receive a jail sentence for non-compliance (Nichols, 2014, p. 2117). Therefore, if the victim does have clear problems with taking the case to court, there are still possible ways to get the charges dropped. While the policy may have saved many lives, it is difficult to measure how many cases were not filed due to fear of retaliation. Also, some no-drop policies include incarcerating victims for not cooperating in court.

CRITIQUE OF THE RESEARCH –
METHODOLOGICALLY & THEORETICAL

Many of the articles used to build the literature review for this study consisted of excellent information on domestic violence policy, specifically the no-drop policy. But, while reading through many of them, I noticed some areas that should be updated or reworded to best fit in with new literature and revised laws. Much has changed over the past few years with domestic violence policy and laws, so prior research is quickly outdated. For example, the rape law was just recently changed in January 1st of 2013 to include males as victims (prior to 2013, only females were considered victims). Just like the rape law changed, domestic violence policies are changing rapidly. Therefore, I did find some data that I was reluctant to include in my literature review for fear it was not up-to-date and accurate.

Laws on domestic violence should not take gender into account. Many studies, such as Jordan's (2004) article titled "Intimate Partner Violence And The Justice System: An Examination Of The Interface," referred to the victims of domestic violence as female. Domestic violence affects everybody, and the criminal justice system and society are starting to realize that now. As noted earlier, for example, housing for men in shelters has opened around the country.

One major problem with domestic violence is the stigma experienced by the victim. Not only do victims fear coming forward with their relationship problems, but it is especially difficult for men. There is a social stigma for men, who are not fulfilling the role of the dominant person in the relationship, who are emotional, or who do not inflict power and control over their partner. While domestic violence has been making huge improvements with offering victims help, it is imperative that these studies are using data

17

that analyzes all victims, not just women. Also, men need to become aware that they can certainly be victims. Compared to heterosexual couples, same-sex couples are actually just as likely, if not more likely, to have violence in their relationships, which calls for an increased lobbying and updated policy. It is imperative that we have policies that protect everybody, as anyone can fall a victim to domestic violence.

A problem often found in domestic violence literature is the lack of a serious theoretical argument. Social learning theory, which argues that the cycle of violence continues across generations and can play a large role in why domestic violence occurs (which has been the primary explanation for domestic violence.) But it does not always hold true. Many children who grow up in violent homes do not have violent tendencies. Whether the children raised in violent homes learn that the behavior is wrong, or just choose not to be violent, many of these children are not violent themselves when they grow up. There is also a theory that media, such as video games and movies that display a large amount of violence teach the viewers these behaviors. Hopefully with more research on domestic violence becoming available, a strong, more broadly-based theory will soon develop that can properly explain more domestic violence case scenarios.

When comparing domestic violence policies and practices, it is critical that the researcher keeps in mind that many variables come into play when analyzing domestic violence cases. Relating jurisdictions can be challenging due to the different approaches that law enforcement agencies take, as well as the people living in the jurisdiction. Also, different agencies may have different names for the same or similar policy, while on the other hand, some agencies may share a policy name, but have totally different implementations. As Peterson (2013, p. 474) found, some agencies are using "evidence-

based" prosecution laws may also use a wide range of policies and practices that are

"victim-centered." Therefore, policy researchers need to identify exactly what the law

they are analyzing is examining.

THEORETICAL ARGUMENT

According to Homans (1958, p. 597), social behavior can be seen as an exchange of goods in order to clarify the relations among the four bodies of this theory: behavioral psychology, economics, propositions about the dynamics of influence, and propositions about small groups and structure. Social exchange theory argues that social behaviors result from a practice of exchanges based on maximizing personal benefits and minimizing personal disadvantages (Miller, 2003). Individuals assess the rewards against the costs to decide what social relationship is the most beneficial to engage in or what the best decision is to make. Social exchange theory developed in the 1960s as an approach to social relationships that also considered economic principals. Individuals can assess their own profits and losses with their social situations and relationship and chose the relationship that has the most benefits for them. Looking at the profit side of a relationship, the rewards a person obtains from being in that social relationship may include fun, friendship, or possibly even financial gain. Whichever the benefits may be, the reward is based on the individual's perception; what motivates one person may not be considered beneficial to another. On the other hand, where social benefits are lacking, individuals may seek exchanges in which the perceived costs are low. There are three main categories or types of costs according to social exchange theory: expenditure of energy and emotion, investment of time, money, and other resources, and lost opportunities from potential rewards from other relationships. This concept is similar to a minimum pay wage that a person is willing to receive for doing a particular job; anything below their wage level would not be measured tolerable and the person would most likely decline the job. This same situation goes for social exchanges and

relationships: any interaction that is less rewarding than a person is willing to accept, means the termination of the said relationship. All social interactions involve an expenditure of energy, which is a cost, and only those behaviors that are satisfactorily rewarded or that produce the smallest cost tend to be repeated, therefore creating a pattern of consistency in social relationships. In conclusion, the individuals that offer the greatest advantages hold the most power in their social interactions (Miller, 2003).

According to Arthur & Clark (2009, p. 150), social exchange theory proposes that domestic violence will be higher in societies where its benefits to the offenders are high and/or where the costs to the offenders are low. In some societies, costs of violence are low because of insufficient social controls placed on violence and because of an emphasis on male aggressiveness actually encourages it. If the costs of domestic violence rise in a society, domestic violence will decline in that said society. Nations that enforce laws against domestic violence will have lower levels of domestic violence than other nations who do not have similar laws. Also, nations that have domestic violence laws, but chose to not enforce them, will have higher rates than nations that have them and chose to enforce them (Arthur & Clark, 2009, p. 150-151.)

Using social exchange theory in terms of the no-drop domestic violence policy and the current study, the offender may be less likely to be violent towards the victim if they know they will be arrested and not be able to have the charges filed on them dropped. If the offender is aware that they will be charged in court and could possibly face jail time or be sent to a treatment program for their acts, it may be a major determinant influencing their decision to commit the violence. In brief, the offender may think twice about their actions because they know that their city has tough no-drop laws.

