

Summer 2019

Trends in the Prevalence of Arrest for Intimate Partner Violence Using the National Crime Victimization Survey

Tara E. Martin

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd>



Part of the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Martin, T. E.(2019). *Trends in the Prevalence of Arrest for Intimate Partner Violence Using the National Crime Victimization Survey*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/5385>

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you by Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact digres@mailbox.sc.edu.

TRENDS IN THE PREVALENCE OF ARREST FOR INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE
USING THE NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMIZATION SURVEY

by

Tara E. Martin

Bachelor of Science
College of William & Mary, 2012

Master of Arts
University of South Carolina, 2014

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in

Criminology and Criminal Justice

College of Arts and Sciences

University of South Carolina

2019

Accepted by:

Robert Brame, Major Professor

Barbara A. Koons-Witt, Committee Member

Tia Stevens Andersen, Committee Member

Angela R. Gover, Committee Member

Cheryl L. Addy, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

© Copyright by Tara E. Martin, 2019
All Rights Reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this dissertation would not have been possible without the help of many people. First and foremost, I want to thank my mother for supporting me unconditionally throughout my life and educational career. She has provided an example of how to be independent, caring, and kind. My siblings, grandparents, aunts, uncles, and cousins have also all served as a source of support and joy through both the exciting and difficult parts of graduate school. Without my family's love, I would not be where I am today.

I am grateful for the people I have met during graduate school. I was drawn to the University of South Carolina because of those people. While nearly every one of the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice faculty members has worked with and supported me at some point over the last seven years, I want to specifically thank the members of my committee. Robert Brame has never wavered in his belief in my capabilities; this has in turn helped me believe in myself. His support has helped me through the most difficult periods of graduate school. Dr. Brame has also taught me what it means to be thoughtful and thorough, which are two skills I hope to pass on to future students. Barbara Koons-Witt has always been an honest and understanding person in my corner. Tia Stevens Andersen has served as a confidant and has always made sure I was taking care of myself. Though not in our department, Angela Gover has managed to know exactly when to offer emotional support from across the country. I look forward to continued professional and personal relationships with each of these people.

The graduate students before me provided examples of how to be successful while also actively working to facilitate my own success. In addition to those examples in cohorts ahead of mine, Toniqua Mikell, Sarah King, and Amanda Huffman have ensured that I stayed happy and healthy throughout graduate school.

Finally, I want to thank Jenna Truman, a statistician with the Bureau of Justice Statistics. She answered my persistent questions, allowing me to successfully work with the National Crime Victimization Survey to complete this project.

ABSTRACT

Average annual reporting and arrest victimization rates, or the probability that an intimate partner violence (IPV) victimization is reported or ends in arrest, are estimated to be 56% and 23%, respectively, according to the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS; Reaves, 2017). These estimates are based on the number of victimizations that occur annually, but certain repetitive reporting or arrest patterns for a household may mask an offender's individual probability of being reported or arrested. To address this problem, the current study examines prevalence rates, which examine the number of unique victims who report an offender or experience an incident that ends in arrest, using data from the NCVS for the years 1994–2015. Additionally, these rates are examined over time for varying levels IPV severity. Results provide mixed evidence regarding changes in the prevalence of reporting and arrest for cases of IPV. The dissertation concludes with a discussion of the limitations of the data and directions for future research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	v
List of Tables	vii
List of Figures	viii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: A Review of the History and Literature	3
Chapter 3: Data and Methods	53
Chapter 4: Results	72
Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusions.....	83
References	92
Appendix A: Example Screening Questions in the NCS and the NCVS	108
Appendix B: NCVS Sample Sizes	110
Appendix C: NCVS Rotating Panel Design	111
Appendix D: Data for Results Figures.....	112

LIST OF TABLES

Table 5.1 Summary of Support for Hypotheses.....	83
Table A.1 Example Changes to Screening Questions for Violent Crime After the Redesign	108
Table A.2 Example Changes to Screening Questions for All Types of Crime After the Redesign	109
Table B.1 Sample Sizes and Response Rates	110
Table D.1 Incidence and Prevalence of IPV	112
Table D.2 Incidence and Prevalence of Reporting	113
Table D.3 Incidence and Prevalence of Arrest	114
Table D.4 Incidence and Prevalence of Arrest after Reporting	115
Table D.5 Incidence and Prevalence of IPV by Severity.....	116
Table D.6 Incidence and Prevalence of Reporting by Severity	117
Table D.7 Incidence and Prevalence of Arrest by Severity	118
Table D.8 Incidence and Prevalence of Arrest after Reporting by Severity.....	119

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 4.1 Incidence and prevalence of IPV	73
Figure 4.2 Incidence and prevalence of reporting	73
Figure 4.3 Incidence and prevalence of arrest	75
Figure 4.4 Incidence and prevalence of arrest after reporting	76
Figure 4.5 Incidence and prevalence of IPV by severity	79
Figure 4.6 Incidence and prevalence of reporting by severity	80
Figure 4.7 Incidence and prevalence of arrest by severity.....	81
Figure 4.8 Incidence and prevalence of arrest after reporting by severity.....	82
Figure 5.1 Prevalence of reporting for IPV and total violence	87
Figure C.1 Example of the NCVS rotating panel design.....	111

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Intimate partner violence (IPV) is a public health concern (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2017). In 2016, there were an estimated 806,000 IPV victimizations. Over 40% of those incidents were considered serious violent crimes, including attempted or completed robberies and threatened, attempted, or completed rapes, sexual assaults, and aggravated assaults, although it is unclear how many were attempted, completed, or threatened (Truman & Morgan, 2016). Thirteen percent of IPV incidents against women and 5% of IPV incidents against men result in serious physical injuries, including gunshot and knife wounds, unconsciousness, internal injuries, and broken bones (Catalano, 2013). Compounding the issue, 77% of women report being victimized by the same offender more than once, with 9% of women who have experienced abuse reporting they have suffered more than 50 instances of physical abuse and 6% reporting they have suffered abuse for over 20 years (Catalano, 2012; Thompson et al., 2006). In addition to the immediate physical danger IPV poses, victimization can have enduring mental and physical health consequences, including chronic pain, ulcers, migraines, and challenges with depression, substance use, and self-esteem (Bonomi et al., 2006; Coker, Smith, Bethea, King, & McKeown, 2000; Coker et al., 2002; Zlotnick, Johnson, & Kohn, 2006). These data suggest that IPV is often ongoing and affects the physical and mental health of a large number of people in the U.S. Given the recurring nature and long-lasting consequences of IPV, it is important to understand the means to

prevent it. The police can serve as one formal gateway to justice and victim services, but only slightly more than 50% of incidents are reported to the police (Reaves, 2017). Understanding victim connectedness to the police, as well as the police response, is essential for effective policies aimed at reducing IPV (Berk & Loseke, 1980/81). This dissertation will first explore the history of and changes in criminological thought and public policy regarding IPV to provide perspective on the current understanding. With this background set, the dissertation will then consider victim reporting practices and courses of action the police may take in cases of IPV. Next, contemporary concerns and key unanswered questions will be discussed. The dissertation will conclude with concrete recommendations for future research and how such research could be executed.

Throughout this dissertation, different terms will be used to describe violence between intimate partners. *Intimate partner violence* includes violence against men and women but limits the violence to that between intimate partners (Addington & Perumean-Chaney, 2014). Other terms, such as *wife assault* and *spouse assault*, are more specific but were typically used before the problem of violence was recognized to be a problem between other types of intimate partners as well. *Domestic violence* and *family violence* refer to violence that happens within the home that is not limited to violence between intimates. These terms are not interchangeable in the context of this dissertation. Instead, they are used to convey the type of violence that was the focus of the time period or they are used to represent a researcher's operationalization.

CHAPTER 2

A REVIEW OF THE HISTORY AND LITERATURE

Historical Perspectives on IPV

IPV, especially against women, has been a part of Western civilization for thousands of years. However, in the past 400 years there have been periods where public sentiment regarding IPV changed, however briefly. This history, including prescriptions for violence against women as well as periods of reform, are important for framing modern understanding of the issue. This section will trace that history up until the last 50 years when IPV was fully recognized as a crime that warranted attention from the criminal justice system.

Historical treatments—limited here to European and American perspectives—trace the subjugation of women and the acceptance of violence against them to the shift away from hunter-gatherer societies, a shift typically associated with the late Neolithic Period and early Bronze Age or roughly 5,000 to 2,000 B.C. (Engels, 1884/1972; Leacock, 1972). The development of agriculture and animal domestication reduced women's role in food production and created a surplus of goods that could be used as an indicator of wealth (Gough, 1971). As property was privatized, the family became a monogamous, economic unit, and the order of inheritance became more important for keeping wealth within the family (Engels, 1884/1972). Inheritance began to pass through the patriarchal line, and men ensured their wives' fidelity and thereby their inheritance line with any means necessary: "if he kill[ed] her, he [was] only exercising his rights"

(Engels, 1884/1972, p. 122). Although violence was not necessarily new, women lost the recourse to easily separate from men with this change.

A man's right to legally kill his wife for adultery without a trial carried into ancient Roman civilization, while in Greece violence against a wife could be anything short of death (O'Faolain & Martines, 1973). Additionally, men could divorce their wives. Women, however, could not harm their husbands for any misdeeds without state retribution, nor could they escape marriage by initiating divorce. During the Punic Wars (264 B.C. to 146 B.C), women gained some power as they were left to tend to typical male responsibilities while the men were at war (Dobash & Dobash, 1979). After the Punic Wars women who were not slaves gained the right to divorce their husbands in the case of severe physical abuse, which was violence identified as excessive. This was the first time violence towards a wife that was short of death could be considered abusive or excessive and the first time women were given recourse to escape the violence.

Patriarchal religions reinforced the need for female chastisement and subordination. For example, in Greek mythology Pandora released evil into the world and was the reason men suffered worldly troubles (O'Faolain & Martines, 1973). Christianity, a large influence on Western civilization, has similar themes: Eve was created from Adam, so she is the lesser being, and she leads Adam into sin. Men, therefore, drew their authority in the hierarchy from God during the Middle Ages (Dobash & Dobash, 1979). In Hinduism, the sage Arundhati is more revered for her devotion to her husband than her own spiritual accomplishments, and Muslim women are encouraged to maintain similar levels of devotion to their husbands (Ayyub, 2000; Dasgupta & Warriar, 1996).

As the supposedly wiser and morally superior sex, men were legally permitted to physically punish their wives for sinning in order to correct her behavior (O'Faolain & Martines, 1973; see Cherubino, 1888, for an example of a religious leader prescribing such corrective action). In Western Europe, the rise of Protestantism slightly tempered the acceptable severity of violence as religious leaders attempted to encourage obedience through fear of damnation rather than force, but violence was still common (Dobash & Dobash, 1979). Modern Christian clergy members emphasize that violence is a sin. Still, in many denominations, clergy members encourage wives to be submissive to their husband and are hesitant to refer IPV victims to secular services in the interest of promoting the sanctity of marriage (Shannon-Lewy & Dull, 2005; Skiff, Horwitz, LaRussa-Trott, Pearson, & Santiago, 2008).

