

2010-01-01

Civil Protection Orders: A Revisit to Wilmington, Denver, and Washington, D.C.

Carleen Vincent-Robinson

University of Miami, carleenvincent@hotmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/oa_theses

Recommended Citation

Vincent-Robinson, Carleen, "Civil Protection Orders: A Revisit to Wilmington, Denver, and Washington, D.C." (2010). *Open Access Theses*. 72.

https://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/oa_theses/72

This Open access is brought to you for free and open access by the Electronic Theses and Dissertations at Scholarly Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Theses by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Repository. For more information, please contact repository.library@miami.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI

CIVIL PROTECTION ORDERS: A REVISIT TO WILMINGTON, DENVER, AND
WASHINGTON, D.C.

By

Carleen Vincent-Robinson

A THESIS

Submitted to the Faculty
of the University of Miami
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

Coral Gables, Florida

December 2010

©2010
Carleen Vincent-Robinson
All Rights Reserved

UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

CIVIL PROTECTION ORDERS: A REVISIT TO WILMINGTON, DENVER, AND
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Carleen Vincent-Robinson

Approved:

Amie Nielsen, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Sociology

Terri A. Scandura, Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School

Roger Dunham, Ph.D.
Professor of Sociology

Donna Coker, J.D.
Professor of Law

VINCENT-ROBINSON, CARLEEN
Civil Protection Orders: A Revisit to Wilmington,
Denver, and Washington, D.C.

(M.A., Sociology)
(December 2010)

Abstract of a thesis at the University of Miami.

Thesis supervised by Dr. Amie Nielsen.
No. of pages in text. (174)

Despite the fact that all U.S. states offer some form of civil protection orders to intimate partner violence (IPV) victims, little research has assessed their efficacy. In this analysis, the effect of race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status on civil protection order effectiveness is examined. The results indicate that race/ethnicity, overall, is not a significant predictor in protection order efficacy. However, SES, as measured by the petitioner's highest educational attainment, employment status, and income, is statistically related to repeat victimization and perceptions of efficacy. Policy recommendations and areas for future research are proposed.

DEDICATION

This is dedicated to the thousands of brothers and sisters in Haiti who perished January 12, 2010. We will never forget you.

“We are hard pressed on every side, yet not crushed; we are perplexed but not in despair; persecuted by not forsake; struck down, but not destroyed.”

2 Corinthians 4: 8-9

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge several individuals for their continued support.

- Amie Nielsen, Ph.D., committee chairperson, and Roger Dunham, Ph.D., and Donna Coker, J.D., members of my thesis committee
- Paulette Johnson, Ph.D., for her unwavering dedication in explaining measurement analysis in a way that I finally understood
- Alan Gregg, Ph.D., for helping me keep my sanity while I progressed, regressed, and progressed again through the graduate program
- Marie M. Paret, my mother, for never doubting my intelligence or ability even when others did
- Eric L. Robinson, my beloved husband, for his faith in me, his steadfast support, and for pushing me when I didn't think I could be pushed any more.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	List of Tables	vii
Chapter		Page
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Introductory Remarks	1
2	REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	7
	Early Church Doctrine and Legislation Giving Rise to Intimate Partner Violence.....	7
	A Concern of National Proportions.....	9
	Intimate Partner Violence Today and Tomorrow.....	10
	Measuring Intimate Partner Violence.....	10
	The Intersectionality of Race and Ethnicity in IPV Research	19
	Intimate Partner Violence Interventions.....	26
	Arrest.....	26
	Civil Liability.....	27
	Shelters and Community Support.....	27
	Batterer Intervention Programs.....	28
	The Evolution of Civil Protection Orders.....	29
	Prior Studies Examining Effectiveness of Protection Orders.....	34
3	DATA AND METHODOLOGY.....	53
	Overview.....	53
	Sites, Statutes, and Provisions.....	53
	Data.....	55
	Variables.....	58
	Dependent Variables.....	58
	Independent Variables.....	59
	Analyses.....	63
4	RESULTS.....	66
	Overview.....	66
	Description of Sample.....	66
	Bivariate Analysis.....	72
	Multivariate Results.....	111
	Logistic Regression Results.....	124
5	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	150
	Overview.....	150
	The Decision to Study Civil Protection Orders.....	150

Description of Findings.....	151
Conclusion.	158
Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research.....	161
Policy Issues and Implications.....	164
6 REFERENCES.	166

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 4.1	68
Table 4.2	70
Table 4.3	72
Table 4.4	76
Table 4.5	79
Table 4.6	83
Table 4.7	85
Table 4.8	94
Table 4.9	99
Table 4.10	104
Table 4.11	107
Table 4.12	116
Table 4.13	122
Table 4.14	131
Table 4.15	139
Table 4.16	146
Table 5.1	152

Chapter 1: Introduction

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

In a nation where headlines are replete with stories of estranged husbands or jealous partners murdering wives, girlfriends, and children in fits of rage, one must question what actions we initiate to empower and, perhaps, save those experiencing violence in the alleged sanctity of their homes. Historically, women have continuously suffered abuse at the hands of their loved ones. In fact, King Romulus of Rome, in 753 BC, first promulgated “wives were ‘to conform themselves entirely to the temper of their husbands and the husbands to rule their wives as necessary and inseparable possessions’” (Pressman 1984: 18, cited in Buzawa and Buzawa 2003: 57-58). Furthermore, under the Roman doctrine of *patria potestas*, the legal status of Roman wives changed to that of daughters, thus permitting Roman husbands to physically chastise their wives, and in some instances kill¹, without recourse (Dobash and Dobash 1981, cited in Buzawa and Buzawa 2003; Gelles 1997).

British legal doctrine, from which the United States has formulated much of its own laws, has often been cited as permitting the husband, as lord and master, to chastise his wife in moderation² (Buzawa and Buzawa 2003; Walker 1990). In fact, in *State v. Rhodes* 61 N.C. 453 (1868), a United States court pronounced husbands innocent of domestic abuse, citing the same British principle. However, with evolving standards of decency, the extension of human rights to women, and the radical changes resulting from

¹Roman laws indicated the punishments were appropriate for the following crimes: “adultery, public drunkenness, and attending public games” (Gelles 1997: 21-22).

² Although the “rule of thumb” is frequently cited as providing limitation to the severity of the abuse, no solid evidence has been found to prove this.

the feminist movement, laws condoning domestic abuse have been repealed and replaced with various social and legal avenues aimed at stopping intimate partner violence (IPV) (Buzawa and Buzawa 1992).

Although, close to 1.5 million women per year are victims of IPV, public response also has been far from effective in dealing with the consequences of or in condemning the behavior (Center for Disease Control and Prevention 2009; NCADV 2009).³ Until recently, law enforcement personnel failed to respond appropriately to domestic disturbance calls. This failure resulted from a deeply ingrained belief that a man ruled his own castle; accordingly, police officers saw no reason to interfere in what was perceived as private familial matters (Erez and Belknap 1995). Nevertheless, with the women's liberation movement and the acceptance of restraining orders as a means to end domestic violence, women's rights groups began to file suits against police departments claiming that they failed to protect the victims from their batterers such that great bodily harm or death ensued.

A case that served as a catalyst for changes within police practices was *Thurman v. City of Torrington*, 595 F. Supp. 1531 (1984). This Connecticut case occurred as a result of Tracy Thurman obtaining an order of protection against her estranged husband; despite the order, her husband continued to harass her over an eight month period. On June 10, 1983, Charles Thurman arrived at Mrs. Thurman's home where he viciously attacked her. Although police had been summoned, 25 minutes passed before the first officer arrived on the scene. The arriving officer observed the violent attack on Mrs. Thurman but failed to immediately take the knife from Mr. Thurman, prevent him from

³ Although IPV may involve reciprocal violence, most studies reflect data limited to female victimization. Consequently, this study will focus on the victimization of women by intimates (boyfriends or spouses but not including same sex partners).

continuing to assault Mrs. Thurman, or arrest him. Accordingly, Tracy Thurman sued the City of Torrington and 29 police officers for failing to protect her pursuant to the 14th Amendment's equal protection clause. She was awarded \$2.3 million for the gross negligence of the department.

Thurman also resulted in the promulgation of mandatory arrest policies in Connecticut and around the country. Consequently, because civil liability became a growing issue for police departments, more aggressive tactics were used to curb intimate partner violence. Nevertheless, *Thurman* clearly illustrates that protection orders may not fulfill their purpose of protecting victims from future acts of violence, including lethal events. Although lethal outcomes are rare compared to nonlethal acts of intimate partner violence, civil protection orders may fail to protect these victims from continued victimization, including but not limited to physical assaults, threats or intimidation.

Civil protection orders are often the first step many victims of IPV take to stop the violence. *Black's Law Dictionary* defines a protection order as "a court order prohibiting or restricting a party from engaging in conduct . . . that unduly annoys or burdens the opposing party or a third-party witness" (Garner 1999: 577). Different from a restraining order, which in some jurisdictions requires that criminal charges be filed against the perpetrator and which possesses a much higher standard of proof, a civil protection order simply requires that the person requesting it believe that his or her life is in danger. Thus, a civil protection order is a "legally binding court order that restrains an individual who has committed an act of violence against . . . [another] from further acts against that person" (Holt et al. 2002: 589). To date, all 50 states allow victims of domestic violence to obtain civil protection orders (Michigan Judicial Institute 2004; Smith 2005). These

orders differ from regular injunctions in the nature of the relief sought (e.g., child custody, sole use of the marital home). They also differ in the ability to obtain a civil protection order *ex parte*, meaning that only one party must be present in court to show either immediate danger or irreparable injury (Michigan Judicial Institute 2004; Meiers 2005).

Despite the fact that all states in the nation offer civil protection orders, little research has assessed their efficacy. In one recent study (1997), researchers at the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) evaluated the effectiveness of civil protection orders in deterring domestic violence in Wilmington, Delaware; Denver, Colorado; and Washington, D.C. Researchers discovered that during the first month after the order was obtained, victims felt empowered, demonstrated by feelings of well-being and safety (Keilitz et al. 1997). Additionally, at the 6-month mark, 85% of the victims claimed that their lives had improved in one fashion or another, and nearly all of the victims reported that they would seek additional protection orders if their situations necessitated such action (Keilitz et al. 1997; Michigan Judicial Institute 2004). Furthermore, the majority of the victims reported that the issuance of the protection order did, indeed, decrease the occurrence of assaults, batteries, and psychological abuse.

Despite these findings, the literature assessing the efficacy of civil protection orders is limited. Prior research restricted the determination of efficacy to whether or not a decrease in re-abuse occurred after the issuance of the order (Harrell, Smith, and Nemark 1993; Tjaden and Thoennes 1998; Mears et al. 2001; Keilitz, Hannaford and Efkean 1997). Moreover, few studies paid specific attention to race, socioeconomic status or other factors potentially associated with civil protection order effectiveness

(Carlson, Harris, and Holden 1999; McFarlane, Malecha, Gist, Watson, Batten, Hall, and Smith 2004; Horton, Simonidis and Simonidis 1987).

Both race and socioeconomic status are of particular importance for multiple reasons. First, a considerable amount of domestic violence research addresses the (White) majority population. However, Black women have an increased risk of abuse with nearly double the rate of domestic violence victimization than that of White women (Rennison and Welchans 2000; Straus and Gelles 1997). Moreover, Tjaden and Thoennes (2000) indicate that American Indian/Alaskan Natives report much higher rates of domestic victimization than any other group. Accordingly, the needs of the previously ignored and more marginalized populations must be considered. The current research includes Blacks and Hispanics and will, thus, provide key insights into whether the efficacy and perceptions of safety related to civil protection orders among minority IPV victims differ from those of Whites.

Additionally, because a clear and standardized definition of socioeconomic status (SES) has yet to be provided, there is a lack of comparability among studies that include SES as a predictor. Although IPV is said not to discriminate against its victims on the basis of SES, research suggests that members of the lower-class are disproportionately victimized and experience IPV at a higher rate than middle- or upper-class women (Kaufman Kantor and Jasinski 1997). As such, a lower income may increase the risk of IPV. The implication for civil protection order effectiveness, then, is that lower-class victims may utilize protection orders more than upper-class victims, but it is unclear if the orders are equally effective among lower- and upper-class victims. Therefore, this thesis will move beyond the extant research to address some of the gaps in the current

literature by attempting to identify the effectiveness of civil protection orders, a key but understudied legal approach to dealing with IPV experiences as well as if effectiveness differs among various races and socioeconomic groups.

Specifically in this thesis, I will reanalyze the data from the National Center for State Courts study and assess whether and how race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status may impact the effectiveness of the protection orders. Effectiveness will be assessed in terms of both the occurrence of re-abuse as well as in the victims' perceptions.

Specifically, the key questions to be addressed are: 1) Do civil protection orders reduce revictimization? 2) Are there race/ethnicity and/or SES differences in violence reduction once a civil protection order has been obtained? 3) Does the presence of civil protection orders impact victims' quality of life (perception of safety) and 4) does this differ by race/ethnicity and/or SES?

In summary, violence within the home continues to adversely impact not only the individuals directly involved but society at large. A readily accessible intervention in dealing with IPV is the civil protection order. Yet, its effectiveness, especially among different racial, ethnic and class groups, has received limited attention in the extant literature. The purpose of this thesis is to re-evaluate an earlier NCSC study and assess the race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status differences, if any, that are associated with the effectiveness of civil protection orders and the resulting perceptions of safety and well-being.

The following chapters include a review of the most current and pertinent literature. Next, the methodology used will be explained in detail. This will be followed by chapters addressing the results as well as a discussion of the findings and a conclusion.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

The United States has a long history of domestic violence. Intimate partner violence (IPV), in particular, is of grave concern because of the high rates of incidence and prevalence as well as the staggering costs associated therewith. For example, according to the National Institute of Justice, 25% of women in the United States will be victimized by an intimate at some point in their lifetimes (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000). The following section reviews the origins of doctrines supporting IPV as well as the incidence and prevalence of IPV, the available interventions and the findings of various studies assessing the efficacy of civil protection orders. However, before moving on, a distinction must be made between *domestic violence* and *intimate partner violence*. Although often used interchangeably, *domestic violence* refers to violence in any familial relationship such as that between siblings, parents, and the elderly (Gelles 1997). For the purposes of the current study, intimate partner violence (IPV) will be used to refer to violent victimization among intimates and will focus on the violence (physical and emotional) inflicted by a spouse or boyfriend, current or former, on female victims.

EARLY CHURCH DOCTRINE AND LEGISLATION GIVING RISE TO INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE

The idea that women were the property of their husbands has origins in early church doctrine and the biblical and patriarchal explanation of social relationships (Kroeger and Beck 1996). Early on, religious leaders used the book of Genesis (specifically 2:18) to explain women's subordinate position to men. It was thought that a

woman's duty was to submit to her husband as she lacked the intellectual and moral capacity to exercise authority over herself.⁴ The fulfillment of this obligation reinforced the belief that the husband was the head and her lord and master.⁵ Consequently, the church allowed men "to punish those women who [stepped] outside of their religiously assigned role and [violated] the rules of patriarchy" (Kroeger and Beck 1996: 18).

There were no laws criminalizing IPV in the 17th and 18th centuries, and English law presumed ownership of the wife through marriage (van Wormer and Bartollas 2007). Likened to chattel or children, women could receive "'moderate correction' under the doctrine of coverture, the legal doctrine that held that a married woman's legal identity was subsumed under her husband's" (Blackstone 1979, cited in van Wormer and Bartollas 2007: 233). In fact, once a woman married, she ceased to exist as a legal entity. Therefore, as husbands were legally liable for the actions of their wives, "men . . . were supported in their attempts to regain or retain dominance by ridiculing and shaming the woman publicly and/or by punishing her physically" (Dobash and Dobash 1981: 566). It was not until the late 1800s that the physical punishment of one's wife was outlawed (Gelles 1997). Yet, IPV was still considered a private familial matter that permitted the chastisement of "errant wives" as necessary (Gelles 1997). Nevertheless, an additional 70 years would pass before women were assured social and legal interventions to escape abuse.

⁴ Ephesians 5:22-24

⁵ Deuteronomy 28:13

A CONCERN OF NATIONAL PROPORTIONS

IPV first emerged as a research interest in the 1970s. Together, victims and various feminist organizations coordinated a grassroots movement that resulted in the establishment of battered women's shelters (Gelles 1997). In 1973, IPV research that attempted to identify risk factors as well as patterns of behavior was first published. Although publications resulted in growing public awareness, interest levels flourished when Congresswoman Barbara Milkulski introduced the National Domestic Violence and Treatment Act (42 USC 13701) which was passed into law in the 1980s (Gelles 1997). One decade later, IPV research proliferated.

In 1994, O.J. Simpson, a renowned retired NFL player, was accused of murdering his ex-wife, Nicole Brown Simpson, and her companion, Ronald Goldman. The case garnered global media attention and forced the public to acknowledge the high rates of family violence. Close to the time of the murders, Congress enacted the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act, which included Title IV, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) (Gelles 1997). Under VAWA, \$1.5 billion was allocated to render services and offer assistance to IPV and sexual assault victims. For the first time, female victims could seek civil rights remedies for their violent victimizations. Similarly, education and training efforts were intensified for police and court officials in order to bolster and enhance sensitivity to victims (Kurz 1998). Advocacy efforts were also strengthened to minimize the effects of IPV on children, and a nationwide 24-hour hotline was established to deal with domestic violence and sexual assault victims in crisis. Consequently, IPV developed into a social concern of national proportions (Gelles 1997).

INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE TODAY AND TOMORROW

Currently, there is not a nationally standardized definition of IPV. This lack of consensus contributes to the disparities in IPV statistics to be discussed below. The United States Department of Justice Office of Violence Against Women defines domestic violence 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” (United States Department of Justice, Office of Violence Against Women 2009). The abuse may be physical, sexual, emotional, economic, and/or psychological, including but not limited to verbal assaults, social isolation, complete financial submission, torture of pets, marital rape, and threats of death (van Wormer and Bartollas 2007). In spite of this, most state statutes require a history of physical assault for criminal prosecution and to obtain restraining orders.

MEASURING INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE

Although the home should be where one feels the safest, it may, for many women, be a place of grave danger. Only within the past 40 years have official records of IPV been kept, and researchers have only recently (within the past 30 years) delved into this area (Gelles 1997). The National Institute of Justice (2004) indicates that one in four women will be victimized by an intimate partner at some point during her lifetime. Each year approximately 5 million women experience intimate partner abuse in the form of physical and/or sexual assault (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000). However, the statistics are far from reliable as IPV is rarely reported because some victims do not perceive the behavior as criminal, many are ashamed to come forward, and others fear that no one will

believe them (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000; Gelles 1997; van Wormer and Bartollas 2007). Overall, it is estimated that women report to the police less than 25% of assaults and less than 20% of rapes committed against them by spouses or partners (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000). Nevertheless, IPV is the single most significant cause of injury to women in the United States (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000).

In order to obtain a better understanding of the incidence and prevalence of IPV, three landmark surveys must be reviewed: The National Family Violence Survey (Straus and Gelles 1986), the National Violence Against Women Survey (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000), and the National Crime Victimization Survey (Rennison and Welchans 2000). The National Family Violence Survey (NFVS), administered in 1975 and 1985, examined family conflict in a national sample of 2,143 family members. Using the Conflict Tactics Scale to measure domestic violence, attempts were made to determine how couples handled disagreements (Straus and Kaufman Kantor 1994). The options included discussion or negotiation, psychological abuse (including verbal and non-verbal hostility), and acts of physical violence (Roberts 2002). The NFVS revealed that, in 1975, less than 25% of wives and 33% of husbands believed that, depending on the situation, “a couple slapping one another was at least somewhat necessary, normal, and good” (Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz 1980: 47, cited in Gelles 1997: 37-38). When the survey was repeated one decade later, the approval level of husbands and wives slapping each other decreased to 13% (Gelles and Straus 1988; Gelles 1997). Also in 1985, 28% of the couples interviewed indicated that a violent incident had occurred at some point during their marriages, but 16% of the families surveyed reported a violent incident in the immediate preceding 12 months (Gelles 1997).

In addition, Straus and Gelles provided the first national data showing violence in African American homes (Straus et al. 1980; Straus and Gelles 1986). They determined that minority groups, specifically African Americans, possessed higher prevalence rates of severe assaults against their intimate partners than their White counterparts; however, African Americans were comparable to their Hispanic counterparts. Severe violence rates for husbands to wives were 71 per 1,000 for African American males, 30 per 1,000 for White males, and 73 per 1,000 per 1,000 Hispanic males. Violent offending rates, overall, for husbands to wives were 174 per 1,000 for African American males, 108 per 1,000 for White males, and 173 per 1,000 Hispanic males (Hampton and Washington Coner-Edwards 1993). Severe violence rates for wives to husbands were 112 per 1,000 African American females, 40 per 1,000 per White females, and 78 per 1,000 Hispanic females. However, for any violence by female partners, offending rates were 207 per 1,000 African American females, 115 per 1,000 White females, and 168 per 1,000 Hispanic females (Hampton and Washington Coner-Edwards 1993). Accordingly, the National Family Violence Survey was one of the first national victimization surveys to illuminate the importance of race/ethnicity in IPV research.

To address some of the gaps in understanding why violence against women occurs and the risk factors that are associated with it, researchers from the National Institute of Justice and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention conducted the National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS) from November 1995 to May 1996. A national sample of 16,000 men and women (8,000 of each, age 18 or older) were interviewed, via telephone, regarding their violent victimization experiences including, but not limited to, any physical assault they experienced as children or adults

and histories of forcible rape and stalking (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000). NVAWS findings indicated that an estimated 1.5 million women experienced physical assault or rape by their partners annually (Tjaden and Thoennes 1998). Additionally, 64% of the women who reported being raped, physically assaulted, and/or stalked since age 18 had been victimized by a current or former intimate partner, thus reaffirming the belief that women are frequently victimized at the hands of their intimates.

Regarding race and ethnicity as they pertain to reporting habits, the NVAWS exposed the tendency of American Indian/Alaska Native women to report more violent victimization to the police than women of other racial backgrounds. American Indian/Alaska Natives were also much more likely than Asian/Pacific Islander women, White women, African-American women, or mixed-race women to report a sexual assault or physical assault (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000). Specifically, 64.8% of American Indian/Alaska Native women compared to 51.9% of Asian/Pacific Islander women, 54.5% of White women, 55.1% of African American women, and 61.2% of mixed-race women reported sexual or physical assault during their lifetime. Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) advise cautious interpretation of the results because the small number of American Indian/Alaska Native and Asian/Pacific Islander women in the study preclude generalization of the findings to all American Indian/Alaska Native and Asian/Pacific Islander women. Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) also reveal that Hispanic women are less likely to report sexual assault but more likely to report physical assault to police than non-Hispanic women (54.9% v. 55.1%, respectively). As a result of the small number of American Indian/Alaska Native and Asian/Pacific Islander women in the study as well as the limited data available for this particular group, the authors were unable to provide a

clear explanation for the reporting differences. Nonetheless, these findings further illustrate the need to examine race and ethnic differences when researching IPV.

Using a nationally representative sample of households, the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), conducted by the Department of Justice and Bureau of the Census, was used to obtain information regarding rape, sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault and simple assault at the hands of both heterosexual and homosexual intimate partners (Rennison and Welchans 2000). This study, ongoing since the 1970s, showed that in 1993 there were an estimated 1.1 million nonfatal violent crimes against women committed by a current or former intimate partner; nonfatal violent crimes included rape, sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault, and simple assault (Rennison 2003). Five years later, the results were virtually the same with more than 1 million violent offenses committed by intimates (former or present) against their female partners, with a rate of 9 per 1,000 women (Rennison and Welchans, 2000; Gelles 1997). Overall, however, a 48.4% decrease in nonfatal violent victimization against intimates occurred from 1993 to 1998 (41.8% for males and 49.3% for females, respectively (Rennison 2003)). In 2001, there were 691,701 nonfatal violent victimizations committed by intimates, with 85% of them (588,490) committed against women. Accordingly, intimate partner violence accounted for 20% of all violent crimes against women in 2001 (Rennison 2003).

The NCVS provides insights into several factors related to IPV and of interest to this study. Between 2001 and 2005, the presence of alcohol or drugs was reported by victims in 42% of all domestic violence incidents. Eight percent of nonfatal violence victimizations occurred when the offender was under the influence of both alcohol and

drugs, and 6% occurred while the offender was solely under the influence of drugs (Catalano 2007). Regarding patterns of reporting nonfatal IPV to police, from 2001-2005 Black females reported a higher percentage of incidents than White males and Black males; reporting was also higher for male Hispanic victims than non-Hispanic males (Catalano 2007). Overall, females ages 12 to 15 or greater than 50, had the lowest risk of nonfatal domestic violence, with those 20 to 24 years of age having the greatest risk. Marital status also played a significant role; separated females had higher rates of nonfatal violence while those females who were married and/or widowed had the lowest risk (Catalano 2007).

Concerning trends over time, from 1993 to 2005, the NCVS reveals that nonlethal IPV decreased for White females, White males, and Black females. However, rates of IPV overall stabilized between 2004 and 2005 with White females experiencing a rate of 3.1 per 1,000, Black females experiencing a rate of 4.5 per 1,000, and White males experiencing a rate of 0.7 per 1,000 (all age 12 or older).⁶ Hispanic females experienced a greater decline (66%) in nonfatal IPV compared to non-Hispanic females (more than half) between 1993 and 2005. Yet, from 2001-2005, IPV rates remained similar for Hispanic and non-Hispanic females and males with 4.3 per 1,000 for Hispanic females, 4.2 per 1,000 for non-Hispanic females, 0.6 per 1,000 for Hispanic males, and 0.9 per 1,000 for non-Hispanic males. Regarding lethal IPV, men experienced a significant decline in (68%) from 1976 to 2000. Women, however, experienced a much smaller decline (22%) in intimate partner homicide during the same time frame (Catalano 2007).

⁶ The small number of cases involving victimization of Black males precludes reliable annual estimates; therefore, data regarding Black males was not reported by the USDOJ, Office of Justice Programs.

Additionally, females with lower socioeconomic status (SES), as demonstrated by income level, experienced the highest annual rates of nonfatal IPV (Catalano 2007). Female victims with an annual household income of less than \$7,500 experienced an IPV victimization rate of 12.7 per 1,000 persons age 12 or older in contrast to male victims who experienced a rate of 1.5 per 1,000 persons. The victimization rate was one-half of this (6.2) for female victims with an annual household income between \$7,500 and \$24,999 although higher household income did not impact the male victimization rate. The victimization rate was slightly lower for female and male victims who had an annual household income between \$25,000 and \$49,999 with 5.2 and 0.8 per 1,000 persons, respectively. Finally, the IPV victimization rates were lowest for females (2.0 per 1,000 persons age 12 or older) and males (0.6 per 1,000 persons) when the annual household income was \$50,000 or higher (Catalano 2007).

The national data on IPV from these various surveys provide mixed and often contradictory results. This is due, in part, to the definitions and operationalization of domestic abuse and the corresponding variables being researched. Therefore, the statistics that are reported may not refer solely to IPV. One of the most difficult issues in reconciling IPV incidence and prevalence is age. The National Crime Victimization Survey includes females ages 12 and older; the National Violence Against Women survey addresses female victims ages 16 and above; and the NFVS includes only those married or cohabitating heterosexual couples over age 18. Accordingly, child abuse, teenage violence and violence directed towards teens from their parents may all be captured in the statistics reported as domestic violence (Buzawa and Buzawa 2003).

Regardless of which study is used, estimates do not adequately capture the true incidence and prevalence of IPV. Victims may suffer from memory recall problems, participate in telescoping, or may not want to acknowledge their victimization (Mosher et al. 2002). All of these issues may impact the reliability and validity of the survey instrument. Also, the issue of prevalence, which is often defined as whether the person has been physically victimized within the previous twelve months *or* within their lifetime, can be easily misrepresented depending upon which definition is used and to which population the questions are directed (Buzawa and Buzawa 2003).

Nonetheless, a review of the aforementioned seminal studies suggests that IPV is on the decline although it remains a very serious issue. For example, the National Crime Victimization Survey findings suggest a decline in nonlethal IPV for White females, White males, and Black females from 1993 to 2004, followed by a stabilization period from 2004 to 2005. Additionally, when compared to non-Hispanic females, victimization rates for Hispanic females declined by more than half during the same period (Catalano 2007). Furthermore, data from both waves of the National Family Violence Survey (Straus and Gelles, 1986) indicate that minor assaults by husbands against wives decreased between 1976 and 1985 and then increased between 1985 and 1992. Severe assaults by husbands decreased 48%, from 38 per 1,000 in 1976 to 19 per 1,000 in 1992. Straus and Gelles (1986) attribute the decline in violence against women to the changing attitudes regarding IPV.

First, the American family evolved from requiring a single income to needing dual incomes. As such, women entered the workforce and ultimately narrowed the gap between the wages for men and women, thereby, providing women with resources to

leave as well as a sense of empowerment. This is of particular importance because research indicates that economic dependence upon an abuser is a key reason why victims remain in the relationship (Wallace 1996; Kalmuss and Straus 1990). Impoverished women faced with the decision of whether to leave or stay in the relationship ponder issues such as securing suitable childcare, schooling, the ability to financially support children and afford medical care, and potential victimization in a world of crime and violence (Barnett 2000). Each of these issues may overwhelm and further disempower the victim. Therefore, a victim who obtains employment loosens the “‘golden handcuffs’ that binds . . . [her] to the abusive partner” and is empowered in the process (Wallace 1996: 167). Second, an upsurge in public awareness about IPV furthered the development of new treatment and prevention programs and shelters for battered women as well as batterer intervention programs providing more options for victims. This information promotes the belief that IPV is decreasing and that the current interventions (CPOs, restraining orders, batterer intervention programs, anger management, and the presence of shelters) are fulfilling their purpose of curbing domestic violence (Gelles 1997). Yet, as discussed below, the efficacy of some of the interventions, especially CPOs, have received little research attention.

THE INTERSECTIONALITY OF RACE AND ETHNICITY IN INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE RESEARCH

Previously, scholars were not particularly interested in the relationships between race, culture and violence (White 1994; Hampton and Gullotta 2006). Therefore, studies of IPV focused on White female victims which suggested the alleged racial neutrality of the research. But as African Americans in particular began to experience very high levels of both lethal and nonlethal violence in the 1980s, violence in the Black community became a public health concern worthy of scholarly investigation (Hampton and Oliver 2006). Consequently, an increase occurred in research conducted on all minority groups. As studies were completed and published, intersectionality of race and socioeconomic status in IPV became evident. Intersectionality refers to the various interactions and hierarchies that are at play when discussing multiple forms of oppression (Crenshaw 1991). The implications of intersectionality in IPV are: 1) victims are different from one another; 2) their experiences are different from one another; and 3) their responses to victimization are different from one another (Josephson 2002).