Also, if the victim was dissatisfied with the policy, it may appear as a cost to them, without receiving any benefits of calling the police. The victim may choose to not call the police in future incidents of domestic violence if they know they will not receive desired benefits from the criminal justice system. For example, if the victim's main source of income is the offender, they may choose to cope with the violence because they know they will no longer have an income if they call the police. Also, if the victim had children present at the scene, they may be less likely to call the police because the children witnessing such an activity are a major cost. Other victims might perceive this as a benefit, though, because it is teaching the children that violence is not okay, and that police officers will be there in times of need.

THE CURRENT STUDY

The current study will examine victim's satisfaction with the no-drop policy. The primary research question is "How satisfied are victims with the no-drop policy?" Following that, the secondary question will examine why these victims may have been satisfied or dissatisfied with the no-drop policy. More specifically, my second, third, and fourth models will test if the victims were satisfied because their offender was arrested, jailed, or put in a treatment program, by order of the court. It is important to recognize not only if victims are satisfied with the policy, but also why. Implications for future policy changes can be made based on these findings.

HYPOTHESES

Domestic violence needs serious attention. Among the 2.1 million occurrences of family violence that were reported to law enforcement between the years of 1998 and 2002, only 36% of the cases resulted in an arrest (Durose, 2005, p. 2). With these astonishing numbers, research on satisfaction with the current domestic violence policies is necessary.

Based on the literature and theory review it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 1: The more dissatisfied the victim was with the no-drop policy, the less likely they are to call the police next time a domestic incident occurs.

Null Hypothesis: There is no relationship between satisfaction with the no-drop policy and the likelihood of calling the police in future domestic violence cases.

Hypothesis 2: If the victim had children under the age of 16, the victim did not want the defendant arrested.

Null Hypothesis: There is no relationship between if the victim had children under the age of 16 and if they wanted their defendant arrested.

Hypothesis 3: If the victim's main source of income is from the defendant, the victim did not want the court to put the defendant in jail.

Null Hypothesis: There is no relationship between income source and if the victim wanted the defendant to be jailed.

Hypothesis 4: If the victim wanted the courts to put the defendant in a treatment program, they would be more satisfied with the no-drop policy.

Null Hypothesis: There is no relationship between satisfaction with the no-drop policy and if the victim wanted the defendant in a treatment program.

DATA & METHODS

To conduct an accurate study of the effectiveness of the no-drop policy, I used

secondary data from the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research

(ICPSR) (available at: https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/studies/3319).

Fortunately, court records are public records, so I was be able to obtain information on

domestic violence cases, especially the victim, who is my primary focus. The data set

was originally assembled for a study titled "'Evaluation of No-Drop Policies for

Domestic Violence Cases in San Diego, California, Omaha, Nebraska, Klamath Falls,

Oregon, and Everett, Washington, 1996-2000' (ICPSR 3319)" by Smith, Davis, Nickles,

and Davies (2002). The study was designed to observe the impacts of the no-drop

policies on the victim's satisfaction of court outcomes, the victim's satisfaction with the

criminal justice system, and the victim's feelings of safety. The researchers sought to

determine if

> (1) prosecution without the victim's cooperation was feasible with appropriate
> increases in resources,
> (2) implementing a no-drop policy resulted in increased convictions and fewer
> dismissals,
> (3) the number of trials would increase in jurisdictions where no-drop was
> adopted as a result of the prosecutor's demand for a plea in cases in which victims
> were uncooperative or unavailable, and
> (4) prosecutors would have to downgrade sentence demands to persuade defense
> attorneys to negotiate pleas in the new context of a no-drop policy
> (Smith, Davis, Nickles, & Davies, 2002, n.p.).

The part of the dataset that I used for my study was gathered by telephone

interviews in the four sites that had domestic violence victims whose cases were resolved

with the no-drop policy, Part 6 of the data set. Variables for Part 6 that I used in this

study included:

- The relationship between victim and defendant

- Whether the victim wanted the offender arrested

- If the victim spoke and was cooperative with personnel in the court system, such as the prosecutor, detective, victim advocate, defense attorney, judge, or a probation officer

Demographic information such as race, income, and level of education were collected on the victim as well (Smith, Davis, Nickles, & Davies, 2002).

POPULATION & SAMPLE

The researchers pinpointed locations where the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) granted funds for the no-drop prosecution under the Violence Against Women Office (VAWO) grant program to support arrest policies. The researchers chose Everett, Washington, Klamath Fall, Oregon, and Omaha, Nebraska, due to their strong no-drop policies and added San Diego, California to observe the impact of two state laws favorable to prosecutors (Smith, Davis, Nickles, & Davies, 2002). These cities developed statutes that were intended to make the process of admitting evidence and thus increasing the prosecutor's chances of succeeding in trials without cooperation from the victim a smoother process. The policies implemented in these locations have characteristics of "hard" no-drop policies. Researchers gathered official records from a sample of domestic violence cases that occurred through the years of 1996 to 2000 (Smith, Davis, Nickles, & Davies, 2002).

VARIABLES & MEASUREMENTS

Dependent Variable: Likeliness Of Calling Police In Future Incidents of Domestic Violence

The dependent variable for the first part of this study is the likelihood that a domestic violence victim will call the police again in a future domestic violence scenario. I am able to study this because participants were asked on a phone interview for Part 6 of the research about their likelihood of calling the police in future domestic violence cases (Smith, Davis, Nickles, & Davies, 2002). The variable was labeled as "FUTURE" in SPSS with the values of 1=Would call the police, 2=Might call the police, 3=Would not call the police, 9=Don't know, and 99=Missing. This variable was recoded with a new label of "FUTURERC" with the new values of 0=would call the police and 1=Would not call the police to test with binary logistic regression. I recoded the variable to have the cases in which victims were unsure if they would call the police again with the "Would not call the police" group, assuming that the majority of times if they were unsure if they would call the police during the interview, they would choose not to make a call. The "Missing" values were excluded from the analyses.