Although these religious ideals, particularly those of Christianity, and English common law were brought to the American settlements, the Puritans in the Massachusetts Bay Colony became the first to criminalize spousal assault in 1641 (Pleck, 1989). The New England Puritans believed the family was a necessary component of their religion, and, as such, violence had no place within it. The laws were symbolic representations of their religious beliefs. To help monitor families, neighbors were encouraged to report incidents of domestic violence, which could be punished with fines and whippings if the violence was considered illegitimate. Although violence within the family was discouraged, women in Puritan society were still subservient to men. Women who challenged this social order were in danger of being labeled a witch and put to death, as was the case for many women accused during the Salem Witch Trials from 1692 to 1693 (Karlsen, 1987).

Despite the proscription against family violence and the encouragement of neighbor intervention, in the nearly 170 years from 1633 to 1802, less than 20 cases of wife assault were brought to the Puritan courts (Pleck, 1989).¹ It is unclear how many cases were actually reported because cases were often settled informally with a minister (Nelson, 1978; Pleck, 1987). When cases did go to court, judges frequently asked women what they did to provoke their husbands, and women occasionally refused to testify. The spousal murder rate may be a more telling statistic, as homicide rates are considered a reliable crime statistic because homicides are likely to be reported, although medical and technological advancements may uncover more homicides than in past centuries (Hindelang, 1974; Pleck, 1987). Between 1630 and 1692, the spousal homicide rate in Puritan New England was 0.1 per 100,000 people (Pleck, 1987). For simple comparison, the rate was 0.5 per 100,000 people in the U.S. in 2015.² Puritan colonies were the only colonies with laws against domestic violence, but violence alone was not considered sufficient grounds for divorce. Reporting and complaints of spousal assault fell around the beginning of the 1700s, and domestic violence remained largely hidden in America due to a rise in the belief that the state should not meddle in private affairs.

Although the creation of professional police forces in the 1800s made it easier for women to report incidents of violence, the police were reluctant to arrest men and prosecutors were hesitant to convict them because the family would likely be without an

¹ The Plymouth Colony court records are generally well-preserved. The records from 1798 through the 1830s have deteriorated due to their storage conditions, but the accuracy of the prior years' data appears to be limited more by omissions made by the clerks of the court responsible for recording the information (Konig, 1978). Occasionally, the clerks omitted full court terms, in which case Konig (1978) supplements the missing records with appellate and superior court records.

² The 2015 estimate was calculated per 100,000 based on the number of intimate partner murders where the offender relationship is known (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015) and the number of people in the population over the age of 18 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015).

income while he was imprisoned (Pleck, 1989). Tennessee and Georgia passed laws against domestic violence in the 1850s, while judges in other states ruled that violence was acceptable or that the court would not interfere in family cases where there were no permanent injuries (*State v. Oliver*, 1874; *State v. Rhodes*, 1868). After the Civil War, spousal homicides increased. For example, in Philadelphia the rate of spousal homicides quadrupled to 0.41 deaths per 100,000 people in the decades following the Civil War (Pleck, 1983).

Women fighting for temperance and women's suffrage brought awareness to the issue of violence against women towards the end of the nineteenth century (Pleck, 1983). Liberal feminists like Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony contended that violence was the result of women being treated as the property of their husbands in marriage. Conservative feminists such as Lucy Stone saw a similar problem but, rather than calling for marriage reform like the liberal feminists, sought legal protection for victims. Stone was unable to garner support for her bill that would allow women victimized by their husbands to legally separate and receive monetary support from their husbands and conceded that women would need political power (e.g., the right to vote) before true change would come. The Women's Christian Temperance Union, which saw alcohol and intemperance as the source of violence, was able to effect legislative change in 23 states by supporting statutes that allowed women to sue saloon owners in cases where an intoxicated husband had beaten them. The first organization to provide aid to women who were victims of violence, the Protective Agency for Women and Children in Chicago, was created during this period of reform as well (Pleck, 1983). Additionally, under the advice of male reformers, three states passed flogging as the punishment for

“wife beating,” although from 1901 to 1942, only 21 men – disproportionately black – were punished in this manner (Pleck, 1989).

Attention to the problem of violence against women dwindled at the turn of the century, not to be rediscovered until the latter half of the twentieth century. Okun (1986) credits three things for the reemergence of interest: physicians’ attention to child abuse which also brought attention to other forms of family violence, the public’s general sensitivity to violence and crime at the time, and the women’s liberation movement, with the latter being the most influential. Violence against women was a secondary concern of the second-wave feminism movement which began in the late 1960s and ended in the early 1980s. The movement started with small groups of women who were concerned about equal pay and abortion rights (Evans, 1980); however, the women in these groups soon acknowledged their similar experiences with rape and IPV and began to include campaigns to end violence against women in their reform efforts (Evans, 1980; Pleck, 1987). Abortion restrictions, rape, and IPV were all perceived as attempts to regulate women’s behavior and sexuality in order to keep women subservient to men. The feminist movement, coupled with class-action lawsuits against police departments that claimed the police failed to protect victims of IPV and the law-and-order public sentiment of the time, led to widespread attention to IPV, victim service programs, and criminal justice reform efforts (Pleck, 1987).

With few time periods as exceptions, thousands of years of encouraging or accepting violence against wives coupled with a desire to separate public and private behavior, led to widespread ignorance of the extent of domestic violence and weak enforcement of any existing laws against it. In the past half-century, researchers and

reformers have worked to uncover and understand domestic violence and dispel misconceptions surrounding victims (e.g., they are masochistic or they provoked their abuser; Okun, 1986). These challenges to historical patterns of acceptance changed the landscape of public sentiment and the criminal justice response to IPV.

Challenging Traditional Perspectives on IPV

Challenges to traditional perceptions of IPV and explanations for violent behavior in the household during the past half-century came from three main perspectives: the psychological, family violence, and feminist perspectives. Each had its own explanation for IPV, as well as its own suggestions for ending it. Although the feminist perspective is the one that has resulted in the most change, assumptions from other perspectives (e.g., the victim is masochistic if she or he refuses to leave an abusive relationship) are still pervasive in public thinking. This section will detail the three perspectives, while acknowledging their role at shaping the current understanding of IPV and society's response to it.

Early psychological explanations focused on the individual characteristics of both parties (Houston, 2014). Men and women in abusive relationships were both to blame, and their deficiencies created violent, dysfunctional relationships. From this perspective, violence could be ended through individual and couple counseling. For example, Schultz (1960) describes four black men raised in the rural South with abusive childhoods and their “masculine, outspoken, [and] domineering” wives (p.108). These men were convicted of assault with intent to kill and were sentenced to probation – which, notably, each of their wives did not think was a severe enough sentence. Schultz, their probation officer, prescribed separation from their wives, avoidance of relationships without his

permission, and counseling with him as part of their probation. Snell, Rosenwald, and Robey (1964), also from the psychological perspective, attributed spousal assault to the need for each party to reassert their traditional gender roles, referring to societal expectations that husbands be dominant in the relationship. They claimed that in dysfunctional and violent relationships, the man is passive, while the woman is controlling, masculine, masochistic, and sexually frigid. The psychological perspective recommended therapy—with a focus on the role of the woman in the household—to combat this problem (Snell et al., 1964).

The psychological perspective's influence can be seen in New York City, where a Family Crisis Intervention Unit was implemented (Bard, 1970; Houston, 2014). This unit operated for two years, responding to domestic disturbance calls and mediating between the parties involved. The officers were to assess the situation, inform both parties of their roles in the situation, ask how they would resolve the issue in the future, refer parties who disagreed with the officer's assessment to mental health services, and encourage the parties to seek counseling in the event of future problems (Bard, 1970). Feminists argued that this approach blamed the victim and took responsibility away from the abuser and counseling as a solution only served to privatize the problem of violence (Houston, 2014). Furthermore, they argued that results and theoretical conclusions from the psychological perspective were based on small samples (e.g., Schultz [1960] based his information on four men where he found "a common pattern was characteristic of all" from his sample of 14 [p.103]; Dobash & Dobash, 1979).

In contrast to the psychological researchers, proponents of the family violence perspective argued that violence in American families, while a problem, is normal

(Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980). Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz based this conclusion on a nationally representative study of 2,143 people chosen through random sampling of cohabitating couples. Data from the Conflict Tactic Scales, which asked respondents how they dealt with problems in their relationship, led them to conclude that sociological factors are to blame in most cases instead of personality deficiencies (Straus et al., 1980). According to the authors, low income, unemployment, and multiple children contribute to stress, a major source of violence. Unequal family power dynamics also contribute to stress, as men and women struggle with their traditional gender roles. Societal expectations of gender roles place the brunt of responsibility for household decisions with men, regardless of their capabilities, while women who may need or want to help in the decision-making are relegated to a passive position in the household. Straus et al. (1980) claim violence can result as men and women attempt to gain or assert their power in the household. To combat violence in relationships, they suggest a comprehensive strategy, including better-funded shelters, a police and court system willing to act in cases of domestic violence, reducing unemployment, and changing gender expectations to ensure a more equitable division of power in families (Straus et al., 1980).

Perhaps the most controversial piece of research emanating from the family violence tradition was data suggesting that the incidence of husband abuse was nearly as high as that of wife abuse and that husbands were abused at a higher frequency than wives (Straus, 1977/78). Steinmetz (1977/78) suffered empirical and personal criticism for her article that suggested husband abuse should be given more attention than it had received (Houston, 2014). The Conflict Tactic Scales, feminists noted, failed to account for the context of family violence (i.e., was the violence committed in self-defense) and

the potential for serious injury (Dobash & Dobash, 1979). Feminists also objected to victim-blaming within the family violence perspective (for an example, see Gelles' [1987] section on nagging wives). Feminists argued that gender inequality should be the central component to understanding violence against women, and theories that failed to fully emphasize the female struggle were inadequate (Houston, 2014). The controversial nature of the gender symmetry argument—the argument that men and women commit IPV at similar rates—has continued to affect research on IPV into the 2000s (Gover, 2013).

Drawing from victimization surveys and interviews with victims, feminist writings from the last quarter of the twentieth century echoed sentiments from feminists a century earlier. Martin (1976) challenged the institution of marriage, claiming it perpetuated patriarchy and enabled wife assault. She and Dobash and Dobash (1979) argued that women are taught from a young age that their purpose is wifedom and motherhood. They are given playhouses and dolls where they can practice their roles, and they are taught to be submissive or face life as an unmarried woman. Women lose their names and financial rights upon marriage, exemplifying their subordinate position in the union (Martin, 1976). This second-class status, coupled with the social history of accepted abuse, signaled to men their right to control their wives through violence if need be (Dobash & Dobash, 1979).

Feminists rejected directly blaming women for their abuse and avoided suggestions that women provoked their abuser. They saw this type of victim-blaming as researchers validating that women had no say in domestic affairs (Dobash & Dobash, 1979). To answer the pressing question of why women stay with abusers, they again

implicated patriarchal ideas about marriage, including the stigma of a failed marriage given the social importance of wifehood, economic systems that discriminated against women and made them financially dependent on men, and political systems that valued husbands' rights over those of wives, in addition to fear of the abuser (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Martin, 1976). Learned helplessness (i.e., the ingrained idea that one is powerless to stop the abuse) and the need to project a happy family explained why even an independently successful woman would stay (Walker, 1977/78).