Intersectionality can be used to identify the complex interaction of race and socioeconomic status as they relate to IPV. Some scholars asserted that most intellectual works focused only on the plight of White women experiencing IPV, thereby ignoring and, thus, trivializing the violent victimization of women of color (Crenshaw 1991). Furthermore, structural intersectionality underscores the possibility that “the ways in which the location of women of color at the intersection of race and gender make our actual experience of intimate partner violence, rape, and remedial reform . . . qualitatively different than that of white women” (Crenshaw 1991:1245, cited in Josephson 2005:86).

African American women experience IPV differently from their White counterparts. This is due, in part, to the situations African American women often find themselves in early in life. African American women tend to be younger when dealing with IPV and living in heavily impoverished areas marked by economic disadvantage. Additionally, hypersegregation, which is often found in areas of extreme poverty, is further compounded by the lack of access to resources, poor opportunity structure, limited education, and decreased job availability. Each of the aforementioned contributes to the income disparities that ultimately influence how African Americans experience IPV and the available choices they make in addressing it (Hampton and Gelles 1994; Rennison and Planty 2003; Kaufman Kantor and Jasinski 1997; Yllo and Straus 1990). The income disparities, in turn, are related to the employment status of the husband/partner, and this has implications for IPV. Because African American men are frequently unemployed, underemployed or out of the workforce altogether, they are unable to provide for their families and attempt to reestablish their masculinity through violent acts, the results of which are the disproportionate levels of IPV among African American families (Hampton and Oliver 2006: 6; Johnson 2000; Anderson 1999). Hence, financial strain marked by insufficient funds, an inability to remain gainfully employed, and concentrated poverty all adversely impact the severity and likelihood of African American female victimization by their partners (Benson and Fox 2003; Jory 2006).

The resulting social isolation and disorganization associated with socioeconomic and structural inequalities require that we acknowledge the differing patterns of IPV. Straus and Gelles (1986) presented the first national data available on IPV within the

African American family, reporting that “African-American males had higher rates of overall and severe violence toward their wives than did white husbands” with rates of 206 per 1,000 and 115 per 1,000 respectively (Hampton and Oliver 2006:2; Straus and Gelles 1986; Straus et al. 1980; Hampton and Gelles 1994). Also, the NCVS indicated that African American men and women were victimized by intimates at a significantly higher rate than any other racial group (Rennison and Welchans 2000). In fact, African American women were victimized at a rate 35% higher than White women (Rennison and Welchans 2000). Moreover, the NVAWS revealed that African American males were 1.5 times more likely than White males to use violence against their partners (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000). Clearly, African American women are victimized at a higher rate than their White counterparts. However, after controlling for various measures of ecological context such as economic disparities (i.e. household income), the rates of IPV were the same for Whites and African Americans at all income levels (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000; Benson, Wooldredge, Thistlethwaite and Fox 2004).

Although lethal and severe IPV are disproportionately higher among African Americans, due consideration must be given to the socioeconomic and structural inequalities that distinguish the experiences of African Americans from those of Whites (Hampton, Carrillo and Kim 1998). Additionally, a history fraught with police brutality and a lack of trust in government generate African American victims’ reluctance to seek assistance from law enforcement or other social services and, thus, result in a different response from White victims of IPV (Crenshaw 1991; White 1994; Josephson 2002). Therefore, the intersectionality of race and SES, as it pertains to IPV, is confounded by the fact that “African American families are disproportionately likely to live in extreme

poverty, which makes it difficult to truly separate the effects of race and income” (Sokoloff and Pratt 2005:116).

The incidence and prevalence of IPV among different racial and ethnic groups and members of varying socioeconomic statuses raises questions as to which particular interventions these groups seek. Studies reveal that the majority of abused women do not seek social, mental health, or legal services (Kaslow, Thorn, and Paranjape 2007; Henning and Klesges, 2002). In fact, less than 10% of female victims inquire about services offered at shelters, and the shelter is often a last resort for victims. African American females are even less likely than their White counterparts to visit a shelter for assistance unless they have experienced severe and egregious acts of violence (Joseph 1997; Coley and Beckett, 1988; Kaslow et al., 2007). This is because many “African Americans are less likely to seek assistance from institutions that historically have contributed to their oppression” (Wyatt 1994, cited in Kaslow et al. 2007: 66). More specifically, Black males and females commonly fear and assume that the failure to gain access to resources or to be taken seriously by law enforcement, politicians, and the like are direct results of racial discrimination (Wyatt 1994). Consequently, they choose to seek assistance from institutions within their own communities as it provides them freedom from judgment or negative stereotypes associated with their specific race/ethnic group as well as a sense of self that is not easily understood by those in the majority population. Additionally, less than 35% of IPV victims seek mental health services (Gondolf 1998; Kaslow et al. 2007). This is even lower for black women as they remain hesitant to seek professional mental health services because doing so is often considered taboo within the Black community (Joseph 1997; Sorenson et al. 1996).

Studies show that African-American women are also less likely than white women to obtain protection orders for fear of being perceived as whiny, complaining all the time, and unsupportive of their male partners (Kaslow et al. 2007; Saunders-Robinson, 1991). According to Kaslow et al. (2007), these women are reluctant to contribute to the negative and violent stereotypes of Black males and females found in popular culture (White 1985; Malley-Morrison and Hines 2007). Therefore, not only are they less likely to seek protection orders, African American females are less likely to call the police because they refuse to add to Black men's repeated victimization by law enforcement (Kaslow et. al, 2007; Malley-Morrison and Hines 2007). In an ethnographic study of African-American women (n=20), Tricia Rose (2003) describes African-American women's conflicting emotions regarding interpersonal violence. These women articulated a desire to remain dedicated and unwavering in their loyalty to the Black men in their lives. They did not want to betray nor further victimize Black men whom, they asserted, continue to be persecuted by racism in White America. Nevertheless, these women conceded that their own victimizations came at the hands of the very men they wanted to protect.

Not surprisingly, Hispanic women may also be less inclined to report IPV to officials. First, language may pose a barrier to seeking services because the geographical region of the country in which the research is being conducted may not have a sufficient number of service providers who are able to communicate effectively in Spanish or other languages (Dasgupta 2005). Additionally, the rate of acculturation may play a role in both reporting and seeking assistance (Yoshioka, Gilbert, El-Bassel, and Baig-Amin 2003). Hispanic women who are hesitant to abandon their own cultures may continue to

support strong cultural ideologies of *familism*⁷, *respeto*⁸, and *marianismo*⁹ (Malley-Morrison and Hines 2007; Bidegain 1989). Therefore, the shame associated with the individual victimization becomes even greater because the entire family suffers the humiliation. Accordingly, the individual, who is also required to follow the directions and guidance of her elders, must not end the abusive marriage because doing so would place her individual needs above that of the family (Malley-Morrison and Hines 2004). Therefore, she must endure the victimization in silence and, furthermore, should accept the divine will of God as wanting “those things” such as the victimization to occur. By doing so, the victim demonstrates her ability to self-sacrifice and endures suffering for her family (Malley-Morrison and Hines 2004; Stevens 1973).

Moreover, immigrant women must deal with issues pertaining to the villainization associated with being “Westernized” (Yoshioka, Gilbert, El-Bassel, and Baig-Amin 2003). Open discussion for many immigrant groups, not simply Hispanics, may be perceived as an assault on the native culture and an embrace of the American culture. In addition, fear of deportation also plays a role in why immigrant women may be reluctant to seek assistance or report their victimization (Malley-Morrison and Hines 2007). Although there are laws in place that prevent the deportation of abused women, immigrant women who are not familiar with the laws of the United States are not likely to be aware of such legislation; hence, they refuse to seek any assistance outside of their families (Grossman and Lundy 2007; Raj and Silverman 2002).

⁷ Merriam-Webster’s dictionary defines familism as “a social pattern in which the family assumes a position of ascendance over individual interests” (In *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*. Retrieved March 16, 2010, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/familism>).

⁸ “Respeto” refers to the respect shown for elders.

⁹ “Marianismo” is frequently used to describe the moral strength and sexual innocence of unmarried women (Bidegain 1989; Malley-Morrison and Hines 2007).

Last, the same fear that plagues African American women regarding the history of law enforcement officials abusing the abusers and the fear that reporting victimization will also contribute to the negative stereotypes of the male batterers are also applicable to Hispanics and often dissuade race/ethnic minorities from seeking assistance from local service providers or law enforcement (Malley-Morrison and Hines 2007).

As stated above, intersectionality refers to a complex hierarchy and interaction of various factors related to oppression with the implications that victims as well as their experiences and responses differ. Certainly White and African American women differ, *prima facie*, by virtue of racial categorization and usual SES positions. Their experiences vary, in part, due to cultural diversity, belief systems, and the deeply rooted social tolerance of physical punishment for people of color. Additionally, the types of abuse the victims are subjected to causes variations in their experiences. IPV within the African American family is more often marked by mutual abuse¹⁰ with reciprocal abuse found in 49% of African American domestic violence cases compared to 38% of White cases (Hampton, Carrillo, and Kim 1998). Last, both access to and willingness to seek and use interventions varies among racial groups. This is partly demonstrated by the unwillingness of many African American females to call the police for fear of betraying their partners and communities by subjecting their partners to the victimization African American males have often suffered at the hands of law enforcement (White 1994; Rose 2003). Consequently, further studies must be undertaken to explore why and how violence occurs within these communities as well as the interventions available to those who seek assistance. It is for this reason that analyses of civil protection order efficacy

¹⁰ Mutual abuse refers to situations where both parties use violence in an attempt to gain control over the relationship (Johnson and Ferraro 2000).

must be conducted with explicit attention paid to the roles of race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status.

INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE INTERVENTIONS

Four major events contributed to the development of IPV as a national concern (Roberts 2002). First, the women's movement diverted some of the attention on child abuse to IPV (Gelles 1997). Second, two national surveys were conducted that illuminated the high incidence of IPV in American society (Straus and Gelles, 1990; Straus, Steinmetz, and Gelles 1980). Third, the research on IPV proliferated, especially in the late 1980s and 1990s (Gelles 1997; VAWA 1994). Finally, new legislation and litigation against police departments prompted policy changes in police practices nationwide (Roberts 2002). Each of these events contributed to the creation of various interventions available for victims of IPV. These interventions (arrest, civil liability, shelters and community support, batterer intervention programs, and protection orders) may be used singly or in combination with the others, including use of civil protection orders.

Arrest

As the recognition of violence among intimates increased, more aggressive tactics were needed to adequately address and respond to violent victimization in the home. Those tactics included the introduction of mandatory and preferred arrest policies. The more stringent of the policies is the mandatory arrest policy, the purpose of which is to both assist law enforcement personnel who lack sufficient knowledge about IPV and are,

thus, poorly equipped to handle such disturbances, and to increase the likelihood that arrested offenders will be prosecuted (Buzawa and Buzawa 2003). Though commendable in purpose, mandatory arrest policies divest the officer of any discretion in making an arrest; once probable cause can be established that an act of intimate partner violence has occurred, an arrest must be made regardless of the victim's wishes. Preferred arrest policies, although they do not mandate an arrest, provide precise guidelines that urge arrest thereby limiting but not completely eradicating the officer's discretion (Buzawa and Buzawa 2003).

Civil Liability

Civil liability also predicated policy changes within police departments. As discussed above, *Thurman v. City of Torrington*, 595 F. Supp. 1531 (1984) served as a catalyst for changes in police practices. Tracy Thurman sued the City of Torrington and 29 police officers for failing to protect her pursuant to the 14th Amendment's equal protection clause by refusing to enforce her protection order against her husband. She was awarded \$2.3 million for the gross negligence of the department which led to Connecticut's passage of a mandatory arrest policy. Hence, civil liability helped push law enforcement personnel to take seriously domestic disturbances and the continual threat of abuse.

Shelters and Community Support

Within the safety and security of a battered women's shelter, a victim may attend group counseling where she can discover the options available to her and plan

accordingly. These may involve leaving her abuser permanently and, thus, asserting her independence or returning home with various stipulations including her refusal to accept violence as a control mechanism. While housed at the facility and by acknowledging her vulnerability, the victim may divest herself of self blame or guilt (van Wormer and Bartollas 2007). However, because there are limitations to how long a victim may stay at a shelter, she must often turn to her community and/or family for support (Tutty and Rothery 2002).

Batterer Intervention Programs

The purpose of batterer intervention programs is to punish those batterers who have been in contact with the criminal justice system, to hold them accountable for their actions, to educate them about patriarchy, to change attitudes and behaviors, and to provide batterers with various tools to control anger and communicate more effectively (Hanson 2002). Court-mandated batterer intervention is more effective when partnered with some type of treatment program (Buzawa and Buzawa 2003). Counseling is available almost immediately after a violent incident when the batterer is more receptive to different philosophical explanations for the violent outburst and is most remorseful and concerned about the criminal justice process. Moreover, pending the completion of a batterer intervention program, prosecution may be suspended; upon completion of the program, the charges are dropped. However, if the program is not completed, prosecutorial efforts may resume (Buzawa and Buzawa 2003).

Each of the aforementioned interventions is readily available to victims of IPV. However, some may choose to seek a protection order or some variation thereof for a

multitude of reasons. Those include, but are not limited to, dissatisfaction with law enforcement, the excessive costs of civil litigation, or an inability to seek shelter care because of male children (who are excluded from shelters). These protection orders, which aim to decrease abusive behaviors by forbidding contact between the abuser and the victim, are the primary topic of this thesis and thus of the remaining sections.

The Evolution of Civil Protection Orders

Although social perceptions regarding domestic abuse began to change during the second wave of the feminist movement (1960s-1970s), the legislative and judicial wheels turned slowly. Previously, the criminal justice system and society at large were unprepared to acknowledge the wide spectrum of family violence, having formerly limited their focus to child abuse. This was, to some degree, a result of the statistics available at that time not reflecting family violence as a growing phenomenon (Gelles 1997). But a paradigm shift occurred as feminism took hold and the grassroots efforts of various feminist organizations gave rise to the consideration of IPV as an issue of national concern (Gelles 1997; Grau, Fagan, and Wexler 1984). Suddenly, IPV moved from the private sphere to the public sphere causing a shift in public opinion. As victims and those affected by domestic violence emerged from hiding and shared their experiences, women who had been victimized became an interest group worthy of public attention, and they demanded gender equality and the right to be free from violence within the home (Zalman 1992). These interest groups voiced an exigency for social and legislative change, which would ultimately impact the practices of law enforcement, social agencies, and the judiciary. Consequently, state legislation granted arrest powers

to law enforcement personnel, and domestic violence statutes criminalizing abusive behavior were enacted. Additionally, new state legislation facilitated the development of protection orders for victims and diversionary programs for batterers (Zalman 1992). Yet, even though legal codes proclaimed domestic abuse to be a crime subject to sanctions of the court, reports and prosecution of IPV were still rare as society had not yet completely divested itself of the belief that family violence was a private issue (Buzawa and Buzawa 2003).

By the early 1970s, as IPV had not yet been taken seriously as a crime by law enforcement personnel, the recourse available to victims of IPV, heretofore, was a civil suit against the offender for damages associated with the victimization, especially the intentional infliction of emotional distress (Buzawa and Buzawa 2003). Also, the offender's wages could potentially be garnished in order to pay for costs related to relocation or any medical care resulting from the violence. Yet, many victims were unable to file civil suits because they could not retain private counsel due to the exorbitant costs nor wait months or years for the rare criminal trial to occur. The rare occurrence of criminal trials was partly attributable to the failure of law enforcement to consider IPV a crime due to the nature of the relationship between the victim and offender and to prosecutorial discretion which often had a deleterious impact on whether or not a case proceeded through the judicial system (Cahn 1992). The cases that were added to the criminal docket further inundated the judicial system by increasing the backlog of cases to be heard.

The civil remedy to alleviate the backlog was the use of injunctions within the civil court to combat IPV. However, civil protection orders, at first, were rarely granted

as issuance of injunctive relief was not the primary purpose of the court and judiciary took great care not to violate the constitutional rights of the offenders by failing to provide them with procedural due process (Buzawa and Buzawa 2003). Accordingly, higher standards of proof—proof beyond a reasonable doubt that there was a threat to the complainant—were required before a protective order was issued (Buzawa and Buzawa 2003).

Although initially rarely issued, injunctive relief afforded by the civil court was virtually unrestrained. The court could, in essence, provide any relief deemed necessary to ensure the protection and safety of the victim (Buzawa and Buzawa 2003). For instance, the court could prohibit contact between the abuser, victim and victim's children (if any); this comprises contact by telephone, U.S. Postal Service, or any form of electronic communication. In addition, the court is authorized to order the offender into some type of anger management or batterer intervention program. Moreover, an abuser may be ordered to vacate the family home, and a victim may be granted exclusive use of personal property (Buzawa and Buzawa 2003). The types of relief afforded are of great importance to victims because the civil court, via its leniency reflected by a much lower burden of proof, was able to issue injunctions rather expeditiously. The relative facility of obtaining injunctive relief presumably immediately empowered recipients regardless of the fact that the orders were initially weakly or rarely enforced (Buzawa and Buzawa 2003).

Civil protection orders became increasingly more widely issued in the late 1970s and early 1980s. This was due, in part, to the pressure feminist organizations, shelters, and formerly battered women placed upon state legislatures around the country to

acknowledge IPV as a crime and to provide protection, via the protection order, to victims of abuse. The feminist grassroots movement led to the development of key organizations and institutions such as the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence in 1978, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Office on Domestic Violence in 1979, and the Department of Justice Task Force on Family Violence in 1984 (OVW: History-VAWA 2010). Over the next decade, an increase in litigation against police departments occurred with the goal of holding departments liable for the injuries sustained by women who were being abused and who asserted they were being denied equal protection under the law because of their gender and, often times, their marital status.¹¹ Furthermore, in 1985, U.S. Surgeon General Everett Koop first acknowledged IPV as a major health concern followed by a similar statement in 1988 indicating IPV as the leading health concern for American women (OVW: History-VAWA 2010).

The combination of the aforementioned events including the pressure on the legislature to address domestic violence as a crime, in turn, forced the judiciary into action. As courts and legislators broadened their focus to include criminal punishment, deterrence of batterers, treatment, and protective interventions to ensure victims' safety and empowerment, the goal of American society changed from ignoring IPV to protecting women and punishing offenders (Fagan 1996). Accordingly, during the 1980s, 37 states passed domestic violence legislation that modified protection orders by adding a criminal component (Buzawa 1996). Today, all 50 states permit criminal sanctions for offenders who violate the protective orders.

With these advancements, civil protection orders presumably further empowered victims and ensured their safety. However, problems remained. IPV cases competed

¹¹ see *Thurman v. City of Torrington*, 595 F. Supp. 1531 (1984).

with other cases on the criminal docket for limited resources. These cases often resulted in dismissal or less serious punishments, often at the expense of the victim (Fritzler and Simon 2000). Nevertheless, law enforcement personnel, prosecutorial staff, victim advocates, and the judiciary noticed an undesirable trend -- minimal interaction with the court did not deter IPV offenders. To the contrary, victims and batterers went through the criminal justice system repeatedly. This was due, in part, to the ignorance of all parties involved regarding the unique characteristics and intricacies of domestic violence cases such as the emotional and financial dependence between the parties (Fritzler and Simon 2000; Kaye and Knipps 2000). The resulting systemic failure of the justice system in properly handling IPV cases necessitated the development of domestic violence courts, which now is where most IPV civil protection orders are issued.

Traditionally, temporary civil protection orders last for 10 to 14 days depending on the jurisdiction and can be granted *ex parte* (in the absence of the other party) (Meiers 2005; DeJong & Burgess-Proctor 2006; Logan et al. 2007; Logan et al. 2005; Buzawa and Buzawa 2003). Among the three sites considered in this study, Delaware, for example, grants the initial order for approximately 10 days (10 Del. C. § 1042) whereas Colorado and the District of Columbia provide the order for 14 days (C.R.S. §13-14-102 and D.C. Code §16-1003, respectively). However, once an order of protection is issued, it can remain in effect for one year and can be extended by the court following another hearing.

Hence, a civil protection order is a court issued document mandating one person to refrain from harming or contacting another. It requires that the petitioner believe that she or he is in danger but does not generally require that criminal charges be levied

against the perpetrator (Buzawa and Buzawa 2003; DeJong and Burgess-Proctor 2006). Because criminal charges are not required, a lower standard of proof, a preponderance of the evidence, is required. Although a civil protection order “restrains an individual who has committed an act of violence against . . . [another] from further acts against that person,” it is important to consider whether the orders are actually effective in helping victims of domestic violence (Holt et al 2002:589).

PRIOR STUDIES EXAMINING EFFECTIVENESS OF PROTECTION ORDERS

One of the first and most accessible forms of protection available for IPV victims is the civil protection order. With the advent of protection orders and their increased accessibility, researchers and policymakers, over the past 20 years, have begun to delve into the purview of civil protection orders and their effectiveness. To date, some of the research emphasizes the lack of consistent enforceability of civil protection orders and how tragedy may occur despite legal interventions (Logan et al. 2006). Other studies focus on their effectiveness, and these are discussed below.

In 1984, Grau, Faban, and Wexler conducted one of the first empirical studies of protection orders. Women from Florida, Vermont, Ohio, and North Carolina (n=270) who were also clients of a federally funded Family Violence Demonstration Program were interviewed regarding the incidence of IPV depending upon the presence or absence of a restraining order. Both post-project *abuse* and post-project *violence* were used as outcomes where post-project *abuse* represented harassment, threats, and physical violence, and post-project *violence* referred only to “physical acts of violence, which often are the criteria prescribing certain types of legal sanctions against the assailant”

(Grau et al. 1984: 20-21). Thirty-three percent of the women interviewed secured a protection order. Those women shared several characteristics including younger age, employment, separation from their spouses in an attempt to stop the violence, a shorter marriage marked by decreased violence, and children living in the home. Restraining orders also appeared to be more readily available to financially independent women.

Moreover, severity of the prior violence experienced by the victim was also an issue. Forty-four percent of victims who had experienced low levels of prior injury (defined as bruises or less) and received a protection order were re-abused compared to 54% of victims who had experienced low levels of prior injury but had not obtained a protection order. Sixty-seven percent of victims who had experienced high levels of prior injury (defined as lacerations or worse) who secured an order were re-abused compared to 65% of victims who experienced high levels of prior injury but were unable to secure a protection order. Accordingly, victims who received restraining orders were less likely to be re-abused but only if their prior injuries were less severe. For those who experienced more severe violence prior to obtaining the order, it had no impact on subsequent abuse. Yet, when restraining orders were not in effect, victims were more likely to be re-abused after the project intervention, regardless of the history of pre-project violence. Fifty-nine percent of victims who did not receive temporary restraining orders were re-abused compared to 56% who did receive the order.

The victims were also questioned regarding the perceived efficacy of the restraining orders. Twenty-six percent of the victims said that the order was “not at all effective,” 2% indicated that it “was too soon to tell,” 29% reported that the orders were “somewhat effective,” and 43% replied that the orders were “very effective” in reducing

violence. Ultimately, Grau and colleagues (1984) determined that post-project abuse and violence were unaffected by restraining orders as nearly three in five women were re-victimized within four months regardless of whether or not they had obtained a restraining order.

Three years later, Horton, Simonidis and Simonidis (1987) reported their findings on 120 Dane County, Wisconsin victims seeking temporary restraining orders over the course of four months (August-November 20, 1982). Of the 120 victims who sought temporary restraining orders, 68 received the orders, 50 of whom completed both follow-up questionnaires. Those 50 victims were typically young females, age 30 or younger, who were often married to and lived with their abusers, and had an average of 2.25 children. Additionally, 80% had only a high school diploma or GED while 50% possessed no marketable job skills, 56% were unemployed, and 50% were receiving governmental assistance through Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). Sixty-two percent of the women obtained their protection orders utilizing a fee waiver.

Seventy-two percent of the Dane County victims reported a violent history with their batterers: 64% reported being hit by their abusers, 50% reported being beaten, and 18% indicated being threatened with knives. During the three months preceding the order, more than 33% of the perpetrators reported at least 10 instances of victimization and 16% reported at least 25 instances. More than one-quarter of the women sought police assistance at least once within the same three month period.

At the end of the four month follow-up period, restraining orders were still in effect for 88% of the victims. Forty-four percent of the victims claimed they had required further police contact after receiving the order, typically to report unwelcome

phone calls or visits. Thirty-eight percent of the victims experienced complete offender-compliance while 46% continued to have some difficulty with unwanted contacts; 24% of the victims were contacted once or less per week and 22% experienced two or more contacts weekly. Additionally, 16% had reconciled and were living with the offenders by the end of the study. Overall, 86% of the victims surveyed were satisfied with their experience, 50% were very satisfied with the restraining orders, and 94% believed that obtaining a temporary restraining order was good for them.

In 1991, Harrell et al. (1993) conducted a study of Colorado women (n=779) who had been injured in a domestic incident and consequently sought protection orders. Interviews were conducted with both the victims and offenders. Ninety-three percent of the offenders believed they would be sanctioned if they violated the order. The deterrent effect resulted in a vast majority of the abusers (85%) complying with the mandate by ceasing their violent behaviors. Revictimization was most common with offenders who wanted to remain in the family home or sought child custody. Nevertheless, certain behaviors continued regardless of the court's order. For example, despite the no-contact proviso, 75% of victims were contacted by their abusers. Also problematic was the presence of collateral effects; collateral effects are demonstrated by the development or manifestation of new behaviors that replace the prior forbidden ones. In this study, although physical violence ceased, unwanted phone calls occurred for just over 50% of the victims. Furthermore, over 20% experienced stalking and another 20% reported the abuser entering her home. Therefore, as the results for this study are mixed, protection orders have a limited effect on completely reducing revictimization.

Chaudhuri and Daly (1992) built upon Grau, Faban, and Wexler's work when they interviewed 30 Connecticut women who had obtained temporary restraining orders in 1986. The population consisted of mostly minority women (53% Black and 30% Hispanic) with an average age of 25 years. Forty percent of the female participants did not have a high school education compared to 54% of the men with whom they were in relationships. Additionally, the women were steadily employed and earned between \$10,000 and \$42,000 annually (median = \$19,150) compared to their partners who were less likely to be employed full-time with a median income of \$23,500. Also, the women were less likely to abuse drugs or alcohol (13% and 73%, respectively) and less likely to have a criminal record than the men (0% and 13%, respectively). Seventy-seven percent of the participants were married at the time of their interview, and 90% of the participants had children.

Regarding the severity of the violent episodes, 10% of the women had been hospitalized due to injuries resulting from their IPV victimization and 13.33% had been assaulted with weapons. Nonetheless, prior to securing the restraining orders, 30% of the victims called the police once for intervention, 30% called the police 5 to 10 times, and 40% called the police on 2 to 4 separate occasions. The authors reported, similar to Grau et al. (1984), that the women who obtained the orders were:

Younger, have completed more years of education, have paid jobs and earn more, and are in relationships of shorter duration with a history of separations. With a measure of financial and emotional independence from abusive partners, women who obtain TROs may be one step ahead of other abused women (Chaudhuri and Daly 1992: 233).

Chaudhuri and Daly also discovered that temporary restraining orders reduced the probability of physical violence as long as the offender had no prior criminal history and

was employed. Of the 11 men who violated the temporary restraining order, 4 had a criminal history, 10 regularly abused alcohol or drugs, and 10 were either unemployed or employed part-time. Of the 19 men who adhered to the order, none had a criminal history, and 17 were employed full-time; however, 12 regularly abused alcohol or drugs. Therefore, if the offender had a criminal history, was unemployed, employed part-time, or used alcohol or drugs, the presence of a protection order had little effect on reducing revictimization. The authors found that 63% of the offenders were in total compliance with the order. After the two month follow-up period, 20 women (66%) who obtained temporary restraining orders reported a complete cessation of physical assault or threats by the offender, suggesting that whether the temporary restraining order effectively reduces repeat victimization is based on offender characteristics.

Kaci (1994) conducted a study to determine if the Domestic Violence Temporary Restraining Order Clinic located within a California Legal Aid office was effective. The recruitment period was from September 1993 to the end of January 1994. Ultimately, a total of 137 southern California victims who filed for protective orders against their abusers agreed to participate. Researchers distributed questionnaires to the victims at one month and four months after visiting the Legal Aid office. Although the response rates were poor (36 participants (26%) at one month and 14 participants (10%) at four months, respectively), the vast majority of women at both intervals (including 86% of married applicants and 84% of non-married applicants) indicated that the protection order led to a decrease in violence. More specifically, the authors found that temporary restraining orders were effective at decreasing severe (i.e., aggravated assault/battery with serious injury), moderate (i.e., battery without serious injury) and minor (i.e., threats or isolated

incidents) violence (87.5%, 80% and 90%, respectively) (Kaci 1994: 211). Nonetheless, a complete cessation of violence did not necessarily imply a complete cession of contact and/or communication with the offender.

Women who completed the questionnaire were also asked to participate in in-person interviews to provide a deeper understanding of the effectiveness of protection orders. Ten of the women who obtained the temporary restraining order agreed to be interviewed, 70% of whom indicated that the violence had stopped. One indicated that the violence stopped but harassment continued, one reported that violence continued, and one reported that the violence worsened. Of the women who secured a permanent order at the four month interview, 60% indicated that the violence had stopped, 20% reported continued harassment despite violence cessation, 20% reported that violence continued; however, no one reported that the violence had worsened. In conclusion, although one person reported that the physical abuse continued after procurement of the temporary order, none of the victims reported an increase in abuse after the issuance of a permanent protection order. In fact, they indicated that other than separating from their partners, another effective mechanism, the civil protection order was particularly useful in preventing re-abuse (Kaci 1994).

Using data from a sample of temporary restraining orders issued from January to September 1991, Harrell and Smith (1996) interviewed 355 civil protection order recipients addressing male-to-female violence to ascertain whether the orders resulted in a decrease in revictimization. Although there were 706 filings, 43% of the petitioners could not be located and 7% refused to participate. Accordingly, 355 victims and 142 offenders were interviewed three months after the temporary restraining orders were

obtained; the victims were interviewed again one year after the order. More than 50% of the female victims were White, 33% were Hispanic, 10% were Black, while the remainder was either Native American or other. Employment status included 33% of the female victims being unemployed, 50% employed full-time, and nearly 20% employed part-time.

Most of the victims and offenders reported contact within the first three months after the issuance of the temporary restraining order (77% of women and 71% of men, respectively). During the first three months, unwanted contact was reported by more than 50% of women with temporary restraining orders. However, the contact reported occasionally represented a reunion or reconciliation between the parties (15% of the women moved back in with the offender, and 13% reported a reconciliation within the first three months after the order was issued). Nevertheless, the majority (86%) of the women who obtained temporary restraining orders reported that the order was “very” or “somewhat” helpful in documenting that the abuse had occurred; 79% found the order “very” or “somewhat” helpful in sending a message to the offender that abuse is wrong; and 62% thought the order was “very” or “somewhat” helpful in punishing their partners.

The amount of contact was not impacted by the presence of a permanent order. In fact, permanent protection orders did not increase deterrence as “women who had permanent orders were as likely as those without to report continued abuse” (Harrell and Smith 1996: 240). During the follow-up period (months 4-12), 60% of the women interviewed reported some form of revictimization, especially psychological abuse more than physical assault. Hence, as violations of the restraining orders were common, questions regarding their effectiveness are warranted.