The secondary part of this study focused on why the victim may have been satisfied or dissatisfied with the no-drop policy. For my second model, my dependent variable was if the victim wanted the offender arrested. The original variable was labeled "ARRESTYN" with values of 1=Yes, 2=No, 8=N/a, 9=Don't know, and 99=Blank. This variable was recoded and labeled as "ARRESTYNRC" with the values of 0=Yes and 1=No, I excluded the "N/A" and "Blank" as system missing and included the "Don't Know" with no, assuming that if they did not know if they wanted the offender arrested, they most likely did not want them arrested.

The third model examined if the victim wanted the offender jailed as the dependent variable. The original variable was labeled as "CORTJAIL" with values of 1=yes, 2= no, 8=N/A, 9=DK, and 99=blank. I recoded this variable and labeled it "CORTJAILRC" with the new values of 0=Yes and 1=No. I excluded "N/A" and "Blank" from the analyses. I put the respondents who answered "Don't know" with the "No", assuming that if they did not know if they wanted the offender jailed, they most likely did not want them jailed.

Finally, the fourth model's dependent variable was if the victim wanted the offender in a treatment program. This variable was originally named "CORTREAT" with the values of 1=Yes, 2=No, 8=N/A, 9=DK, and 99=blank. I recoded this variable with the new label as "CORTTREATRC" and values of 0=Yes, and 1=No. I excluded "N/A" and "Blank" from the analyses and put "DK" with no, assuming that if the victim did not know if they wanted the offender in a treatment program, they probably would chose to not have the court place them in one.

<u>Independent Variables: Satisfaction With The No-Drop Policy</u>

The independent variable of primary interest used in this study is satisfaction with the no-drop policy. Victim participants were asked if they were satisfied with the outcome of their case. This variable was originally labeled as "OUTCOME" with the values of 1=Satisfied, 2=In-between satisfied and dissatisfied, 3=Dissatisfied, 8=N/A, 10=No Opinion, and 99=Missing. I recoded this variable with the values of 0=Satisfied and 1=Dissatisfied. I also changed the name of the variable to "Satisfaction." I recoded in-between opinions as dissatisfied assuming that if they had any doubts about being satisfied, they were not really satisfied. I also excluded "no opinion" and "missing" as system missing and excluded these cases from analysis.

After I analyzed if victims were satisfied with the no-drop policy, I then looked at why they may have felt satisfied or dissatisfied. To understand why the victim had these feelings is also equally important. In my second hypothesis, the dependent variable was if the victim wanted the offender arrested. The third hypothesis tested if the victim wanted the offender jailed. And finally, the fourth hypothesis consisted of if the victim wanted the offender in a treatment program. These dependent variables were tested with the same independent variables as the first model discussed above, which include victim's race, income, education, sex, presence of children, age, and satisfaction with the no-drop policy.

Control Variables

To decrease the possibility of other variables influencing the results of my study, demographic questions were included in the analysis to collect basic information on the participants. Prior research has suggested that many socio-demographics can influence other variables associated with domestic violence. People born in different generations may have different mindsets or attitudes toward domestic violence. Also, some races are more likely to believe that a man should hold the power in the relationship and the woman has to be submissive to the man and obey his commands. Therefore, it is imperative to collect demographic information about each participant regarding the cultural and ethnic background they come from, as it can play a huge role in their experience with the criminal justice system. Like ethnicity, education level can also have an impact on the victim's ideologies about domestic violence and the court outcomes.

Asking about race, education, sex, age, and number of children present at the time of the incident allowed me to explore possible correlations among these variables, domestic violence, and the no-drop policy. I chose to include basic demographic factors in my study to see if a relationship existed among them, domestic violence, and the no-drop policy.

The control variables I chose to use were the number of children the victim has under the age of 16 years, the victim's race, education, age, sex, and source of income. The number of children the victim had under the age of 16 was originally labeled as "CHILDREN" with the values of 0=0 children, 1=1 child, 2= 2 children, 3=3 children, 4=4 children, 5=5 children, 6=6 children, 7=7 children, 8=8 children, and 99= missing. The main purpose of the question was to see if having any children influenced the

victim's satisfaction with the no-drop policy, therefore, I recoded this variable into 0=No children and 1=1 or more children. Race was originally coded as 1=Caucasian, 2=African-American, 3=Hispanic, 4=Other, and 99=Refused to answer. I recoded race into 0=White, and 1=Non-White, because the majority of victims were Caucasian (62.35%), followed by African Americans at 19.41% and Hispanics at only 8.82%, Other and Refused to answer totaled at 9.41%, which were excluded from the analysis. It would also be interesting to see distinctions among Whites vs. minority populations. Age was measured by asking age in years. Some victims were as young as 15, and old as 72. There were 4 missing cases and 4 victims under the age of 18, making up 4.8% that I excluded from the analysis. I also recoded this variable so that age could be analyzed in groups: 1=18-21 years old, 2=22-29, 3=30-39, 4=40-49, 5=50-59, 6=60-69, and 7=70-79. Age was grouped into categories to be able to test for differences in cohorts. Source of the victim's income was measured by 1=Full-time employment, 2=Part-time employment, 3=Government assistance (welfare), 4=Unemployed Insurance, 5=Defendant's income, 6=Someone else's income, 7=Financial aid/school loans, 8=Disabled, 9=Social Security, 10=No income, 11=Welfare, Social Security, child support, 12= Child support, 13=Financial Aid/welfare, 99=Missing.   I recoded the source of the victim's income into 0=Defendant's income, and 1=Some other form of income, to see if the victim's main source of income was the defendant had any impact on the victim's satisfaction with the no-drop policy. I excluded the missing cases from the analyses. Education was measured by highest grade of school completed with values of 7=7th Grade, 8=8th Grade, 9=9th Grade, 10=10th Grade, 11=11th Grade, 12=12th Grade, 13=GED, 14=Trade School, 15=Some College, 16= College Degree, 17=Master's