Within the feminist framework, admitting abuse was admitting to marital failure, so reporting incidents to police was only likely to happen in desperation (Martin, 1976). When cases were reported, the police were minimally helpful. Prior to the 1980s, in most states misdemeanor arrests were only possible if the officer had witnessed the incident, and felony arrests were discretionary (Buzawa, Buzawa, & Stark, 2017; Houston, 2014). While policies varied by jurisdiction, the International Association of Chiefs of Police training recommendations in 1965 suggested that arrest be used only as a last resort in domestic disturbances (Parnas, 1967). To feminists, although the legal system no longer condoned violence against women, selective enforcement was seen as the system being complicit in the abuse and male domination of women (Dobash & Dobash, 1979).

Feminists, reluctant to join efforts with a male-dominated state and take autonomy away from individual women, acknowledged that legal attention to violence against women would indicate that such violence was wrong and should not be tolerated (Miccio, 2005). Institutional change would publicize the violence and was believed to have the potential to alter societal attitudes towards violence against women (Martin, 1976). In conjunction with harsher punishments for violence in general and the results of the

Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment which found that arrest deterred future incidents of violence, feminist thought resulted in mandatory arrest policies that challenged historical perspectives of violence against wives and led us to our current strategies for combating IPV despite concerns about the disempowerment of victims (Houston, 2014; Miccio, 2005).

Attention from the psychological, family violence, and feminist perspectives changed the public's awareness and response to IPV. While the psychological perspective implicated men and women who violated their gender roles by the men being weak and the women being dominant as the cause of violence, the family violence and feminist perspectives included sociological and economic factors into their understanding. Each perspective, regardless of accuracy, brought attention to IPV and initiated research and reform efforts.

Reporting Behaviors

The public attention to violence between intimate partners has increased the amount of research conducted on the topic. The history of public attention and sentiment regarding IPV just discussed is crucial to understanding how the system treats victims and offenders (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1990). Deterrence at the police level begins with a call from the victim, and without that call the victim must find resources on his or her own or hope that the violence ceases. Therefore, police reporting behaviors are important for policy implications. The majority of the information on reporting behavior comes from victimization surveys which provide researchers data on reported and unreported incidents of IPV.

Reporting estimates using the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), regardless of version, have been relatively consistent throughout the years. Early estimates from the National Crime Survey (NCS) suggest that approximately 55% of spouse assault was reported to the police, while more recent NCVS estimates suggest 54% of IPV is reported (Gaquin, 1977/78; Truman & Morgan, 2016).³ The percentage of IPV victimizations reported to the police has consistently remained in the lower to mid-50s for the past 40 years (Bachman, 1994; Bachman & Coker, 1995; Felson, Ackerman, & Gallagher, 2005; Greenfeld et al., 1998; Harlow, 1991; Reaves, 2017; Rennison, 2001). Victims themselves, as opposed to a third party, are responsible for reporting roughly 75% of those reported victimizations (Felson et al., 2005; Reaves, 2017).

Estimates from the National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS) are lower than those from the NCVS, with about 30% of female victims reporting their most recent victimization to police (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). The National Family Violence Survey (NFVS) has the lowest estimates, with only 6.7% of incidents being reported to police (Kaufman Kantor & Straus, 1990). Differences in reporting estimates between the NCVS, the NVAWS, and the NFVS could be due to differences in question framing (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). The NFVS potentially leads respondents by framing relationship conflict as a common occurrence and asking how often example behaviors provided in the survey occurred in the past year (Straus et al., 1980). The NVAWS removed the statement regarding the occurrence of relationship conflict and asked

³ The NCS did not have cue questions encouraging respondents to consider incidents committed by people the victim knew, but if an incident was reported to the interviewer, the victim's relationship to the offender was then questioned (Bachman & Taylor, 1994). The question regarding police notification in the NCS was nearly identical to the current NCVS question that follows the report of an incident to the interviewer: "Were the police informed of this incident in any way?"

whether a list of behaviors had occurred rather than how often they occurred (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). The framing of relationship conflict as common may have led to the NFVS collecting less severe experiences than the NVAWS, fewer of which were reported to police. Additionally, the NCVS is administered as a crime victimization survey, which could result in detecting more serious offenses, explaining why more IPV incidents in the NCVS are reported to police.

Regarding the role of the victim-offender relationship in the decision to report an incident to the police, data from the NCVS suggests that victims of IPV report violent incidents at similar rates to victims whose attacker was another family member, an acquaintance, or a stranger (Baumer & Lauritsen, 2010; Felson, Messner, & Hoskin, 1999; Gaquin, 1977/78; Harlow, 1991). Recent data even suggests that reporting rates are higher for victims of IPV, compared to victims of violence at the hands of other family members and strangers, but it is unclear how many of the incidents in each victim-offender category were threatened, attempted, or completed (Reaves, 2017; Truman & Morgan, 2016). Data from the NVAWS suggests that knowing the offender decreases the likelihood of reporting, but victims report intimate partners at similar rates to other people they know (e.g., other family members or acquaintances; Felson & Paré, 2005). The difference between the NCVS and the NVAWS regarding this point may be the result of differences between the surveys or the result of a difference in the timing of data collection (recent, yearly estimates from the NCVS versus estimates from 1995–1996 from the NVAWS).

Results from both surveys still go against conventional wisdom that suggests victims do not report violence from their partners. These higher reporting rates for IPV

incidents could suggest that victims do not consider IPV as private a matter as originally thought. The rates might also be the result of the danger posed by the inescapability of a violent intimate partner (Felson et al., 1999). While a victim is unlikely to come into contact with a violent stranger again, they will probably see a violent partner again and may even reside with the offender. IPV victims likely have a more pressing need to deter an offender's future behavior due to the social proximity of the relationship. However, only ex-spouses are more likely to be reported than strangers after controlling for incident seriousness (Felson et al., 1999). Other intimate partners and known offenders are no more or less likely to be reported than strangers. Additionally, victims are more likely to report ex-spouses and partners who do not live with them in comparison to cohabitating spouses (Ackerman & Love, 2014). These results support the feminist perspective that women are conscious of their role as wives and that it may inhibit them from seeking help, but results could also indicate that victims are more likely to report an offender who does not have a right to be in the home.

When considering the reporting behaviors of third parties, reporting varies depending on the relationship between the severity of injuries and the social distance between the offender and victim. For example, incidents between intimate partners involving only threats are less likely to be reported by third parties than threatened incidents between strangers (Felson et al., 1999). However, the social distance between the victim and offender is irrelevant when the assault is more serious, with third parties reporting both intimate partners and strangers in such cases. Outside parties may feel like they should not interfere in the business of others if the event is less serious but may feel obligated to intervene when it is more serious.

The likelihood that an incident comes to the attention of police depends partly upon situational variants, like the location and circumstances of the event. Victimization in general are more likely to be reported by the victim if they occur inside the home, supporting the idea that IPV victimizations are more likely to be reported than other assaults (Felson & Paré, 2005; Xie, Pogarsky, Lynch, & McDowall, 2006). The first assault by an intimate partner is more likely to be reported, while repeat assaults are less likely to be reported (Ackerman & Love, 2014; Bachman & Coker, 1995; Reaves, 2017). Repeat victims may be unwilling to report for various reasons, including the belief that reporting will not help, prior negative experiences with reporting, fear of the stigma of staying with a violent offender, or they may choose to seek help from sources other than the police (Gover, Tomsich, & Richards, 2015). The presence and severity of injuries also increase the likelihood that an incident will be reported (Bachman & Coker, 1995; Bachman & Saltzman, 1995; Felson & Paré, 2005). Similarly, incidents with aggravating circumstances, like the presence of a weapon, are more likely to be reported (Ackerman & Love, 2014; Reaves, 2017).

Alcohol use is another contributing factor in victims' decisions to report incidents to the police. Earlier work on the relationship between alcohol use and police notification using a women's shelter sample revealed that victims are more likely to report IPV to the police if the offender had been drinking (Johnson, 1990). Data from the NVAWS revealed a similar pattern, with female victims being more likely to report incidents when their partner had been drinking; however, this relationship disappeared when controlling for other situational characteristics, like the presence of a weapon (Thompson & Kingree, 2006). Female victims may be more concerned with problematic drinking rather than

alcohol use in general. Women whose partners are frequently drunk are more likely to report an incident of IPV to the police than women whose partners are rarely drunk (Hutchison, 2003). Regardless of other situational characteristics, male victims were more likely to call the police if their female partner had been drinking in the NVAWS sample. Male victims were less likely to call the police, though, when they themselves have been drinking, which suggests that they may prefer to involve the police when they are unlikely to be mistaken for the primary aggressor (Thompson & Kingree, 2006).

Individual characteristics are also associated with decisions to notify the police. Despite having similar rates of IPV victimization, black IPV victims are more likely to contact the police than white victims (Ackerman & Love, 2014; Bachman, 1994; Bachman & Coker, 1995; Felson & Paré, 2005; Greenfeld et al., 1998; Hutchison, 2003). This is consistent with the reporting behaviors of black victims of violence more broadly (Baumer & Lauritsen, 2010; Langton, Berzofsky, Krebs, & Smiley-McDonald, 2012), although there is some variation for specific crimes and between genders (Baumer & Lauritsen, 2010). Victims with low socioeconomic statuses are more likely to contact the police as well (Baumer & Lauritsen, 2010). The concentration of low socioeconomic status among black communities suggests that there may be an interaction effect between race, socioeconomic status, and police notification (Massey, 2004; Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997; Wilson, 1987/2012). Indeed, Ackerman and Love's (2014) results suggest that socioeconomic status partially mediates the relationship between race and police notification. Their results support structural models which propose that minorities will rely heavily on the police as a social service, whereas white victims have greater access to other services like mental health facilities. Still, socioeconomic status

did not fully explain the race disparity, which is consistent with the broader literature regarding race and concentration effects which posits that segregation and inequality have worked to spatially isolate black communities from certain social institutions (Massey, 1990; Wilson, 1987/2012).

Similar to black victims, Hispanic victims are more likely than non-Hispanic white victims to contact the police (Ackerman & Love, 2014). However, Lipsky, Caetano, Field, and Larkin (2006) found that this relationship varies according to levels of acculturation (i.e., English ability, openness to interethnic marriages, proportion of friends who are non-Hispanic). Hispanic women with low levels of acculturation are less likely to use social services like the police, while Hispanic women with high levels of acculturation are more likely to use social services. Women with lower levels of acculturation may be less familiar with English and the cultural norms in the U.S., or they may be unaware of the services available. Immigrant women have reported language as a barrier to seeking help from the police, and some women have even reported that the police used the offender as an interpreter (Reina, Lohman, & Maldonado, 2014; Vidales, 2010; Wolf, Ly, Hobart, & Kernic, 2003). In addition to language barriers, immigrant women have implicated fear of their own or the offender's deportation, lack of knowledge of services, confusion regarding American laws, and negative experiences with law enforcement in their country of origin as reasons for not involving the police (Bauer, Rodriguez, Quiroga, & Flores-Ortiz, 2000; Bui, 2003; Bui & Morash, 1999; Erez, Adelman, & Gregory, 2009; Reina et al., 2014; Ting, 2010; Vidales, 2010).