Carlson et al. (1999) reviewed court data from both the Travis County (Texas) Courthouse and records of the Austin Police Department. Using these data, they discovered that more than 1,400 petitions for temporary restraining orders were filed from 1990 to 1992. The authors limited their sample to those orders filed during the months of January, August, and October for the years that the data were obtained and for which both court and police records were available. The result was a sample of 348 court cases; however, 33 cases were excluded for a variety of reasons. Two hundred and ten of the remaining 313 court cases included police contact prior to the order being filed.

The authors retrospectively analyzed the police records of 210 couples for two years both prior to the issuance of a protection order as well as two years following the issuance. They found that 68% of the women reported physical violence in the two years prior to obtaining a protection order. For the two years after the protection order, 23% of the women reported being revictimized. Additionally, 87% of women involved in cases where the offender had been arrested reported being victimized prior to obtaining the protection order; approximately 25% of those same women were revictimized after procuring it. The type of protection order obtained also appeared to make a difference. Women who obtained permanent protection orders were less likely to be revictimized than women who only had temporary orders (21% and 31%, respectively). Therefore, in this particular study, the finding of a significant decline in the occurrence of abuse reported after issuance of the order indicates that protection orders are effective in reducing revictimization for some female IPV victims.

The relationship between children, the length of the relationship between the victim and the offender, and protection order efficacy was also examined. The authors

found that women with children were more likely to be re-abused after the protection order than women without children (33% and 18%, respectively). Furthermore, a negative relationship was found between the length of the relationship with the batterer and the likelihood of re-abuse. Women whose relationships with their abusers were longer than 5 years were less likely than those whose relationships were shorter than 5 years to be re-abused after the protection order (9% v. 26%, respectively). Hence, the presence of children and the length of the relationship with the abuser are additional factors that may impact whether protection orders are effective in particular situations.

Last, Carlson et al.'s (1999) study revealed that both race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status play an important role in the risk of revictimization. Black women experienced higher rates of physical violence before and after the protection order in comparison to their White or Hispanic counterparts. In fact, 76% percent of the African-American women reported physical abuse before filing and 38% reported abuse following the protection order (50% decline); 56% of the White women reported physical abuse prior to filing and 15% reported abuse after the order (73% decline); and 68% of Hispanic women reported physical abuse prior to filing and 18% reported abuse following the order's issuance (74% decline). Also, 70% of women earning less than \$18,000 annually (very low SES) reported physical violence prior to the filing and 33% reported abuse after the order (53% decline) compared to women earning above \$18,000 annually, 65% of whom reported physical abuse prior to the order and 19% of whom reported abused after the protection order (71% decline). Therefore, Black women and those women with low SES (irrespective of race) were more likely to report violence before and to experience it after obtaining a protection order, thus suggesting that

race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status are predictors of IPV and protection order effectiveness.

Race and ethnicity were highlighted in another study. In 2002, McFarlane et al. (2004) conducted a study of 150 Black, Hispanic, and White women who applied and qualified for a two-year protective order in Houston, Texas. Follow-up interviews were conducted at 3, 6, 12 and 18 months with 149 of the 150 women who applied for protective orders; one victim committed suicide. Eighty-one of the 149 women were granted the protection order; 69 did not receive the order because they either dropped the petition, could not locate or serve the offender, or the court dismissed the petition. Forty-four percent of the women who obtained the order indicated that at least one violation had occurred during the 18-month follow-up period; however, violations were reported at each of the intervals: at 3 months 21% of the women reported violations; at 6 months 20% of the women reported violations; at 12 months 25% of the women reported violations; and at 18 months 23% of the women reported violations. Fifty-eight percent of the women who obtained an order that was violated called the police to report a violation of the order. Generally, the violations pertained to the stay-away orders where the offenders failed to stay 200 feet away from a victim's home or workplace. Yet, the authors also discovered a significant decrease in assaults, batteries, stalking, and harassment at work regardless of the race and ethnicity of the victim and regardless of whether the victims had actually secured protective orders. Consequently, the attempt to secure the order was just as important in reducing revictimization. Ultimately, McFarlane et al. (2004) found the presence or absence of a protection order did not make a significant difference as it related to the amount of violence initially reported or during

the various follow-up periods, nor were there variations in the effectiveness of orders across race/ethnicity of the victims.

Holt et al. (2002) conducted a retrospective cohort study of 2,691 women who reported a domestic violence incident to the Seattle, Washington police between August 1998 and December 1999. None of the petitioners had secured permanent protection orders within the previous 12 months of the index incident. Outcomes were measured by subsequent incidents of re-abuse that were reported to law enforcement. Those incidents included physical (assault, reckless endangerment, or unlawful imprisonment) or psychological (harassment, stalking, threats, etc.) abuse; simple violations of the orders (e.g. through contact) were not included in the analysis.

The authors compared women who obtained temporary protection orders versus those who did not have orders and those who obtained permanent protection orders versus those who did not have orders. Initially, similarities regarding age, pregnancy, and history of abuse were found among women who did not secure protection orders at all, those who secured temporary protection orders, and those secured permanent protection orders. The majority of the women across all groups were between 20 and 39 years of age. Less than 5% in each group was pregnant at the time the study was conducted. Few women across the groups were assaulted with weapons (1.8%, 2.9%, and 2.7%, respectively); however, the majority experienced a simple assault at the hands of their abusers (64.8%, 53.6%, and 53.5%, respectively). Additionally, less than 5% across all groups reported IPV to the police in the previous year. On the other hand, women who failed to secure a protection order and their partners were more likely to have been under the influence of drugs or alcohol (14.8%) than those with temporary

protection orders (4.3%) or permanent orders (3.8%). Moreover, alcohol and/or other drugs were factors with the abuser as well. In those instances where a protection order was not obtained, 24.1% of the abusers were under the influence of alcohol and/or other drugs at the time of the index incident compared with 13.6% of abusers in situations where a temporary protection order was obtained and 9.2% where a permanent order was obtained. Last, women who had not obtained a protection order were more likely to be cohabitating (53.2%) with the partner at the time of the index incident when compared to those with a temporary protection order (44.4%) and those with a permanent order (41.7%).

Two hundred twenty-two incidents of police-reported physical abuse (16.5 incidents per 100 person-years) and 223 incidents of police-reported psychological abuse (16.6 per 100 person-years) occurred within the first six months of the follow-up period. At the end of the twelve month period, a total of 363 incidents of police-reported physical abuse (13.5 per 100 person-years) and 330 incidents of psychological abuse (12.3 per 100 person-years) were reported. Holt and colleagues discovered (within the first 6 months) a rate of police-reported physical abuse of 17.2 per 100 person-years existed for those women who did not have protection orders. Yet, women with temporary protection orders-exposed time¹² experienced a physical abuse rate of 14.7 per 100 person-years, and those with permanent orders-exposed time experienced a rate of 5.4 per 100 person-years. For the 12 month duration of the study, women who did not have protection orders had a rate of police-reported physical abuse of 14.0 per 100 person-years while those with temporary protection orders-exposed time had a physical abuse rate of 24.7 per 100

¹² The authors calculated “Relative Risks using Cox proportional hazards regression with time-dependent exposure” (Holt et al. 2002: 592).

person-years, and those with permanent orders-exposed time experienced a rate of 2.9 per 100 person-years.

For police-reported psychological abuse, participants without a protection order experienced a victimization rate of 16.0 per 100 person-years within the first six months. Those with temporary protection orders-exposed time experienced a psychological abuse rate of 95.6 per 100 person-years while those with permanent orders experienced an abuse rate of 16.2 per 100 person-years. For the 12-month duration of the study, women without protection orders experienced a psychological abuse rate of 11.8 per 100 person-years. Those with temporary protection orders-exposed time experienced a psychological abuse rate of 104.9 per 100 person-years. Women with permanent orders-exposed time experienced a psychological abuse rate of 10.2 per 100 person-years. Regarding the effectiveness of the orders themselves, the authors reported that permanent protection orders were associated with an 80% decrease in the risk of police-reported violence (particularly physical violence) against women by male intimates within 12 months after the index incident, but the same could not be said for temporary protection orders. In fact, women who had secured temporary protection orders were more likely to be psychologically abused than women who had no orders by the first follow-up interview. Accordingly, the temporary protection orders were associated with significantly a higher re-abuse rate when compared to not having an order or having a permanent order and were, therefore, not helpful relative to not having an order or having a permanent order.

Holt et al. (2003) also conducted a study of 448 adult females living in the Seattle, Washington area who were abused or threatened by their partners as documented by a police report as well as those women who obtained civil protection orders between

October 1997 and December 1998. The women were divided into two groups: a group of women who received a protection order (temporary or permanent) irrespective of whether or not an IPV incident was reported to the police and a comparison group of women who had IPV-related police contact but had not obtained a protection order. Four hundred forty-eight women participated in baseline interviews, 253 of whom had secured protection orders and 195 who had not. Follow-up interviews were conducted at 4.8 months and 9.4 months after the index incident (either the incident leading to the protection order or the incident leading the victim to contact the police). Outcomes were measured by: contact with the offenders; unwanted communication via telephone or visit; threats of any kind made via telephone, in person, or with a weapon; psychological, sexual, or physical abuse; any injury resulting from an IPV incident and whether or not medical attention was required for the injury (Holt 2003).

At the four month follow-up, interviews were conducted with 240 women with civil protection orders and 157 women who did not obtain the orders. There was not a statistically significant difference regarding race among women who obtained civil protection orders and women who did not obtain the orders. Statistically significant differences were evident, however, in that women who had obtained civil protection orders were more likely to be employed full-time (55.6% v. 42.3%), pregnant (7.6% v. 2.6%), depressed (71.3% v. 60.5%), and less likely to have a substance abuse problem (34.2% v. 47.1%) than those who did not obtain the orders. Additionally, women with the protection orders typically did not live with the offender at the time of the incident leading to the protection order or police report (40.4% v. 54.8%) and were also more likely to report sexual assault in the prior year (47.5% v. 37.6%). Nonetheless, victims

with protection orders at the baseline interview had lower rates of revictimization between the index incident and the first follow-up interview when compared to women who did not obtain the protection order.

At the second interview, 224 women with protection orders and 138 without protection orders remained. The data revealed that women with a protection order between the index incident and the first follow-up interview experienced a decline in all measures of abuse except for unwelcome calls. Women who obtained a protection order between the first and second follow-up interviews experienced an even greater decline in outcome measures once again, except for unwelcome calls, compared to women who had not secured an order. Additionally, the length of time that had passed since the victim obtained the protection order was also associated with a decrease in the rate of abuse. More specifically, “65% of women with CPOs at baseline who had permanent CPOs at the follow-up experienced a substantial and significant decrease in risk of most abuse outcomes; these decreases were larger than those we observed for all women with civil protection orders at the baseline” (Holt et al. 2003: 19). In fact, the women who maintained their protection orders throughout the follow-up period experienced a 70% decrease in physical abuse. Thus, longer follow-up periods were associated with greater decreases in revictimization. Hence, Holt and colleagues (2003) concluded that protection orders were associated with a significant and substantial decrease in risks of revictimization and that orders which were maintained for longer periods of time were more effective in decreasing future violence among intimates versus temporary or no orders.

Finally, Keilitz et al. (1997) (n = 285) conducted a study using the same data as used in this thesis. They evaluated the effectiveness of civil protection orders in deterring IPV in Wilmington, Delaware; Denver, Colorado; and Washington, D.C. Although the attrition rate of participants was significant, the results in and of themselves were promising. Prior to obtaining the order, 54.4% of the participants had experienced severe abuse (e.g., beaten/choked), 83.9% had experienced mild abuse (e.g., slap, kick, shove), 36.8% had been threatened with or injured by a weapon, and 98.9% had been intimidated by their partner. At the initial interview, which occurred one month after the civil protection order was obtained, 72.3% of the victims indicated that their lives had improved and 73.7% indicated that they felt safer.

The majority of the victims (72.4% at the first follow-up interview and 65.3% at the 6 month follow-up) reported complete compliance from the offender after procuring the protection order. In fact, few of the participants reported repeat physical abuse (less than 3%) or psychological abuse (4.4%) at the first follow-up interview although both repeat physical and psychological abuse had increased at the 6 month mark (8.4% and 12.6%, respectively). Additionally, few of the victims experienced stalking behaviors (4% at the first follow-up interview and 7% at the second follow-up interview); however, more victims experienced difficulty with unwanted visits (9% at initial interview and 9% at the six month follow-up interview) and phone calls (16.1% at the initial interview and 17.4% at the six month follow-up interview) (Keilitz et al. 1997).

At the six month mark, with only 177 participants remaining, 85% of the victims claimed that their lives had improved, 92.7% claimed they felt better, and 80.5% indicated they felt safer. Ninety-five percent of the victims reported that they would seek

additional protection orders if needed. Overall, the majority of the victims viewed the protection orders and their effectiveness in positive ways. However, Keilitz et al.'s (1997) findings are limited, at best, as they only presented descriptive statistics and had a high attrition rate. Therefore, I plan to move beyond the Keilitz (1997) study by conducting multivariate analyses that allow me to control for relevant predictors. More specifically, I plan to examine race/ethnicity and SES, two potentially key factors for civil protection order effectiveness, as well as other predictors of effectiveness.

In summary, the studies conducted on the effectiveness of protection orders provide mixed and contradictory results. The limited research indicates that civil protection orders do not cause a complete cessation in revictimization (Grau et al. 1984; Horton et al. 1987), but they are associated with a significant decline in revictimization given certain factors (Kaci 1994; Carlson et al. 1999). However, the probability of revictimization is greatly reduced when the offender has no prior criminal history and is employed (Chaudhuri and Daly 1992). Additionally, Horton and colleagues (1987) illuminated the importance of socioeconomic status of victims as factors that could potentially impact civil protection order effectiveness. Consequently, SES and extreme poverty are important predictors in revictimization (Horton et al. 1987; Carlson et al. 1999). In most of the literature, race/ethnicity were either ignored or found to be not significant (McFarlane et al. 2004). Yet, Carlson et al. (1999) reported that Black women were more likely to report physical violence than White or Hispanic women before and after the protection order. Thus, race/ethnicity could be an issue in civil protection efficacy and is worthy of further research.

As the results of the studies on civil protection orders are mixed, this thesis purports to contribute additional knowledge to the literature pertaining to protection order efficacy in IPV. Race and socioeconomic status are clearly important predictors of IPV victimization, and they may be important as well for civil protection order effectiveness. Specifically, in this study, I seek to move beyond the descriptive statistics provided in the original NCSC study (Keilitz et al. 2007) and contribute to the extant literature by using a more sophisticated statistical analysis to determine the effect, if any, of race/ethnicity and SES on civil protection order effectiveness. Effectiveness will be assessed in terms of violence reduction after obtaining the order, perceptions of efficacy, and feelings of safety. The specific hypotheses to be tested are as follows:

H₁: White females are more likely than Black females or Hispanic females to experience violence reduction once a civil protection order has been obtained.

H₂: Higher SES females are more likely than lower SES females to experience violence reduction once a civil protection order has been obtained.

H₃: White females are more likely than Black females or Hispanic females to experience contact reduction once a civil protection order has been obtained.

H₄: Higher SES females are more likely than lower SES females to experience contact reduction once a civil protection order has been obtained.

H₅: White females are more likely than Black females or Hispanic females to perceive their civil protection orders as effective.

H₆: Higher SES females are more likely than lower SES females to perceive their civil protection orders as effective.

H₇: White females are more likely than Black females or Hispanic females to have increased feelings of safety after obtaining a civil protection order.

H₈: Higher SES females are more likely than lower SES females to have increased feelings of safety after obtaining a civil protection order.

The next chapter describes the research methodology used to test these hypotheses.

Chapter 3: Data and Methodology

OVERVIEW

The results of the studies on the effectiveness of civil protection orders are mixed. Nevertheless, race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status remain clearly important predictors of IPV victimization, and they may very well be important for civil protection order effectiveness. In this study, I assess the effect, if any, of race/ethnicity and SES on violence reduction, perceptions of efficacy, and feelings of safety after obtaining the protection order. In the following sections, I identify the three locations for this study, present the statutes and provisions associated with civil protection orders, review the sources of data, describe variables of interest, and discuss the analyses.

SITES, STATUTES, AND PROVISIONS

The three locations in this study are Wilmington, Delaware; Denver, Colorado; and Washington, District of Columbia. These were the three sites selected for the *Benefits and Limitations of Civil Protection Orders for Victims of Domestic Violence in Wilmington, Delaware, Denver, Colorado, and DC, 1994-1995* study to be reanalyzed here. Each of the jurisdictions has unique and distinct criteria for issuing protection orders; however, all allow for the issuance of ex parte orders as well as warrantless arrests.

The Delaware Family Court has the responsibility of issuing Protection From Abuse Orders (PFAs) to family members, former spouses, heterosexual couples living together with or without children in common, or heterosexual couples living apart with a child in common (Del. Code Ann. Tit. 10 §1041(2) and 1045). Behavior prohibited

under Title 10 § 901(9) of the Delaware Code “includes causing or attempting to cause physical injury, threatening to cause physical injury, destroying property, trespassing, child abuse, unlawful imprisonment, and insults or taunts that reasonably would cause alarm, humiliation, or degradation in another individual” (Keilitz 1997: 13). Colorado permits issuance of a protection order for those persons subjected to violence or threats thereof, including children under the age of 18 pursuant to Colo. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 13-14-101(2) and 102. Persons who are permitted to seek a protection order are spouses or former spouses, current or former unmarried couples, persons with a child in common, or housemates (Colo. Rev. Stat. § 13-14-101(2)). The District of Columbia allows a protection order to be issued when physical abuse, threats to injure or stalking are at issue between parties who are related by blood, legal custody, marriage, who have a child in common, cohabitate, or are in a current or have had a prior romantic relationship (D.C. Code § 16- §1001(A)(B)).

The jurisdictions offer similar relief to victims of IPV. All of the jurisdictions allow for the issuance of the order on behalf of the victim and her children and prohibit contact (telephone or in person including staying away from specified locations) between the victim and the perpetrator (Del. Code Ann. Tit. 10 §1041, D.C. Code § 16-1005(9), C.R.S. 13-14-102) although Colorado specifies distance in terms of yardage. The victim can also be awarded exclusive use of the family home as well as personal property, temporary custody of any children and child support in all three jurisdictions. The Delaware court may also order spousal support and provide a monetary award to the victim to pay for damages caused by intimate partner violence as well as require the perpetrator to relinquish firearms to police, prohibit him from obtaining any additional

firearms, and order evaluations for substance abuse treatment and counseling (Del. Code Ann. Tit. 10 §1041). Colorado also expressly prohibits the perpetrator from possessing firearms for the duration of the protection order (C.R.S. 13-14-102). The unique characteristic of a protection order in the District of Columbia is the notice provided to Metropolitan Police, within the text of the order, that the mutual residence should be monitored while the perpetrator removes his personal property (D.C. Code § 16-1005(9)).

DATA

The data for this study were obtained from ICPSR Study No. 2557, *Benefits and Limitations of Civil Protection Orders for Victims of Domestic Violence in Wilmington, Delaware, Denver, Colorado, and DC, 1994-1995*. This study was funded by the United States Department of Justice through the National Institute of Justice. The project examined protection order efficacy in decreasing re-abuse as well as victims' perceptions of safety and well-being within three jurisdictions: Wilmington, Delaware; Denver, Colorado; and the District of Columbia. There were four sources of data (all of which were limited to female victims) for the study: 1) telephone interviews conducted with 285 female petitioners one month after they received the protection order; 2) follow-up interviews with 177 of the original 285 petitioners 6 months later; 3) victims' case records; and 4) criminal records of the perpetrator-offenders named in the orders. Additional information was obtained via on-site interviews conducted with judges and courthouse staff as well as through observations of hearings for temporary and permanent orders (Keilitz et al. 2007). In this study, I focused on the telephone interviews conducted with the original 285 female petitioners conducted one month after the

protection order; however, after deciding to eliminate the cases with missing data, the sample size was decreased to 110 petitioners.

Beginning in July 1994, researchers recruited participants at the three jurisdictional courts. All women who were seeking protection orders at that time were asked to participate in the research study. All 554 women asked (151 in Delaware; 194 in Denver; and 209 in District of Columbia) agreed to participate in the study and signed consent forms. An initial interview was completed with 285 of the women (90 in Delaware; 90 in Denver; and 105 in the District of Columbia) one month after they received their protection orders. (As discussed below, a number of women (269) who agreed to participate did not for a variety of reasons.) Six months later, follow-up interviews were conducted with 177 of the 285 women. Additional data were retrieved from the victims' case records as well as from the offenders' criminal records (Keilitz et al. 1997).

A key component to conducting any research study is the ability to communicate with study participants. Although written documentation is frequently used in many research projects, such documents were inappropriate in this study because they could be easily intercepted by the offenders, thus placing the victim-petitioners in further danger. Therefore, as this study was conducted prior to the global phenomenon of cellular telephones, landlines were the only available form of communication with the women.

The study is marked by low initial response rates and high levels of attrition resulting from the inability to maintain telephone contact with the victim-petitioners (Keilitz 2009). Women seeking protection orders find themselves in unstable and precarious positions; therefore, they are relocating, disconnecting telephones and

reestablishing telephone connection in another location. Accordingly, study-related messages for all of the participants were left on answering machines or with individuals. Interviews were conducted with approximately 51% (285) of the 554 recruited women. Of the remaining 269 women, 20% (55) of the women did not respond to telephone messages requesting that they call a toll-free number. Additionally, 16% (43) of the women who agreed to participate could not be reached because their telephones had been disconnected and neither emergency contact information nor alternative telephone numbers had been provided. Approximately 10% (29) of the women recruited were not interviewed because researchers were unable to leave a message (e.g., no answering machine available) or if a male answered the telephone the call was disconnected. Several other petitioners were not interviewed because the telephone numbers were incorrect (4%) and others did not have telephones (3%). Nine percent (24) of the recruited women simply changed their minds and no longer wanted to participate. Seven percent (20) cancelled, missed, or rescheduled appointments multiple times. Six percent (16) of the recruited women were unsuccessful in obtaining the protection orders; 4% (11) had moved; and 5% (13) were disqualified from participating because they had petitioned for protection orders against a family member who was not an intimate partner (Keilitz et al. 1997). Thus, initial participation rates were low.

In addition, this study relied exclusively on self-reports of continuation or cessation of violence. Significant amounts of data were missing. Missing data are problematic because they are typically not missing completely at random. Thus, cases with complete data typically differ from those with incomplete data. Because of this, excluding cases with incomplete data makes the remaining sample and findings less

generalizable. However, listwise deletion of cases with missing data, as used here, is preferable to simple missing data approaches such as mean substitution (Allison 2002). This yielded a drastically smaller final sample size of 110 petitioners.

VARIABLES

Dependent Variables

The effectiveness of civil protection orders in this study is measured by violence victimization and feelings of safety. Protection orders have been found to be associated with a decrease in revictimization; however, this does not necessarily entail a complete cessation of violence or contact (Grau et al. 1984; Horton et al. 1987; Chaudhuri and Daly 1992). Feelings of safety are often attributed to knowledge that the order may provide a no contact proviso, cease and desist of abuse, exclusive use of the home, custody of children, and surrender of firearms (National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges 2005). Several questions were used to operationalize victimization in this study. The first question used to assess contact with the perpetrator was, “Have you had contact with the person named in the protection . . . order since it was issued?” It was coded 0 for no contact and 1 for contact. The types of problems with the perpetrator were also assessed through the question, “What kind of problems, if any, have you had since you’ve had the order?” The response possibilities included: no problems, called at home or work, came to house, stalked, physical abuse, psychological abuse. Each positive response was coded 1 and 0 for no problems. These problems were summed to measure “total problems.”

Feelings/perceptions of safety comprise the second dependent concept. Perpetrators were asked about their views about civil protection orders and their usefulness. The first question used to assess feelings of safety was, “Did the protection order make you feel safer from physical harm than before you had the order?” The response possibilities included: much safer than before, safer than before, about the same, and less safe than before. Much safer than before was coded 4, safer than before was coded 3, about the same was coded 2, and less safe than before was coded 1. The second question asked was, “In your opinion, has the man violated the protection order?” It was coded 0 for no and 1 for yes.

Independent Variables

Race and ethnicity are key independent variables in this study. Most of the limited extant literature either ignores race/ethnicity or finds it to be not significant as it relates to civil protection order effectiveness (McFarlane et al. 2004). Nevertheless, one study found that Black women were more likely to report physical violence than others (Whites or Hispanics) before and after the protection order; therefore, race/ethnicity could be an issue in civil protection efficacy (Carlson et al. 1999). The petitioners were asked, “How would you identify your racial or ethnic background?” A series of dummy variables (yes = 1; no = 0) were used: White/Caucasian, African American (Black), and Hispanic American (Latino) with Whites used as the reference category.

Socioeconomic status is the other key independent concept to be examined. Some research has shown that men with low SES (especially unemployment) have less to lose; hence, protective orders do not easily deter them from repeating their abusive behaviors

(Sherman et al. 1992). Therefore, civil protection orders may be less effective for couples with lower SES. In addition, women in extreme poverty were more likely to report violence before and after obtaining a protection order, and obtaining the order tended to be most helpful for women with very low-SES (Carlson et al. 1999). In this study, the first question to operationalize SES was, “Are you currently employed in a paying job?” This was coded 1 for yes and 0 for no. The second question was, “What is the highest grade you completed in school?” The response possibilities included: to 11th grade, high school graduate, some college/vocational/technical training, college graduate, and some post graduate education. To 11th grade was coded as 1, high school graduate was coded as 2, some college/vocational/technical training was coded as 3, college graduate was coded as 4, and some postgraduate education was coded as 5. Next, petitioners were asked, “What is your monthly income?” For this question, the petitioners listed dollar amounts and this unit was used in the analyses. Although not a measure of the petitioner’s SES, the petitioner was questioned about the perpetrator’s employment status to control for his status. The question asked was, “At the time of the protection order, was the man named in the order employed in a paying job?” This was coded as 1 for yes and 0 for no.

Relationship characteristics were significant predictors in intimate partner victimization and may be important in civil protection orders (Kaci 1994). The first question asked to operationalize the family factors was, “What is your current marital status with the man named in the protection order?” A dummy variable (yes = 1, no = 0) was used to distinguish married from the other statuses (separated, divorced, and never been married). The reference category was separated/divorced/never been married. The

second question was, “How long did you have a relationship with the man named in the protection order when you got the order?” Petitioners provided the length of their relationships in days or years (240 days to 35 years). Then, petitioners were asked, “What was your living arrangement with this man when you got a protection order?” Possible responses included living together; not living together, but dating; and not living together, not dating. Living together was coded as 1, and not living together was coded as 0. Petitioners were also asked, “Do you have any children?” Each positive response was coded 1, and a negative response was coded 0. Next, petitioners were asked, “How many children in common with the man named in the protection order?” and “How many children from other relationships?” These were used to create a variable for the number of children ranging from 0 to 7.

Prior violence is associated with civil protection order effectiveness, and it is included as a control in this study (Grau et al. 1984; Kaci 1994). The first question used to operationalize CPO effectiveness was, “How long had physical abuse been occurring before you got the protection order?” Petitioners provided a range of answers using days or years (one day to 5 years).

Several questions were asked about specific types of prior violence; all were coded 1 for yes and 0 for no. “Had the man named in the order ever tried to frighten or intimidate you by making threats, following you around, or harassing you on the phone?” Then, the petitioners were asked, “Had he ever beaten or choked you?” Next, the petitioners were asked, “Had he ever done anything to physically hurt you, such as slapping, grabbing, shoving, kicking, punching, or the like, even if it didn’t leave any marks or you didn’t report it?” The petitioners were also asked, “Had he ever used a

weapon such as a gun, knife or car to threaten or to injure you?” Next, the petitioners were asked, “Did he ever force you to have sex with him?” Then, the petitioners were questioned, “Were you physically injured during the incident that led to the protection order?” Also, the petitioners were asked, “Did this man’s abusive behavior ever occur after he used alcohol or drugs?” Possible responses included: yes, always; yes, often; yes, sometimes; yes, rarely; no. “Yes, always” was coded as 4, “yes, often” was coded as 3, “sometimes” was coded as 2, and “yes, rarely/no” was coded as 1. Finally, the petitioners were asked, “Was the man ever arrested for other abuse?” A positive response was coded 1, and a negative response was coded 0.

Although not a measure of the petitioner’s abuse experiences, the petitioner was also questioned about the perpetrator’s prior arrest history. This question was included to determine if a relationship existed between the tendency to engage in any criminal activity and the likelihood to violate a civil protection order. The question was, “To your knowledge, has this man ever been arrested for any crimes other than abusive behavior to you?” This was coded 1 for yes and 0 for no. None of the aforementioned experiences of prior violence were confirmed through independent sources. All of the measures provided were based entirely on self reports.

Finally, the state/location was controlled for in case there were differences in efficacy across study sites. Two dummy variables (yes = 1, no = 0) were used to reflect three categories: Wilmington, DE; Denver, CO; and Washington, DC. The reference category was Denver, CO.

In conclusion, the petitioners were asked a series of questions regarding demographics, relationship status, prior violence, perpetrator characteristics, and site

location. For the dichotomous variables, all affirmative responses to were coded 1, and negative responses were coded 0. Interval level variables were recoded as appropriate to facilitate the reader's understanding.

ANALYSES

Using SPSS statistical software for all analyses, the means, standard deviations, and frequencies are presented to show demographic characteristics of the victims, distributions for control variables, and levels of civil protection order effectiveness. Then, the bivariate relationships between each of the independent variables (marital status, whether the offender intimidated, frightened, beat, choked, slapped, grabbed, or used a weapon against the victim before the order, and whether she had compliance problems) and the dependent variables (victimization, perception of safety) are examined in order to assess which factors are related to CPO effectiveness.

Because the nature of the relationship between the perceived effectiveness of temporary protection orders and both race/ethnicity and SES, two potentially key factors for civil protection order effectiveness, require analysis, multivariate analyses are conducted that allow for the control of relevant predictors. Ordinary least squares (OLS) is used to analyze the continuous outcome of perceptions of effectiveness. Then, logistic regression is used to assess the individual effects, if any, of the independent variables on the probability of revictimization (a binary dependent variable) as well as feelings of safety.

There are assumptions found with OLS and logistic regression techniques. There are various underlying assumptions of both OLS and logistic regression techniques

including a large sample size, the use of independent observations, and that the model is fitted correctly by including and/or excluding certain variables (Allison 1999; Williams 2009; Salkind 2008; Fox, Levin, and Forde 2009; Menard 2002). Several assumptions, however, are unique to OLS regression. First, OLS assumes a linear relationship between the independent and dependent variables meaning that the relationship between x and y follows a straight line (Allison 1999). The second assumption is the normal distribution of the variables, suggesting that the data are selected at random (Allison 1999). The third assumption is that there is little or no multicollinearity (Allison 1999). Multicollinearity refers to a linear relationship between two independent variables; these variables are so highly correlated that they, in essence, measure the same effect. The fourth assumption is that there is no autocorrelation, meaning that the error terms in the regression analysis are not correlated (Allison 1999). Accordingly, the error terms are assumed to be normally distributed and should not be correlated with independent variables irrespective of changes in the value of the independent variable (Menard 2002). The final assumption is the presence of homoscedasticity (Allison 1999). This indicates that the variances of the error terms are constant irrespective of the value of x .