Degree, and 99=Blank. I recoded this variable into 0=High School Diploma or less, and 1=At least some college, which also included trade school. Age was measured by the age of the victim at time of arraignment. The range was from 15 to 72 years old, with 4 missing cases. There were 4 victims under the age of 18, comprising 2.4% of the total victims. I excluded the 15, 16, and 17 year olds and the missing cases as system missing to be excluded from the analyses. I then recoded the victim's age into categories as follows: 1=18-21, 2=22-29, 3=30-39, 4=40-49, 5=50-59, 6=60-69, and 7=70-79 years old.   Sex of the victim was coded as 0=Male and 1=Female. See Table 1 below for coding information. The last control variable I included in my analysis was Satisfaction, which was originally labeled as "OUTCOME" and coded as 1=Satisfied, 2=In-between satisfied and dissatisfied, 3=Dissatisfied, 8=N/A, 10=No Opinion and 99=Blank. I recoded this variable and labeled it as Satisfaction with the values of 0=Satisfied and 1=Dissatisfied. I excluded "N/A", "No opinion", and "Blank" as system missing and paired in-between attitudes with dissatisfied, because if they were not completely satisfied, they should be grouped with the dissatisfied variables.

Table 1: Coding Information

How the variables are coded in SPSS.

Variable Name	Variable Label	Values	
FUTURERC	Would V call police if D did same in future	0=Would Call Police	1= Would not call the police*
ARRESTYNRC	Did V want D arrested	0=Yes	1=No*
CORTJAILRC	Did V want court to put D in jail	0=Yes	1=No*
RACERC	V's Race	0=White	1=Non-White
INCOMERC	What is V's main source of income	0=Defendant's Income	1=Some other form of income
SCHOOLRC	Highest grade V completed	0=High School Diploma or Less	1= At least some college (including trade school)
VSEXRC	Victim's sex	0=Male	1=Female
CHILDRENRC	# of children under age 16 V has	0=No Children	1=At least one child
CORTTREATRC	V wanted court to put D in treatment program	0=Yes	1=No
OUTCOMERC (seen as "Satisfaction" in models)	V satisfied with the outcome of the case	0=Satisfied	1=Dissatisfied*
VAGERC	V's age at arraignment	1=18-21 2=22-29 3=30-39 4=40-49 5=50-59 6=60-69 7=70-79	
* signifies cases in which victim answered "Don't Know" to the given question. I grouped the cases in which the victim "did not know" with "no", assuming that the majority of times if they were unsure they would chose no.			

ANALYTIC STRATEGY

I used binary logistic regression to examine the influence of the independent variables on the dependent variables using Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) because the dependent variables were comprised of two categories. I ran four separate models. The first model explores if the victim would call 911 in the future as my dependent variable and race, income, education, sex, children, and satisfaction with court outcome as the independent variables. The second model[1] contains if the victim wanted the offender arrested as the dependent variable with race, income, education, sex, and number of children the victim had as the independent variables. The third model[1] contains the same independent variables, but with whether the victim wanted the offender jailed as the dependent variable. The fourth model looked at if the victim wanted the courts to put the offender in a treatment program with the same independent variables used in the previous models. I looked at the step-chi and model chi-square, which measure the goodness of the fit between observed values and those expected theoretically, degrees of freedom, and the Nagelkerke R-Square, which measures the model fit and how good the models are at predicting the outcome. Then, the effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable was examined. The usual probability level used is .05 meaning that the finding (or relationship between the independent and dependent variable) could be expected in 95 out of 100 analyses. Because this work is exploratory and some of the significance levels were very close to the .05 level, I report a .10 probability or greater as significant to show when the probability is at or above 90 out of 100. I began analyzing the data by exploring the descriptive statistics to get a better idea about the description of each variable and the

accuracy of the data. Because multicollinearity can be an issue among the predictor

variables that influences the results, I explored the data for any problems that may arise.

Fisher and Mason (1981) use a variety of different approached for finding efficient

estimates in multicollinearity. By following Fisher and Mason's (1981) advice, choosing

the lowest value of k (the bias term) that reduced all variance inflation factors below the

value of 4.0. Therefore, I analyzed the VIFs[2] for all independent variables used in the

models to ensure that there were not any significant multicollinearity issues. My research

on the domestic violence no-drop policy is important because it brings together multiple

factors that should be considered with new legislation and can indicate which groups may

favor the policy and which groups do not. This research will help assess what victims

want and need from our criminal justice system.

---

[1]When looking over the results, I decided to run the models with the dependent variables
of "victim wanted offender arrested" and "victim wanted offender jailed" as independent
variables to see how if the victim wanted the offender to go to jail and if the victim
wanted the offender arrested would influence the overall satisfaction of the policy. When
I ran these dependent variables as independent together, the model showed no
significance. But, when I ran if the victim wanted the offender arrested, the model
showed significance. Following that model, I ran if the victim wanted the offender jailed
without the influence of if the victim wanted the offender arrested, the model was not
significant either. I concluded that while the victim may have wanted their offender
arrested, they most likely did not want them jailed.

[2]VIFs: Race =1.047–1.065, Income = 1.022–1.030, Education = 1.048–1.127,
Sex = 1.180–1.206, Children = 1.134–1.055, Age = 1.055–1.196,
Satisfaction = 1.102–1.151.

FINDINGS

The first part of the explanatory section of the current study examines victim satisfaction with the no-drop policy. It is important to analyze how people feel about the policy that governs them. The no-drop policy was formulated to protect domestic violence victims and contends that safety is the criminal justice system's priority, just as much as prosecuting violent offenders. While the policy may help protect and save many victims' lives, it is important that the policy is not deterring victims from calling the police in the first place. The data compiled from the ICPSR and my data analyses can inform policy makers about the effectiveness and victim satisfaction with the no-drop policy, as well as identify any future implications that could be used to improve the policy.