When estimates of reporting behaviors are distinguished by racial and ethnic group, the responses of Asians, Pacific Islanders, Native Hawaiians, Alaskan Natives,

and American Indians are most often condensed into one “other” group. It is, therefore, difficult to interpret national estimates of the reporting behaviors of these groups. However, research with Asian immigrant women has found similar acculturation effects to those with Hispanic victims and immigrant women more broadly with regards to social service access (Bauer et al., 2000; Wolf et al., 2003). Asian immigrant women, specifically, are hesitant to involve the police for fear of bringing shame upon their family (Bauer et al., 2000; Bui, 2003; Bui & Morash, 1999; Lee & Au, 2007). Many Asian cultures place emphasis on the family over the individual, and view individuals as representatives of the family, including past generations. Any potentially shameful act, such as exposing violence in the home, risks disgracing the entire family (Ho, 1990). This cultural influence among Asian immigrants is different from considering IPV to be a private matter, which would align more closely with the victim being embarrassed or believing they should handle the violence themselves (Felson, Messner, Hoskin, & Deane, 2002).

Another individual characteristic associated with the likelihood that IPV comes to the attention of the police is sex. Data from the NCVS suggest that between 1993 and 1998 53% of victimizations against women and 46% against men were reported to police (Rennison & Welchans, 2000). In 2008, NCVS data revealed that 49% of victimizations against women and 72% against men were reported (Catalano, Smith, Snyder, & Rand, 2009). Aggregated NCVS data from 2006 to 2015 suggest that average annual reporting for women was 57% and 52% for men (Reaves, 2017). While women’s reporting rates appear to have remained within a 10-point range, men’s reporting rates vary more widely. The 72% for men’s reporting in 2008 seems to be a random fluctuation in the data, but it

is in stark contrast to estimates from the NVAWS conducted from 1995 to 1996: approximately 28% and 13% of women and men, respectively, reported their most recent assault to police (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000).

As previously mentioned, methodological differences between the NCVS and the NVAWS may partially explain why rates differ drastically from survey to survey. The redesigned NCVS was implemented in 1993 and was changed to encourage more reporting of incidents that people may not typically think of as criminal, such as family violence. Prior to this change reports were qualified with statements specifying that the data only reflect incidents that respondents viewed as criminal (e.g., see Klaus & Rand, 1984). Respondents are now cued during the screening questionnaire with statements like, “People often don’t think of incidents committed by someone they know” (Bachman, 1994, p. 13). Estimates comparing the NCS and the redesigned NCVS suggest that women and men reported 1.7 and 2.8 times as many IPV incidents to interviewers, respectively, after the new questions were implemented (Bachman & Saltzman, 1995). This change suggests that the framing of questions can dramatically impact rates, possibly explaining the differences between the NVAWS and the NCVS.

Men and women in same-sex relationships report their victimizations to police at roughly similar rates to their counterparts in heterosexual relationships. Lesbians report about 60% of their domestic violence victimizations, which includes violence from partners, roommates, and family members, while gay men report less than half of theirs (Kuehnle & Sullivan, 2003). A final individual characteristic of interest is age, which has a curvilinear relationship with reporting. Assaults against adolescents aged 12 to 15 and assaults against women 50 and older are the least likely to be reported to police, while

assaults against women ages 25 to 49 are the most likely to be reported (Rennison, 2001). The adolescent notification rate is particularly low at 27.9%. Adolescents may be unsure of potential options in violent situations, whereas older victims may be experiencing repeat assaults, which are less likely to be reported (Bachman & Coker, 1995).

Although the effectiveness of police response on reducing IPV will be discussed in detail in the next section, a few police behaviors and criminal justice policies are related to victims' reporting behaviors and should be mentioned here. For example, police responses to previous incidents—violent and nonviolent—will influence a victim's future reporting behavior. Controlling for the situational and individual characteristics that are associated with reporting, Conaway and Lohr (1994) determined that victims are more likely to report future violent victimizations if the police followed up on the previous crime or if the police arrested the offender or recovered property in the previous crime. In a similar study, Xie et al. (2006) found that increased police effort, measured by whether the police conducted a search and took evidence, during the previously reported crime increased the likelihood of future reporting, while an arrest for the previous incident did not. This relationship only held for victimizations previously reported by the victim and not by someone else in the household.

Results from focus groups with IPV victims in particular also suggest that prior police response is a significant factor in future decisions to report to the police (Wolf et al., 2003). Police behavior at the scene, including appearing to bond with the offender, not listening to the victim, or trivializing the situation decreased the likelihood that a victim would report in the future. Victims also stated that if the offender received a light sentence or was not arrested, they were unlikely to report incidents in the future. On the

other hand, if the police had a pleasant demeanor towards the victim during the previous incident, victims expressed comfort with reporting again. For example, if the officer took the victim seriously, told the victim they deserved better behavior from the offender, arrested the offender without making the victim decide, and followed up with the victim, she reported willingness to report future incidents (Wolf et al., 2003). Police treating the victim fairly and with respect during the first incident appears to increase self-reported willingness to involve the police in future incidents. Interviews with investigators for a specialized domestic violence court have also indicated that those trained to work with victims understand the importance of these interactions with law enforcement for the victim's future behavior (Gover, Brank, & MacDonald, 2007).

These results are consistent with the literature regarding procedural justice and police legitimacy which suggests that the police can increase victim cooperation through fair procedures (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 1990). If the public views the police as a legitimate source of authority, which is aided by the belief that the police are fair in their actions, members of the public are more likely to aid the police in ways such as reporting crime. While gender alone is an inconsistent predictor of perceptions of the police (Brown & Benedict, 2002), the police can influence the opinions of IPV victims during interactions with them (Apsler, Cummins, & Carl, 2003; Johnson, 2007).

Legislative policies also appear to be related to victim reporting behaviors. Dugan (2003) examined how statutes regarding different types of civil protection orders related to domestic violence victimizations reported in the NCVS. Her results suggest that mandatory arrest policies for violating a civil protection order are associated with reduced reporting of victimizations, while statutes that classify violating a civil protection order as

a felony are associated with increased reporting. In a related study, Felson and Paré (2005) found no evidence that reporting for violence against women increased during the 1980s and 1990s when mandatory arrest policies were widely publicized and implemented. These combined results suggest that mandatory arrest policies for IPV or protection order violations do not encourage victims to report. Perhaps victims are unwilling to report incidents of IPV without increased assurance that the offender will actually face punishment, as potentially is the case with felony classification statutes (Dugan, 2003).

On the other hand, victims may be afraid that they will be arrested with the offender or misidentified as the primary aggressor, especially if they injured the offender during attempts at self-defense (Wolf et al., 2003). However, results regarding legislative effects on reporting assume victims are aware of the statutes and factor such knowledge into their decisions to report (Dugan, 2003). Victims and offenders may be unaware of the specific policy regarding arrest in cases of IPV used by their local police force. For example, more than a year after a mandatory arrest policy was put into place in Milwaukee, interviews with victims revealed that only 24% were aware of the policy (Sherman et al., 1991).

The NCVS also asks victims why they did or did not report incidents of IPV to the police. Early estimates from the NCS revealed that the vast majority (70.9%) of spouse assault victims did not report their victimization to the police because they considered it a private matter (Gaquin, 1977/78). Recent estimates reveal that privacy is still the main reason for not reporting an incident (29%), although the disparity between that and other possible reasons has decreased (Reaves, 2017). The percentage of people

who did not report because it was a private matter appears to have steadily declined through the years (Harlow, 1991). These findings suggest that public attention to IPV may be working to change opinions regarding the privacy of violence as Martin (1976) proposed it would.

Evidence against the gender symmetry argument from the family violence perspective of IPV appears when examining other reasons for not reporting an incident. Women are four times more likely than men to say fear of the offender is an important reason for not reporting, whereas men are more likely to say that the incident was too minor to alert the police (Reaves, 2017). This suggests that women find IPV more threatening than men do, meaning the experience is gendered which contradicts family violence views that IPV is equally serious for men and women. Additionally, women are six times more likely to fear reprisal from the offender in cases of IPV compared to stranger-perpetrated violence, suggesting the victim-offender proximity heightens and exacerbates the fear experienced by women (Bachman, 1994).

Other reasons for not reporting include fear of potential consequences beyond the offender's retaliation. Women have reported concerns that they will be misidentified as the primary aggressor and arrested, as well as concerns regarding financial dependence on the offender and the potential loss of custody of their children (Wolf et al., 2003). People in same-sex relationships report fear of being "outed" and fear of police homophobia, as well as concern that stereotyping could lead to the misidentification of the primary aggressor, as barriers to reporting (Calton, Cattaneo, & Gebhard, 2016; Ollen, Ameral, Reed, & Hines, 2017; Wolf et al., 2003). Victims also report a desire to protect the offender (Reaves, 2017; Wolf et al., 2003). Minority women in particular fear

that racial police bias may lead to a dangerous situation for the offender or unduly harsh punishments, although this is not reflected through reduced reporting rates for minorities (Bachman & Coker, 1995; Bui, 2003; Wolf et al., 2003). Occasionally, the batterer has physically prevented the victim from calling the police, so the decision to not report was not a choice on the part of the victim (Wolf et al., 2003).

Victim justifications for choosing to report an offender are also important to understand. The three most commonly reported reasons for calling the police for an IPV incident include a desire to stop the current incident, a desire to prevent another incident, and a desire to punish the offender (Harlow, 1991). When asked to choose the most important reason for reporting an incident, the most common reason given is a desire to punish the offender (Bachman, 1994). This is true regardless of the victim-offender relationship. However, a higher percentage of family violence victims report the most important reason for calling the police is a desire to stop the current violent incident or prevent a future one, compared to victims of violence committed by acquaintances and strangers (Bachman, 1994). This supports the idea that the police are called because of the inescapability of offenders who have a close personal relationship to the victim.

It is important to note that victims' decisions to report or not report IPV to the police are not necessarily indicative of their help-seeking behaviors more broadly. Victims rely on a number of additional formal and informal sources of support, including friends, family, clergy, healthcare services, and shelters (Flicker et al., 2011; Fugate, Landis, Riordan, Naureckas, & Engel, 2005; Hutchison & Hirschel, 1998; Ingram, 2007; Kaukinen, 2002a; Kaukinen, 2002b). The majority of victims seek help from at least one source, which is most frequently friends or family (Fugate et al., 2005; Hutchison &

Hirschel, 1998; Ingram, 2007; Kaukinen, 2002b). Victim utilization of sources other than the police for help following an incident of IPV may suggest that non-police resources are sufficiently meeting the needs of the victim (Kaukinen, 2002b). While attention to additional types of help-seeking behaviors and their effectiveness for victims of IPV is relevant, the focus of this dissertation is on reporting to and intervention by the police.

In sum, according to the NCVS, the percentage of victims who reported IPV to the police has remained in the low to mid-50s for decades despite changes in question framing, while estimates from the NVAWS and NFVS were lower at 30% and 6.7%, respectively. A victim's decision to report varies with a number of individual, situational, and legislative factors (Dugan, 2003; Gover et al., 2015). Additionally, victim's reasons for choosing to report or not report range from fear of the offender to a desire to punish the offender. However, police notification—either by the victim or someone else—is necessary for the police to intervene. Whether that intervention is successful at reducing IPV is discussed in the next section.