There are also assumptions unique to logistic regression. First, logistic regression assumes that the dependent variables are binary (Pampel 2000). The dependent variables, therefore, are dichotomous. Second, logistic regression assumes that the error terms are independent; this does not imply, however, that the errors are normally distributed (Menard 2002). Finally, logistic regression does not assume, as does OLS, that there is a linear relationship between the independent and dependent variables; therefore, the relationship could potentially be curvilinear.

In the results section, beta coefficients, which indicate how much the dependent variable changes with each one unit increase in the independent variable, and standard errors are reported for OLS regression. In the logistic regression analysis, odds ratios and standard errors are presented. Odds ratios are the amount by which the probability of an event occurring increase or decrease with a one unit increase in the independent variables.

The modeling approach used in both OLS and logistic regression involved four blocks of variables. The first block included only the covariates. The second block included race/ethnicity. Socioeconomic measures were added in the third block. Finally, race/ethnicity and SES were entered together in the fourth block. The block entry approach was used in the multiple regression analyses to identify whether race/ethnicity and SES were associated with CPO effectiveness both individually and combined after controlling for the other covariates. The same approach was used in logistic regression to determine how race/ethnicity and SES both individually and combined explained variance in whether the petitioner had compliance problems after the protection order, whether the petitioner had contact with the perpetrator after the protection order, and whether the petitioner believed that the perpetrator had violated the order after controlling for other covariates.

Chapter 4: Results

OVERVIEW

This chapter provides a detailed analysis of the data from a 1994 National Institute of Justice grant-funded study regarding the effectiveness of protection orders in three locations: Wilmington, Delaware; Denver, Colorado; and Washington, District of Columbia. Descriptive univariate statistics are presented to show demographic characteristics of the victims and levels of civil protection order effectiveness while bivariate relationships between each of the independent variables and the dependent variables are analyzed to identify which factors are related to CPO effectiveness. Finally, regression techniques are used to assess the individual effects of the independent variables, net of the others, on the probability of revictimization as well as feelings of safety and perceptions of effectiveness of the protection orders.

DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE

Tables 4.1 and 4.2 present the descriptive statistics for the sample. Categorical independent variables are presented in Table 4.1, and continuous independent variables are presented in Table 4.2. As the tables show, of the 110 women surveyed, 36% of the women were White, 53.6% were Black, and 10.0% were Hispanic. Approximately 24% of the female victims had less than a high school education, 40% had graduated from high school, 25.5% had some college or vocational/technical training, 7.3% had college degrees, and 3.6% had some postgraduate education. Fifty-eight percent of the women were employed full-time, 10% were employed part-time, and 31.8% were not employed. Close to 33% of the victims were married, 21.8% were separated, 10% were divorced,

and 35.5% had never been married. Approximately 51% of the women had been living with the perpetrator at the time that the CPO had been obtained, 9.1% remained involved with the perpetrator but did not live with him, and 40% were neither dating nor living with the perpetrator at the time that the CPO had been obtained.

The women surveyed experienced varied forms of abuse prior to filing for the protection order. The majority of them (83.6%) were frightened or intimidated prior to securing a CPO. More than two-thirds (68.2%) were severely abused, defined as having been beaten or choked. Ninety percent of the women suffered mild abuse (e.g., slapped or grabbed) whereas 40% of the women were threatened with a weapon by the perpetrator, and 44.5% were forced to have sex with the perpetrators. Additionally, about 69.1% of petitioners indicated that the perpetrators had consumed alcohol or drugs at least once prior to the inflicted abuse whereas 30.9% of the petitioners reported that their victimization had not occurred under such circumstances. Approximately 36.4% of the petitioners were physically injured during the incident that led to the protection order.

As for perpetrator characteristics, more than half (53.6%) of the perpetrators were employed full-time, 14.5% were employed part-time, and 31.8% were not employed. Approximately 46% of perpetrators were arrested for abuse prior to the petitioner seeking the protection order whereas 52.7% were arrested for other crimes. Finally, 39.1% of the victims were from Wilmington, 30.9% were from Denver, and 30.0% were from Washington, D.C.

Table 4.1
Univariate Analyses for Demographic Variables, Relationship Status, Prior Violence, CPO,
Perpetrator Characteristics, and Site ID (N = 110)

Variable	Frequency	Percent
<i>Race</i>		
White	40	36.4
Black	59	53.6
Hispanic	11	10.0
<i>Socioeconomic Status Proxies</i>		
<i>Education</i>		
To 11 th grade	26	23.6
High School graduate	44	40.0
College/vocational/technical	28	25.5
College graduate	8	7.3
Post-graduate	4	3.6
<i>Petitioner's employment status</i>		
Full-time	64	58.2
Part-time	11	10.0
Not employed	35	31.8
<i>Relationship Status</i>		
<i>Marital status</i>		
Married	36	32.7
Separated	24	21.8
Divorced	11	10.0
Never been married	39	35.5
<i>Living arrangement at time of CPO</i>		
Living together	56	50.9
Dating/not living together	10	9.1
Not dating/not living together	44	40.0
<i>Violence before CPO</i>		
<i>Frightened/intimidated</i>		
Yes	92	83.6
No	18	16.4
<i>Beaten/choked</i>		
Yes	75	68.2
No	35	31.8
<i>Slapped/grabbed</i>		
Yes	99	90.0
No	11	10.0
<i>Threatened with weapon</i>		
Yes	44	40.0
No	66	60.0

<hr/>		
Forced sex		
Yes	49	44.5
No	61	55.5
<i>Abuse occurred after alcohol/drugs</i>		
Yes, always	44	40.0
Yes, often	15	13.6
Yes, sometimes	17	15.5
No	34	30.9
<i>Petitioner physically injured during incident leading to CPO</i>		
Yes	40	36.4
No	70	63.6
<i>Perpetrator Characteristics</i>		
<i>Perpetrator's employment status</i>		
Full-time	59	53.6
Part-time	16	14.5
Not employed	35	31.8
<i>Perpetrator arrested for other abuse</i>		
Yes	51	46.4
No	59	53.6
<i>Perpetrator arrested for other crimes</i>		
Yes	58	52.7
No	52	47.3
<i>Site ID</i>		
Wilmington	43	39.1
Denver	34	30.9
Washington, D.C.	33	30.0

Notes: *Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .01 level

As Table 4.2 shows, the women surveyed ranged in age from 19 to 60 with an average age of 32 years. The monthly income of the women averaged \$1,076.55. On average, the length of the relationship was approximately 8.6 years; however, the women experienced 4.4 years of abuse prior to obtaining the temporary protection order. In addition, the petitioners averaged 3.26 incidents of prior violence and 0.45 compliance problems. Last, the majority of the women had children, with a mean of 1.4 children

with the perpetrators, 0.6 children from other relationships, and a total average of 2.0 children.

Table 4.2
Univariate Analyses for Age, Petitioner's Monthly Income, Length of Relationship, Duration of Abuse, Count of Prior Violence, Count of Compliance Problems and Number of Children (N = 110)

Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
<i>Age</i>	32.1	8.2	19	60
<i>Petitioner's monthly income</i>	1076.55	933.77	0	6200
<i>Length of relationship (years)</i>	8.6	6.9	240 days	35 years
<i>Duration of abuse before CPO (years)</i>	4.4	4.8	1 day	5 years
<i>Count of prior violence</i>	3.26	1.15	1	5
<i>Count of compliance problems</i>	0.45	0.86	0	4
<i>Number of children</i>				
Children in common with Perpetrator	1.4	1.3	0	7
Other children	0.6	1.1	0	6
Total children	2.0	1.5	0	7

Notes: ANOVA = Analysis of Variance

*Significant at .05 level

**Significant at .01 level

Table 4.3 presents the descriptive statistics pertaining to the dependent variables of victimization and feelings/perceptions of safety. Initially, interviewers questioned the petitioners about contact with the perpetrator after which they were questioned about compliance problems. Nearly 72% of the petitioners reported that they had contact with the perpetrators. Approximately 32% of petitioners reported compliance problems with the order.¹³ Seventeen percent of the petitioners indicated that they were called at home or work by the perpetrators, 10.9% claimed that the perpetrator came to their home, and 4.5% of the petitioners reported that they were stalked by the perpetrators. Less than 5% of petitioners indicated that they had suffered repeat physical abuse after obtaining the protection order and 7.3% had suffered repeat psychological abuse after the protection order.

Feelings/perceptions of safety were also measured. Approximately 35% of the petitioners reported feeling “much safer” than before the order while 40.9% felt “safer” than before. Close to 21% of the petitioners felt “about the same” regarding safety before and after the order, and 3.6% felt “less safe” than before the protection order. Last, 30.9% of the petitioners believed that their CPOs had been violated by the perpetrators.

¹³ Compliance problems include, but are not limited to, contact, calling the petitioner at home/work, coming to the petitioner’s home, stalking the petitioner, bothering the children, problems with visitation, threatening to keep the children, and repeat abuse after the protection order. Whether or not the petitioner reported compliance problems is based upon what was asked for and granted in the protection order.

Table 4.3
Univariate Statistics for Dependent Variables: Contact, Compliance Problems, Feelings of Safety, and Violation of CPO (N = 110)

Variable	Frequency	Percent
<i>Victimization</i>		
Perpetrator contacted Petitioner	79	71.8
Perpetrator did not contact Petitioner	31	28.2
Petitioner reported compliance problems	35	31.8
Petitioner did not report compliance problems	75	68.2
Perpetrator called Petitioner at home/work	19	17.3
Perpetrator did not call Petitioner	91	82.7
Perpetrator came to Petitioner's home	12	10.9
Perpetrator did not go to Petitioner's home	98	89.1
Perpetrator stalked Petitioner	5	4.5
Perpetrator did not stalk Petitioner	105	95.5
Petitioner suffered repeat physical abuse	5	4.5
Petitioner did not suffer repeat abuse	105	95.5
Petitioner suffered repeat psychological abuse	8	7.3
Petitioner did not suffer repeat abuse	102	92.7
<i>Feelings/Perceptions of Safety</i>		
Petitioner feels much safer	38	34.5
Petitioner feels safer	45	40.9
Petitioner feels about the same	23	20.9
Petitioner feels less safe	4	3.6
<i>Petitioner Beliefs</i>		
Petitioner believed CPO violated	34	30.9
Petitioner did not believe CPO violated	76	69.1

Notes: *Significant at .05 level
 **Significant at .01 level

Bivariate Analyses

Bivariate analyses were conducted for each of the outcome measures and the independent variables. The results are presented in Tables 4.4 through 4.11. Table 4.4 displays the relationships between the independent variables and the outcome measure of

contact with the perpetrator. Nearly 73% of Whites had contact with the offenders compared to 72.9% of Blacks, and 63.6% of Hispanics, although the relationship between race/ethnicity and the outcome was not statistically significant. Because there was not a direct measure of SES, the petitioner's highest educational status and the petitioner's employment status were used as proxies. Bivariate analyses indicate that 81% of petitioners who did not graduate from high school had contact with the petitioner in contrast to 68.2% of high school graduates, 64.3% of petitioners with some college or vocational/technical training, 87.5% of college graduates, and 75% of petitioners with some post-graduate education, but this was not statistically significant. Also, the relationship between the petitioner's employment status and contact was not statistically significant. Nearly 69% of victims who were employed full-time, 63.6% of victims who were employed part-time, and 80% of unemployed victims had contact with the perpetrator after they had secured the protection order.

One measure of relationship status was significantly associated with contact with the perpetrator. Eighty-six percent of married petitioners, 50% of petitioners who were separated from their spouses, 81.8% of petitioners who were divorced, and 69.2% of petitioners who had never married had contact with the perpetrator after the issuance of the protection order ($\chi^2(3) = 9.95, p = .02$). On the other hand, the petitioner's living arrangement at the time of the protection order was not statistically related to contact with the perpetrator. Approximately 80% of women who were living with the perpetrator at the time they secured the protection order, 60% of petitioners who were intimately involved with the perpetrator but were not living with him, and 63.6% of petitioners who were neither dating nor living with the perpetrator had contact with the perpetrator.

Next, prior violence was examined in light of subsequent contact with the perpetrator. Nearly 71% of women who reported that they had been frightened or intimidated by the perpetrator prior to securing the protection order had contact with the perpetrator after the order, but this did not differ significantly from those women who did not report being frightened or intimidated. Sixty-nine percent of women who reported being beaten or choked prior to the order as well as 77.1% of women who did not report being beaten or choked had subsequent contact with the perpetrator, but this was not statistically significant. Approximately 71% of petitioners indicated that they had been slapped or grabbed by the perpetrator prior to the order; however, this did not differ significantly from those women who did not report minor abuse. Close to 64% of victims who indicated they had been threatened with a weapon as well as 77.3% of victims who were not threatened with a weapon reported the same. Last, 69% of victims reported that the perpetrators had forced them to have sex prior to securing the protection orders, but this did not differ significantly from those women who did not report such abuse.

The perpetrator's use of alcohol or drugs prior to the victim's victimization was not significantly related to whether the petitioner had contact with the perpetrator subsequent to the protection order. Nearly 71% of women who reported that their victimization "always" came after the perpetrator had consumed alcohol/drugs, 73% of women who reported that their victimization "often" came after the perpetrator had consumed alcohol/drugs, and 70.6% of women who claimed that their victimization "sometimes" came after the perpetrator had consumed alcohol/drugs had contact with the perpetrator after the protection order. However, 73.5% of women who asserted that alcohol/drug use had not occurred prior to their victimization also had contact with the

perpetrator subsequent to the protection order. In addition, several petitioners were physically injured during the incident leading up to the protection order; however, this was not significantly related to having contact with the perpetrator after the order. Almost 78% of the petitioners who suffered a physical injury in the incident leading to the protection order had contact with the perpetrator as did 68.6% of petitioners who did not suffer a physical injury at that time.

Concerning perpetrator employment, about 73% of perpetrators employed full-time had contact with the victim compared to 68.8% of perpetrators employed part-time and 71.4% of unemployed perpetrators, but this was not statistically significant. Furthermore, neither the perpetrator's arrest for abuse prior to the petitioner securing the protection order nor the perpetrator's arrest for crimes unrelated to abuse were significantly associated with subsequent contact. Approximately 77% of petitioners who indicated that the perpetrator had been arrested for prior abuse had contact with the perpetrator after securing the protection order whereas 74.1% of perpetrators who had arrest histories for crimes unrelated to the petitioner's abuse had contact with the victim subsequent to the protection order.

Last, site ID was examined in light of subsequent contact with the perpetrator. Seventy-two percent of women from Wilmington had contact with the perpetrator after the order in contrast to 73.5% of women from Denver, and 69.7% of women from Washington, D.C. However, these differences were not statistically significant.

Table 4.4
Bivariate Results for Petitioner Had Contact with Perpetrator by Demographic Variables, Relationship Status, Prior Violence, CPO, Perpetrator Characteristics, and Site ID (N = 110)

Variable	Petitioner Had Contact	No Contact	χ^2	df	p
	% (n)	% (n)			
<i>Race</i>			0.41	2	.82
White	72.5 (29)	27.5 (11)			
Black	72.9 (43)	27.1 (16)			
Hispanic	63.6 (7)	36.4 (4)			
<i>Socioeconomic Status Proxies</i>					
<i>Education</i>			3.09	4	.54
To 11 th grade	80.8 (21)	19.2 (5)			
High school graduate	68.2 (30)	31.8 (14)			
Some college/vocational/technical	64.3 (18)	35.7 (10)			
College graduate	87.5 (7)	12.5 (1)			
Post-graduate	75.0 (3)	25.0 (1)			
<i>Petitioner employment status</i>			1.82	2	.40
Full-time	68.8 (44)	31.3 (20)			
Part-time	63.6 (7)	36.4 (4)			
Not employed	80.0 (28)	20.0 (7)			
<i>Relationship Status</i>			9.95	3	.02*
<i>Marital status</i>					
Married	86.1 (31)	13.9 (5)			
Separated	50.0 (12)	50.0 (12)			
Divorced	81.8 (9)	18.2 (2)			
Never been married	69.2 (27)	30.8 (12)			
<i>Living Arrangement at Time of CPO</i>			4.16	2	.13
Living together	80.4 (45)	19.6 (11)			
Dating/Not living together	60.0 (6)	40.0 (4)			
Not Dating/Not living together	63.6 (28)	36.4 (16)			
<i>Violence before CPO</i>					
<i>Frightened/Intimidated</i>			0.38	1	.54
Yes	70.7 (65)	29.3 (27)			
No	77.8 (14)	22.2 (4)			
<i>Beaten/Choked</i>			0.72	1	.40
Yes	69.3 (52)	30.7 (23)			
No	77.1 (27)	22.9 (8)			
<i>Slapped/Grabbed</i>			0.60	1	.44
Yes	70.7 (70)	29.3 (29)			
No	81.8 (9)	18.2 (2)			
<i>Threatened with Weapon</i>			2.43	1	.12
Yes	63.6 (28)	36.4 (16)			
No	77.3 (51)	22.7 (15)			

Forced sex			0.26	1	.61
Yes	69.4 (34)	30.6 (15)			
No	73.8 (45)	26.2 (16)			
<i>Abuse occurred after alcohol/drugs</i>			0.48	3	.98
Yes, always	70.5 (31)	29.5 (13)			
Yes, often	73.3 (11)	26.7 (4)			
Yes, sometimes	70.6 (12)	29.4 (5)			
No	73.5 (25)	26.5 (9)			
<i>Petitioner physically injured during incident leading to CPO</i>			1.00	1	.32
Yes	77.5 (31)	22.5 (9)			
No	68.6 (48)	31.4 (22)			
<i>Perpetrator Characteristics</i>					
<i>Perpetrator's employment status</i>			0.11	2	.95
Full-time	72.9 (43)	27.1 (6)			
Part-time	68.8 (11)	31.3 (5)			
Not employed	71.4 (25)	28.6 (10)			
<i>Perpetrator arrested for other abuse</i>			1.02	1	.31
Yes	76.5 (39)	23.5 (12)			
No	67.8 (40)	32.2 (19)			
<i>Perpetrator arrested for other crimes</i>			0.33	1	.57
Yes	74.1 (43)	25.9 (15)			
No	69.2 (36)	30.8 (16)			
<i>Site ID</i>			0.12	2	.94
Wilmington	72.1 (31)	27.9 (12)			
Denver	73.5 (25)	26.5 (9)			
Washington, D.C.	69.7 (23)	30.3 (10)			

Notes: *Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .01 level

As Table 4.5 shows, although age varied significantly with whether the petitioner had contact with the perpetrator after securing the protection order ($F= 5.49, p = .02$), monthly income did not. Women who had contact with the offenders were, on average, four years younger (30.9 years) than women who had no contact (34.9 years). The monthly income of victims who had contact was lower than those who did not have contact with the offender (\$1,059.94 and \$1,118.87, respectively).

In addition, neither the length of the relationship nor the duration of abuse varied significantly with contact with the perpetrator. Petitioners who had contact with the perpetrators were intimately involved with their batterers for a shorter duration (8.4 years) than women who did not have contact (9.2 years). Moreover, petitioners who had contact with the perpetrators after securing the protection order also endured abuse for a shorter duration (4.1 years) than women who did not have contact with the perpetrators (5.1 years). Additionally, petitioners who had contact with the perpetrators experienced less prior violence (3.2) than women who did not have contact (3.5); this relationship was not statistically significant. However, petitioners who had contact experienced more compliance problems (0.6) than women who did not have contact with the perpetrators (0.1); these findings were statistically significant ($F = 6.07, p = .02$).

Regarding the presence of children, women who had contact with the perpetrators were comparable with women who did not have contact in terms of children with the perpetrators (1.4 and 1.2, respectively), children from other relationships (0.6, and 0.8, respectively), and the total number of children (2.0 and 2.0, respectively), but these were not statistically significant differences.

Table 4.5
Bivariate Results for Petitioner Had Contact with Perpetrator by Age, Monthly Income, Length of Relationship, Duration of Abuse, Count of Prior Violence, Count of Compliance Problems, and Number of Children (N = 110)

Variable	Petitioner Had Contact	No Contact	F	<i>p</i>
<i>Age</i>	Mean	Mean	5.49	.02*
	30.9	34.9		
	SD	SD		
	7.6	9.1		
<i>Petitioner's monthly income</i>	Mean	Mean	0.09	.77
	1059.94	1118.87		
	SD	SD		
	863.35	1107.91		
<i>Length of relationship (years)</i>	Mean	Mean	0.24	.63
	8.4	9.2		
	SD	SD		
	6.2	8.5		
<i>Duration of abuse before CPO (years)</i>	Mean	Mean	0.80	.37
	4.1	5.1		
	SD	SD		
	4.7	5.8		
<i>Count of prior violence</i>	Mean	Mean	2.70	.10
	3.2	3.5		
	SD	SD		
	1.1	1.2		
<i>Count of compliance problems</i>	Mean	Mean	6.07	.02*
	0.6	0.1		
	SD	SD		
	1.0	0.4		
<i>Number of children</i> Children in common with perpetrator	Mean	Mean	0.89	.35
	1.4	1.2		
	SD	SD		
	1.2	1.4		
Other children	Mean	Mean	1.19	.28
	0.6	0.8		
	SD	SD		
	1.1	1.1		
Total children	Mean	Mean	0.00	.98
	2.0	2.0		
	SD	SD		
	1.4	1.7		

Notes: *Significant at .05 level
 **Significant at .01 level

Tables 4.6 and 4.7 display the bivariate relationships between the independent variables and compliance problems with perpetrators. To begin, the relationship between compliance problems and race/ethnicity was statistically significant ($\chi^2(2) = 6.42, p = .04$). Forty-five percent of White victims, 27.1% of Black victims, and 9.1% of Hispanic victims experienced compliance problems.

Regarding the proxies used for socioeconomic status, the petitioner's highest educational attainment was not significantly related to compliance problems. Approximately 42% of petitioners who did not complete high school experienced compliance problems compared to 22.7% of high school graduates. Nearly 36% of petitioners with some college or vocational/technical training, 25% of college graduates, and 50% of petitioners who had some post-graduate education reported compliance problems. On the other hand, the petitioner's employment status was significantly related to such problems ($\chi^2(2) = 7.66, p = .02$). Approximately 23% of victims who were employed full-time, 63.6% of victims who were employed part-time, and 37.1% of victims not employed experienced compliance problems.

Although marital status was not significantly related to compliance problems, the petitioner's living arrangements at the time she secured the protection order ($\chi^2(2) = 7.91, p = .02$) were significantly related to compliance problems. Approximately 17% of married petitioners, 45.8% of petitioners separated from their spouses, 36.4% of divorced petitioners, and 35.9% of petitioners who had never been married experienced compliance problems after the issuance of the protection order. Moreover, 19.6% of petitioners living with the perpetrator, 40% of petitioners dating but not living with the

perpetrator and 45.5% of petitioners who were neither dating nor living with the perpetrator had compliance problems after the protection order.

None of the forms of prior violence was significantly associated with the petitioner experiencing compliance problems. Nearly 34% of women who were frightened or intimidated by the perpetrator prior to the order as well as 22.2% of petitioners who did not report being frightened before the protection order reported compliance problems. Close to 27% of women who were severely abused as well as 42.9% of women who were not beaten or choked reported compliance problems. Thirty-two percent of petitioners who had been slapped or grabbed prior to the protection order reported compliance problems after the issuance of the protection order as did 27.3% of petitioners who did not suffer such abuse. Furthermore, 27.3% of women who had been threatened with or had a weapon used against them as well as 34.8% of women who had not been threatened with a weapon reported compliance problems after the issuance of the protection order. Nearly 37% of women whom the perpetrator forced to have sex reported compliance problems, but 27.9% of women whom the perpetrator did not force to have sex reported compliance problems as well.

Neither the perpetrator's use of alcohol/drugs prior to the petitioner's victimization nor the petitioner suffering a physical injury during the incident leading to the protection order was significantly related to compliance problems. Twenty-five percent of victims who asserted that their victimization "always" occurred after the perpetrator consumed alcohol or drugs, 26.7% of victims who asserted that their victimization "often" occurred after the perpetrator consumed alcohol or drugs, and 47.1% of victims who asserted that their victimization "sometimes" occurred after the

perpetrator consumed alcohol or drugs reported compliance problems. However, 35.3% of victims who stated that alcohol or drug abuse was not a contributing factor to their victimization also experienced compliance problems. Moreover, 35% of petitioners who suffered a physical injury immediately before securing the protection order experienced compliance problems after the protection order compared to 30% with no injuries.

Next, perpetrator characteristics were examined relative to compliance problems. Approximately 32% of the perpetrators employed full-time, 25% of perpetrators employed part-time, and 34.3% of unemployed perpetrators experienced difficulty in complying with the protection orders. Perpetrator employment status, however, was not related to compliance problems. Additionally, 33.3% of perpetrators were arrested for other abuse prior to the issuance of the protection order relative to 30.5% not arrested for abuse, and 34.5% of perpetrators were arrested for other crimes unrelated to the abuse reported compliance problems relative to 28.8% not arrested for other crimes, but neither of these findings was statistically significant.

Last, site ID was examined relative to compliance problems. Thirty-five percent of petitioners who lived in Wilmington, 41% who lived in Denver, and 18.2% who lived in Washington, D.C. experienced compliance problems after the issuance of the protection order, but these differences were not statistically significant.

Table 4.6
Bivariate Results for Compliance Problems by Demographic Variables, Relationship Status, Prior Violence, CPO, Perpetrator Characteristics, and Site ID (N = 110)

Variable	Compliance Problems % (n)	No Compliance Problems % (n)	χ^2	df	<i>p</i>
<i>Race</i>			6.42	2	.04*
White	45.0 (18)	55.0 (22)			
Black	27.1 (16)	72.9 (43)			
Hispanic	9.1 (1)	90.9 (10)			
<i>Socioeconomic Status Proxies</i>					
<i>Education</i>			3.97	4	.41
To 11 th grade	42.3 (11)	57.7 (15)			
High school graduate	22.7 (10)	77.3 (34)			
Some college/vocational/technical	35.7 (10)	64.3 (18)			
College graduate	25.0 (2)	75.0 (6)			
Post-graduate	50.0 (2)	50.0 (2)			
<i>Petitioner Employment Status</i>			7.66	2	.02*
Full-time	23.4 (15)	76.6 (49)			
Part-time	63.6 (7)	36.4 (4)			
Not employed	37.1 (13)	62.9 (22)			
<i>Marital Status</i>			6.39	3	.09
Married	16.7 (6)	83.3 (30)			
Separated	45.8 (11)	54.2 (13)			
Divorced	36.4 (4)	63.6 (7)			
Never been married	35.9 (14)	64.1 (25)			
<i>Living Arrangement at Time of CPO</i>			7.91	2	.02*
Living together	19.6 (11)	80.4 (45)			
Dating/not living together	40.0 (4)	60.0 (6)			
Not dating/not living together	45.5 (29)	54.5 (24)			
<i>Violence before CPO</i>					
Frightened/Intimidated			0.91	1	.34
Yes	33.7 (31)	66.3 (61)			
No	22.2 (4)	77.8 (14)			
Beaten/Choked			2.88	1	.09
Yes	26.7 (20)	73.3 (55)			
No	42.9 (15)	57.1 (20)			
Slapped/Grabbed			0.12	1	.73
Yes	32.3 (32)	67.7 (67)			
No	27.3 (3)	72.7 (8)			
Threatened with weapon			0.70	1	.40
Yes	27.3 (12)	72.7 (32)			
No	34.8 (23)	65.2 (43)			
Forced sex			0.99	1	.32
Yes	36.7 (18)	63.3 (31)			
No	27.9 (17)	72.1 (44)			

<i>Abuse occurred after alcohol/drugs</i>			3.73	3	.44
Yes, Always	25.0 (11)	75.0 (33)			
Yes, Often	26.7 (4)	73.3 (11)			
Yes, Sometimes	47.1 (8)	52.9 (9)			
No	35.3 (12)	64.7 (22)			
<i>Petitioner physically injured during incident leading to CPO</i>			0.29	1	.59
Yes	35.0 (14)	65.0 (26)			
No	30.0 (21)	70.0 (49)			
<i>Perpetrator Characteristics</i>					
<i>Perpetrator's employment status</i>			0.45	2	.80
Full-time	32.2 (19)	67.8 (40)			
Part-time	25.0 (4)	75.0 (12)			
Not employed	34.3 (12)	65.7 (23)			
<i>Perpetrator arrested for other abuse</i>			0.10	1	.75
Yes	33.3 (17)	66.7 (34)			
No	30.5 (18)	69.5 (41)			
<i>Perpetrator arrested for other crimes</i>			0.40	1	.53
Yes	34.5 (20)	65.5 (38)			
No	28.8 (15)	71.2 (37)			
<i>Site ID</i>			4.39	2	.11
Wilmington	34.9 (15)	65.1 (28)			
Denver	41.2 (14)	58.8 (20)			
Washington, D.C.	18.2 (6)	81.8 (27)			

Notes: *Significant at .05 level
 **Significant at .01 level

As Table 4.7 shows, age and monthly income were not significantly related to compliance problems. On average, women who had compliance problems were nearly three years younger (30.1 years) than women who had no problems (32.9 years). They also earned less each month (\$862.20) than their counterparts (\$1,176.57). Generally, victims with compliance problems were intimately involved with their batterers for a shorter duration (6.5 years) than women who did not have such problems (9.6 years); this was statistically significant ($F= 5.05, p = .03$). They also endured abuse for a shorter duration (3.3 years) compared to women who did not experience these problems (4.9

years); however, this was not statistically significant. Also, petitioners with compliance problems had a lower count (3.2), on average, of prior violence than petitioners without compliance problems (3.3), but this, too, was not statistically significant.

Overall, petitioners who experienced compliance problems also had fewer children with the perpetrators (1.3) but more children from other relationships (0.9) and more children, total, (2.2), than women who did not have compliance problems (1.4, 0.5, and 1.9 respectively), but these differences were not statistically significant.