For hypothesis one, I predicted that the more the victim was dissatisfied with the outcome of their case, the less likely they would be to call the police in the future if another domestic violence incident occurred. The variable, labeled "Satisfaction" in Table 3, had a significance of .433, which was not significant at the .10 probability level or above. I found that education and sex were the only significant variables with education having a significance level of .094, which was marginally significant at the .10 probability level. Although education is marginally significant at the .10 probability level, for every .780 unit increase in education they are less likely to call the police in the future if another domestic violence incident occurs. Therefore, the more likely someone has some college or more, the more likely they would not call the police in the future. The only variable that was significant at the .05 probability level was sex, which was significant and negative; sex was found to have a significance level of .049 of the .05

probability level. Men are more likely to not call 911 in the future. I predicted that if they were satisfied with the outcome of the case, they would call the police in future incidents, which was not significant. I reject my hypothesis. The step chi-square and model chi-square had the same values, explaining 15.035% of the variance in the model with a significance level of .036 probability level, meaning that this model is significant.

The second hypothesis predicted that if the victim had children under the age of 16 years, they would not want the defendant arrested. The number of children the victim had was not significant. On the other hand, other variables were significant when analyzing whether victims wanted the offender arrested. Race had a marginally significant negative relationship (or influence on) the likelihood of wanting the offender arrested at .075 of a .10 probability level, indicating that the more likely the victim was white, the more likely they do not want the defendant to be arrested. Income had a negative and significant relationship at the .033 probability level; therefore, if the victim's main source of income was the defendant, they did not want them to be arrested. Education had a positive significance at .043 probability level; the higher the victim's education, the more likely they wanted the defendant arrested. Each unit increase, e.g. each additional year of education increased the chance that they wanted the defendant arrested by 85.9%. Compared to Model 1, sex remained negative and significant at a .047 probability level, indicating that males are more likely to not want the offender arrested. Therefore, I fail to reject my hypothesis that if the victim had children under the age of 16, they would not want the defendant arrested. The step chi-square and model chi-square had the same value, explaining 22.317% of the variance in the model with a significance of .002 probability level, making this finding significant.

If the victim's main source of income was from the defendant, then the victim did not want them to go to jail, as the third hypothesis states. The variable, labeled "Income" in Table 4 shows no significant (.569) influence on whether the victim wanted the offender jailed. None of the variables that I used in this model reached significance, thus I reject my hypothesis concerning the victim's source of income and if they wanted the defendant to be jailed. The step and model chi-square explained 8.307% of variance with a significance of .343, that is, the model was not significant.

The fourth hypothesis states if the victim wanted the court to put the defendant in a treatment program, they would be more satisfied with the no-drop policy. Satisfaction with the no-drop policy is seen in Table 3 as "Satisfaction" with a significance level of .315, which does not reach significance. Although the victim's desire for offender treatment was not significant, the number of children the victim had under the age of 16 was positive and marginally significant at the .064 level. Therefore, the more likely the victim had children under 16, the more they did not want the defendant in a treatment program. The step and model chi-squares both were 8.945 and had a significance level of .257, leaving this finding not significant. Therefore, I reject my hypothesis that if the victim wanted the court to put the defendant in a treatment program, they would be more satisfied with the no-drop policy.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

Statistics for variables included in the analyses N= 170.

Variable Name	Variable Label	Frequency	Mean	Std. Deviation
FUTURERC	Would V call police if D did same in future	0=133 1=35 M=2	.2083	.40733
ARRESTYNRC	Did V want D arrested	0=127 1=41 M=2	.2440	.42081
CORTJAILRC	Did V want court to put D in jail	0=127 1=41 M=2	.4508	.49963
RACERC	V's Race	0=106 1=60 M=4	.3614	.48187
INCOMERC	What is V's main source of income	0=7 1=161 M=2	.9583	.20042
SCHOOLRC	Highest grade V completed	0=105 1=63 M=2	.3750	.48557
VSEXRC	Victim's sex	0=28 1=142 M=0	.8353	.37201
CHILDRENRC	# of children under age 16 V has	0=58 1=111 M=1	.6568	.47619
CORTTREATRC	V wanted court to put D in treatment program	0=95 1=26 M=49	.2149	.41244
OUTCOMERC ("Satisfaction")	V satisfied with the outcome of the case	0=92 1=65 M=13	.4140	.49413
VAGERC	V's age at arraignment	1=22 2=39 3=48 4=42 5=8 6=2 7=1 M=8	2.9074	1.20457 M= Missing Cases

Table 3: Binary Logistic Regression Models 1 & 2

Hypothesis 1 & 2

Independent Variables	Model 1: Call in Future			Model 2: Victim Wanted Offender Arrested		
	ß	SE	b	ß	SE	b
Race	.177	.488	1.194	-.820	.461	.441*
Income	-1.542	.959	.214	-2.201	1.035	.111**
Education	.780	.466	2.182*	.859	.424	2.360**
Sex	-1.122	.569	.326**	-1.076	.541	.341**
Children	-.682	.510	.506	-.178	.458	.837
Age	-.084	.207	.920	.223	.188	1.250
Satisfaction	.378	.482	1.459	.347	.438	1.415
VIF	<4			<4		
N	148			148		
Missing Cases	22			22		
Step Chi-Square	15.035**			22.317**		
Model Chi-Square	15.035**			22.317**		
Degrees of Freedom	7			7		
Nagelkerke R-Square	.160			.209		