Police Response

Police response to calls for help after an incident of IPV have varied with public perceptions of violence against women. Prior to feminist movements, the police paid little attention to IPV, largely because it was not considered criminal behavior (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1990; Houston, 2014; Sherman, 1992). After legislative changes, the police had to determine how best to respond to calls. Early responses involved little action for fear of agitating the offender and creating a dangerous situation for the officer and the victim (Parnas, 1967). More contemporary responses include an emphasis on mandatory or preferred arrest of IPV suspects in many states (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1990; Sherman &

Cohn, 1989). This section will discuss the range of these responses and what is known about the effectiveness of each approach.

Prior to the renewal of interest in violence against women in the 1960s and 1970s, police response to violence in the home was minimal (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1990). The International Association of Chiefs of Police and the American Bar Association went so far as to actively discourage police intervention in domestic violence (Sherman, 1992). At worst, thousands of years of encouragement of violence against women and, at best, indifference to such violence created a culture where active intervention in family violence was not favored. Although arrest rates for domestic incidents were similar to those for other types of incidents, police responded to domestic calls more slowly and underenforced incidents relative to their severity (i.e., injury levels and offenders' demeanors suggested arrest should have been used more often; Oppenlander, 1982). Several factors contributed to the perpetuation of informal responses: the view that responding to domestic calls was more dangerous than responding to other types of calls, the low likelihood that domestic cases would end in a successful prosecution, and statutes requiring misdemeanors to be witnessed by police before arrest occurred (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1990; Parnas, 1967; Sherman, 1992).

Garner and Clemmer (1986) challenged the belief that domestic calls were exceedingly dangerous by critiquing the data upon which these conclusions were made. The FBI's data on police deaths contained a broad disturbance category, in which family disputes were included. However, alongside of family disputes were gang calls, bar fights, and even incidents involving the brandishing of a gun. Based on this broad definition, "disturbances" were one of the deadliest call types for police officers. In 1982

disturbances were disaggregated into two categories, “Disturbance Calls (family quarrels)” and “Disturbance Calls (bar fights, man with gun).” This separation revealed that domestic disputes were one of the least deadly call types to which police respond, although it is unclear whether “family quarrels” refers to all domestic disturbances or only disturbances between related family members, which would exclude unmarried partners (Garner & Clemmer, 1986). The belief that IPV calls were particularly dangerous was, therefore, largely an artifact of how the data were categorized.

Before this challenge to traditional thinking regarding the danger of domestic calls, the rise of psychologically-informed responses to domestic violence led departments to change the way they approached domestic calls. The previously mentioned New York City Family Crisis Intervention Unit was the first attempt at doing something over nothing. Bard’s (1970) goal was to use the police as “case-finders” who identified people on the verge of emotional disorders based on their involvement in family conflict. Officers were to act as a mediator in cases of domestic violence and attempt to link parties to mental health services. It was also hoped that the interpersonal skills training would reduce the danger to the police when they responded to such calls.

A cursory evaluation revealed that homicides increased in the precinct where the Unit was operating compared to a control precinct, although none of the homicides were committed in families that had interacted with the Unit (Bard, 1970). Baseline data regarding family assaults were not available from before the Unit’s implementation, but there were fewer assaults reported in the Unit’s precinct in comparison to the control precinct. The usefulness of the control precinct as a comparison is questionable, though, as the control precinct appeared to record fewer of its family violence incidents, and its

population was larger and ethnically different from the treatment precinct's population (Bard, 1970). Still, none of the Family Crisis Intervention Unit's officers sustained injuries during the intervention period despite their increased exposure to family cases (Bard, 1970). However, it is unclear how well officers implemented the mediations, and the effectiveness of mediation training on reducing domestic violence was not rigorously evaluated afterwards (Sherman, 1992). Additionally, concerns regarding the cost of implementation of crisis intervention units prohibited widespread adoption.

During the 1980s, there was a shift towards arrest for incidents of IPV. Feminists had lobbied legislatures for years demanding violence against women be taken seriously by the criminal justice system. The motivation for change, however, came in the form of several lawsuits (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1990). After police failures to protect victims from IPV, suits claimed that the police were treating violence perpetrated by husbands differently than that perpetrated by strangers. Given the gendered nature of spousal assault, plaintiffs argued that departments were violating the 14th Amendment which guarantees equal protection under the law. The desire to avoid lawsuits in addition to evidence that arrest reduces the likelihood of repeat IPV (discussed in detail later) led to widespread pro-arrest policies (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1990).

This change is reflected in the data for arrests. According to data from the NCVS, the offender was arrested or charged in 33% of the IPV cases reported to police from 1992 to 1996 (Greenfeld et al., 1998). Using NCVS data from 1992 to 1998, Dugan (2003) also found that offenders are arrested in one-third of the cases reported to the police, which amounts to one-sixth of all victimizations. The number arrested or charged rose to 42% for the aggregated period of 2006 to 2015, and when victimizations not

reported to police are considered, approximately 23% resulted in arrest (Reaves, 2017). The original NCS did not ask victims about arrest outcomes, so estimates from the earliest period of research interest in IPV are unknown, but roughly 27% more incidents that come to the attention of the police now end in arrest than in the early 1990s. Estimates for arrest from the 1985 Family Violence Resurvey—a partial replication of the 1975 National Family Violence Survey—are much lower than the NCVS estimates, similar to reporting comparisons between the NFVS and the NCS. The Resurvey found that only about 1% of all wife assaults and 16% of wife assaults in which the police were notified ended in arrest, which is likely the result of the difference in the framing of the surveys as previously discussed (Kaufman Kantor & Straus, 1990; Straus, 1990b).

Estimates from police data more closely resemble those from the NCVS. National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) data from 2000 suggest that 50% of reported IPV incidents result in arrest (Hirschel, Buzawa, Pattavina, & Faggiani, 2007). However, arrest rates have varied by jurisdiction. For example, in Santa Barbara County, California, arrests were made in 39% of IPV cases (Berk & Loseke, 1980/81). These results are based on incidents that police thought important enough to document, so 39% is likely an overestimation of arrest in cases reported to police if less severe cases were excluded from the sample. Data from Houston from 2005 suffers a similar problem, with over half of domestic violence cases having scant reports, which Lee, Zhang, and Hoover (2013) suggest is the result of the suspect being absent when the police responded. In cases with sufficient detail regarding the arrest decision and the suspect to be included in the study (i.e., cases where the suspect was present when the police responded), the arrest rate in Houston was 50%. Data from forms that were supposed to be filled out at every domestic

violence call to a department in the Midwest revealed an arrest rate of 36%, while in Florida where officers are required to fill out reports at domestic violence calls, the arrest rate in one department was 38% (Robinson & Chandek, 2000; Tatum & Pence, 2015).

Differences between departments may be due to the legislative context of the state, although evidence supporting this notion is mixed. Results from Hirschel, Buzawa, Pattavina, and Faggiani (2007) suggest that states with mandatory or preferred arrest policies had higher rates of arrest compared to those states with discretionary policies. Dugan (2003), on the other hand, found that arrest rates did not vary according to state provisions for protection order violations. The disagreement between the two studies could be based on the sources of the data or the statutes examined. Hirschel, Buzawa, Pattavina, and Faggiani (2007) utilized NIBRS and arrest policies for incidents brought to the attention of police. Meanwhile, Dugan (2003) relied on the NCVS and policies for violations of protection orders which do not require the initial incident (that presumably led to the order) to be reported. Police may treat protection order violations that were based on unreported incidents differently. Regardless, in both studies less than half of the reported incidents ended in arrest.

Similar to reporting, the likelihood of arrest varies according to various situational and individual characteristics. Factors that suggest that arrest is necessary to deescalate the situation increase the likelihood of arrest. For instance, offenders under the influence of alcohol have a higher likelihood of being arrested (Berk & Loseke, 1980/81; Feder, 1997). Additionally, incidents occurring in the home or between cohabitating partners are more likely to end in arrest (Hirschel, Buzawa, Pattavina, & Faggiani, 2007; Lee et al., 2013; Robinson & Chandek, 2000). Officers may view arrest as the easiest way to

separate partners who live in the same location. One obvious factor that affects the likelihood of arrest is the offender being present when the police arrive, which also supports the idea that police may view arrest as an easy way to ensure separation (Robinson & Chandek, 2000).

Aggravated assaults are more likely to result in arrest, especially in states with mandatory and preferred arrest policies (Bachman & Coker, 1995; Hirschel, Buzawa, Pattavina, & Faggiani 2007; Lee et al., 2013). Mandatory and preferred arrest policies likely have a greater influence over more severe cases, when the lack of arrest would be a clear violation of policy (Hirschel, Buzawa, Pattavina, & Faggiani, 2007). Given that aggravated assault increases the likelihood of arrest compared to simple assault, one would assume that the presence of injuries also increases that likelihood. However, when injuries are measured by police reports, the relationship between injury and arrest is unclear (Berk & Loseke, 1980/81; Robinson & Chandek, 2000; Tatum & Pence, 2015). This may be due to the measurement of injuries in police data, with injuries being measured by what is visible to police. The presence of injuries increases the likelihood of arrest when the victim describes his or her own injuries (Bachman & Coker, 1995). A similar effect of police perception of the situation may be seen in the likelihood to arrest based on the presence of a weapon. Lee et al. (2013) found that the presence of a weapon did not increase the likelihood of arrest, reasoning that the police may be unsure of how the weapon factored into the offense if it did not leave a mark. However, the effect of weapon presence on arrest is difficult to distinguish from the effect of more serious offenses in multivariate models, as offense seriousness and weapon presence are highly correlated (Hirschel, Buzawa, Pattavina, & Faggiani, 2007).

Evidence regarding the presence of children on the decision to arrest is mixed and may depend on the legislative context of the state in which the study was conducted. For example, Florida requires officers to notify a child protective service agency if they receive a call for violence when a child is in the home (Tatum & Pence, 2015). Florida also requires officers to produce a written report in cases of domestic violence, so conducting an arrest may not seem like that much of an added burden in cases where they have to notify another agency and write a report. Additionally, the requirements for the involvement of another agency and a written report may indicate to officers that such instances should be taken seriously. Therefore, it is unsurprising that Tatum and Pence (2015) found that the presence of a child increases the likelihood of arrest in Florida. Robinson and Chandek (2000), on the other hand, do not find that the presence of a child increases the likelihood of arrest in their Midwestern-based study. This could be because a child's presence does not matter or because the legislative requirements regarding the presence of children (which was not discussed in their article) are different from Florida's.

Bachman and Coker (1995) found that first-time offenders were more likely to be both reported and arrested. Their results suggest that victims decrease reporting over time and that repeat offenders are the least likely to be arrested in IPV cases. One potential explanation for this troubling pattern is that repeat offenders may have learned how to avoid arrest by altering their demeanor towards officers (Bachman & Coker, 1995; Terrill & Paoline, 2007). The decrease in reporting and arrest after the first offense supports feminist writings on learned helplessness, which suggests that the victim may stop trying to end the abuse if seeking help does not seem to work (Walker, 1977/78).