Table 4.7
Bivariate Results for Compliance Problems by Age, Monthly Income, Length of Relationship, Duration of Abuse, Count of Prior Violence, and Number of Children (N = 110)

Variable	Compliance Problems	No Compliance Problems	F	<i>p</i>
<i>Age</i>	Mean 30.1 SD 6.3	Mean 32.9 SD 8.9	2.98	.09
<i>Petitioner's monthly income</i>	Mean 862.20 SD 529.06	Mean 1176.57 SD 1060.12	2.75	.10
<i>Length of relationship (years)</i>	Mean 6.5 SD 4.3	Mean 9.6 SD 7.6	5.05	.03*
<i>Duration of abuse before CPO (years)</i>	Mean 3.3 SD 2.8	Mean 4.9 SD 5.7	2.57	.11
<i>Count of prior violence</i>	Mean 3.2 SD 1.0	Mean 3.3 SD 1.2	0.05	0.83

<i>Number of children</i>				
Children in common with Perpetrator	Mean	Mean	0.00	.99
	SD	SD		
Other children	Mean	Mean	2.34	.13
	SD	SD		
Total children	Mean	Mean	1.27	.26
	SD	SD		

Notes: *Significant at .05 level
 **Significant at .01 level

Tables 4.8 and 4.9 provide the results of the bivariate analyses regarding the independent variables and the outcome measure of feelings/perceptions of safety. Results for categorical independent variables are presented in Table 4.8, and those for continuous independent variables are presented in Table 4.9. Overall, feelings/perceptions of safety after the protection order did not vary significantly by race/ethnicity. Approximately 7.5% of White petitioners felt “less safe than before” the order, 17.5% felt “about the same,” 35% felt “safer than before,” and 40% felt “much safer” than before the order. Almost 2% of Black petitioners felt “less safe than before” the order, 27.1% felt “about the same,” 42.4% felt “safer than before,” and 28.8% felt “much safer than before.” No Hispanics reported feeling “less safe than before” or “about the same;” however, 54.5% felt “safer than before,” and 45.5% felt “much safer than before.” These findings were not statistically significant.

The relationship between the petitioner’s highest educational attainment and feelings of safety was statistically significant ($\chi^2(12) = 29.35, p = .00$). Although none of

the petitioners with less than a high school education reported feeling less safe than before, 23.1% experienced no change in feelings of safety after the order whereas 46.2% reported feeling “safer,” and 30.8% reported feeling “much safer than before” the order. Less than 3% of high school graduates, on the other hand, believed the order compromised their safety; however, 20.5% experienced no change in feelings of safety after the order, 40.9% indicated that they felt “safer than before” and 36.4% indicated that they felt “much safer than before” the protection order. Nonetheless, 3.6% of petitioners with some college or vocational/technical training believed their safety had been compromised; 14.3% did not experience any increase in feelings of safety while 42.9% reported increased feelings of safety, and 39.3% reported significant increases in feelings of safety. Although no college graduates believed that the protection order compromised their safety, 50% of petitioners with some post-graduate education felt “less safe than before” the protection order. Approximately 38% of college graduates and 25% of petitioners with some post-graduate education felt no improvement in safety levels after securing the protection order. Although 37.5% of college graduates experienced increased feelings of safety after the protection order, none of the petitioners with post-graduate education felt the same. Nonetheless, 25% of college graduates and 25% of petitioners with post-graduate education reported significantly increased feelings of safety.

Approximately 3% of petitioners employed full-time asserted feeling “less safe than before” the protection order, 21.9% asserted feeling “about the same,” 34.4% asserted feeling “safer,” and 40.6% reported feeling “much safer.” None of the petitioners employed part-time and 5.7% of unemployed petitioners reported decreased

feelings of safety. In contrast, 9.1% of petitioners employed part-time and 22.9% of unemployed petitioners reported no increased feelings of safety. On the other hand, 45.5% of petitioners employed part-time and 51.4% of unemployed petitioners reported increased feelings of safety while 45.5% of petitioners employed part-time and 20% of unemployed petitioners reported feeling “much safer than before.” The relationship between feelings of safety and the petitioner’s employment status was not statistically significant.

Neither marital status nor living arrangements at the time of the protection order was significantly related to feelings of safety. Almost 3% of married petitioners, 8.3% of petitioners separated from their spouses, and 2.6% of petitioners who had never been married indicated feeling “less safe than before” the issuance of the protection order. Approximately 19% of married victims, 12.5% of separated victims, 27.3% of divorced victims, and 25.6% of victims who had never been married reported no changes in feelings of safety whereas 44.4% of married victims, 37.5% of separated victims, 27.3% of divorced victims, and 43.6% of victims who had never been married indicated feeling “safer than before” the protection order. Last, 33.3% of married petitioners, 41.7% of petitioners separated from their spouses, 45.5% of divorced petitioners, and 28.2% of petitioners who had never been married reported feeling much safer than before the protection order.

Close to 4% of victims who lived with their batterers when they secured the protection order asserted decreased feelings of safety after securing the protection order, 16.1% asserted no change, 44.6% asserted an increase in feelings of safety, and 35.7% asserted a significant increase in feelings of safety. Additionally, of petitioners who were

dating but not residing with the perpetrator, 30% experienced no change in feelings of safety, 30% experienced an increase in feelings of safety, and 40% felt “much safer than before.” Last, of petitioners who were neither dating nor living with the perpetrator, 4.5% believed that the protection order compromised their safety, 25% experienced no change, 38.6% believed their safety had increased, and 31.8% felt a significant increase in their personal safety. None of these findings were statistically significant.

As for episodes of prior violence, 4.3% of women who asserted that they had been frightened or intimidated by the perpetrator prior to obtaining the protection order felt “less safe than before” the protection order compared to 18.5% who felt “about the same,” 43.5% who felt “safer,” and 33.7% who felt “much safer than before” the order. However, 33.3% of petitioners who did not report being frightened or intimidated prior to the order indicated no change, 27.8% indicated feeling “safer,” and 38.9% indicated feeling “much safer than before” the protection order. Four percent of women with histories of severe abuse believed the protection order compromised their safety, 20% experienced no change in terms of feelings/perceptions of safety, 40% asserted increased feelings of safety, and 36% claimed significantly increased feelings of safety. Nonetheless, 2.9% of women who had not been beaten or choked reported decreased feelings of safety, 22.9% reported no change, 42.9% reported an increase in feelings of safety, and 31.4% reported significant increases in safety. Three percent of women who had been slapped or grabbed felt decreased feelings of safety whereas 22.2% felt “about the same,” 40.4% believed their level of safety had increased, and 34.3% believed they were significantly safer than before the protection order. Yet, 9.1% of women who had

not been slapped or grabbed prior to the order felt decreased feelings of safety, 9.1% felt “about the same,” 45.5% felt “safer,” and 36.4% felt “much safer than before.”

Close to 5% of women who had been threatened with a weapon or whom had had a weapon used against them felt “less safe” after the issuance of the protection order compared to 22.7% who felt “about the same,” 43.2% who felt “safer than before,” and 29.5% who felt “much safer than before.” However, 3% of petitioners who had not been threatened with a weapon also reported decreased feelings of safety, 19.7% reported no change, 39.4% reported increased safety, and 37.9% reported significant increases in safety. Finally, of women who were forced to have sex with the perpetrator, 4.1% felt “less safe,” 14.3% felt the same, 38.8% felt “safer,” and 42.9% felt “much safer than before” the protection order. Yet, 3.3% of petitioners who were not forced to have sex also felt “less safe,” 26.2% felt “about the same,” 42.6% felt “safer,” and 27.9% felt “much safer than before.” None of the forms of prior violence was significantly related to feelings/perceptions of safety.

Approximately 23% of victims who asserted that their victimization “always” came after the perpetrator consumed alcohol or drugs felt “about the same” in terms of feelings/perceptions of safety, 31.8% experienced increased feelings of safety, and 45.5% experienced significantly increased feelings of safety. Of women who stated that their victimization “often” came after the perpetrator consumed alcohol or drugs, 20% felt “about the same,” 33.3% felt “safer,” and 46.7% felt “much safer than before” the issuance of the protection order. Nearly 12% of victims who claimed that their victimization was “sometimes” precipitated by the perpetrator’s consumption of alcohol/drugs reported decreased feelings of safety compared to 17.6% who experienced

no change, 41.2% who experienced some modicum of increased feelings of safety, and 29.4% who experienced a significant increase in feelings of safety. Last, of women who indicated that the perpetrator's abuse of alcohol/drugs did not trigger their victimization, 5.9% reported feeling "less safe," 20.6% felt "about the same," 55.9% felt "safer," and 17.6% felt "much safer than before" the protection order was issued. The relationship between the perpetrator's abuse of alcohol/drugs prior to the petitioner's victimization and feelings/perceptions of safety was not statistically significant.

None of the petitioners who sustained a physical injury during the incident leading to the protection order reported decreased feelings of safety; however, 30% reported no change, 40% reported feeling "safer than before" the protection order, and 30% reported feeling "much safer." Less than 6% of petitioners who did not sustain physical injuries claimed decreased feelings of safety after securing the protection order, 15.7% indicated no change, 41.4% indicated feeling safer, and 37.1% indicated feeling much safer. These findings were not statistically significant.

Regarding perpetrator characteristics, 5% of victims intimately involved with perpetrators employed full-time felt "less safe than before," 22% felt "about the same," 33.9% felt "safer" and 39% felt "much safer than before" the protection order. Six percent of victims intimately involved with perpetrators employed part-time felt "about the same" whereas 62.5% expressed increased feelings of safety and 31.3% expressed marked increases in feelings of safety. Three percent of victims intimately involved with unemployed perpetrators claimed decreased feelings of safety as opposed to 25.7% who reported feeling the same, 42.9% who claimed increased feelings of safety and 28.6%

who claimed significant increases in feelings of safety. These findings were not statistically significant.

Whether or not the perpetrator had been arrested for other abuse prior to the issuance of the protection order or had been arrested for other crimes unrelated to the petitioner's abuse were examined relative to feelings/perceptions of safety. Six percent of petitioners who reported that the perpetrator had been arrested for prior abuse claimed decreased feelings of safety after the protection order, 19.6% indicated no change in their feelings, 39.2% reported feeling "safer than before," and 35.3% indicated feeling "much safer," relative to 1.7% of those who had not been arrested who claimed decreased feelings of safety, 22% who indicated no change in their feelings, 42.4% who reported feeling "safer than before," and 33.9% who indicated feeling "much safer," but this was not statistically significant. Approximately 3% of petitioners who indicated that the perpetrator had been arrested for other crimes felt "less safe" than before the protection order. Nearly one-quarter (22.4%) of petitioners who reported that the perpetrator had a history of other arrests reported no change in feelings of safety; however, 39.7% felt "safer," and 34.5% felt "much safer" than before the protection order had been issued. Nonetheless, the relationship between the perpetrator's arrest history and feelings/perceptions of safety was not statistically significant.

Finally, study site location was examined by feelings of safety. Close to 5% of women in Wilmington, 2.9% of women in Denver, and 3% of women in Washington, D.C. felt "less safe than before" the protection order had been issued. Approximately 19% of women in Wilmington, 11.8% of women in Denver, and 33.3% of women in Washington, D.C. felt "about the same" whereas 39.5% of women in Wilmington, 41.2%

of women in Denver, and 42.4% of women in Washington, D.C. felt “safer than before” the protection order. Last, 37.2% of women in Wilmington, 44.1% of women in Denver, and 21.2% of women in Washington, D.C. reported feeling “much safer than before” the order, but this was not statistically significant.

Table 4.8
Bivariate Results for Feelings/Perceptions of Safety by Demographic Variables, Relationship Status, Prior Violence, CPO, Perpetrator Characteristics, and Site ID (N = 110)

Variable	Less Safe than Before	About the Same	Safer than Before	Much Safer than Before	χ^2	df	p
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)			
<i>Race</i>					8.42	6	.21
White	7.5 (3)	17.5 (7)	35.0 (14)	40.0 (16)			
Black	1.7 (1)	27.1 (16)	42.4 (25)	28.8 (17)			
Hispanic	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	54.5 (6)	45.5 (5)			
<i>Socioeconomic Status Proxies</i>							
<i>Education</i>					29.35	12	.00**
To 11 th grade	0.0 (0)	23.1 (6)	46.2 (12)	30.8 (8)			
High school graduate	2.3 (1)	20.5 (9)	40.9 (18)	36.4 (16)			
College/vocational/technical	3.6 (1)	14.3 (4)	42.9 (12)	39.3 (11)			
College graduate	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	37.5 (6)	25.0 (2)			
Post-graduate	50.0 (2)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)			
<i>Petitioner Employment Status</i>					6.57	6	.36
Full-time	3.1 (2)	21.9 (14)	34.4 (22)	40.6 (26)			
Part-time	0.0 (0)	9.1 (1)	45.5 (5)	45.5 (5)			
Not employed	5.7 (2)	22.9 (8)	51.4 (18)	20.0 (7)			
<i>Relationship Status</i>							
<i>Marital Status</i>					5.48	9	.79
Married	2.8 (1)	19.4 (7)	44.4 (16)	33.3 (12)			
Separated	8.3 (2)	12.5 (3)	37.5 (9)	41.7 (10)			
Divorced	0.0 (0)	27.3 (3)	27.3 (3)	45.5 (5)			
Never been married	2.6 (1)	25.6 (10)	43.6 (17)	28.2 (11)			
<i>Living arrangement at time of CPO</i>					2.58	6	.86
Living together	3.6 (2)	16.1 (9)	44.6 (25)	35.7 (20)			
Dating/not living together	0.0 (0)	30.0 (3)	30.0 (3)	40.0 (4)			
Not Dating/not living together	4.5 (2)	25.0 (11)	38.6 (17)	31.8 (14)			

<i>Violence before CPO</i>							
Frightened/Intimidated							
Yes	4.3 (4)	18.5 (17)	43.5 (40)	33.7 (31)	3.40	3	.33
No	0.0 (0)	33.3 (6)	27.8 (5)	38.9 (7)			
Beaten/Choked							
Yes	4.0 (3)	20.0 (15)	40.0 (30)	36.0 (27)	0.37	3	.95
No	2.9 (1)	22.9 (8)	42.9 (15)	31.4 (11)			
Slapped/Grabbed							
Yes	3.0 (3)	22.2 (22)	40.4 (40)	34.3 (34)	1.89	3	.60
No	9.1 (1)	9.1 (1)	45.5 (5)	36.4 (4)			
Threatened with Weapon							
Yes	4.5 (2)	22.7 (10)	43.2 (19)	29.5 (13)	0.91	3	.82
No	3.0 (2)	19.7 (13)	39.4 (26)	37.9 (25)			
Forced sex							
Yes	4.1 (2)	14.3 (7)	38.8 (19)	42.9 (21)	3.77	3	.29
No	3.3 (2)	26.2 (16)	42.6 (26)	27.9 (17)			
<i>Abuse occurred after alcohol/drugs</i>							
Yes, always	0.0 (0)	22.7 (10)	31.8 (14)	45.5 (20)	14.82	12	.25
Yes, often	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	33.3 (5)	46.7 (7)			
Yes, sometimes	11.8 (2)	17.6 (3)	41.2 (7)	29.4 (5)			
No	5.9 (2)	20.6 (7)	55.9 (19)	17.6 (7)			
<i>Petitioner physically injured during incident leading to CPO</i>							
Yes	0.0 (0)	30.0 (12)	40.0 (16)	30.0 (12)	5.16	3	.16
No	5.7 (4)	15.7 (11)	41.4 (29)	37.1 (26)			
<i>Perpetrator Characteristics</i>							
<i>Perpetrator's employment status</i>							
Full-time	5.1 (3)	22.0 (13)	33.9 (20)	39.0 (23)	6.36	6	.38
Part-time	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	62.5 (10)	31.3 (5)			
Not employed	2.9 (1)	25.7 (9)	42.9 (15)	28.6 (10)			

<i>Perpetrator arrested for other abuse</i>					1.48	3	.69
Yes	5.9 (3)	19.6 (10)	39.2 (20)	35.3 (18)			
No	1.7 (1)	22.0 (13)	42.4 (25)	33.9 (20)			
<i>Perpetrator arrested for other crimes</i>					0.19	3	.98
Yes	3.4 (2)	22.4 (13)	39.7 (23)	34.5 (20)			
No	3.8 (2)	19.2 (10)	42.3 (22)	34.6 (18)			
<i>Site ID</i>					6.83	6	.34
Wilmington	4.7 (2)	18.6 (8)	39.5 (17)	37.2 (16)			
Denver	2.9 (1)	11.8 (4)	41.2 (14)	44.1 (15)			
Washington, D.C.	3.0 (1)	33.3 (11)	42.4 (14)	21.2 (7)			

Notes: *Significant at .05 level
 **Significant at .01 level

As Table 4.9 shows, neither the petitioner's age nor her monthly income was significantly related to feelings/perceptions of safety. Women who felt "less safe" were younger (29.5 years) than women who felt "about the same" (29.7 years), women who felt "safer" (32.0 years), or women who felt "much safer" (33.8 years). Overall, women who felt "less safe" had a lower monthly income (\$738.50) than women who felt "about the same" (\$1,184.48), women who felt "safer than before" (\$993.69), or women who felt "much safer than before" (\$1,144.92).

Generally, women who felt "less safe" stayed in abusive relationships for as long (7.3 years) as women who felt the same (7.2 years) but less than women who felt "safer than before" the protection order (9.2 years) or "much safer than before" the order (9.0 years); yet, this was not statistically significant. However, women who felt "less safe" endured the abuse for a longer period of time before seeking the protection order (5.1 years) relative to women who felt "about the same" (2.8 years), "safer than before" (4.8), or "much safer than before" (4.8 years); this, too, was not statistically significant. Furthermore, women who felt "less safe" had a higher count of prior violence (3.5) than women who felt "about the same" (3.1), "safer" (3.3) or "much safer" (3.3), but this was not statistically significant. Last, petitioners who felt "less safe" experienced more compliance problems (1.5) than women who felt "about the same" (0.5), "safer than before" the protection order (0.4), or "much safer than before" the protection order (0.3). As the number of compliance problems decreased, feelings of safety increased, but this was not statistically significant.

In addition, women who felt "less safe" had more children with the perpetrator (1.0) than women who felt "about the same" (0.9) but less than women who felt "safer

than before” (1.7) or “much safer than before” (1.3). However, women who felt “less safe” had less children from other relationships (0.0) than women who felt “about the same (1.0), “safer than before” (0.4), or “much safer than before” (0.7). Finally, women who felt “less safe” had less children, overall, (1.0) than women who felt “about the same” (1.9), women who felt “safer than before” (2.1), or women who felt “ much safer than before” (2.0), but the presence of children was not significantly related to feelings/perceptions of safety.

Table 4.9
Bivariate Analyses for Feelings of Safety by Age, Petitioner’s Monthly Income, Length of Relationship, Length of Abuse, Count of Prior Violence, Count of Compliance Problems, and Number of Children (N = 110)

Variable	Less Safe	About the Same	Safer than Before	Much Safer than Before	F	p
<i>Age</i>	Mean 29.5 SD 4.7	Mean 29.7 SD 6.4	Mean 32.0 SD 8.2	Mean 33.8 SD 9.3	1.37	.26
<i>Petitioner’s monthly income</i>	Mean 738.50 SD 661.80	Mean 1184.48 SD 811.00	Mean 993.69 SD 941.58	Mean 1144.92 SD 1027.14	0.46	.71
<i>Length of relationship (years)</i>	Mean 7.3 SD 4.6	Mean 7.2 SD 6.3	Mean 9.2 SD 7.7	Mean 9.0 SD 6.5	0.51	.68
<i>Duration of abuse before CPO (years)</i>	Mean 5.1 SD 2.8	Mean 2.8 SD 2.8	Mean 4.8 SD 6.2	Mean 4.8 SD 4.5	0.9	.40
<i>Count of prior violence</i>	Mean 3.5 SD 1.0	Mean 3.1 SD 1.2	Mean 3.3 SD 1.2	Mean 3.3 SD 1.2	0.27	.85
<i>Count of compliance problems</i>	Mean 1.5 SD 1.0	Mean 0.5 SD 0.9	Mean 0.4 SD 0.8	Mean 0.3 SD 0.8	2.44	.07

Number of Children

Children with Perpetrator	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	2.37	.08
	1.0	0.9	1.7	1.3		
	SD	SD	SD	SD		
	1.2	0.9	1.5	1.2		
Other children	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	2.2	.09
	0.0	1.0	0.4	0.7		
	SD	SD	SD	SD		
	0.0	1.3	0.8	1.3		
Total children	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	0.75	.53
	1.0	1.9	2.1	2.0		
	SD	SD	SD	SD		
	1.2	1.4	1.5	1.5		

ANOVA = Analysis of Variance

*Significant at .05 level

**Significant at .01 level

Table 4.10 displays the bivariate relationships between the independent variables and the outcome measure of whether the petitioner believed the perpetrator violated the protection order. As Table 4.10 shows, the relationship between race/ethnicity and the belief that the perpetrator violated the order was statistically significant ($\chi^2(2) = 9.03, p = .01$). White victims were more likely to believe that the protection order had been violated (47.5%) than Black victims (23.7%) or Hispanic victims (9.1%). In addition, both measures of socioeconomic status were significantly related to the belief that the order had been violated. Forty-two percent of petitioners with less than a high school education, 15.9% of high school graduates, 35.7% of petitioners with some college or vocational/technical training, 25% of college graduates, and 100% of petitioners with post-graduate education believed that the protection order had been violated ($\chi^2(4) = 15.59, p = .00$). Twenty percent of petitioners employed full-time, 45.5% of petitioners employed part-time, and 45.7% of unemployed petitioners believed that the order had been violated ($\chi^2(2) = 8.05, p = .02$).

However, none of the measures of relationship status were statistically associated with the belief that the order had been violated. Divorcees (45.5%) were more likely to believe that the order had been violated than those who were married (19.4%), separated (37.5%) or had never been married (33.3%). Additionally, women who were neither dating nor living with the perpetrator when they secured the protection order (40.9%) were more likely than women who living with the perpetrators (23.2%) or women who were still intimately involved with the perpetrator but not living with them (30%) to believe that the order had been violated.

One measure of prior violence was significantly related to believing that the order had been violated. Approximately 35% of women who had been frightened or intimidated prior to the issuance of the protection order and 11.1% of women who had not been frightened or intimidated believed that the order was violated ($\chi^2(1) = 3.95, p = .05$). Nearly 27% of women who had been severely abused and 40% of women who had not been severely abused also believed that the order was violated, but this was not statistically significant. Approximately 33% of petitioners who had been slapped or grabbed prior to the protection order as well as 9.1% of petitioners who had not been slapped or grabbed believed that the order was violated; this was not statistically significant. Twenty-five percent of women whom the perpetrator had threatened with a weapon and 34.8% of women whom the perpetrator had not threatened with a weapon believed that the protection order had been violated whereas 36.7% of women whom the perpetrator forced to have sex and 26.2% of women whom the perpetrator had not forced to have sex also believed that their orders had been violated, but these findings were not statistically significant.

The perpetrator's abuse of alcohol/drugs prior to the petitioner's victimization was not significantly related to whether the victim believed that the perpetrator had violated the order. Approximately 30% of victims who asserted that their victimization was "always" preceded by the perpetrator's ingestion of alcohol/drugs believed that the order had been violated in contrast to 26.7% of victims who asserted that their victimization was "often" precipitated by the perpetrator's ingestion of alcohol/drugs. Furthermore, 35.3% of victims who asserted that their victimization was "sometimes" brought about by the perpetrator's ingestion of alcohol/drugs believed that their orders

were violated as did the 32% who indicated that their victimization was not triggered by the perpetrator's use of alcohol/drugs.

Approximately 28% of petitioners who were physically injured during the incident leading to the protection order believed that the order had been violated, but this did not differ significantly from those petitioners (33%) who were not physically injured.

As for perpetrator characteristics, the relationship between the perpetrator's employment status and the petitioner's belief that the protection order had been violated was not statistically significant. Approximately 31% of victims who had relationships with perpetrators who were employed full-time believed the protection order had been violated compared to 31.3% of victims who had relationships with perpetrators who were employed part-time, or 31.4% who had relationships with perpetrators who were not employed.

Whether or not the perpetrator had been arrested for prior abuse or other crimes unrelated to abuse was examined relative to the petitioner's belief that the protection order had been violated. Thirty-five percent of petitioners who reported that the perpetrators were arrested for abuse prior to securing the protection order believed that the perpetrator violated the protection order, but this did not differ significantly from those petitioners (27%) who did not report the perpetrator's arrest for prior abuse. Additionally, 34.5% of petitioners who were involved with perpetrators who were arrested for other crimes unrelated to the abuse and 26.9% of those who were involved with perpetrators without a history of arrests believed that the orders had been violated. Neither of these findings was statistically significant.

Finally, site ID was examined relative to the petitioner's belief that the protection order had been violated. Thirty-five percent of petitioners from Wilmington, 41.2% of petitioners from Denver, and 15.2% of petitioners from Washington, D.C. believed that their orders had been violated. The relationship between site ID and the petitioner's belief that the perpetrator violated the protection order was not statistically significant.

Table 4.10
Bivariate Results for Petitioner Believes Order Violated by Demographic Variables, Relationship Status, Prior Violence, CPO, Perpetrator Characteristics, and Site ID (N = 110)

Variable	Petitioner Believed Order Violated % (n)	Petitioner Does Not Believe Order Violated % (n)	χ^2	df	p
<i>Race</i>			9.03	2	.01**
White	47.5 (19)	52.5 (21)			
Black	23.7 (14)	76.3 (45)			
Hispanic	9.1 (1)	90.9 (10)			
<i>Socioeconomic Status Proxies</i>					
<i>Education</i>			15.59	4	.00**
To 11 th grade	42.3 (11)	57.7 (15)			
High school graduate	15.9 (7)	84.1 (37)			
College/vocational/technical	35.7 (10)	64.3 (18)			
College graduate	25.0 (2)	75.0 (6)			
Post-graduate	100.0 (4)	0.0 (0)			
<i>Petitioner's employment status</i>			8.05	2	.02*
Full-time	20.3 (13)	79.7 (51)			
Part-time	45.5 (5)	54.5 (6)			
Not employed	45.7 (16)	54.3 (19)			
<i>Marital status</i>			3.90	3	.27
Married	19.4 (7)	80.6 (29)			
Separated	37.5 (9)	62.5 (15)			
Divorced	45.5 (5)	54.5 (6)			
Never been married	33.3 (13)	66.7 (26)			
<i>Living arrangement at time of CPO</i>			3.62	2	.16
Living together	23.2 (13)	76.8 (43)			
Dating/not living together	30.0 (3)	70.0 (7)			
Not Dating/not living together	40.9 (18)	59.1 (26)			
<i>Violence before CPO</i>			3.95	1	.05*
Frightened/Intimidated					
Yes	34.8 (32)	65.2 (60)			
No	11.1 (2)	88.9 (16)			

Beaten/Choked			1.99	1	.16
Yes	26.7 (20)	73.3 (55)			
No	40.0 (14)	60.0 (21)			
Slapped/Grabbed			2.72	1	.10
Yes	33.3 (33)	66.7 (66)			
No	9.1 (1)	90.9 (10)			
Threatened with weapon			1.20	1	.27
Yes	25.0 (11)	75.0 (33)			
No	34.8 (23)	65.2 (43)			
Forced sex			1.40	1	.24
Yes	36.7 (18)	63.3 (31)			
No	26.2 (16)	73.8 (45)			
<i>Abuse occurred after alcohol/drugs</i>			0.86	3	.93
Yes, always	29.5 (13)	70.5 (31)			
Yes, often	26.7 (4)	73.3 (11)			
Yes, sometimes	35.3 (6)	64.7 (11)			
No	32.4 (11)	67.6 (23)			
<i>Petitioner physically injured during incident leading to CPO</i>			0.34	1	.56
Yes	27.5 (11)	72.5 (29)			
No	32.9 (23)	67.1 (47)			
<i>Perpetrator's Characteristics</i>					
<i>Perpetrator's employment status</i>			0.01	2	1.00
Full-time	30.5 (18)	69.5 (41)			
Part-time	31.3 (5)	68.8 (11)			
Not employed	31.4 (11)	68.6 (24)			
<i>Perpetrator arrested for other abuse</i>			0.86	1	.36
Yes	35.3 (18)	64.7 (33)			
No	27.1 (16)	72.9 (43)			
<i>Perpetrator arrested for other crimes</i>			0.73	1	.39
Yes	34.5 (20)	65.5 (38)			
No	26.9 (14)	73.1 (38)			
<i>Site ID</i>			0.49	1	.48
Wilmington	34.9 (15)	65.1 (28)			
Denver	41.2 (14)	58.8 (20)			
Washington, D.C.	15.2 (5)	84.8 (28)			

Notes: *Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .01 level

As Table 4.11 shows, neither age nor monthly income was significantly associated with the petitioner's belief that the protection order had been violated. Victims who believed that the perpetrators had violated the orders were, on average, nearly two years younger (30.4 years) than women who did not believe the orders had been violated (32.8 years). The monthly incomes of women with this belief were lower than those who did not believe their orders had been violated (\$904.00 and \$1,153.74, respectively), but this was not statistically significant.

The length of the relationship prior to the issuance of the protection order was significantly associated with the petitioner's belief that the protection order had been violated ($F = 4.09, p = .05$). Victims who believed that the orders were violated were intimately involved with the perpetrator for a shorter duration (6.7 years) than women who did not share this belief (9.5 years). Petitioners who believed that the orders had been violated also endured the abuse for a shorter duration (3.2 years) than women who did not believe that the orders had been violated (4.9 years), but this was not statistically significant. Additionally, petitioners who believed that the orders had been violated had higher counts of prior violence (3.4) than women who did not have this belief (3.2), but this was not statistically significant.

Finally, victims who believed their orders had been violated had, on average, 1.4 children with their perpetrators, 0.8 children from other relationships, and 2.2 children, total, while women who did not believe that the order had been violated had, on average, 1.3 with the perpetrators, 0.6 children from other relationships, and 1.9 children, total; these findings were not statistically significant.

Table 4.11
Bivariate Results for Petitioner Believes Order Violated by Age, Monthly Income, Length of Relationship, Duration of Abuse, Count of Prior Violence, and Number of Children (N = 110)

Variable	Petitioner Believes Order Violated	Petitioner Does Not Believe Order Violated	F	<i>p</i>
<i>Age</i>	Mean 30.4 SD 6.9	Mean 32.8 SD 8.7	1.97	.16
<i>Petitioner's monthly income</i>	Mean 904.00 SD 590.29	Mean 1153.74 SD 1046.12	1.69	.20
<i>Length of relationship (years)</i>	Mean 6.7 SD 4.2	Mean 9.5 SD 7.7	4.09	.05*
<i>Duration of abuse before CPO (years)</i>	Mean 3.2 SD 2.6	Mean 4.9 SD 5.7	3.00	.09
<i>Count of prior violence</i>	Mean 3.4 SD 1.0	Mean 3.2 SD 1.2	0.30	.59
<i>Number of children</i>				
Children in common with Perpetrator	Mean 1.4 SD 1.6	Mean 1.3 SD 1.1	0.00	.97
Other children	Mean 0.8 SD 1.4	Mean 0.6 SD 0.9	0.79	.38
Total children	Mean 2.2 SD 1.7	Mean 1.9 SD 1.3	0.49	.49

Notes: *Significant at .05 level
 **Significant at .01 level

Overall, the bivariate analyses do not provide much support for the eight hypotheses. Hypothesis 1 asserted that White victims would experience more violence reduction than their Black or Hispanic counterparts after the issuance of the protection order. The bivariate analyses, however, indicate that Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics did not differ significantly in the likelihood of violence reduction, measured in terms of experiencing physical abuse after the issuance of the protection order.