[a] *p<0.1, **p<0.05, ***p<0.01

Table 4: Binary Logistic Regression Models 3 & 4

Hypothesis 3 & 4

Independent Variables	Model 3: Victim Wanted Offender Jailed			Model 4: Victim Wanted Offender in Treatment Program		
	ß	SE	b	ß	SE	b
Race	.593	.422	1.809	-.254	.522	.776
Income	-.593	1.042	.553	20.177	20004.078	579073682
Education	.370	.431	1.448	-2.86	.582	.751
Sex	-.492	.721	.611	.666	1.170	1.946
Children	-.363	.456	.695	1.267	.685	3.551*
Age	.202	.192	1.224	-.141	.235	.868
Satisfaction	.470	.428	1.600	.540	.537	1.715
VIF	<4			<4		
N	170			110		
Missing Cases	59			60		
Step Chi-Square	8.307			8.945		
Model Chi-Square	8.307			8.945		
Degrees of Freedom	7			7		
Nagelkerke R-Square	.097			.123		

[a] *p<0.1, **p<0.05, ***p<0.01

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

After analyzing the four different models, many conclusions can be made. The first model tested how likely the victim was to call the police if there are future domestic violence incidents. Although this association could not be made based off of my analyses, education was a significant predictor. The more educated the victim was, the more likely they would not call the police in the future domestic violence scenarios. Therefore, as education increased, victims are less likely to call the police in future. Education was measured by highest grade of school completed. Victims who were educated may have also known about the no-drop policy and they knew from the beginning what would happen when they called the police. Therefore, if more people were aware of the policy and what it involved, there may actually be less people calling the police in a domestic scenario. Awareness is a huge factor, especially with new policies. It is important that these policies are put into the public's eyes so they know what will happen in domestic violence cases in their city. Also, more educated people generally understand domestic violence or have been at least exposed to information about it. They are also, I expect, to be more likely to use internet or other informational sources to learn about domestic violence and possible ways to handle it, which may have given them an advantage about the policy.

The second part of my study analyzed why victims may have been satisfied or dissatisfied with the outcome of the case. My three models that tested this analyzed if the victim wanted their defendant arrested (model 2), jailed (model 3), or put into a treatment program (model 4). The researchers asked the victim if they wanted the court to put the defendant in a treatment program (the variable I used), but they also asked what specific

treatment program they would like the defendant to put it into. The options the dataset included are: regular treatment program, alcohol/drugs, anger management, domestic violence, parenting, family counseling, individual, prostitution, and an "other" treatment program (where victim did not know what type they wanted the defendant in). I analyzed each treatment program option with each of the control variables to see if there was any association between satisfaction and the type of treatment program the victim wanted the defendant in. Surprisingly, after running multiple models of logistic regression, nothing was significant. It appeared as though the victims were unsure of not only which treatment program they wanted their defendant in, but also what they wanted to happen to the defendant. No-drop policies make that decision for the victim; they have to go through with the charges and they will not be dropped. The victim may be dissatisfied, but based off of this dataset, it seems as though they are unsure of what they would want to happen beyond arrest. This could be why many victims will drop charges, yet call law enforcement when the same thing happens again.

Thinking back to a presentation at the 2015 Homicide Research Working Group meeting, Jessie Holton and Dr. Adam Pritchard gave a presentation titled "Can Comprehensive Domestic Violence Strangulation Prevention and Response Efforts Prevent Homicide?" Their study found that strangulation for a certain short people of time could cause brain injuries. They discussed the case where Ebony Wilkerson drove her van with her three children into the ocean off of Daytona Beach. Many people who hear about this case make assumptions that Ebony was a horrible mother and should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. What people most likely did not know was that Ebony was actually fleeing her abusive relationship in North Carolina. Her abusive

45

partner often strangled her to the point where she suffered brain injuries, yet showed no physical signs such as bruising, red marks, petechial of the eyes and/or skin, etc. This is a important finding because the victims may suffer from brain damage that is often classified as a mental illness, yet there are no physical signs of injury. This finding is important, especially in instances where brain damage has occurred, yet there are no physical signs. Therefore, if these victims have been strangled and suffer from brain injuries, it could be a reason why they are undecided about many aspects of their case, such as what type of treatment they want the defendant to go though. No-drop policies in this scenario may benefit the victim, as they may be suffering from a mental illness and not be able to comprehend the severity of the abuse.

Another possible explanation of the victim not knowing what they wanted could be that the offender has been extremely controlling so that the victim has not had the opportunity to make decisions for so long that they cannot do so in this type of situation. Then, when a domestic incident occurs, they may have trouble making important decisions for themselves. The victim has already faced many traumatic experiences and it could be difficult for them to make decisions when in that state of mind. The no-drop policy would alleviate the victim from having the option to drop the charges against their offender.

Financial abuse is an aspect of domestic violence that is often forgotten. Financial abuse leaves no bruises, scars, broken bones, yet the toll it takes on its victims is enormous. My second model looked at if the victim wanted their offender arrested with the prediction that if the victim had children under the age of 16, they would not want them arrested. The biggest predictor of the victim wanting their offender arrested

46

was source of income, not children. The more likely the victim's main source of income was the defendant, the more they did not want them arrested, at a -2.201 unit decrease. This finding suggests that the victim's source of income can play a huge role in if they want the defendant arrested. Programs and resources specifically for domestic violence victims who have also been a victim of financial abuse should be created. Many times a victim will choose to stay in a violent relationship because they are stuck; they do not have their own income, job, assets, or anywhere else to go and they can not make decisions. These victims are trapped in a situation that is extremely hard to get out of and these victims need the most help. Referring back to my original hypothesis, my prediction was not only wrong, but the complete opposite is true. According to my findings, the fewer children the victim had, the more likely the victim wanted the offender arrested. Although the victim may not want what could have been a father figure to be locked up, they could also want to set a good example for their children; violence is not the answer and could lead to serious legal trouble. I would expect that when compared to females, the males would have a lower influence of income and children, and this is what I found in my analyses. On the other hand, the victims may have been concerned and did not want treatment for the offender if they had children, but otherwise the number of children made no difference. My fourth model, about whether the victim wanted the courts to put the defendant in jail also had children as a significant variable. If the victim had children under the age of 16, they were more likely to not want the defendant in a treatment program. Thus, based on my research and findings, children can be a significant predictor in how the victim wanted their case handled. Children could influence the victim's responses and satisfaction levels of the no-drop

policy because the victim may not want the offender to go to a treatment program, as I found in my analyses. This could be because of the fear of possible retaliation by the defendant for being forced to go to a treatment program by the victim. On the other hand, the victim could want to keep the family together, making the victim less likely to want the offender to go to jail. The influence of having children may be related to women's rather than men's experiences.