Although the offender's demeanor may impact an officer's decision to arrest, the victim's does not appear to do the same. Using officers' ratings of various measures of victim cooperativeness, Robinson and Chandek (2000) found that an officer's perception of the victim's fear of retaliation, level of distress, probable substance use problem, and likelihood of cooperation with the offender's prosecution were not significantly related to the arrest decision. However, Berk and Loseke (1980/81) found that the victim's decision to sign a complaint, which may serve as a formal indicator of cooperation, against the offender did increase the likelihood of arrest. The seeming discrepancy between these two studies may be the result of their differing settings or methodologies. Robinson and Chandek's study relied on officers' ratings of victims' cooperation and data from a police department with a proarrest policy for domestic violence cases, meaning victim and offender demeanor may be less important than the facts of the case. Berk and Loseke relied on data from police reports that indicated whether or not the victim signed (or intended to sign) a complaint, which was a less subjective measure of victim cooperation and a stronger pressure from the victim to arrest than officers' perceived feelings of cooperativeness.

With regards to the relationship between arrest and demographic characteristics, the literature is still mixed. The data from incident reports suggest that being black decreases the likelihood of arrest in cases where the police are notified (Hirschel, Buzawa, Pattavina, & Faggiani, 2007; Lee et al., 2013), while victimization surveys suggest that being black increases the likelihood of arrest when considering unreported and reported offenses (Bachman & Coker, 1995). This may be because black offenders are more likely to be reported, and, therefore, a higher percentage of black offenders may

be arrested, but further research is needed for clarification. Regarding sex effects, Berk and Loseke (1980/81) found using data from police reports that if a female victim who resides with the offender reports her victimization to the police, as opposed to someone like a third party, the offender is less likely to be arrested. They suggest that this could be because police may not view it as serious enough because she was able to call police or because it has not caught the attention of neighbors. Tatum and Pence (2015) report that arrest is more likely when the victim is male, while Lee et al. (2013) report that male-on-female assault is the most likely to end in arrest, compared to female-on-female, male-on-male, and female-on-male assault. Meanwhile, Hirschel, Buzawa, Pattavina, and Faggiani (2007) fail to find any relationship between sex and arrest.

Officers' views on women may play a role in the relationship between sex and arrest. Officers with less traditional views about gender roles (e.g., those who agree that women are as good of police officers as men and those who disagree that it is better for men to be achievers) are more likely to arrest offenders (Feder, 1997). Male officers appear more likely to arrest than female officers, potentially because women prefer to honor the victim's wishes regarding arrest (Robinson & Chandek, 2000). Police in general tend to prefer mandatory policies for violence against women, while they prefer discretionary policies for violence against men (Gracia, García, & Lila, 2014). This may be because of the seriousness of the offenses. If women are more likely to be injured than men in cases of IPV, police may prefer mandatory arrest in cases of violence against women. Officers' knowledge of mandatory policies in the department or state increases the likelihood that officers will arrest offenders (Feder, 1997). If officers are unaware of a mandatory policy, they may exercise discretion more than an officer who is aware of the

policy. While more recent studies often do not specifically measure whether or not officers are aware of the IPV policy in their department, officers are more likely to make an arrest if they believe their department rewards officers for IPV arrests (Johnson, 2010). Additionally, officers who think calls for domestic violence are important and who think the police can have a positive impact during such calls are more likely to arrest, suggesting they feel that arrest will have a positive effect (Feder, 1997).

In one of the most influential studies on IPV to date, Sherman and Berk (1984) conducted a randomized experiment in an attempt to determine whether arrest is effective in IPV cases. Officers in the Minneapolis Police Department were instructed to take one of three randomly assigned actions when they received a call for a misdemeanor domestic assault: arrest the offender, separate the two parties, or treat the incident as a dispute to be mediated. Domestic violence recidivism was then measured through police reports and victim interviews for six months after the initial incident. Official reports revealed that 18.2% of offenders recidivated, while victim data revealed that 28.9% of offenders recidivated. Both data sources, however, suggested that offenders who were arrested were the least likely to recidivate (Sherman & Berk, 1984). These results suggested that arrest could deter future incidents of domestic violence when compared to traditional strategies of separation or mediation, although there were questions regarding the construct validity of the separation and mediation treatments. The results of the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment were widely publicized and led to the widespread adoption of pro-arrest policies (Sherman & Cohn, 1989).

Inconsistent findings regarding the effectiveness of arrest from five replications sites employing similar experimental designs – collectively known as the Spouse Abuse

Replication Program – were less politically influential (Maxwell, Garner, & Fagan, 2002). Results from Charlotte and Omaha suggest that arrest is no more or less effective than nonarrest strategies for reducing subsequent incidents, while results from Milwaukee, Colorado Springs, and Dade County suggest that the deterrent effect of arrest depends on the offender's stake in conformity (Berk, Campbell, Klap, & Western, 1992; Dunford, Huizinga, & Elliott, 1990; Hirschel, Hutchinson, & Dean, 1992; Pate & Hamilton, 1992; Sherman, Smith, Schmidt, & Rogan, 1992). For example, in Milwaukee and Dade County, arrest was associated with a decrease in future violence for employed offenders and an increase in violence for unemployed offenders (Pate & Hamilton, 1992; Sherman et al., 1992). In Colorado Springs, arrest was associated with a decrease in future violence for employed offenders, but the evidence regarding a criminogenic effect for unemployed offenders is weak (Berk et al., 1992). This may suggest that labor market conditions may influence unemployed offenders' behavior, as stake in conformity may not be as diminished in unemployed offenders when their prospects are better. Berk et al. (1992) suggest that findings regarding unemployment and IPV recidivism may be due to exposure (i.e., time spent with the victim) rather than stake in conformity. Unemployed offenders may have an increased opportunity for violence. Future studies should attempt to parse out theoretical explanations further.

The mixed results from the replication sites call into question the implementation of the experimental design in the original Minneapolis study. Sherman and Berk (1984) randomly assigned the treatment to domestic violence calls with the intent of making the groups as similar as possible before treatment, attempting to reduce selection bias (i.e., the idea that group outcomes differed based on differences inherent to the group

compositions rather than the treatment; Cook & Campbell, 1979). The treatments delivered differed from the treatments assigned in about 18% of cases, with the majority of those misapplied moving “up” to arrest. If the arrest group included more severe offenders after the treatment was applied, results suggesting a deterrent effect could be biased (Sampson, 2010). Siddique (2013) reanalyzed the data, applying upper and lower bounds based on different noncompliance assumptions. For example, if noncompliance is only likely when officers suspect the offender is at a high-risk of recidivism, then between 11% and 12% of arrested offenders will recidivate within 6 months. This is compared to 13% of those who were arrested and recidivated in the original study (Sherman & Berk, 1984). Siddique’s (2013) results under different assumptions do support the finding that arrest deters future IPV incidents better than nonarrest strategies. Pooled analyses from all replication sites also suggest that arrest is a deterrent to future violence (Maxwell et al., 2002).

Still, the impact of an arrest is unclear. When unreported cases are considered, only one-sixth of IPV incidents result in arrest (Dugan, 2003). In the Charlotte study, 35.5% of citation or arrest cases were actually prosecuted, and 1% of offenders served additional jail time (Hirschel et al., 1992). If offenders are rarely arrested, prosecuted, and punished, arrest as a strategy may not be that different from nonarrest strategies. The cost of arrest may not be enough to act as a deterrent. Furthermore, perceived procedural justice, or the belief that one has been treated fairly by police, may be as important as the actual outcome in reducing IPV recidivism (Paternoster, Brame, Bachman, & Sherman, 1997; Tyler, 1990).

However, data from police records fail to account for incidents that are not reported to police. It may be that police notification is more important than police action. Langan and Innes (1986) investigate this possibility using data from the NCS and find that 41% of the women whose initial incident was not reported were reassaulted in the six-months after an incident, while 15% of those whose incident was reported were reassaulted.⁴ However, the NCS did not ask victims if anyone was arrested in conjunction with an incident, so it is unclear if police action was actually responsible for the lower rate. Felson et al. (2005) addressed this concern by using data from the redesigned NCVS which does ask victims about the outcome of police intervention. When arrest and reporting behaviors are considered simultaneously, results suggest that arrest is not significantly associated with the likelihood of repeat IPV victimization. An initial incident that is not reported to the police, on the other hand, is associated with a greater risk of revictimization. Restricting the sample to misdemeanors for direct comparison to the experiments did not significantly change their findings. The results from these two studies suggest that police notification can drastically reduce the likelihood of future violence, although a contemporary analysis is needed to see if results would still be the same.

Reasons why being reported but not arrested may deter offenders from future violence is unclear but warrants further investigation. It is unlikely that separation or mediation are accounting for the effectiveness of reporting. Instead, police responding to a call may indicate to offenders the criminality of their actions and cause a shift in thinking about IPV. Offenders who would be deterred by arrest may be deterred simply

⁴ Sixty-nine percent of the domestic incidents investigated by Langan and Innes (1986) were committed by intimate partners.

by police presence, or it is possible that officers connect couples to resources that then explain the relationship between reporting and revictimization (Felson et al., 2005).

Even though police actions in cases of IPV have increased in recent decades, there are still questions about the effectiveness of different courses of action. In light of evidence that considers unreported victimizations, the true deterrent effect of arrest is still unknown. Despite this uncertainty, as of 2012 22 states and Washington, D.C., had implemented a mandatory arrest provision in cases of IPV, although a new state had not added a mandatory arrest provision since 1996 (Xie & Lynch, 2017). Still, these policies have raised additional concerns and questions regarding the effectiveness of police response.

Mandatory Arrest Policies

Considering that multiple states have adopted mandatory arrest policies, it is unsurprising that the arrest rate for IPV incidents reported to the police has risen from below 10% in the 1970s to around 50% according to some more recent estimates (Hirschel, McCormack, & Buzawa, 2017). However, one concern is that these increased arrest rates are due to an increase in dual arrests, which are instances where both parties are arrested after an IPV incident. Fueling these concerns are increased simple and aggravated assault arrest rates for women during the late 1990s, even as the male arrest rates for assault fell during the same time period (Chesney-Lind, 2006; Greenfeld & Snell, 1999). Advocates have expressed concerns that dual arrests have contributed to the increased arrest rates for women and may be negatively impacting victims who were acting in self-defense (Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002). An arrest can result in the victim

losing rights and access to beneficial services like temporary housing or the receipt of a restraining order.

Estimates of dual arrest, calculated as the percentage of incidents where both parties are arrested, vary depending on the jurisdiction. For example, localized estimates range from 9.3% in New York City to 33% in Connecticut (Frye, Haviland, & Rajah, 2007; Gerstenberger & Williams, 2013; Martin, 1997). However, a larger study of 2,819 jurisdictions in 19 states revealed the dual arrest rate to be much lower at 1.9% for IPV incidents, with mandatory arrest policies increasing the likelihood of dual arrest outcomes (Hirschel, 2008; Hirschel, Buzawa, Pattavina, & Faggiani, 2007). This study also suggested that while dual arrests are associated with mandatory arrest policies, they are not driving the increased arrest rates for women. Instead, it appears that mandatory arrest policies have increased the likelihood that a female primary aggressor will be arrested, with rates of arrest for males and females in similar circumstances being equal in states with mandatory arrest policies (Hirschel, Buzawa, Pattavina, & Faggiani, 2007).