The second hypothesis stated that higher SES victims would experience more violence reduction than lower SES victims. Because SES was not measured directly, the petitioner's highest educational attainment and the petitioner's employment status were used as proxies. Petitioners with less than a high school education, high school graduates, petitioners with some college or vocational/technical training, college graduates, and petitioners with some post-graduate education did not differ statistically in terms of violence reduction. Additionally, victims employed full-time, part-time, or who were not employed did not statistically differ in terms of violence reduction. Hence, the bivariate analyses indicate no relationship between SES and violence reduction.

The third hypothesis posited that White petitioners were more likely than Blacks or Hispanics to experience contact reduction after the protection order has been obtained. To the contrary, the bivariate analyses indicate that Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics did not differ statistically in the likelihood of being contacted by the perpetrator. Also, in regards to the specific forms of contact, Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics did not differ statistically in the likelihood that they would receive telephone calls from the perpetrator at home or work or in the likelihood that the perpetrator would go to their homes.

Moreover, the likelihood of having contact with the perpetrator after the protection order did not vary by the petitioner's highest level of educational attainment. Petitioners who did not have a high school education, high school graduates, petitioners with some college or vocational/technical training, college graduates, and petitioners with some post-graduate education. In addition, the likelihood of experiencing the various forms of contact did not vary by the petitioner's highest level of educational attainment. As for the petitioner's employment status, victims who were employed full-time, part-time, or who were unemployed did not differ significantly in terms of contact, overall, with the perpetrator after securing the protection order. However, employment status was significantly associated with telephone contact with the perpetrator as well as the perpetrator going to the petitioner's home. Petitioners employed part-time were more likely to receive telephone calls from the perpetrator than petitioners employed full-time or those who were not employed. They were also more likely to be visited by the perpetrator at their homes than petitioners who were employed full-time or who were not employed. Therefore, although the specific forms of contact did not vary significantly with the petitioner's educational attainment, they did vary significantly with the petitioner's employment status.

Hypothesis 5 claimed that White females were more likely than Blacks or Hispanics to perceive their protection orders as effective as measured by the petitioner's belief that the order had been violated. The petitioner's belief that the protection order had been violated was significantly associated with the petitioner's race/ethnicity. Whites were more likely than Blacks or Hispanics to believe that the protection order had been violated, findings that are contrary to this hypothesis.

The sixth hypothesis posited that higher SES females were more likely than lower SES females to perceive their protection orders as effective. The petitioner's highest educational attainment was significantly associated with the petitioner's belief that the protection order had been violated. Petitioners with some post-graduate education were more likely to believe that the protection order had been violated relative to petitioners who did not complete high school, high school graduates, petitioners with some college or vocational/technical training, or college graduates, findings that are opposite of the predictions. In addition, victims employed part-time or who were unemployed were more likely to believe that the orders had been violated relative to those victims employed full-time. This finding, although statistically significant, was also opposite of the predictions.

Hypothesis 7 stated that White females are more likely than Blacks or Hispanics to have increased feelings of safety after the protection order. The bivariate analyses do not support this claim. To the contrary, the analyses indicate that Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics did not vary significantly in their feelings/perceptions of safety.

The final hypothesis posited that petitioners with higher SES were more likely to have increased feelings of safety compared to lower SES victims. Petitioners with some post-graduate education were more likely than their counterparts to report feeling either "less safe" than before the order or "about the same." However, petitioners with less than a high school education indicated feeling "safer than before" the issuance of the protection order. Finally, although college graduates and petitioners with some post-graduate education were comparable in terms of feelings "much safer than before" the protection order, petitioners with some college or vocational/technical training were more

likely to report feeling “much safer than before” the issuance of the protection order. These findings were statistically significant. Last, the victim’s employment status was not statistically related to the petitioner’s feelings/perceptions of safety.

Although the bivariate analyses do not lend much support for the eight hypotheses, and some are contrary than expectations, multivariate analyses will be conducted as they enable further testing of the hypotheses net of effects of the control variables.

Multivariate Results

Multiple regression (OLS) analyses were performed for the dependent variables, the number of compliance problems and feelings/perceptions of physical safety, respectively. This enables testing of the hypotheses concerning whether race/ethnicity and SES (measured using the petitioner’s highest educational level, income, and the petitioner’s employment status as proxies) were associated with CPO effectiveness after controlling for the other covariates. Tables 4.12 and 4.13 display the results of the four OLS regression models. In each table, the first model included only the covariates. Model 2 included race/ethnicity. Socioeconomic measures were added in the third model. In the fourth model, race/ethnicity and SES were entered together. This modeling approach enables examination of the effects of race/ethnicity and SES individually and then together over and above the effects of the other predictors. For all four models in each table, the *b* coefficients as well as standard errors are reported.

The results of the OLS regression analysis for the number of compliance problems are shown in Table 4.12. Model 1 included only the covariates. Age was not a significant predictor in the number of compliance problems experienced by the petitioner.

Petitioners who were married averaged 0.11 more compliance problems than petitioners who were separated, divorced, or not married. Also, victims living with the perpetrator experienced averaged 0.15 fewer compliance problems than victims not living with the perpetrator. Neither marital status nor living arrangement significantly predicted the number of compliance problems experienced by the petitioner. Petitioners also generally experienced 0.05 more compliance problems for each child, but this finding was not statistically significant.

The history of abuse was not related to compliance problems. The duration of abuse prior to the order did not significantly predict the number of compliance problems. For each additional count of prior violence petitioners experienced, there was, on average, a 0.07 more compliance problems; however, this was not statistically significant. Additionally, petitioners who were physically injured during the incident leading to the protection order generally experienced 0.21 more compliance problems than those who were not physically injured, but this was not statistically significant.

Perpetrator characteristics were not related to the outcome. Each additional level in the frequency of the perpetrator's alcohol/drug abuse prior to victimizing the petitioner was associated with a 0.08 point decrease in the number of compliance problems, but this was not statistically significant. Victims involved with perpetrators who were employed generally had an average of 0.01 more compliance problems than those involved with unemployed perpetrators. Additionally, petitioners involved with perpetrators who were arrested for prior IPV averaged 0.16 more compliance problems than those involved with perpetrators who were not arrested for prior IPV. Neither the perpetrator's employment

status nor his arrest history for prior abuse was statistically related to compliance problems.

Last, women who lived in Wilmington averaged 0.21 more compliance problems than women who lived in Denver; petitioners from Washington, D.C. averaged 0.14 fewer compliance problems than women who lived in Denver, but site ID was not a significant predictor of the number of compliance problems. Overall, the covariates in Model 1 explain 12.6% of the variance in protection order efficacy as demonstrated by the number of compliance problems. However, none of the predictors was significantly related to the outcome.

Race/ethnicity was included in Model 2. Overall, neither Black nor Hispanic victims differed significantly from White victims in compliance problems, findings that are contrary to the prediction in hypothesis 1. Black women averaged 0.01 fewer compliance problems than White women. Hispanic women averaged 0.40 fewer compliance problems compared to White women. The remaining predictors had little effect on the number of compliance problems after the addition of race/ethnicity in the analysis. Overall, Model 2 explains 13.9% of the protection order effectiveness as demonstrated by the number of compliance problems experienced after the protection order. This is 1.3% more than what the covariates alone explained, although again none of the predictors was significantly related to the outcome. Accordingly, race/ethnicity offers little predictive power regarding the number of compliance problems.

Model 3 included the SES measures to determine if they were associated with the number of compliance problems experienced by petitioners; but they are not statistically significant, findings contrary to the prediction in hypothesis 2. For each additional level

of education (less than high school, high school graduate, some college or vocational/technical training, college graduate, and some post-graduate education), the petitioner experienced a 0.01 point increase in the number of compliance problems. Furthermore, victims employed full-time or part-time did not differ significantly from unemployed petitioners in compliance problems. Employed petitioners averaged 0.16 fewer compliance problems than petitioners who were not unemployed. In addition, the petitioner's monthly income was not associated with an increase in compliance problems. Overall, the inclusion of SES predictors resulted in little change in the effects of other predictors. Thus, Model 3 explains 14.6% of the variability in number of compliance problems, 1.9% above what is explained by the covariates alone. None of the predictors is significantly associated with compliance problems.

Race/ethnicity and SES were entered together in Model 4. With both race/ethnicity and SES in the model, Black victims experienced 0.02 more compliance problems than White victims whereas Hispanic victims experienced 0.38 fewer compliance problems than White victims, but these differences were not statistically significant. Additionally, the petitioner's educational status, employment status, and monthly income were not significantly associated with the number of compliance problems. For each additional level of education, the petitioner experienced 0.01 fewer compliance problems. Furthermore, employed petitioners averaged 0.15 fewer compliance problems than petitioners who were not unemployed. Finally, the petitioner's monthly income was not associated with an increase in compliance problems. Overall, the inclusion of race/ethnicity and SES predictors resulted in little change in the effects of other predictors. In conclusion, Model 4 indicated that the variables explained

15.8% of the variance in the number of compliance problems experienced after the protection order. Race/ethnicity and SES explain 3.2% above what is explained by the covariates alone. Therefore, race/ethnicity, SES, and the model, overall, offer limited predictive power in explaining protection order effectiveness as demonstrated by the number of compliance problems experienced by the petitioner.

Table 4.12
Results from Ordinary Least Squares Regression for Number of Compliance Problems Regressed on Covariates, Race/Ethnicity, and SES (N = 110)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	<i>B</i>	S.E.	<i>B</i>	S.E.	<i>b</i>	S.E.	<i>b</i>	S.E.
Constant	0.17	0.60	0.23	0.62	0.35	0.76	0.46	0.78
Age	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
Relationship Status								
Married ¹	0.11	0.07	1.00	0.07	0.10	0.07	0.09	0.07
Living Together ²	-0.15	0.18	-0.12	0.18	-0.15	0.18	-0.13	0.18
Total Number of Children	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.06
History of Abuse								
Duration of Physical Abuse Before CPO	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Count of Prior Abuse	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.08
Petitioner Physically Injured During Incident Leading to CPO ³	0.21	0.18	0.24	0.19	0.18	0.19	0.21	0.19
Perpetrator Characteristics								
Perpetrator Abused Alcohol/Drugs Prior to Victimization ⁴	-0.08	0.07	-0.07	0.07	-0.07	0.07	-0.07	0.07
Perpetrator Employed ⁵	0.01	0.19	-0.03	0.20	0.10	0.21	0.08	0.22
Perpetrator Arrested for Prior Abuse ⁶	0.16	0.18	0.16	0.19	0.16	0.19	0.16	0.19
Site ID ⁷								
Wilmington, DE	0.21	0.20	1.00	0.22	0.21	0.21	0.10	0.23
Washington, D.C.	-0.14	0.23	-0.24	0.29	-0.13	0.23	-0.25	0.30
Race/Ethnicity ⁸								
Black			-0.01	0.23			0.02	0.24
Hispanic			-0.40	0.35			-0.38	0.35

Socioeconomic Status Proxies

Petitioner's Highest Educational Status			0.01	0.09	-0.01	0.09
Petitioner's Employment Status ⁹			-0.16	0.18	-0.15	0.18
Petitioner's Monthly Income			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
R-squared	0.126	0.139	0.146		0.158	

Note: *Significant at .05 level (2-tailed)

**Significant at .01 level (2-tailed)

Model 4 $F(5, 92) = 1.02, p = .45, R^2 = 15.8\%$

Reference category¹ is "separated/divorced/never been married."

Reference category² is "not living together."

Reference category³ is "petitioner not injured during incident leading to CPO."

Reference category⁴ is "perpetrator did not use alcohol/drugs prior to victimization."

Reference category⁵ is "perpetrator unemployed."

Reference category⁶ is "perpetrator not arrested for prior abuse."

Reference category⁷ is "Denver, CO."

Reference category⁸ is "White."

Reference category⁹ is "petitioner unemployed."

The results of the OLS regression analysis for feelings/perceptions of physical safety, race/ethnicity, and SES are shown in Table 4.13. Model 1 included only the covariates. These results show that for every one year increase in age, feelings/perceptions of safety increase, on average, by 0.01 points. Petitioners who were married had feelings/perceptions of physical safety that averaged 0.04 points lower than petitioners who were separated, divorced, or had never been married. Also, victims living with the perpetrator at the time of the protection order had feelings/perceptions of safety that averaged 0.04 points more than victims not living with the perpetrators. Age, marital status, and living arrangement were unrelated to the petitioner's feelings/perceptions of physical safety. As for the presence of children, each additional child resulted in a 0.06 point increase in feelings/perceptions of safety, but this was not statistically significant.

Prior relationship violence was unrelated to feelings/perceptions of safety. The length of prior abuse prior to securing the protection order did not significantly affect the petitioner's feelings/perceptions of physical safety. Also, each additional count of prior violence was associated with a 0.01 point increase in feelings/perceptions of safety; this, too, was not statistically significant. Additionally, petitioners who were physically injured during the incident leading to the protection order had feelings/perceptions of safety 0.04 points less than those who were not physically injured, but this was not statistically significant.

Perpetrator characteristics were not significantly associated with feelings/perceptions of safety. Each additional level in the frequency of the perpetrator's alcohol/drug abuse prior to victimizing the petitioner was associated with a 0.11 point

increase in feelings/perceptions of safety. When the perpetrator was employed, victims averaged feelings/perceptions of safety 0.14 points higher than when involved with unemployed perpetrators, but this was not statistically significant. Furthermore, petitioners involved with perpetrators who had been arrested for other abuse averaged feelings of safety 0.26 points less than those who were involved with perpetrators who had not been arrested for other abuse, but this also was not significant. Last, women who lived in Wilmington had an average of feelings/perceptions of physical safety 0.20 points lower than women who lived in Denver whereas petitioners from Washington, D.C. averaged 0.46 points lower in feelings/perceptions of safety than women who lived in Denver. However, residing in Washington, D.C. was a statistically significant predictor of feelings/perceptions of safety ($p < .05$). Overall, the covariates in Model 1 explain 12.8% of the variability in protection order efficacy as demonstrated by feelings/perceptions of safety. However, only the study site was significantly related to the outcome.

Race and ethnicity were included in Model 2. Black and Hispanic victims did not differ significantly from White victims in terms of feelings/perceptions of safety, findings contrary to the prediction in hypothesis 7. Black victims averaged 0.20 points higher than Whites in feelings/perceptions of safety whereas Hispanics averaged 0.29 points higher than Whites in feelings/perceptions of safety. The inclusion of race/ethnicity as predictors resulted in little change in the effects of other predictors. However, residing in Washington, D.C. was no longer a significant predictor of feelings/perceptions of safety (petitioners living in Washington, D.C. averaged 0.54 points fewer in feelings/perceptions of safety compared to those living in Denver). This suggests that

part of site difference was due to race/ethnicity differences across locations. Overall, the results of this analysis indicate that Model 2 accounts for 13.9% of the amount of the efficacy variability as demonstrated by feelings/perceptions of physical safety.

Therefore, race and ethnicity explained an additional 1.1% of the variance over and above the covariates and, consequently, appear to offer little predictive power regarding feelings/perceptions of safety.

Model 3 examined whether SES measures predicted feelings/perceptions of physical safety. These results show that for each progression in educational status, petitioners experienced a 0.15 point decrease in feelings/perceptions of safety, findings that are contrary to the prediction in hypothesis 8; but this was not statistically significant. Also, employed petitioners did not differ significantly from unemployed petitioners, a finding also contrary to the prediction in hypothesis 8. Employed petitioners experienced a 0.26 point increase in feelings/perceptions of safety compared to unemployed petitioners. Finally, the petitioner's monthly income was not a significant predictor of feelings/perceptions of safety. Overall, the inclusion of SES predictors resulted in little change in the effects of other predictors. However, residing in Washington, D.C. returned to its prior state of significance as living in Washington, D.C. was associated with a 0.47 point decrease in feelings/perceptions of safety ($p < .05$) relative to women living in Denver. As such, Model 3 explains 17.4% of the variability in feelings/perceptions of physical safety, 4.6% above what is explained by the covariates. Accordingly, SES has some predictive power for feelings/perceptions of safety.

Finally, Model 4 included both race/ethnicity and SES. With both race/ethnicity and SES in the model, the effects of both sets of predictors remain unchanged. Black and Hispanic women did not differ significantly from White women in feelings/perceptions of safety. Additionally, the petitioner's highest educational attainment was not a significant predictor of the petitioner's feelings/perceptions of safety. Furthermore, neither the petitioner's employment status nor her monthly income was associated with increased feelings/perceptions of safety. The final model indicates that 18.5% of the variance in feelings/perceptions of physical safety is accounted for by the predictors; of the variance, race/ethnicity and SES account for 5.7% above the amount of variance explained by the covariates. Therefore, neither race/ethnicity nor SES has significant predictive powers for feelings/perceptions of safety above the effects of the other control variables.

Table 4.13
Results from Ordinary Least Squares Regression for Feelings/Perceptions of Physical Safety Regressed on Covariates, Race/Ethnicity, and SES (N = 110)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	<i>b</i>	S.E.	<i>b</i>	S.E.	<i>b</i>	S.E.	<i>b</i>	S.E.
Constant	2.58**	0.58	2.46**	0.60	2.92**	0.73	2.82**	0.74
Age	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01
Relationship Status								
Married ¹	-0.04	0.07	-0.03	0.07	-0.04	0.07	-0.03	0.07
Living Together ²	0.04	0.17	0.01	0.18	0.08	0.17	0.05	0.17
Total Number of Children	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.02	0.06	0.01	0.06
History of Abuse								
Duration of Physical Abuse Before CPO	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Count of Prior Abuse	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.07	0.02	0.07	0.03	0.07
Petitioner Physically Injured During Incident Leading to CPO ³	-0.04	0.18	-0.06	0.18	-0.12	0.18	-0.13	0.18
Perpetrator Characteristics								
Perpetrator Abused Alcohol/Drugs Prior to Victimization ⁴	0.11	0.07	0.10	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.07
Perpetrator Employed ⁵	0.14	0.18	0.20	0.19	0.17	0.20	0.24	0.21
Perpetrator Arrested for Prior Abuse ⁶	-0.26	0.18	-0.29	0.18	-0.28	0.18	-0.32	0.18
Site ID ⁷								
Wilmington, DE	-0.20	0.20	-0.15	0.22	-0.17	0.20	-0.15	0.22
Washington, D.C.	-0.46*	0.22	-0.54	0.28	-0.47*	0.22	-0.60*	0.29
Race/Ethnicity ⁸								
Black			0.20	0.23			0.24	0.23
Hispanic			0.29	0.34			0.11	0.33

Socioeconomic Status Proxies				
Petitioner's Highest Educational Status			-0.15	0.10
Petitioner's Employment Status			-0.15	0.09
Petitioner's Monthly Income			0.26	0.18
			0.27	0.33
			0.00	0.00
R-squared	0.128	0.139	0.174	0.185

Note: *Significant at .05 level (2-tailed)

**Significant at .01 level (2-tailed)

Model 4 F (5, 92) = 1.23, p = .26, R² = 18.5%

Reference category¹ is "separated/divorced/never been married."

Reference category² is "not living together."

Reference category³ is "petitioner not injured during incident leading to CPO."

Reference category⁴ is "perpetrator did not use alcohol/drugs prior to victimization."

Reference category⁵ is "perpetrator unemployed."

Reference category⁶ is "perpetrator not arrested for prior abuse."

Reference category⁷ is "Denver, CO."

Reference category⁸ is "White."

Reference category⁸ is "petitioner unemployed."

In sum, the results of the OLS regression indicate that neither Black nor Hispanic victims differed significantly from White victims in the number of compliance problems or feelings/perceptions of public safety. Additionally, petitioners who did not complete high school and high school graduates did not differ significantly from petitioners with a college education in the number of compliance problems but did differ in feelings/perceptions of safety in the direction opposite of what the hypothesis predicted. Furthermore, victims employed full-time or part-time did not differ significantly from unemployed petitioners in compliance problems or safety. Furthermore, with both race/ethnicity and SES in the model, the effects of both sets of predictors remain unchanged except study location. For both outcomes, the fact that neither the petitioner's race/ethnicity nor SES was a significant predictor of compliance problems is noteworthy. The OLS regression results, therefore, are not supportive of hypotheses 1, 2, 7, or 8.

The remaining hypotheses will be tested using logistic regression as it permits further testing of those hypotheses net of effects of the control variables.

Logistic Regression Results

Logistic regression was conducted using the dichotomous dependent variables of whether the petitioner had compliance problems after the protection order, whether the petitioner had contact with the perpetrator after the protection order, and whether the petitioner believed that the perpetrator had violated the order. This enables examination of whether race/ethnicity and SES explained significant variance after controlling for the covariates. Tables 4.14 through 4.16 display the results of the three sets of logistic regression analyses. In each table, the first model included only the covariates. Model 2

included race/ethnicity. Socioeconomic status measures were added in the third model. In the fourth model, race/ethnicity and SES were entered together. This modeling approach enables examination of the effects of race/ethnicity and SES individually and then together over and above the effects of the other predictors. For all four models in each table, the odds ratio as well as standard errors are reported.

The results of the logistic regression analyses for compliance problems are shown in Table 4.14. Model 1 included only the covariates. These results show that older petitioners were 0.98 times as likely as younger petitioners to have compliance problems after securing the protection order, controlling for other variables in the model; this was not statistically significant. Also, married petitioners were 1.23 times as likely as petitioners who were separated, divorced or who had never been married to have compliance problems, but this was not significant. Living arrangements, however, were significantly related to experiencing compliance problems ($p < .01$). Petitioners who were living with the perpetrators at the time of the protection orders were 0.23 times as likely as those not living with the perpetrators to have compliance problems after the protection order. In addition, every additional child increased the odds of having compliance problems by 1.26 times, but this was not statistically significant.

The history of abuse was not related to compliance problems. The duration of abuse prior to the order did not significantly predict whether the petitioner had compliance problems after the protection order. Also, each additional count of prior violence decreased the odds of having compliance problems 0.97 times, but this was not statistically significant. Additionally, petitioners who were physically injured during the incident leading to the protection order were 1.9 times as likely as petitioners who were

not physically injured during that incident to have compliance problems after the protection order; this, too, was not statistically significant.

Overall, perpetrator characteristics were not related to the outcome. Each additional level in the frequency of the perpetrator's alcohol/drug abuse prior to victimizing the petitioner reduced the odds of experiencing compliance problems 0.70 times, but this was not statistically significant. Victims involved with employed perpetrators were 1.45 times as likely as those involved with unemployed perpetrators to have compliance problems after the protection order. Moreover, victims involved with perpetrators who were arrested for prior IPV were 1.72 times as likely as those involved with perpetrators who were not arrested to experience compliance problems. However, neither the perpetrator's employment status nor his arrest history for prior abuse was statistically related to whether the petitioner had compliance problems after securing the protection order when controlling for all other variables.

Last, study site, overall, was significantly related to experiencing compliance problems ($p < .01$). Women who lived in Wilmington were 0.68 times as likely as women living in Denver to have compliance problems, but this was not statistically significant. However, women from Washington, D.C. were 0.14 times as likely as petitioners who lived in Denver to have compliance problems; this was statistically significant ($p < .01$). Overall, the covariates in Model 1, which explained 21.3% (Cox & Snell $R^2 = 0.213$) of the variance in protection order efficacy as demonstrated by whether or not the petitioner experienced compliance problems after securing the protection order, were statistically significant ($\chi^2(12) = 26.29, p < .01$).

Race and ethnicity were included in Model 2. Overall, race/ethnicity were not significant predictors of experiencing compliance problems, findings that are contrary to the prediction in hypothesis 1. Black women were 0.79 times as likely as White women to experience compliance problems, and Hispanic women were 0.11 times as likely as White women to have compliance problems after the order; these findings were not statistically significant. Of the remaining predictors, the petitioner's living arrangement and the study site remained statistically significant. In Model 1, petitioners living with the perpetrator were 0.23 times as likely as those not living with perpetrators to experience compliance problems ($p < .01$) whereas petitioners living with perpetrators in Model 2 were 0.25 times as likely as those not living together to experience compliance problems ($p < .05$). Additionally, living in Washington, D.C. remained a significant predictor of experiencing compliance problems. In Model 1, petitioners living in Washington, D.C. were 0.14 times as likely to have compliance problems as petitioners residing in Denver ($p < .01$). In Model 2, petitioners living in Washington, D.C. were 0.11 times as likely to have compliance problems as women in Denver ($p < .05$). Overall, Model 2 explained 24.2% (Cox & Snell $R^2 = 0.242$) of the protection order effectiveness as demonstrated by whether the petitioner experienced compliance problems after the issuance of the protection order; this was 2.9% more than what the covariates explained. However, the addition of the race and ethnicity measures did not significantly improve the model fit ($\Delta \chi^2 = 3.21$, $\Delta df = 2$). Accordingly, race and ethnicity have limited predictive power regarding whether the petitioner had compliance problems after securing the protection order.

Model 3 included the SES measures to determine if they were associated with whether the petitioner experienced compliance problems after the order. The petitioner's highest educational attainment did not significantly predict compliance problems. After controlling for other covariates, petitioners who did not complete high school were 1.68 times as likely as petitioners who had more than a high school education to have compliance problems after the order, and petitioners who graduated from high school were 0.55 times as likely as petitioners who had more than a high school education to experience compliance problems. Employed victims were 0.62 times as likely as unemployed victims to have compliance problems, but this difference was not statistically significant. In addition, the petitioner's monthly income had no significant impact on the odds of having compliance problems after the order, controlling for all other variables. Of the remaining predictors, the petitioner's living arrangement and study site remained statistically significant. Petitioners who were living with the perpetrator at the time of the protection order were 0.20 times as likely as those not living with the perpetrator to experience compliance problems ($p < .01$). Additionally, petitioners living in Washington, D.C. were 0.17 times as likely as women residing in Denver to experience compliance problems ($p < .05$).

Overall, Model 3 explained 24.3% (Cox & Snell $R^2 = .243$) of the variability in whether or not petitioners experienced compliance problems after the protection order, 3% above what is explained by the covariates alone ($\chi^2(16) = 30.55, p < .05$). Nonetheless, the addition of the SES measures in the analysis did not significantly improve the fit relative to Model 1 ($\Delta\chi^2 = 4.26, \Delta df = 4$). Although none of the measures of SES had any significant impact on the odds of experiencing compliance problems

when all other variables are controlled, the petitioner's living arrangement and study site had limited predictive power.

Race/ethnicity and SES were entered together in Model 4. With race, ethnicity, and SES in the model, Black victims were 0.94 times as likely as White victims to have compliance problems, but this was not statistically significant. Hispanic victims, however, were 0.07 times as likely as White victims to have compliance problems, a finding that is statistically significant ($p < .05$). In fact, the absolute size of the differences between Hispanic women and White women increased in Model 4; hence, once SES differences were taken into account, Hispanics were even less likely than Whites to experience compliance problems. In regards to measures of SES, the petitioner's highest educational attainment did not significantly predict compliance problems. Petitioners with less than a high school education were 2.26 times as likely as those with more than a high school education to experience compliance problems whereas high school graduates were 0.52 times as likely as petitioners with more than a high school education to experience compliance problems. Additionally, employed petitioners were 0.67 times as likely as unemployed petitioners to experience compliance problems; this, too, was not statistically significant.

The inclusion of race/ethnicity and SES as predictors in Model 4 resulted in little change in the effects of other predictors. The petitioner's living arrangement ($p < .01$) and study site remained statistically significant ($p < .05$). In conclusion, Model 4 explained 27.9% of the variance in whether the petitioner had compliance problems after the protection order with race/ethnicity and SES accounting for 6.6% above what was explained by the covariates alone. Yet, the inclusion of both race/ethnicity and SES

measures in the analysis did not significantly improve the fit of the model relative to Model 3 ($\Delta\chi^2 = 5.45$, $\Delta df = 2$). Therefore, race/ethnicity, SES, and the model, overall, offer limited predictive power in explaining protection order efficacy as demonstrated by the petitioner having compliance problems after the issuance of the protection order.

Table 4.14
Results from Logistic Regression for Compliance Problems After the Order Regressed on Covariates, Race/Ethnicity, and SES (N = 110)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.
Age	0.98	0.04	0.98	0.04	0.97	0.04	0.97	0.04
Relationship Status								
Married ¹	1.23	0.21	1.15	0.22	1.16	0.22	1.05	0.23
Living Together ²	0.23**	0.54	0.25*	0.55	0.20**	0.56	0.21**	0.58
Total Number of Children	1.26	0.20	1.31	0.19	1.17	0.22	1.16	0.23
History of Abuse								
Duration of Physical Abuse Before CPO	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
Count of Prior Abuse	0.97	0.23	1.00	0.24	0.90	0.24	0.91	0.25
Petitioner Physically Injured During Incident Leading to CPO ³	1.90	0.55	2.03	0.56	1.40	0.59	1.37	0.61
Perpetrator Characteristics								
Perpetrator Abused Alcohol/Drugs Prior to Abuse ⁴	0.70	0.21	0.73	0.22	0.74	0.22	0.78	0.23
Perpetrator Employed ⁵	1.45	0.53	1.12	0.57	2.63	0.66	2.42	0.72
Perpetrator Arrested for Prior Abuse ⁶	1.72	0.54	1.77	0.56	1.64	0.56	1.64	0.58
Site ID ⁷								
Wilmington, DE	0.68	0.55	0.42	0.61	0.73	0.58	0.41	0.65
Washington, D.C.	0.14**	0.72	0.11*	0.87	0.17*	0.76	0.11*	0.95
Race/Ethnicity ⁸								
Black			0.79	0.64			0.94	0.67
Hispanic			0.11	1.27			0.07*	1.34

Petitioner's Highest Educational Status⁹

Less than High School	1.68	0.75	2.26	0.80
High School Graduate	0.55	0.61	0.52	0.63
Petitioner's Employment Status ¹⁰	0.62	0.56	0.67	0.59
Petitioner's Monthly Income	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
Model 1 ($\chi^2(12) = 26.29, p < .01$) $R^2 = 0.213$				
Model 2 ($\chi^2(14) = 30.50, p < .01$) $R^2 = 0.242$				
Model 3 ($\chi^2(16) = 30.55, p < .05$) $R^2 = 0.243$				
Model 4 ($\chi^2(18) = 36.00, p < .01$) $R^2 = 0.279$				

Note: *Significant at .05 level (2-tailed)

**Significant at .01 level (2-tailed)

Reference category¹ is "separated/divorced/never been married."

Reference category² is "not living together."

Reference category³ is "petitioner not injured during incident leading to CPO."

Reference category⁴ is "perpetrator unemployed."

Reference category⁵ is "perpetrator did not use alcohol/drugs prior to abuse."

Reference category⁶ is "perpetrator not arrested for prior abuse."

Reference category⁷ is "Denver, CO."

Reference category⁸ is "White."

Reference category⁹ is "more than high school/some college education."

Reference category¹⁰ is "petitioner unemployed."