Based on my analyses, I found that males were more likely to not call the police if they were ever in another domestic violence situation. Men's lives are influenced by different variables than women's. So, when men were shown to be influenced more than women by the no-drop policy, the explanations may switch. Men would be less likely, I hypothesize, to be influenced by the number of children, source of income, etc. This study based the hypotheses on women's experience, not men's. The specific gender differences need to be analyzed so that the needs of victims are more appreciate and services could be provided to help them. This could have been due to their experiences as victims of domestic violence. Men will generally have a different experience with domestic violence and that could have strongly influenced the findings of this study.

STRENGTHS & LIMITATIONS

When dealing with such a sensitive topic as domestic violence, there tends to be many limitations. While some of the data came from court records, the survey questions will be based on the victims' self-reporting. Therefore, the quality of the data I analyzed is dependent upon the honesty and accuracy of the participant. I foresee many people not being able to fully recall information about their case. There is a probability that participants may be holding back parts of their answers because domestic violence is a personal issue that is often an emotionally draining experience and that victims may find embarrassing. Having the participants look back at their traumatizing experience can make people reluctant to answer the questions or not tell all the truthful details of their situation. Participants may also forget some of their occurrences with the domestic violence situation and their interactions with the criminal justice system. The dataset I used only gathered information from victims from four cities, making it difficult to generalize these findings to the whole United States. In addition, the data are at least 15 years old, which can be a problem when studying an areas that is changing quickly. Other limitations come from the data set. There were no questions asked about how long ago their case was from the time of the survey and how long the relationship has been between the victim and offender, which are important details with the accuracy of the data. Another limitation was the victim's information on race; the only given categories were 1= Caucasian, 2- African American, 3=Hispanic, 4= Other, 9=Refused to Answer, 99= Blank. No data was given on what may have complied the "other category" which is a major limitation, as Asian populations tend to have lower DV rates, while Native Americans tend to have very high DV rates. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, I

looked at White vs. Non-White to see if minorities had any differences in satisfaction of the no-drop policy than Whites. Another limitation was with the age of victim variable. In the codebook, it states the data on the victim's age was recoded by asking how old the victim was at the arraignment, but in the SPSS dataset, it states that the victim's age was measured by how old they were at the interview. This conflict can cause measurement and data issues. Since some of these cases were from the 1990s, the age of the victim at their arraignment would most likely be much different than their age at the interview. For this study, I refer to the victim's age as their age at the time of arraignment.

Strengths of this data set and study are numerous. Finding domestic violence data is often difficult due to privacy laws. The no-drop policy is also somewhat recent, therefore finding up to date data can be challenging. This data set serves as a great start to analyze whether the no-drop policy helps victims like it was designed to do.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research on domestic violence is imperative because it is a subject that impacts so many people. Over the past years, there has been a great deal of change associated with being a domestic violence victim or offender, policies, and the criminal justice system concerning domestic violence. It is vital for the safety and well-being of the citizens in our society to feel protected under the current laws. For this to occur, research must be continually rendered to help fight this social epidemic again domestic violence. This study, among many others, needs to be repeated to be able to guarantee all citizens their safety, as well as satisfaction with the criminal justice system. The data set I used is very informative with many important questions asked for the victim concerning the no-drop domestic violence policy, which was at the center of my research. While examining this dataset, I realized a lot more questions still need to be answered. There were no data about the length of the relationship between the victim and defendant, which is an important aspect to study when examining domestic violence. Also, there were no data on the time lapse in between the domestic violence incident and when the interview took place. This causes some measurement and accuracy issues as time may change a person's outlook, or the victim may have forgotten some aspects of the case. These data provide a great start to analyze the benefits and consequences of the no-drop policy, but more research definitely needs to be conducted on this to help protect victims of domestic violence.

REFERENCES

Arthur, C., & Clark, R. (2009). DETERMINANTS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE: A Cross-National Study. *International Journal Of Sociology Of The Family*, *35*(2), 147.

Bush, D. (1992). Women's Movement and State Policy Reform Aimed at Domestic Violence Against Women: A Comparison Of The Consequences Of Movement Mobilization In The U.S. And India. *Gender & Society, 6,* 587-608.

Buzawa, E., & Buzawa, A. (2009). Courting Domestic Violence Victims: A Tale Of Two Cities. *Criminology & Public Policy, 7(4),* 671-685.

Center for Disease Control and Prevention (2014). *Prevent Domestic Violence in Your Community.* Retrieved November10th, 2014, from http://www.cdc.gov/Features/IntimatePartnerViolence/

Chiu, E. (2001). Confronting the Agency in Battered Mothers. *Southern California Law Review*, *74*(5), 1223-1273.

Cornell University Law School (2014). *Fourth Amendment.* Retrieved on November 30th, 2014 from http://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/fourth_amendment

Corsilles, A. (1994). No-Drop Policies in the Prosecution of Domestic Violence Cases: Guarantee to Action or Dangerous Solution?. *Fordham Law Review*, *63(3),* 853-881.

Crasso, Y. (2014). My Sister's Keeper: Working to Reduce Domestic Violence and Gun Violence. *Women's Health Activist*, *39*(2), 1-5.

Davis, R. L. (2010). Domestic Violence-related Deaths. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research, 2(2),* 44-52.