Evidence suggests that dual arrest is a larger problem for male victims in heterosexual relationships. Dual arrests are more likely to occur when the primary offender is female (Hirschel, 2008; Hirschel, Buzawa, Pattavina, & Faggiani, 2007). Specifically, when the victim is a male in a heterosexual relationship, the incident is three times more likely to end in dual arrest (Hirschel, 2008). Gestenberger and Williams (2013) also revealed gender asymmetry in dual arrests, with 21% of male-against-female incidents resulting in dual arrest and 58% of female-against-male incidents resulting in dual arrest. One potential explanation for this disparity is the possibility that self-

defensive behaviors by male victims against female aggressors could result in greater injury to the aggressor.

Dual arrests may disproportionately impact victims in same-sex relationships because police may have a more difficult time distinguishing the primary aggressor, and data from NIBRS from 2000 suggests that this is the case (Hirschel, 2008). Compared to incidents where the offender was female and the victim was male, dual arrest rates were 10 times higher for same-sex couples. Compared to cases where the offender was male and the victim was female, dual arrest rates were 30 times higher for same-sex couples.⁵ Dual arrests were twice as likely to occur in intimidation incidents between lesbian couples compared to incidents between gay men (Hirschel, 2008). Offenders and victims who are similar in size and strength may complicate an officer's ability to determine the primary aggressor, accounting for these increased dual arrest rates.

Many states with mandatory arrest policies try to avoid dual arrests through primary aggressor provisions which encourage officers to consider, among other things, the history between the couple to help distinguish the primary aggressor through sustained patterns of behavior, although the effort required for officers to put forth in that determination varies across states (Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002; Hirschel et al., 2017). In their study of 19 states, Hirschel, Buzawa, Pattavina, and Faggiani (2007) found that Connecticut, the only state in the study with a mandatory arrest statute without a primary aggressor statute, had the highest rates of dual arrest. However, the remaining states with mandatory arrest statutes also had higher rates of dual arrest than states without

⁵ While same-sex couples were relatively rare in the sample, there were approximately 2,700 cases involving gay men and 3,000 cases involving lesbian women, suggesting that these disparities were not an artifact of a small number of cases (Hirschel, Buzawa, Pattavina, Faggiani, & Reuland, 2007).

mandatory arrest. More recently, Hirschel et al. (2017) found that primary aggressor statutes reduce the likelihood of a dual arrest, but they also appear to reduce the likelihood of any arrest. This may be because officers have difficulty identifying the primary aggressor and do not want to arrest the wrong party (Gover, Paul, & Dodge, 2011). In light of these studies, the efficacy of primary aggressor statutes warrants further examination.

In addition to dual arrest concerns, advocates also worry that mandatory arrest policies result in the disempowerment of women (Zelcer, 2014). Feminists originally campaigned for mandatory arrest policies on the basis that they were better for the group than perhaps individual women (Houston, 2014). Earlier thought was that if the state endorsed criminal sanctions condemning violence against women, public sentiment as a whole would change. If the state acknowledged that violence against women was wrong, the public would come to agree. In the process, though, women lost autonomy in a situation where empowerment may be crucial to the healing process (Zelcer, 2014). Additionally, women know their own situation best and consider how an arrest may disrupt their lives before calling the police (Fugate et al., 2005; Wolf et al., 2003; Zelcer, 2014). Allowing the victim to have a say in the arrest of the offender may give them the opportunity to end any immediate violence while allowing them to decide what the best course of action is for their particular situation. Future research is needed to evaluate the best strategies for balancing the punishment of offenders with the empowerment of victims.

Increased arrest rates for women that coincided with mandatory arrest policies raised concerns about the effect of dual arrests on victims, but current data suggests that

increased arrests may actually be the result of an increased likelihood for female primary aggressors to be arrested (Hirschel, Buzawa, Pattavina, & Faggiani, 2007). However, officers frequently report difficulty in determining the primary aggressor (Gover et al., 2011). Dual arrests are a significant issue for same-sex couples, and future research should attempt to examine officers' decision-making processes for arrest in cases of same-sex IPV. A more basic concern regards the victim's right to have a say in the resolution of an incident, which second-wave feminists were concerned about when they advocated for mandatory policies years ago. These concerns regarding arrest policies and unintended consequences merit more attention from future research, particularly that which evaluates the effectiveness of police action.

Modern Perspectives on IPV

Hirschel, Buzawa, Pattavina, and Faggiani's (2007) work on mandatory arrest policies and dual arrest emphasizes a theme that family violence scholars have expressed for years: women can be the primary aggressor too (Steinmetz, 1977/78; Straus, 1977/78; Straus et al., 1980). Theoretical perspectives have evolved to include this knowledge. However, additional research is necessary to determine what the typology described below means for victims, offenders, and their relationships with law enforcement.

Modern theoretical perspectives on IPV acknowledge the reality of male- and female- perpetrated IPV while emphasizing the differences between them. Johnson (2008) presents a typology that separates IPV into four categories based on the role of control in the violence: intimate terrorism, violent resistance, situational couple violence, and mutual violent control. The traditional feminist perspective on IPV frames violence against women as a way to control and oppress women in a patriarchal society. This view

closely aligns with the intimate terrorism, also known as coercive controlling violence, type of IPV, which involves one partner exercising coercive control over the other (Johnson, 2008; Kelly & Johnson, 2008). This type of violence consists of a wide range of controlling behaviors, including using economic and emotional abuse, male privilege, manipulation, isolation, threats, intimidation, and children to coerce compliance (Pence & Paymar, 1993). Physical violence combined with these aspects creates terror in the relationship (Johnson, 2008).

While the vast majority of intimate terrorism is perpetrated by men, the vast majority of violent resistance is perpetrated by women (Johnson, 2006). Violent resistance IPV occurs when the victim of an intimate terrorist fights back. The violent resistance aggressor is violent but not controlling (Johnson, 2008). This type of violence may occur often, but it is not part of a pattern used in an attempt to control a partner. In rare cases, both partners are controlling and violent, vying for the power in the relationship. This type of violence is referred to as mutual violent control.

Johnson's (2008) final category of IPV is situational couple violence. The defining aspect of situational couple violence is that neither partner is using violence to gain control over the other. Instead, IPV occurs as a result of conflict and emotions, and can be perpetrated by either partner (Johnson, 2008). While it does not involve the use of controlling behaviors, situational couple violence can result in serious injury. The violence could be an isolated incident, but it can also be recurring and can escalate in severity.

Evidence for the existence of each type of violence varies according to the methodology used to study IPV (Johnson, 1995; Johnson, 2006; Kelly & Johnson, 2008;

Straus, 1990a).⁶ IPV studied using shelter samples will capture more intimate terrorism because women in shelters are attempting to escape violent control and build support outside of the relationship. General population surveys, on the other hand, largely ask respondents about violent victimizations and exclude questions about experience with other coercive behaviors, leading them to capture more situational couple violence—or at least miss the control aspect of intimate terrorism. Broad victimization surveys like the NCVS, however, can capture more behaviors than strictly violence-focused surveys, potentially allowing researchers to study experience with controlling behaviors through proxy measures (e.g., economic abuse through intimate-perpetrated theft) in addition to violent victimization.

Given these methodological challenges, estimates on the prevalence of each type of violence are limited, but some conclusions can be drawn. For example, data from the NVAWS suggests that 0.7% of married women and 0.5% of married men have experienced intimate terrorism from their current spouse, while 3.9% of married women and 1.7% of married men have experienced situational couple violence from their current spouse (Johnson, Leone, & Xu, 2014). When considering ex-spouses, the numbers are much higher. Twenty-two percent of divorced women report experiencing intimate terrorism committed by their ex-husband, while 7.4% report experiencing situational couple violence. Five percent of men report experiencing intimate terrorism from their ex-wife, while 3.9% report experiencing situational couple violence (Johnson et al., 2014). However, some of violence reported above may actually be violent resistance or

⁶ There is an ongoing debate in the literature regarding the gendered nature of IPV within the typology. However, because this dissertation is focused on police knowledge of and response to IPV, further explication of the gender symmetry debate than that covered in previous sections is avoided.

mutual violent control IPV, though it is unclear how much would fall into these categories. Violent resistance IPV is often hard to capture on a survey, but one study analyzing data from divorce mediations found that 4% of divorcing couples experienced mutual violent control IPV (Beck, Anderson, O'Hara, & Benjamin, 2013).

The Current Study

Longstanding traditions regarding the treatment of victims, as well as changes to those traditions over the last half-century, have shaped perceptions of IPV, as well as the reactions of victims, the public, and the criminal justice system. In the last 50 years, there has been increased interest and research on the topic of IPV. Despite this recent growth, many questions remain unanswered, especially regarding reporting practices and the effectiveness of different police responses. For example, the deterrent effect of arrest given different situational contexts is still unknown. Additionally, it is unclear whether other strategies if properly standardized and widely used (e.g., mediation strategies that provide definitive access to community resources) can be effective in reducing IPV. However, there is a more basic gap in the literature regarding an offender's risk of being reported and arrested. Average annual reporting and arrest victimization rates, or the probability that an IPV victimization was reported or ended in arrest, during the aggregate time period between 2006 and 2015 were estimated to be 56% and 23%, respectively (Reaves, 2017). These estimates are based on the number of victimizations that occur annually, but certain repetitive reporting or arrest patterns for a household may mask an offender's individual probability of being reported or arrested.

To address this problem, the current study examines prevalence rates, which provide the number of unique people experiencing a phenomenon within a given period

of time. In this case, they examine the number of unique victims who report an offender or experience an incident that ends in arrest within a year. Incidence rates provide the number of incidents reported or ending in arrest within a year, while victimization rates provide the number of victimizations reported or ending in arrest within a year. Prevalence rates provide further information to the current knowledge regarding the risk of detection and punishment for IPV.

If one man down the street is the only person who is repetitively arrested for IPV, an offender may believe that their own risk of arrest is low. However, if an offender is aware of a few people who have been arrested for IPV, they may believe there is a higher likelihood that they will be arrested if they commit an act of violence against their partner. Incidence rates would mask the possibility of the risk being more dispersed, as in the latter situation. The distinction between incidence and prevalence rates can help detect whether changes in arrest trends over time were due to changes in the number of incidents or changes in the number of offenders (Lauritsen & Rezey, 2013). Because we as a society have become more sensitive to the issue of violence against women and the criminal justice system has become more willing to intervene in cases of IPV, the first hypothesis is that the prevalence of arrest has increased continuously since the early 1990s (H_1).

Still, it may be that any changes in arrest patterns are actually the result of changes in reporting patterns (Brame, Turner, & Paternoster, 2017). For example, if more people report a victimization to the police now, but the police arrest fewer offenders that come to their attention, then the certainty of arrest after police involvement has actually decreased despite more people being arrested generally. To consider this possibility,

prevalence rates for both reporting and arrest will be considered. Given that the percentage of IPV victimizations reported to the police in the NCVS has consistently remained in the lower to mid-50s for decades (Bachman, 1994; Bachman & Coker, 1995; Felson et al., 2005; Greenfeld et al., 1998; Harlow, 1991; Reaves, 2017; Rennison, 2001), the second hypothesis is that the prevalence of victims who reported an incident of violence has remained stable (H_2), while the third hypothesis is that the proportion of victims who had an incident end in arrest after it was reported to the police has increased (H_3). These hypotheses regarding the prevalence of reporting and arrest are consistent with the incidence literature that suggests reporting has remained stable while arrest has increased over time for cases of IPV.