The results of the logistic regression analyses for contact with the perpetrator after the protection order are shown in Table 4.15. Model 1 included only the covariates. These results show that younger petitioners were 0.90 times as likely as older petitioners to have contact with the perpetrator after securing the protection order, controlling for other variables in the model; this is statistically significant ($p < .01$). Although relationship status was not a significant predictor of compliance problems, the petitioner's living arrangements ($p < .05$) were significantly related to having contact with the perpetrator. Married women were 0.7 times as likely as women who were separated, divorced or who had never been married to have contact with the perpetrator, but this was not significant. However, victims who were living with the perpetrators at the time of the protection orders were 3.12 times as likely as those not living with the perpetrators to have contact. Also, each child increased the odds of having contact with the perpetrator by 1.08 times, but this was not statistically significant.

Violence history was somewhat related to contact. The duration of abuse prior to the order did not significantly predict whether the petitioner had contact with the perpetrator after the order. However, petitioners with higher counts of prior violence were 0.62 times as likely as those with lower counts of prior violence to have contact continued contact with the perpetrator; this was statistically significant ($p < .05$). Additionally, petitioners who were physically injured during the incident leading to the order were 1.15 times as likely as petitioners who were not physically injured to have contact with the perpetrator, controlling for all other variables; this was not statistically significant.

Perpetrator characteristics were not related to the outcome. Petitioners victimized by perpetrators who increasingly used/abused alcohol or drugs prior to the victimization were 0.91 times as likely as those petitioners victimized by perpetrators who limited the use/abuse of alcohol or drugs or did not consume such products prior to the victimization to have contact with the perpetrator subsequent to the order, but this was not statistically significant. Victims in relationships with employed perpetrators were 1.18 times as likely as those involved with unemployed perpetrators to have contact after the protection order, holding all other variables constant. Furthermore, petitioners involved with perpetrators with a history of arrest for prior IPV were 1.34 times as likely as those involved with perpetrators without an arrest history to have contact after securing the protection order. Neither the perpetrator's employment status nor his arrest history for prior abuse was statistically related to whether the petitioner had continued contact with the perpetrator after securing the protection order.

Last, women who lived in Wilmington were 0.81 times as likely as women living in Denver to have contact after the protection order. On the other hand, petitioners from Washington, D.C. were 0.61 times as likely as petitioners who lived in Denver to have contact, but site ID was not a significant predictor of whether the petitioner had continued contact after securing the protection order. Overall, the covariates in Model 1 explain 16.2% (Cox & Snell $R^2 = 0.162$) of the variance in protection order efficacy as demonstrated by whether or not the petitioner had continued contact despite the issuance of the protection order. Only the petitioner's age, living arrangement, and the count of prior violence were significantly related to the outcome. Model 1, however, was not statistically significant ($\chi^2(12) = 19.50$).

Race and ethnicity were included in Model 2. Overall, neither Black nor Hispanic victims differed significantly from White victims in having continued contact with the perpetrator after the protection order, findings that are contrary to the prediction in hypothesis 3. Black women were 1.06 times as likely as White women to have continued contact whereas Hispanic women were 0.37 times as likely as White women to have continued contact after the order, but this was not statistically significant. Of the remaining predictors, the petitioner's age, living arrangement, and the count of prior violence remained statistically significant. Young petitioners were 0.90 times as likely as older petitioners to have continued contact with the perpetrator after the protection order, controlling for other variables in the model ($p < .01$). Furthermore, petitioners who were living with the perpetrators at the time of the protection orders were 3.4 times as likely as those not living with the perpetrators to have continued contact ($p < .05$). Finally, petitioners with higher counts of prior violence were 0.63 times as likely as those with lower counts of prior violence to have contact with the perpetrators despite the protection order ($p < .05$). Overall, Model 2 explains 17.2% (Cox & Snell $R^2 = 0.172$) of the protection order effectiveness as demonstrated by whether the petitioner had continued contact despite the issuance of the protection order. This is 1% more than what the covariates alone explained. The addition of the race and ethnicity measures did not significantly improve the model fit, however ($\Delta \chi^2 = 1.22$, $\Delta df = 2$). Accordingly, race and ethnicity offer little predictive power regarding contact.

Model 3 included the SES measures to determine if they were associated with whether the petitioner had continued contact despite the issuance of the protection order. Petitioners who did not complete high school were 2.77 times as likely as petitioners who

had more than a high school education to have contact after the order, and petitioners who graduated from high school were 1.05 times as likely as petitioners who had more than a high school education to have continued contact, controlling for all other variables. These findings are not statistically significant. Additionally, employed victims were 0.30 times as likely as unemployed victims to have contact, a finding that is statistically significant and supportive of hypothesis 4 ($p < .05$). Moreover, the petitioner's monthly income had no significant impact on the odds of having contact with the perpetrator after the order, controlling for all other variables. Of the remaining predictors, the petitioner's age, marital status, living arrangement, and the count of prior violence remained statistically significant. Young petitioners were 0.89 times as likely as older petitioners to have contact with the perpetrator after securing the protection order, controlling for other variables in the model ($p < .01$). Controlling for the effects of SES, married petitioners were now 0.63 times as likely as non-married petitioners to have continued contact, a finding that is significant ($p < .05$). Furthermore, petitioners who were living with the perpetrators were 3.1 times as likely as those not living with the perpetrators to have contact after the order ($p < .05$). Finally, petitioners who experienced higher counts of prior violence were 0.56 times as likely as those who experienced lower counts to have contact ($p < .05$). Overall, Model 3 explains 20.8% (Cox & Snell $R^2 = 0.208$) of the variability in whether or not petitioners had continued contact with the perpetrator despite the issuance of the protection order, 4.6% above what is explained by the covariates alone. Although only the petitioner's employment status had a significant impact on the odds of having continued contact with the perpetrator, several of the remaining predictors (the petitioner's age, relationship status, living arrangement, and count of prior violence)

had predictive power after controlling for all other variables. Nonetheless, the non-significant increase in χ^2 from Model 1 to Model 3 ($\Delta \chi^2 = 6.11$, $\Delta df = 4$) indicated that the fit of the model is not improved with the inclusion of the SES predictors.

Race/ethnicity and SES were entered together in Model 4. With both race/ethnicity and SES in the model, Black victims were 1.03 times as likely as White victims to have contact with the perpetrator after the order whereas Hispanic victims were 0.25 times as likely as White victims to have contact, but these were not statistically significant differences. Petitioners with less than a high school education were 3.79 times as likely as those with more than a high school education to have contact with the perpetrator whereas high school graduates were 1.05 times as likely as those with more than a high school education to have contact with the perpetrator after the order, but these were not statistically significant. Additionally, employed victims were 0.28 times as likely as unemployed victims to have contact; this was statistically significant ($p < .05$). The inclusion of race/ethnicity and SES as predictors resulted in little change in the effects of other predictors. The petitioner's age, relationship status, living arrangement, and the count of prior violence remained statistically significant. Younger petitioners were 0.89 times as likely as older petitioners to have contact with the perpetrator after securing the protection order, controlling for other variables in the model ($p < .01$). Petitioners who were married were 0.62 times as likely as petitioners who were separated, divorced, or who had never been married to have contact after the order ($p < .05$). Petitioners who were living with the perpetrators at the time of the protection orders were 3.49 times as likely as those not living with the perpetrators to have contact after the protection order ($p < .05$). Finally, petitioners with higher counts of prior violence were

0.57 times as likely as those with lower counts of prior violence to have contact with the perpetrator ($p < .05$).

In conclusion, Model 4 explained 22.2% (Cox & Snell $R^2 = 0.22$) of the variance in whether the petitioner had contact with the perpetrator subsequent to the order, 6% above what was explained by the covariates alone. However, the improvement in the fit of the model with both race/ethnicity as well as SES measures included was not significant relative to Model 3 ($\Delta \chi^2 = 2.01$, $\Delta df = 2$). Therefore, race/ethnicity and SES, overall, offer limited predictive power in explaining protection order effectiveness as demonstrated by continued contact with the perpetrator after the issuance of the order.

Table 4.15
Results from Logistic Regression for Contact After the Order Regressed on Covariates, Race/Ethnicity, and SES (N = 110)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.
Age	0.90**	0.04	0.90**	0.04	0.89**	0.04	0.89**	0.04
Relationship Status								
Married ¹	0.70	0.22	0.70	0.22	0.63*	0.22	0.62*	0.23
Living Together ²	3.12*	0.53	3.40*	0.55	3.06*	0.56	3.49*	0.58
Total Number of Children	1.08	0.18	1.10	0.19	1.10	0.21	1.13	0.22
History of Abuse								
Duration of Physical Abuse Before CPO	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
Count of Prior Abuse	0.62*	0.24	0.63*	0.24	0.56*	0.25	0.57*	0.25
Petitioner Physically Injured During Incident Leading to CPO ³	1.15	0.55	1.31	0.57	0.87	0.61	0.99	0.63
Perpetrator Characteristics								
Perpetrator Abused Alcohol/Drugs Prior to Abuse ⁴	0.91	0.19	0.93	0.20	0.87	0.22	0.87	0.23
Perpetrator Employed ⁵	1.18	0.54	1.07	0.57	1.74	0.65	1.75	0.68
Perpetrator Arrested for Prior Abuse ⁶	1.34	0.52	1.33	0.53	1.27	0.55	1.18	0.57
Site ID ⁷								
Wilmington, DE	0.81	0.57	0.60	0.65	0.64	0.64	0.41	0.74
Washington, D.C.	0.61	0.64	0.43	0.89	0.43	0.76	0.25	0.98
Race/Ethnicity ⁸								
Black			1.06	0.69			1.03	0.71
Hispanic			0.37	0.95			0.25	1.04

Petitioner's Highest Educational Status⁹

Less than High School	2.77	0.84	3.79	0.92
High School Graduate	1.05	0.61	1.05	0.62
Petitioner's Employment Status ¹⁰	0.30*	0.61	0.28*	0.64
Petitioner's Monthly Income	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00

Model 1 ($\chi^2(12) = 19.50, p > .05$) $R^2 = 0.162$

Model 2 ($\chi^2(14) = 20.72, p > .05$) $R^2 = 0.172$

Model 3 ($\chi^2(16) = 25.61, p > .05$) $R^2 = 0.208$

Model 4 ($\chi^2(18) = 27.62, p > .05$) $R^2 = 0.222$

Note: *Significant at .05 level (2-tailed)

**Significant at .01 level (2-tailed)

Reference category¹ is "separated/divorced/never been married."

Reference category² is "not living together."

Reference category³ is "petitioner not injured during incident leading to CPO."

Reference category⁴ is "perpetrator did not use alcohol/drugs prior to abuse."

Reference category⁵ is "perpetrator unemployed."

Reference category⁶ is "perpetrator not arrested for prior abuse."

Reference category⁷ is "Denver, CO."

Reference category⁸ is "White."

Reference category⁹ is "some college education."

Reference category¹⁰ is "petitioner unemployed."

Last, the results of the logistic regression analyses for whether the petitioner believed that the protection order had been violated are shown in Table 4.16. Model 1 included only the covariates. These results show that younger petitioners were 0.98 times as likely as older petitioners to believe that the protection order had been violated, controlling for other variables in the model; this finding was not statistically significant. Also, married petitioners were 1.16 times as likely as unmarried petitioners to believe that the order had been violated. Petitioners who were living with the perpetrators at the time of the protection orders were 0.41 times as likely as those not living with the perpetrators to believe that the order had been violated. Nonetheless, neither the petitioner's marital status nor living arrangement was a significant predictor of the belief that the perpetrator had violated the order. Also, petitioners with more children were 1.15 times as likely as those with fewer children to believe that the protection order had been violated, but this, too, was not statistically significant.

Violence history was somewhat related to the belief that the order had been violated. The duration of abuse prior to the order was a significant predictor of whether the petitioner believed that the protection order had been violated ($p < .05$). Petitioners who endured abuse for greater a duration of time were 1.00 times as likely as those who endured abuse for a shorter duration of time to believe that the protection order had been violated. Also, petitioners with higher counts of prior violence were 1.2 times as likely as those with fewer counts of prior violence to believe that the order had been violated, but this was not statistically significant. Petitioners who were physically injured during the incident leading to the protection order were 0.86 times as likely as petitioners who were

not physically injured during that incident to believe that the order had been violated, but this, too, was not statistically significant.

Perpetrator characteristics were not related to the outcome. Petitioners victimized by perpetrators who regularly used/abused alcohol/drugs prior to their victimization were 0.81 times as likely as those victimized by perpetrators who limited their use/abuse of alcohol/drugs prior to the victimization to believe that the order had been violated, but this was not statistically significant. Furthermore, victims involved with employed perpetrators were 1.42 times as likely as those involved with unemployed perpetrators to believe that the order had been violated. Moreover, victims involved with perpetrators with a history of arrest for prior abuse were 1.71 times as likely as those involved with perpetrators who were not arrested to believe that the order had been violated. Nonetheless, neither the perpetrator's employment status nor his arrest history for prior abuse was statistically related to whether the petitioner believed that the perpetrator had violated the protection order.

Last, study site was significantly related to believing that the protection order was violated ($p < .05$). Women living in Wilmington were 0.70 times as likely as women living in Denver to believe that the order had been violated, but this was not statistically significant. Women from Washington, D.C., on the other hand, were 0.18 times as likely as those living in Denver to believe that the order had been violated; this was statistically significant ($p < .01$). Overall, the covariates in Model 1 explained 16.8% (Cox & Snell $R^2 = 0.168$) of the variance in protection order efficacy as demonstrated by whether or not the petitioner believed that the perpetrator had violated the protection order, however, Model 1, was not statistically significant ($\chi^2(12) = 20.28$).

Race and ethnicity were included in Model 2. Overall, race was not a significant predictor of believing that the protection order had been violated, findings that are contrary to the prediction in hypothesis 5. Black women were 0.50 times as likely as White women to have this belief, but this was not statistically significant. On the other hand, Hispanic women were 0.08 times as likely as White women to believe that the order had been violated; this was statistically significant ($p < .05$). Of the remaining predictors, the duration of the abuse prior to obtaining the protection order was no longer significant with race/ethnicity in the model; however, living in Washington, D.C. remained statistically significant ($p < .05$). Petitioners living in Washington, D.C. were 0.19 times as likely to believe that the order had been violated relative to those living in Denver, CO. Overall, Model 2 explained 20.9% (Cox & Snell = 0.209) of the protection order effectiveness as demonstrated by whether the petitioner believed that the perpetrator had violated the order, 4.1% more than what the covariates explained alone. However, the addition of the race and ethnicity measures did not significantly improve the fit of the model relative to Model 1 ($\Delta \chi^2 = 5.56, \Delta df = 2$). Nonetheless, race and ethnicity have limited predictive power, overall, regarding the petitioner's belief.

Model 3 included the SES measures to determine if they were associated with whether the petitioner believed that the order had been violated. Petitioners who did not complete high school were 1.62 times as likely as petitioners who had more than a high school education to believe that the order had been violated, but this was not statistically significant. However, petitioners who graduated from high school were 0.23 times as likely as petitioners who had more than a high school education to have this belief, a finding that was statistically significant ($p < .05$) and contrary to hypothesis 6. The

petitioner's employment status was a significant predictor of the belief that the order had been violated ($p < .05$). Employed victims were 0.27 times as likely as unemployed victims to believe that the perpetrator violated the order, findings which were supportive of hypothesis 6. The petitioner's monthly income, however, had no significant impact on the odds of believing that the order had been violated, controlling for all other variables. Of the remaining predictors, the petitioner's living arrangement became statistically significant ($p < .05$) with the SES measures in the analysis. Petitioners living with the perpetrators at the time of the protection order were 0.25 times as likely as those not living with the perpetrators to believe that the order had been violated. Additionally, victims residing in Washington, D.C. were 0.19 times as likely as women residing in Denver to believe that their orders had been violated ($p < .05$). Overall, Model 3 explained 27.6% (Cox & Snell $R^2 = 0.276$) of the variability in the petitioner's belief that the perpetrator had violated the protection order, 10.8% above what is explained by the covariates alone. The addition of the SES measures, significantly improves the fit of the model relative to Model 1 ($\Delta \chi^2 = 15.45$, $\Delta df = 4$).

Finally, race/ethnicity and SES were entered together in Model 4. With race/ethnicity and SES in the model, Black victims were 0.57 times as likely as White victims to believe that the protection order had been violated, but this was not statistically significant. However, controlling for SES further widened the gap between Hispanics and Whites. In fact, Hispanic victims were 0.05 times as likely as White victims to have this belief, a finding that is statistically significant ($p < .05$). Additionally, the petitioner's educational status, overall, was related to the belief that the order had been violated ($p < .05$). Petitioners with less than a high school education were 2.03 times as

likely as those with more than a high school education to believe that the protection order had been violated, but this was not statistically significant. On the other hand, petitioners who graduated from high school were 0.22 times as likely as petitioners with more than a high school education to believe that the order had been violated, a finding that was statistically significant ($p < .05$). Moreover, the petitioner's employment status remained significant ($p < .05$). Employed victims were 0.28 times as likely as unemployed victims to believe that the order had been violated. Once again, the petitioner's monthly income did not significantly predict the petitioner's belief that the protection order had been violated, controlling for all other variables.

The inclusion of race/ethnicity and SES predictors impacted the effects of a few of the other predictors. The petitioner's living arrangement ($p < .05$) remained a significant predictor of whether the petitioner believed that the order had been violated. Petitioners who were living with the perpetrators at the time of the protection orders were 0.26 times as likely as those not living with the perpetrators to have this belief. Study site, on the other hand, was no longer significantly related to the belief that the perpetrator had violated the protection order. In conclusion, Model 4 indicated that the variables explained 31.7% (Cox & Snell $R^2 = 0.317$) of the variance in the belief that the protection order had been violated. Race/ethnicity and SES explain 14.9% above what is explained by the covariates alone. The addition of both race and ethnicity measures as well as measures for SES did not significantly improve the model relative to Model 3 ($\Delta \chi^2 = 5.19, \Delta df = 2$). Nonetheless, race/ethnicity, SES, and the model, overall, offer some predictive power in explaining protection order effectiveness as demonstrated by the petitioner's belief that the protection order had been violated.

Table 4.16
Results from Logistic Regression for Petitioner’s Belief that the Protection Order Had Been Violated Regressed on Covariates, Race/Ethnicity, and SES (N = 110)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.
Age	0.98	0.03	0.98	0.04	0.96	0.04	0.96	0.04
Relationship Status								
Married ¹	1.16	0.19	1.09	0.20	1.05	0.22	0.96	0.23
Living Together ²	0.41	0.50	0.45	0.52	0.25*	0.58	0.26*	0.62
Total Number of Children	1.15	0.19	1.18	0.20	1.14	0.22	1.16	0.23
History of Abuse								
Duration of Physical Abuse Before CPO	1.00*	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
Count of Prior Abuse	1.20	0.23	1.22	0.24	1.02	0.24	1.00	0.26
Petitioner Physically Injured During Incident Leading to CPO ³	0.86	0.51	0.92	0.53	0.58	0.59	0.61	0.63
Perpetrator Characteristics								
Perpetrator Abused Alcohol/Drugs Prior to Abuse ⁴	0.81	0.20	0.86	0.21	0.90	0.23	0.95	0.25
Perpetrator Employed ⁵	1.42	0.52	1.01	0.55	3.47	0.70	2.77	0.76
Perpetrator Arrested for Prior Abuse ⁶	1.71	0.51	2.00	0.53	1.81	0.57	2.10	0.61
Site ID ⁷								
Wilmington, DE	0.70	0.53	0.43	0.59	0.72	0.60	0.39	0.69
Washington, D.C.	0.18**	0.69	0.19*	0.82	0.19*	0.79	0.15	1.00
Race/Ethnicity ⁸								
Black			0.50	0.62			0.57	0.70
Hispanic			0.08*	1.28			0.05*	1.40

Petitioner's Highest Educational Status ⁹				
Less than High School	1.62	0.76	2.03	0.82
High School Graduate	0.23*	0.67	0.22*	0.69
Petitioner's Employment Status ¹⁰	0.27*	0.58	0.28*	0.62
Petitioner's Monthly Income	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
Model 1 ($\chi^2(12) = 20.28, p > .05$)	$R^2 = 0.168$			
Model 2 ($\chi^2(14) = 25.84, p < .05$)	$R^2 = 0.209$			
Model 3 ($\chi^2(16) = 35.73, p < .01$)	$R^2 = 0.276$			
Model 4 ($\chi^2(18) = 41.91, p < .01$)	$R^2 = 0.317$			

Note: *Significant at .05 level (2-tailed)

**Significant at .01 level (2-tailed)

Reference category¹ is "separated/divorced/never been married."

Reference category² is "not living together."

Reference category³ is "petitioner not injured during incident leading to CPO."

Reference category⁴ is "perpetrator did not use alcohol/drugs prior to abuse."

Reference category⁵ is "perpetrator unemployed."

Reference category⁶ is "perpetrator not arrested for prior abuse."

Reference category⁷ is "Denver, CO."

Reference category⁸ is "White."

Reference category⁹ is "some college education."

Reference category¹⁰ is "petitioner unemployed."

In sum, the results of the logistic regression analyses indicate that there are some ethnic differences in protection order compliance. While Black and White victims did not differ significantly in experiencing compliance problems, Hispanic victims were significantly different from White victims. There were no significant differences among race/ethnic groups regarding contact with the perpetrator pursuant to the protection order, a finding which is contrary to hypothesis 3. Finally, Black and White victims did not differ significantly in their beliefs that the order had been violated. To the contrary, Hispanics victims were significantly less likely than Whites to believe that the order had been violated, a finding which is contrary to hypothesis 5.

Regarding SES measures, variations in educational attainment, employment status and income did not produce significant differences in experiencing compliance problems. Furthermore, neither the petitioner's highest educational attainment nor monthly income was a significant predictor of contact after the order which is contrary to hypothesis 4. On the other hand, the petitioner's employment status was significantly related to continued contact with the perpetrator, a finding that is supportive of hypothesis 4. Additionally, variations in educational attainment and employment status were related to the petitioner's belief that the order had been violated. Although petitioners who did not graduate from high school did not differ from petitioners who had some education beyond a high school diploma, high school graduates were significantly different from petitioners who had some education beyond a high school diploma, a finding which is contrary to hypothesis 6. Nonetheless, the petitioner's employment status was a significant predictor of the petitioner's belief that the order had been violated, a finding that is supportive of hypothesis 6.

When race/ethnicity and SES were entered into the model together, Hispanics remained significantly different from Whites in experiencing compliance problems. In this analysis, SES had no significant predictive ability. When race/ethnicity and SES were combined in the model regarding continued contact after the protection order as well as the model pertaining to the petitioner's belief that the order had been violated, the effects of both sets of predictors remained unchanged. Accordingly, overall, the logistic regression results are not supportive of hypotheses 3 and 5 but are partially supportive of hypotheses 4 and 6.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

OVERVIEW

This final chapter reviews the empirical findings and policy implications of this thesis. A brief overview of the extant literature that guided my research questions is provided followed by a presentation of the findings. A discussion of methodological limitations and recommendations for future research are provided. Finally, various policy implications regarding race/ethnicity and SES as potential factors impacting civil protection order effectiveness are described.

THE DECISION TO STUDY CIVIL PROTECTION ORDERS

Civil protection orders are “legally binding court order[s] that . . . [restrain] an individual who has committed an act of violence against . . . [another] from further acts against that person” (Holt et al. 2002: 589). Available in all 50 states, protection orders differ from regular injunctions in the nature of the relief sought (e.g., child custody, sole use of the marital home) and in the ability to be secured *ex parte* (Michigan Judicial Institute 2004; Meiers 2005). To date, little research has assessed the efficacy of protection orders. Such research has typically defined efficacy as whether or not a decrease in re-abuse occurred after the issuance of the order (Harrell, Smith, and Nemark 1993; Tjaden and Thoennes 1998; Mears et al. 2001; Keilitz, Hannaford and Efke 1997). Nonetheless, most studies have ignored race/ethnicity or socioeconomic status as factors possibly associated with civil protection order effectiveness (Carlson, Harris, and Holden 1999; McFarlane, Malecha, Gist, Watson, Batten, Hall, and Smith 2004; Horton, Simonidis and Simonidis 1987). Hence, this thesis purported to assess how race/ethnicity

and socioeconomic status impact, if at all, the effectiveness of the protection orders. Effectiveness was assessed in terms of the occurrence of re-abuse as well as in the victims' perceptions. The key questions addressed were: 1) Do civil protection orders reduce revictimization? 2) Are there race/ethnic and/or SES differences in violence reduction once a civil protection order has been obtained? 3) Does the presence of civil protection orders impact victims' perceptions of safety? And, 4) does this differ by race/ethnicity and/or SES? These questions were addressed using data collected from a convenience sample of women seeking protection orders in three U.S. cities: Wilmington, Delaware; Denver, Colorado; and Washington, D.C.

DESCRIPTION OF FINDINGS

A total of eight hypotheses were tested in the study, and Table 5.1 summarizes the hypotheses and whether each was supported. The first hypothesis was that White females were more likely than Black or Hispanic females to experience violence reduction once a civil protection order had been obtained. The occurrence of compliance problems was used as a proxy to measure overall violence reduction. The initial bivariate analyses indicated that there were race/ethnic differences in compliance problems with 45% of White victims, 27.1% of Black victims, and 9.1% of Hispanic victims experiencing compliance problems. However, multivariate analyses showed that when controlling for other factors, ethnicity but not race was not related to the occurrence of or count of compliance problems. That is, Hispanic women were less likely than White women to experience problems, but the ethnicity effects were in a direction contrary to the hypothesis. Concerning the count of compliance problems, neither Black nor Hispanic

victims differed significantly from White victims. These findings are not supportive of hypothesis 1.

Table 5.1 Summary of Hypotheses and Relevant Findings

<p>H₁: White females are more likely than Black females or Hispanic females to experience violence reduction once a civil protection order has been obtained.</p>	<p>The hypothesis is not supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multivariate analyses indicated that Hispanic women were less likely than White women to experience problems, but the effects were in a direction contrary to the prediction.
<p>H₂: Higher SES females are more likely than lower SES females to experience violence reduction once a civil protection order has been obtained.</p>	<p>The hypothesis is not supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multivariate analyses indicate that none of the SES measures were significantly related to compliance problems.
<p>H₃: White females are more likely than Black females or Hispanic females to experience contact reduction once a civil protection order has been obtained.</p>	<p>The hypothesis is not supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contact reduction did not vary significantly by race/ethnicity.
<p>H₄: Higher SES females are more likely than lower SES females to experience contact reduction once a civil protection order has been obtained.</p>	<p>The hypothesis is somewhat supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment status was significantly related to contact reduction. • Neither education nor monthly income were significant predictors of the outcome measure.
<p>H₅: White females are more likely than Black females or Hispanic females to perceive their civil protection orders as effective.</p>	<p>The hypothesis is not supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logistic regression analyses indicated that ethnicity, but not race, was significantly related to the outcome measure in the direction contrary to the hypothesis.
<p>H₆: Higher SES females are more likely than lower SES females to perceive their civil protection orders as effective.</p>	<p>The hypothesis is somewhat supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multivariate analyses indicate that petitioners who did not complete high school and those who had more than a high school education did not differ in their belief that the order had been violated. Petitioners who graduated from high school were much less likely than petitioners who had more than a high school education to believe that the order had been violated. • Employed victims were less likely than unemployed victims to believe that the perpetrator violated the order

H ₇ : White females are more likely than Black females or Hispanic females to have increased feelings of safety after obtaining a civil protection order.	The hypothesis is not supported. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multivariate analyses indicated the Black and Hispanic victims did not significantly differ from Whites in their feelings/perceptions of safety.
H ₈ : Higher SES females are more likely than lower SES females to have increased feelings of safety after obtaining a civil protection order.	The hypothesis is not supported. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multivariate analyses indicated that none of the measures of SES were significantly related to the outcome measure.

Additionally, these findings are not consistent with those of Carlson et al.'s 1999 study. Carlson et al. (1999) found significant differences between Black and White petitioners. They determined that Black women experienced higher rates of physical violence before and after the protection order in comparison to their White or Hispanic counterparts. In fact, 76% percent of the African-American women reported physical abuse before filing and 38% reported abuse following the protection order (50% decline); 56% of the White women reported physical abuse prior to filing and 15% reported abuse after the order (73% decline); and 68% of Hispanic women reported physical abuse prior to filing and 18% reported abuse following the order's issuance (74% decline). Carlson et al. (1999) also found that Blacks were 3.47 times more likely to report re-abuse than Whites whereas Hispanics were 0.76 times less likely to report re-abuse relative to Whites. These findings were statistically significant in Carlson et al.'s (1999) study.

The second hypothesis stated that higher SES females were more likely to experience violence reduction than lower SES females. Because SES was not measured directly, the petitioner's highest educational attainment, income, and employment status were used as proxies. Bivariate analyses indicated that neither education nor monthly income was related to compliance problems. However, approximately 23% of victims

employed full-time, 63.6% of victims employed part-time, and 37.1% of unemployed victims reported compliance problems; these findings, on the other hand, were statistically significant. The multivariate analyses confirmed that education was not related to compliance. Once controlling for other variables in the multivariate analyses, neither income nor employment status were related to compliance problems. Therefore, the hypothesis is not supported.

The findings for SES in the current study are not consistent with those found in Carlson et al. (1999). Carlson and colleagues (1999) found that petitioners with very low SES (earning less than \$18,000 annually) were more likely than those with low/medium SES (earning above \$18,000 annually) to report violence before and after the protection order. Seventy percent of women characterized as having very low SES reported physical violence prior to the filing and 33% reported abuse after the order compared to 65% of women characterized as having low/medium SES who reported physical abuse prior to the order and 19% who reported abused after the protection order; these findings that were statistically significant in the Carlson study (1999). Furthermore, petitioners with low SES were 0.35 times as likely as those with very low SES to report re-abuse, and those with medium SES were 0.63 times as likely as petitioners with very low SES to report the same, findings that were also statistically significant in Carlson et al.'s study.

Hypothesis 3 posited that White females were more likely than Black females or Hispanic females to experience contact reduction once the civil protection order had been obtained. The results, however, indicated that contact reduction did not vary significantly by race/ethnicity. These findings held for the specific forms of contact (phone calls and

visits to the home) in both bivariate and multivariate analyses. These findings were contrary to the prediction in hypothesis 3.

Contact reduction was also measured in light of SES. The fourth hypothesis posited that higher SES females were more likely than lower SES females to experience contact reduction once a civil protection order had been obtained. This hypothesis had minimal support. In the bivariate analyses, employment status was significantly associated with telephone contact with the perpetrator as well as the perpetrator going to the petitioner's home. Petitioners employed part-time were more likely to receive telephone calls from the perpetrator than petitioners employed full-time or those who were not employed. They were also more likely to be visited by the perpetrator at their homes than petitioners who were employed full-time or who were not employed. In the logistic regression analyses, however, neither education nor the petitioner's monthly income was a significant predictor of the outcome measure. Yet, employment status was a significant predictor of contact with the perpetrator after the protection order.