Davis, R.C., O'Sullivan, C.S., Farole, Jr., D.J., Rempel, M. (2008). A Comparison of Two Prosecution Policies in Cases of Intimate Partner Violence: Mandatory Case Filing Versus Following the Victim's Lead. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 7(4), 633-662.

Drake, E. (2013). Recidivism Trends of Domestic Violence Offenders in Washington State. *Washington State Institute for Public Policy*.

Durose, M. R. (2005). *Family violence statistics. [electronic resource] : including statistics on strangers and acquaintances*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, [2005].

Eshareturi, C., Lyle, C., & Morgan, A. (2014). Policy Responses to Honor Based Violence: A Cultural or National Problem? *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma,* 23(4), 369-382.

Fisher, J.C. and Mason, R.L. (1981). The analysis of multicollinear data in criminology. *Methods in Quantitative Criminology,* edited by James Alan Fox. Academic, 99-125.

Flannigan, K.R. (2013). The Importance of Prosecution Policies in Domestic Violence Cases. *Criminology & Public Policy, 12(3),* 481-490.

Gauthier, S. (2010). The Perceptions of Judicial and Psychosocial Interveners of the Consequences of Dropped Charges in Domestic Violence Cases. *Violence Against Women*, *16*(12), 1375-1395.

Griffith, R. (2014). Government Implementation of Domestic Violence Protection Measures Nationwide. *British Journal Of Community Nursing*, *19(6),* 302-306.

Han, E. (2003). Mandatory Arrest and No-Drop Policies: Victim Empowerment in Domestic Violence Cases. *Boston College Third World Law Journal, 23(1),* 158-193.

Hanna, C. (1996). No Right to Choose: Mandated Victim Participation in Domestic Violence Prosecutions. *Harvard Law Review*, *109(8),*1849-1910.

Hanson, B. (n.d.). *Domestic Violence*. Retrieved November 10, 2014, from http://www.justice.gov/ovw/domestic-violence

Hare, S. (2010). Intimate Partner Violence: Victims' Opinions About Going to Trial. *Journal Of Family Violence*, 25(8), 765-776.

Heffernan, K., Blythe, B., & Nicolson, P. (2014). How Do Social Workers Understand and Respond to Domestic Violence and Relate This to Organizational Policy and Practice?. *International Social Work, 57(6),* 698-713.

Homans, G. C. (1958). Social Behavior as Exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, (6). 597.

Homans, G. C., & Merton, R. K. (1961). *Social behavior: its elementary forms*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & World, c1961.

Jordan, C. (2004). Intimate Partner Violence And The Justice System: An Examination Of The Interface. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19(12),* 1412-1434.

Kruttschnitt, C. (2009). The Effect Of "No-Drop" Prosecution Policies On Perpetrators Of Intimate Partner Violence. *Criminology & Public Policy, 7(4),* 629-632.

Kuennen, T. L. (2007). No-Drop Civil Protection Orders: Exploring the Bounds of Judicial Intervention in the Lives of Domestic Violence Victims. *UCLA Women's Law Journal*, *16(1),* 39-95.

Kuennen, T. L. (2010). Private Relationships and Public Problems: Applying Principles of Relational Contract Theory to Domestic. *Brigham Young University Law Review*, *2010(2),* 515-595.

Mills, L. (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(3),* 306-318.

Miller, S. P. (2013). Social exchange theory. *Salem Press Encyclopedia*.

Nichols, A. J. (2014). No-Drop Prosecution in Domestic Violence Cases: Survivor-Defined and Social Change Approaches to Victim Advocacy. *Journal Of Interpersonal Violence*, *29*(*11),* 2114-2142.

Peterson, R. (2013). Victim Engagement in the Prosecution of Domestic Violence Cases. *Criminology & Public Policy, 12(3),* 473-480.

Pritchard, Adam, and Holton, Jessie. 'Can Comprehensive Domestic Violence Strangulation Prevention And Response Efforts Prevent Homicide?'. 2015. Homicide Research Working Group Meeting. Presentation. Clearwater, FL.

Robbins, K. (1999). No-Drop Prosecution of Domestic Violence: Just Good Policy, or Equal Protection Mandate? *Stanford Law Review*, *52(1),* 205-233.

Sack, E. J. (2009). From the Right of Chastisement to the Criminalization of Domestic Violence: A Study in Resistance to Effective Policy Reform. *Thomas Jefferson Law Review*, *32(1),* 31-63.

Smith, B., Davis, R., Nickles, L., and Davies, H. (2002). Evaluation of No-Drop Policies for Domestic Violence Cases in San Diego, California, Omaha, Nebraska, Klamath Falls, Oregon, and Everett, Washington, 1996-2000. National Archive of Criminal Justice Data. Retrieved on November 30th, 2014 from http://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR03319.v1

Stop The Violence. (n.d.). *My Side of This Issue.* Retrieved December 2, 2014, from http://vaw-stoptheviolence-803co2014.weebly.com/3/category/all/1.html

Strom, K., Warner, T., Tichavsky, L., & Zahn, M. (2010). Policing Juveniles: Domestic Violence Arrest Policies, Gender, and Police Response to Child-Parent Violence. *Crime & Delinquency, 60(3),* 427-450.

Swanberg, J. E., Mamta, U., Ojha & Macke, C. (2011). State Employment Protection Statutes for Victims of Domestic Violence: Public Policy's Response to Domestic Violence as an Employment Matter. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *27(3),* 587-619.

Tsankov, M.E., & McShias, P. (2014). Domestic Violence Protections for Unauthorized Migrant Victims In Colorado: A Federal-State Partnership. *Denver University Law Review*, *91(3),* 617-659.

Zosky, D. (2010). Accountability in Teenage Dating Violence: A Comparative Examination of Adult Domestic Violence and Juvenile Justice Systems Policies. *Social Work*, *55(4),* 359-368.