Hypothesis 5 predicted that White females would be more likely than Black or Hispanic females to perceive their protection orders to be as effective as measured by the petitioner's belief that the order had been violated. The petitioner's belief that the protection order had been violated was significantly associated with the petitioner's race/ethnicity. White victims were more likely to believe that the protection order had been violated and, thus, less effective than Black victims or Hispanic victims. These findings, however, were contrary to the predictions of the hypothesis. The results of the logistic regression also indicated that race was not a significant predictor of the petitioner's belief that the order had been violated, as Black and White women did not

differ. On the other hand, Hispanic women were much less likely than White women to believe that the order had been violated. Thus, the results were contrary to hypothesis 5.

The sixth hypothesis posited that higher SES females were more likely than lower SES females to perceive their protection orders to be effective as measured by whether they believed that the protection order had been violated. In the bivariate analyses both the petitioner's highest educational attainment and employment status were significantly associated with the petitioner's belief that the protection order had been violated. Forty-two percent of petitioners with less than a high school education, 15.9% of high school graduates, 35.7% of petitioners with some college or vocational/technical training, 25% of college graduates, and 100% of petitioners with some level of post-graduate education believed that the protection order had been violated; these findings are opposite of the predictions. Multivariate analyses indicated that petitioners who did not complete high school and those who had more than a high school education did not differ in their belief that the order had been violated. However, petitioners who graduated from high school were much less likely than petitioners who had more than a high school education to have this belief, a finding that is contrary to hypothesis 6. As for the petitioner's employment status, 20% of petitioners employed full-time, 45.5% of petitioners employed part-time, and 45.7% of unemployed petitioners believed that the order had been violated, findings that are also contrary to the predictions. The multivariate results showed that employed victims were less likely than unemployed victims to believe that the perpetrator violated the order which indicates that they perceived the protection order as effective. Therefore, holding all other variables constant, the results are supportive of hypothesis 6.

Hypothesis 7 stated that White females were more likely than Black or Hispanic females to have increased feelings of safety after the protection order. The bivariate analyses do not support this claim. To the contrary, the analyses indicate that Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics did not vary significantly in their feelings/perceptions of safety. Multivariate analyses confirmed that Black and Hispanic victims did not differ significantly from White victims in terms of feelings/perceptions of safety, findings contrary to the prediction in hypothesis 7.

The final hypothesis posited that petitioners with higher SES were more likely to have increased feelings of safety compared to lower SES victims. Petitioner's highest educational attainment and feelings of safety were related in the bivariate analysis but not in the multivariate results with the effects of other variables held constant. Employment status and income were unrelated to feelings of safety in any of the analyses.

In sum, the results indicate that neither Black nor Hispanic victims differed significantly from White victims in the number of compliance problems or feelings/perceptions of public safety. Furthermore, although petitioners who did not complete high school and high school graduates did not differ significantly from petitioners with a college education in the number of compliance problems they did differ in feelings/perceptions of safety in the direction opposite of what the hypothesis predicted. Moreover, neither the number of compliance problems nor feelings/perceptions of safety varied significantly across the petitioner's employment status.

Additionally, the results of the logistic regression indicate that experiencing compliance problems, having contact with the perpetrator subsequent to the order, and

whether or not the petitioner believed that the order had been violated did not vary significantly across race/ethnic groups. Also, petitioners who did not complete high school were more likely than petitioners who had more than a high school education to have compliance problems, contact with the perpetrator and believe that the order had been violated. High school graduates, on the other hand, were less likely than petitioners who had more than a high school education to experience compliance problems, more likely to have continued contact, and less likely to believe that the order had been violated. Finally, employed victims were less likely than unemployed victims to have compliance problems, contact with the perpetrator, or believe that the order had been violated; hence, employed victims were more likely than unemployed victims to perceive their orders as effective. Accordingly, of the eight hypotheses, numbers 2, 4, 6, and 8 are somewhat supported by the data.

CONCLUSION

Overall, contrary to hypotheses 1, 3, 5, and 7, there were no race/ethnic differences in CPO effectiveness outcomes. However, there were some differences for Whites and Hispanics, but contrary to the prediction. Additionally, contrary to hypotheses 2, 4, and 6 higher SES females did not significantly differ from lower SES females in CPO effectiveness outcomes. There were, however, some differences in terms of the petitioner's employment status and contact with the perpetrator after the order and the petitioner's belief that the order had been violated. There were also differences in highest educational attainment and the belief that the order had been violated. Finally, in

contrast to hypothesis 8, higher SES females differed from lower SES females in feelings/perceptions of safety, but in the direction opposite of the prediction.

There are several possible explanations as to why the hypotheses ultimately were not supported. First, the study was marked by high attrition rates and missing data. Consequently, listwise deletion was used to obtain a sample of cases that was not missing data on any of the variables being analyzed. The eliminated cases could have consisted of people who were markedly different from those who provided all of the information requested and were ultimately used in the study.

In addition, Black victims may be reluctant to reported continued violations of the protection order in an effort to protect their batterers. Some researchers continue to report that, “Black males who behave aggressively are judged more harshly than their White counterparts are judged (Duncan, 1976; Sagar & Schofield, 1980)” (cited in Harrison and Esqueda 2000: 1045). The perceived aggression, however, may be a result of the 150 years of oppression Blacks suffered during slavery as well as the resulting legacy of oppression that young Blacks experience today. As many Black communities are riddled with poverty, stereotypes of violence, and the corresponding shame and humiliation associated therewith, Black males and females often choose to err on the side of caution in terms of engaging police or social services. Black females are particularly susceptible to these thoughts and, consequently, may refuse to participate in any actions including, but not limited to, reporting a violation of the order (to social service agencies or law enforcement) because of the potential of it 1) being used to further oppress Black males (Gondolf et al. 1988; White 1985); and 2) creating a situation where she no longer has control (Coker 2010). Hence, the failure to report could be related to the fear of

contributing to the stereotype of Blacks as well as the fear that the information will be forwarded to local law enforcement even if promises are made to the contrary.

It is also possible that cultural differences could have affected reporting violations (Davis and Erez 1998; Raj and Silverman 2002). Among respondents, some of the Latinas (in particular) may be immigrants. Immigrant victims may not want to bring further shame upon themselves or their families or they could have concerns with being able to trust Americans or people of other races or ethnicities (Davis and Erez 1998; Raj and Silverman 2002). If trust is of concern, immigrant women may question if the information they provide is actually confidential or if it will somehow get them into the hands of immigration officials.

Socioeconomic differences among victims did not result in the differences predicted in the hypotheses. First, the proxies for SES may not have been fully appropriate to determine significant changes among the victims' experiences as well as their perceptions of efficacy. Petitioners were not asked to identify a category best representing their income. Consequently, a victim could report that she did not have any income (\$0) even if she received child support or governmental assistance. Furthermore, total assets and wealth were not considered which could have hidden the relationship between low income, wealth, and repeat victimization as a petitioner could have considerable wealth but limited income. In addition, the employment status of both the victim and perpetrator were collapsed because of the small sample size and, as such, may not display the extent of the relationship between employment status and victimization or CPO efficacy. More specifically, expanding the categories of employment from full-time, part-time, not at all employed to include unemployed/laid off/looking for work,

unemployed/not looking, never worked for pay, self-employed, and disabled could have illuminated additional differences among victims. Finally, the proxies used for SES did not measure social stress, job satisfaction, and/or occupational status, all of which could have impacted the findings. Hence, these nuances could have resulted in subtle differences that could have altered the overall findings regarding the relationship between SES, repeat victimization, and CPO effectiveness.

LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Limitations have to be considered when interpreting results of any study, and there are several in this study which must be addressed. First, the data were collected using a convenience sample of women who were present at the court seeking protection orders. The convenience sample of women who obtained the order guaranteed that the sample was neither representative of all women nor a cohort study of women reporting an abusive incident to the police (Maxfield and Babbie 2007).

The most significant methodological limitations were the low response rate and missing data. Initial interviews were conducted with 285 of the 554 women who agreed to participate in the study. A large amount of missing data required the use of listwise deletion to eliminate all cases where any values on the variables considered were missing (Allison 2002). This yielded a sample size of 110 petitioners and further limited the generalizability of the findings. Consequently, one of the dependent variables (repeat physical abuse after the protection order) was limited to only five petitioners who experienced that violence; therefore, the occurrence of compliance problems was used as a proxy to measure overall violence reduction. In addition, the study relied exclusively

on self-reports of continuation or cessation of violence which could have been affected by underreporting and poor memory recall (Mosher, Miethe, and Phillips 2002).

There are several other limitations which should be considered and/or rectified in future research. Much of the IPV research reflects data limited to female victimization. Although males may actually represent up to 50% of victims in IPV cases (irrespective of the sex of the offender), they are rarely included in the datasets or analyses (Belknap and Melton 2005; Catalano 2007; Straus 2005; Straus 2004; Arehart-Treichel 2007). Additionally, the data used in this study did not acknowledge reciprocal violence although it is discussed in the extant IPV literature. The failure to include reciprocal or mutual abuse neglects the possibility that men and women batter for different reasons and that the consequences thereof may differ (Dobash, Dobash, Wilson, and Daly 1992). As such, future research should be conducted with males, females, homosexuals, and heterosexuals as both victims and perpetrators to determine if any differences exist among them.

This study was limited to Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics. The literature shows that members of different race/ethnic groups experience IPV at different rates (Rennison and Welchans 2000; Tjaden and Thoennes 2000; Hampton and Oliver 2006:2; Straus and Gelles 1986; Straus et al. 1980; Hampton and Gelles 1994). For example, Tjaden and Thoennes (2000) assert that American Indian/Alaska Natives report much higher rates of domestic violence victimization than any other group. Nonetheless, many studies fail to consider how racial and ethnic diversity impact whether or not violence is accepted within the family and, therefore, may not be considered a crime. Studies also fail to examine if or how groups differ in their attempts to secure a protection order (Baba and

Murray 2001; Almeida, Woods, Messineo, Font, and Heer 1994), and the results here indicate that there are at least some ethnic differences in the effectiveness of protection orders. Moreover, studies should differentiate between immigrant and native populations and their possible cultural variations in the acceptance and/or tolerance of IPV as well as in IPV interventions. Consequently, future research should include additional minorities and marginalized populations and consideration should be given to their specific issues.

Furthermore, the three geographical sites within this study were limited to the middle Atlantic (Washington, D.C. and Wilmington, DE) and the Rocky Mountain region (Denver, CO) of the United States and, thus, could be misleading when attempting to generalize the findings. Traditionally, the southern region of the United States has been associated with a subculture of violence (Gastil 1971). Because violence has been interpreted as being more prevalent in the south, focusing on the three cities considered disallows examination of potentially important regional differences. Moreover, IPV research typically focuses on petitioners living in urban areas. These petitioners may be able to readily secure protection orders whereas those in rural areas may require additional assistance to obtain them. Therefore, additional research should be conducted comparing petitioners in rural and urban areas. Accordingly, a much larger, racially, ethnically and geographically diverse population would be more useful in determining the efficacy of protection orders in decreasing violence.

Finally, some of the more recent studies on protective order effectiveness are confounded by mandatory and dual arrest laws that may impact recidivism (Buzawa and Buzawa 1996; Buzawa and Buzawa 2003). As law enforcement's discretionary practices are increasingly limited in IPV situations and the number of arrests increase, perpetrators

may be less likely to continue abusing the victim after he or she has secured the protection order. It is also possible that recipients of protection order may not seek assistance from law enforcement personnel in order to prevent an arrest from taking place. These issues may be further confounded by whether the petitioner received a temporary or permanent order as some research suggests disparities in efficacy of the two types of orders (Kaci 1994; Harrell and Smith 1996). Hence, the type of order needs to be studied in relation to protection order effectiveness in future work.

POLICY ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS

Intimate partner violence adversely impacts both the individuals directly involved and society at large. Civil protection orders are frequently the most common remedy sought by IPV victims. However, the effectiveness of the order, especially among different racial and ethnic and class groups, factors that could potentially impact civil protection order effectiveness, has received limited attention in the extant literature. Generally, both race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status are of particular importance when researching the prevalence and predictors of intimate partner violence as well as the efficacy of civil protection orders. Although a considerable amount of IPV research addresses the (White) majority population, little research has been conducted to identify differences among race/ethnic groups. Black women, for instance, have an increased risk of abuse with nearly double the rate of domestic violence victimization than that of White women (Rennison and Welchans 2000; Straus and Gelles 1997). As a result, researchers must make efforts to distinguish between White victims and the more marginalized populations in their work. Doing so will provide key insights into whether the efficacy

and perceptions of safety related to protection orders among minority group IPV victims differ from those of Whites. Consequently, various interventions can be further developed that address the needs of previously ignored and more marginalized populations.

Additionally, the absence of a clear and standardized definition of socioeconomic status results in a lack of comparability among studies including SES as a predictor of protection order effectiveness. The extant literature presupposes that lower-class women are disproportionately victimized and experience IPV at a higher rate than middle- or upper-class women (Kaufman Kantor and Jasinski 1997). Consequently, lower SES may increase the risk of IPV. The logical implication for civil protection order effectiveness, then, is that lower-class victims may utilize protection orders more than upper-class victims. Without addressing this underlying issue, whether or not protection orders are equally effective among lower, middle, and upper-class victims remains unclear. As a result, this further limits the development of more appropriate and innovative interventions.

In summary, this thesis added to the literature by examining the infrequently considered issues of the roles of race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status for civil protection order effectiveness. Furthermore, it has illustrated the importance of considering race/ethnicity (especially given the differences between Whites and Hispanics in experiencing problems and their belief that the order had been violated) as well as some SES differences. Future work needs to continue to extend this literature.

References

- Anderson, Elijah. 1999. *Code of The Street: Decency, Violence and The Moral Life of The Inner City*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Barnett, Ola W. 2000. "Why Battered Women Do Not Leave, Part 1: External Inhibiting Factors Within Society." *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse* 1:343-372.
- Benson, Michael L. and Greer L. Fox. 2003. *When Violence Hits Home: How Economics and Neighborhood Play a Role*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Benson, Michael L., John Wooldredge, Amy B. Thistlethwaite, and Greer L. Fox. 2004. "The Correlation between Race and Domestic Violence is Confounded with Community Context." *Social Problems* 51:326-342.
- Bidegain, Ana M. 1989. "Women and the Theology of Liberation." Pp. 15-36 in *Through Her Eyes: Women's Theology from Latin America* edited by Elsa Tamez. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Black's Law Dictionary*. West Publishing Company; 7th edition (August 1999); St. Paul Minnesota.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. 1989. *Criminal Victimization in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Buzawa, Eve S. and Carl G. Buzawa. 1992. *Domestic Violence: The Changing Criminal Justice Response*. Westport, CT: Auburn House.
- Buzawa, Eve S. and Carl G. Buzawa. 1996. *Do Arrests and Restraining Orders Work?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Buzawa, Eve S. and Carl G. Buzawa. 2003. *Domestic Violence: The Criminal Justice Response*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cahn, Naomi R. 1992. "Innovative Approaches to the Prosecution of Domestic Violence Crimes: An Overview." Pp. 161-180 in *Domestic Violence: The Changing Criminal Justice Response*, edited by Eve S. Buzawa and Carl G. Buzawa. Westport, CT: Auburn House.
- Carlson, Matthew J., Susan D. Harris, and George W. Holden. 1999. "Protective Orders and Domestic Violence: Risk Factors for Re-abuse." *Journal of Family Violence* 14:205-226.

- Catalano, Shannon. 2007. *Intimate Partner Violence in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved November 1, 2010 (<http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/intimate/ipv.cfm>).
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2003. "Costs of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in the United States." Atlanta (GA): Center for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. Retrieved August 24, 2010 (www.cdc.gov/ncipc/pub-res/ipv_cost/ipv.htm).
- Chaudhuri, Molly and Kathleen Daly. 1992. "Do Restraining Orders Help? Battered Women's Experience with Male Violence and Legal Process." Pp. 227-254 in *Domestic Violence: The Changing Criminal Justice Response*, edited by Eve S. Buzawa and Carl G. Buzawa. Westport, CT: Auburn House.
- Coley, S. M. and J. O. Beckett. 1988. "Black Battered Women: A Review of the Empirical Literature." *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 66:266-270.
- Colorado Revised Statute § 13-14-101(2).
- Colorado Revised Statute § 13-14-102.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1991. *Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color*. 43 *Stanford Law Review* 1241-99.
- Dasgupta, S. D. 2005. "Women's Realities: Defining Violence Against Women by Immigration, Race, and Class." Pp. 56-70 in *Domestic Violence at the Margins: Readings on Race, Class, Gender, and Culture*, edited by Natalie Sokoloff and Christina Pratt. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Davis, Robert C. and Edna Erez. 1998. *Immigrant Populations as Victims: Toward a Multicultural Criminal Justice System*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- DeJong, Christina and Amanda Burgess-Proctor. 2006. "A Summary of Personal Protection Order Statutes in the United States." *Violence Against Women* 12:68-88.
- Delaware Code Annotated Title 10 §1041(2).
- Delaware Code Annotated Title 10 §1045.
- District of Columbia Code § 16-1031.
- District of Columbia Code §1003.
- District of Columbia Code §1001(5).

- Dobash, Russell P. and R. Emerson Dobash. 1981. "Community Response to Violence Against Wives: Charivari, Abstract Justice and Patriarchy." *Social Problems* 28:563-581.
- Fagan, Jeffrey. 1996. *The Criminalization of Domestic Violence: Promises and Limits*. National Institute of Justice: Research Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved March 16, 2010 (<http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/crimdom.pdf>).
- familism. 2010. In *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*. Retrieved March 16, 2010, (<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/familism>).
- Gastil, Raymond. 1971. "Homicide and a Regional Subculture of Violence." *American Sociological Review* 36:412-427
- Gelles, Richard J. 1972. *The Violent Home: A Study of Physical Aggression Between Husbands and Wives*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gelles, Richard J. 1997. *Intimate Violence in Families*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gelles, Richard J. and Claire Pedrick Cornell. 1983. *International Perspectives on Family Violence*. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Publishing.
- Gelles, Richard J. and Donileen R. Loseke (ed.). 1993. *Current Controversies on Family Violence*. Newbury Park: Newbury Park.
- Gist, Julia, Judith McFarlane, Anne Malecha, Pam Willson, Kathy Watson, Nina Fredland, Pamela Schultz, Terri Walsh, Iva Hall, and Sheila Smith. 2001. "Protection Orders and Assault Charges: Do Justice Interventions Reduce Violence Against Women?" *American Journal of Family Law* 15:59-71.
- Gondolf, E.W. 1997. "Batterer Programs: What We Know and Need to Know." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 12:83-98.
- Grau, Janice, Jeffrey Fagan, and Sandra Wexler. 1985. "Restraining Orders for Battered Women: Issues of Access and Efficacy." *Women and Politics* 4:13-28.
- Grossman, Susan F. and Marta Lundy. 2007. "Domestic Violence Across Race and Ethnicity: Implications for Social Work Practice and Policy." *Violence Against Women* 13:1029-1052.
- Hampton, Robert, Ricardo Carrillo, and Joan Kim. 2005. "Domestic Violence in African American Communities." Pp. 127-141 in *Domestic Violence at the Margins: Readings on Race, Class, Gender, and Culture*, edited by Natalie Sokoloff and Christina Pratt. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

- Hampton, Robert L. and Richard J. Gelles. 1994. "Violence Toward Black Women in a Nationally Representative Sample of Black Families." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 25:105-119.
- Hampton, Robert L. and Thomas P. Gullotta. 2006. *Interpersonal Violence in the African-American Community: Evidence-Based Prevention and Treatment Practices*. New London, CT: Springer.
- Hampton, Robert L., Thomas P. Gullotta, Gerald R. Adams, Earl H. Potter III, and Roger P. Weissberg (eds.). 1993. *Family Violence Prevention and Treatment: Issues in Children's and Families' Lives*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Hampton, Robert L. and William Oliver. 2006. "Violence in the Black Family: What We Know, Where Do We Go?" Pp. 1-15 in *Interpersonal Violence in the African-American Community: Evidence-Based Prevention and Treatment Practices*, edited by Robert L. Hampton and Thomas P. Gullotta. New London, CT: Springer.
- Hampton, Robert, William Oliver, and Lucia Magarian. 2003. "Domestic Violence in the African American Community: An Analysis of Social and Structural Factors." *Violence Against Women* 9:533-557.
- Hampton, Robert L. and Alice F. Washington Coner-Edwards. 1993. "Physical and Sexual Violence in Marriage." Pp. 113-141 in *Family Violence: Prevention and Treatment*, vol. 1, edited by Robert L. Hampton, Thomas P. Gullotta, Gerald R. Adams, Earl H. Potter III, and Roger P. Weissberg. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hanson, Bea. 2002. "Interventions for Batterers: Program Approaches, Program Tensions." Pp. 419-448 in *Handbook of Domestic Violence Intervention Strategies: Policies, Programs and Legal Remedies*, edited by A.A. Roberts. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harrell, Adele and Barbara Smith. 1996. "Effects of Restraining Orders on Domestic Violence Victims." Pp. 214-242 in *Do Arrests and Restraining Orders Work?* edited by Eve S. Buzawa and Carl G. Buzawa. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Harrell, Adele, Barbara Smith, and Lisa Newmark. 1993. *Court Processing and the Effects of Restraining Orders for Domestic Violence Victims*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Henning, K.R. and L.M. Klesges. 2002. "Utilization of Counseling and Supportive Services by Female Victims of Domestic Abuse." *Violence and Victims* 17:623-636.

- Holt, Victoria L., Marie A. Kernie, Thomas Lumley, Marsha E. Wolf, Frederick P. Rivara. 2003. "Do Protection Orders Affect the Likelihood of Future Partner Violence and Injury." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 24:16-21.
- Holt, Victoria L., Marie A. Kernie, Thomas Lumley, Marsha E. Wolf, Frederick P. Rivara. 2002. "Civil Protection Orders and Risk of Subsequent Police-Reported Violence." *Journal of the American Medical Association* 288:589-594.
- Horton, Anne L., Kyriacos M. Simonidis, and Lucy L. Simonidis. 1987. "Legal Remedies for Spousal Abuse: Victim Characteristics, Expectations, and Satisfaction." *Journal of Family Violence* 2:265-279.
- Johnson, H. 2000. "The Role of Alcohol in Male Partners' Assault on Wives." *Journal of Drug Issues* 30:725-741.
- Johnson, Michael P. and Kathleen J. Ferraro. 2000. "Research on Domestic Violence in the 1990s: Making Distinctions." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62:948-963.
- Jory, Brian. 2006. "Intimate Violence Between African-American Couples: Seeking Intimate Justice in the Midst of Social Injustice." Pp. 81-105 in *Interpersonal Violence in the African-American Community: Evidence-Based Prevention and Treatment Practices*, edited by Robert L. Hampton and Thomas P. Gullotta. New London, CT: Springer.
- Joseph, J. 1997. "Women Battering: A Comparative Analysis of Black and White women." Pp. 161-169 in *Out of the Darkness: Contemporary Perspectives on Family Violence*, edited by G.K. Kantor and J.L. Jasinski, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Josephson, Jyl. 2002. "Intersectionality of Domestic Violence and Welfare in the Lives of Poor Women." Pp. 83-101 in *Domestic Violence at the Margins: Readings on Race, Class, Gender, and Culture*, edited by Natalie J. Sokoloff with Christina Pratt. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Kaci, Judy Hails. 1994. "Aftermath of Seeking Domestic Violence Protective Orders: The Victim's Perspective." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 10:204-219.
- Kalmuss, D. S. and M. A. Straus. 1990. "Wife's Marital Dependency and Wife Abuse." Pp. 379-380 in *Physical Violence in American Families*, edited by M.A. Straus and R.J. Gelles. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

- Kaslow, Nadine J., Sheridan L. Thorn, and Anuradha Paranjape. 2006. "Intervention for Abused African-American Women and Their Children." Pp. 47-80 in *Interpersonal Violence in the African-American Community: Evidence-Based Prevention and Treatment Practices*, edited by Robert L. Hampton and Thomas P. Gullotta. New London, CT: Springer.
- Kaufman Kantor, Glenda and Jana L. Jasinski. (eds.). 1997. *Out of Darkness: Contemporary Research Perspectives on Family Violence*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kaufman Kantor, Glenda, and Murray A. Straus. 1990. "Response of Victims and the Police to Assaults on Wives." Pp. 473-486 in *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 families*, edited by M.A. Straus and R.J. Gelles, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Keilitz, Susan L., C. Davis, Hillery S. Efke, C. Eugene Flango, and Paula L. Hannaford. 1998. *Civil Protection Orders: Victims' Views of Effectiveness*. Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts.
- Keilitz, Susan, Hillery S. Efke, and Paula L. Hannaford. 2000. *Benefits and Limitations of Civil Protection Orders for Victims of Domestic Violence in Wilmington, Delaware, Denver, Colorado, and the District of Columbia, 1994-1995*. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research.
- Kroeger, Catherine C. and James R. Beck, (eds.). 1996. *Women, Abuse, and the Bible: How Scripture Can Be Used to Hurt or Heal*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.
- Kurz, Dorothy. 1998. "Old Problems and New Directions in the Study of Violence Against Women." Pp. 197-208 in *Intimate Violence*, edited by R. K. Bergen. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Logan, T. K., Jennifer Cole, Lisa Shannon, and Robert Walker. 2007. "Relationship Characteristics and Protective Orders Among a Diverse Sample of Women." *Journal of Family Violence* 22:237-246.
- Logan, T. K., Lisa Shannon, Robert Walker, and Teri Marie Faragher. 2006. "Protective Orders: Questions and Conundrums." *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse* 7:175-205.
- McFarlane, Judith, Ann Malecha, Julia Gist, Kathy Watson, Elizabeth Batten, Iva Hall, and Sheila Smith. 2004. "Protection Orders and Intimate Partner Violence: An 18-Month Study of 150 Black, Hispanic, and White Women." *American Journal of Public Health* 94:613-618.

- Malley-Morrison, Kathleen and Denise A. Hines. 2007. "Attending to the Role of Race/Ethnicity in Family Violence Research." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 22:943-972.
- Mears, Daniel P., Matthew J. Carlson, George W. Holden, and Susan D. Harris. 2001. "Reducing Domestic Violence Revictimization: The Effects of Individual and Contextual Factors and Type of Legal Intervention." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 16:1260-1283
- Meiers, Allie. 2005. *Civil Orders of Protection*, Journal of the American Academy of Matrimonial Lawyers 19, 374.
- Mosher, Clayton J., Terance D. Miethe, and Dretha M. Phillips. 2002. *The Mismeasure of Crime*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. 2005. "DV Statute Search." Retrieved August 4, 2007 (<http://www.ncjfcj.org/content/blogcategory/255/300/>).
- Rennison, Callie Marie. 2003. *Intimate Partner Violence, 1993-2001*. Office of Justice Programs. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved June 15, 2010 (<http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=1001>).
- Raj, Anita and Jay Silverman. 2002. "Violence Against Immigrant Women: The roles of Culture, Context, and Legal Immigrant Status on Intimate Partner Violence." *Violence Against Women* 8:367-398.
- Rennison, Callie Marie and Mike Planty. 2003. "Nonlethal Intimate Partner Violence: Examining Race, Gender, and Income Patterns." *Violence and Victims* 18:433-443.
- Rennison, Callie Marie and Sarah Welchans. May 2000. *Intimate Partner Violence* (Publication No. NCJ 178247). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Roberts, Albert R. 2002. *Handbook of Domestic Violence Intervention Strategies: Policies, Programs and Legal Remedies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rose, Tricia. 2003. *Longing to Tell: Black Women Talk About Intimacy and Sexuality*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Saunders-Robinson, M. 1991. "Battered Women: An African American Perspective." *Association of Black Nursing Faculty Journal* 2:81-84.
- Sherman, Lawrence W., Douglas A. Smith, Janelle D. Schmidt, Dennis P. Rogan. 1992. "Crime, Punishment and Stake in Conformity: Legal and Informal Control of Domestic Violence." *American Sociological Review* 57:680-690.

- Smith, Judith A. 2005. *Battered Non-Wives and Unequal Protection-Order Coverage: A Call for Reform*. 93 Yale Law and Policy Review 116.
- Sokoloff, Natalie and Christina Pratt. 2005. *Domestic Violence at the Margins: Readings on Race, Class, Gender, and Culture*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Straus, Murray A. 1990. "Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families." Pp. 3-16 in *National Family Violence Surveys*, edited by Murray A. Straus and Richard J. Gelles. Brunswick: Transaction.
- Straus, Murray A. 1999. "The Controversy Over Domestic Violence by Women: A Methodological, Theoretical, and Sociology of Science Analysis." Pp. 17-44 in *Violence in Intimate Relationships*, edited by X. Arriaga and S. Oskamp. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Straus, Murray A. and Richard J. Gelles. 1986. "Societal Change and Family Violence from 1975 to 1985 as Revealed by Two National Surveys." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 48:465-479.
- Straus, Murray A., Richard J. Gelles, and Suzanne K. Steinmetz. 1980. *Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Straus, Murray A., Richard J. Gelles, and Suzanne K. Steinmetz. 2006. *Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Tracy Thurman v. City of Torrington, 595 F. Supp. 1531 (1984).
- Tjaden, Patricia and Nancy Thoennes. 1998. "Stalking in America: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey." National Institute of Justice: Research in Brief. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved November 11, 2010 (<http://www.ncjrs.gov/textfiles/169592.txt>).
- Tjaden, Patricia and Nancy Thoennes. 2000. "Full Report of the Prevalence, Incident, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings From the National Violence Against Women Survey." National Institute of Justice and the Centers of Disease Control and Prevention: Research Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved November 1, 2009 (<http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/183781.pdf>).
- Tutty, Leslie M. and Michael Rothery. "Beyond Shelters: Support Groups and Community Based Advocacy for Abused Women" Pp. 396-418 in *Handbook of Domestic Violence Intervention Strategies: Policies, Programs and Legal Remedies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- U.S. Department of Justice. Office of Violence Against Women. 2009. "About Domestic Violence." Retrieved January 15, 2009 (<http://www.ovw.usdoj.gov/domviolence.htm>).
- van Wormer, Katherine Stuart and Clemens Bartollas. 2007. *Women and the Criminal Justice System*. 2nd ed. New York: Pearson.
- Wallace, Harvey. 1996. *Family Violence: Legal, Medical, and Social Perspectives*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Wyatt, Gail E. 1994. "Sociocultural and Epidemiological Issues in Assessment of Domestic Violence." *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless* 3:7-21.
- Yllo, Kersti and Murray A. Straus. 1990. "Patriarchy and Violence Against Wives: The Impact of Structural and Normative Factors." Pp. 473-486 in *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*, edited by M.A. Straus and R.J. Gelles. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Yoshioka, Marianne R., Louisa Gilbert, Nabila El-Bassel, and Malahat Baig-Amin. 2003. "Social Support and Disclosure of Abuse: Comparing South Asian, African American, and Hispanic Battered Women." *Journal of Family Violence* 18:171-180.
- Zalman, Marvin. 1992. "The Courts' Response to Police Intervention in Domestic Violence." Pp. 79-110 in *Domestic Violence: The Changing Criminal Justice Response*, edited by Eve S. Buzawa and Carl G. Buzawa. Westport, CT: Auburn House.