Another possibility is that changes in prevalence rates are only detectable for certain levels of incident severity. Therefore, prevalence rates will be conditioned according to the severity of incidents. Given changes in the perceptions of IPV, as well as the creation of mandatory and presumptive arrest policies which may have a greater impact on misdemeanor violence where officers can exercise more discretion, the fourth hypothesis is that changes in the prevalence of arrest should be greater for less severe incidents of violence (H_4).

This study expands the literature in several ways. First, it builds upon prior work by examining incidence rates rather than victimization rates (i.e., by focusing on the number of incidents rather than the number of victimizations), which is consistent with reporting and arrest through a deterrence lens from an offender's perspective (Lauritsen & Rezey, 2013; Reaves, 2017). Second, it examines the prevalence rates of reporting and arrest in cases of IPV, providing additional information regarding the deterrent effect of

arrest. Finally, it conditions these rates by severity of physical injury to the victim, contributing further information on how the prevalence of arrest has changed over time.

CHAPTER 3

DATA AND METHODS

Data

The current study uses the public use incident- and person-level concatenated files, which merge multiple years of victim-only data into one dataset, from the redesigned NCVS for the collection years 1994 through 2015⁷ to assess patterns in the prevalence of arrest for cases of intimate partner violence (Bureau of Justice Statistics [BJS], 2018). The NCVS is a nationally representative victimization survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau and sponsored by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). The survey was designed to complement the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Reporting Program by collecting information on crimes both reported and not reported to the police. In addition to capturing victimizations not reported to the police, the NCVS was designed to provide detailed information on victims and incident characteristics over time (Planty & Langton, 2014). The NCVS measures threatened, attempted, and completed personal crimes, including rape, sexual assault, aggravated assault, and simple assault, as well as attempted or completed robbery and personal theft. The survey also measures attempted and completed household property crimes, including burglary, motor vehicle theft, and property theft.

⁷ Although 2016 and 2017 data are available, these data were not used because they are not comparable to past years due to major changes to the sample design (Morgan & Kena, 2017).

Redesign. The NCVS, previously known as the National Crime Survey (NCS), has been a national survey of crime victimization since 1972. Shortly after the NCS's implementation, the National Academy of Sciences published its recommendations for improvement (Penick, 1976; Taylor, 1989). The BJS began testing a revised version of the NCS in 1979 based on those recommendations and began phasing the changes into the sample in 1989 (Bachman & Taylor, 1994). At the end of the redesign period, the survey was renamed the National Crime Victimization Survey, and by mid-1993 the redesigned NCVS had been administered to the entire sample (Bachman & Taylor, 1994). The redesigned NCVS improved crime incident screening questions, included additional questions regarding crime incidents, changed the procedures for identifying series victimizations, and implemented the use of Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (Taylor, 1989).

Of particular consequence were the changes made to the crime incident screening questions during the redesign. To improve the validity of rape and IPV measures, the screening questions were altered to include more behavior-specific wording and to cue respondents on incidents they may not believe to be criminal, such as those committed by intimate partners (Bachman & Saltzman, 1995). Appendix A provides examples of the differences in the wording of screening questions between the NCS and the NCVS. As previously mentioned, comparisons between estimates from the NCS and the NCVS suggest that questions from the redesigned survey elicited 2.8 and 1.7 times more reported IPV incidents from men and women, respectively (Bachman & Saltzman, 1995). Because of this difference in the measurement of IPV, the current study uses the

redesigned data starting in 1994 when the NCVS was implemented in 100% of the sample for the entire collection year.

Sample. The NCVS uses a stratified, multi-stage cluster sample design to provide estimates of victimization for U.S. households. In the first stage, primary sample units (PSUs), consisting of metropolitan areas, counties, or groups of adjacent counties, are sampled. In the second stage, housing units (HUs) and group quarters (GQs) are sampled within each PSU. Detailed descriptions of the sampling process for the NCVS can be found in the NCVS' Technical Documentation (BJS, 2014) and the report from the Panel on Measuring Rape and Sexual Assault in Bureau of Justice Statistics Household Surveys (Kruttschnitt, Kalsbeek, & House, 2014). Appendix B provides the NCVS sample sizes for the years 1994 through 2015.

Panel Design. HUs selected to participate in the NCVS are interviewed every six months for a total of seven interviews. The first interview serves as a bounding interview and is discussed in more detail later. The survey is administered continuously, so households are interviewed using a rotating panel design. The sample is divided into six rotation groups, which are then divided into six panels (BJS, 2014). An entire rotation group is interviewed every six months, while each of the six panels is interviewed in a different month over the six-month period. Every six months a new rotation group enters the sample and replaces a group that has completed its time in the sample. Year-to-year estimates have approximately 60% of the sample households in common (BJS, 2014). Appendix C provides a graphical representation of the panel design.

Interviews. Once a household is selected into the NCVS sample, it remains in the sample regardless of who occupies the household (BJS, 2014). If the occupants move, the

new occupants are interviewed and the household's status as a replacement household is noted, but no adjustment is made in the estimates to account for the change. If the household composition changes slightly (e.g., through marriage), the new household members are added to the household roster and interviewed. An effort is made to interview all household members aged 12 and older during each enumeration. If a child turns 12 while a household is in the sample, they are added to the list of eligible household members.

The NCVS uses three instruments to collect information from households: the Control Card, the Basic Screen Questionnaire, and the Crime Incident Report (BJS, 2014).⁸ The Control Card provides basic demographic information about the household and its members. The Basic Screen Questionnaire uses cue questions to determine if a crime was committed against the household or against any of the eligible household members individually and asks more detailed personal demographic information. The Crime Incident Report is completed for each crime incident identified during the Basic Screen Questionnaire and asks detailed information for each incident, including level of injury sustained, protective actions taken, relationship to the offender, and outcomes of the incident. The person considered to be the most knowledgeable about the household answers screening and follow-up questions regarding household victimization; if the most knowledgeable person is unavailable or unwilling to participate, another person with knowledge of the household may serve as the household respondent (U.S. Census

⁸ The Control Card, the Basic Screen Questionnaire, and the Crime Incident Report for the 2015 NCVS can be found at the following links, respectively: https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ncvs500_2011.pdf, https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ncvs15_bsqs.pdf, and https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ncvs15_cir.pdf.

Bureau, 2012). Each eligible household member answers screening and follow-up questions regarding any personal victimizations they have experienced.

Given the sensitive nature of the NCVS, respondents are assured that their answers are confidential prior to the start of an interview. The confidentiality of respondents is protected under Title 13 U.S.C. §§ 8 and 9 and under Title 42 U.S.C. §§ 3735 and 3789g (the latter sections have been reclassified as Title 34 U.S.C. §§ 10134 and 10231; BJS, 2017). These statutes preclude disclosure of respondent information for anything other than research purposes. A person who violates these statutes may be punished with up to a \$250,000 fine, five years of imprisonment, or both. Respondents are informed of these potential consequences and reassured that all of their personally-identifying information is removed prior to the publication of the data (BJS, 2014; U.S. Census Bureau, 2012).

Bounding. One benefit of the panel design is the ability to bound the data obtained in order to reduce telescoping or the tendency of respondents to include incidents that happened outside of the period under investigation in the survey (Biderman & Cantor, 1984; Neter & Waksberg, 1964). Bounding responses by providing some sort of cognitive benchmark (e.g., a six-month reference period) can reduce telescoping (Neter & Waksberg, 1964). In the NCVS, the first interview serves as the bounding interview (BJS, 2014). This bounding interview is thought to reduce telescoping in three ways: (1) the interviewer can see if an incident was previously reported during another reference period; (2) the previous interview serves as a discrete reference point; and (3) by emphasizing the specific reference period, the need for accuracy is conveyed to the

respondent (Addington, 2005; Biderman & Cantor, 1984; Skogan, 1981; Tourangeau & McNeeley, 2003).

Prior to 2007, the first interview was only used for bounding purposes and the data obtained were excluded from national estimates due to potential telescoping (BJS, 2014). Since 2007, data obtained from the first interview have been used after a statistical bounding adjustment is applied. However, this adjustment is not applied to the unbounded interviews of replacement households, which are roughly four percent of households in the sample (BJS, 2014; BJS, 2017). In other words, if household members move and are replaced, the first interview for the new members of the sample does not receive the bounding adjustment. The bounding adjustment for original households is used in the current study and is described in more detail in the analytic strategy section.

Mode of collection. While a large portion of interviews are conducted over the phone to minimize costs, a household's first interview is conducted in person (BJS, 2014). Additionally, the second through seventh interview may occur in person if the respondent prefers to complete the survey in person, the household does not have a phone, the household is difficult to contact, or the household has not been successfully interviewed in the past (i.e., the household's first interview was not completed). The percentage of interviews that are conducted by phone has decreased over time from 71% in 1993 to 49% in 2016, largely due to a shift away from utilizing telephone interviewers at centralized call centers to having field representatives conduct all interviews starting in 2006 (BJS, 2017; Catalano, 2016).

For in-person interviews, NCVS interviewers are instructed to make attempts to conduct interviews in private (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). If the respondents do not want

the interview to be conducted privately or if a private interview is not physically possible in the space, the interview may be conducted in the presence of others, and the interviewer will note who was present. Interviewers are not told to ensure the respondent is alone when conducting phone interviews, nor do they note the presence of others during the screening questionnaire for phone interviews (Coker & Stasny, 1994; U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). However, interviewers during in-person and phone interviews emphasize that the interview can be rescheduled at any point if necessary (Bachman & Taylor, 1994).

One concern regarding the validity of self-report data is how the presence of third parties during the interview influences a respondent's answers (Tourangeau & McNeeley, 2003). This concern is exacerbated when considering self-reported IPV victimization data collected in the home, which the victim likely shares with the offender. This concern is validated by analyses of data from the NCS and the NCVS which suggest that IPV is reported at a lower rate both when a spouse is present at the time of the interview and when an interview is conducted over the phone rather than in person (Coker & Stasny, 1994; Yu, Stasny, & Li, 2008). As such, the incidence and prevalence of reporting and arrest may be overestimated given potential underestimation in the number of incidents.

Proxy interviews. In cases where a respondent is unable to participate in the survey, a proxy interview may be accepted (BJS, 2014). A proxy interview is an interview where a knowledgeable household member answers the survey in place of the intended respondent. Proxy interviews are discouraged and are only allowed in certain circumstances, including when a guardian refuses to allow a child aged 12 or 13 to participate, when a respondent is absent from the household during the entire interview

period, or when a respondent is mentally or physically incapable of participating. Proxy interviews are included in this study, but if a proxy is unaware of a person's victimization, IPV will be underreported in the sample. However, proxy interviews are rare, accounting for fewer than 4.9% of all interviews in which a victimization was reported in every year under investigation, and the restrictions on proxy interviews and the focus here on IPV (rather than child abuse, for example) likely minimize the potential underestimation effects.

Series Victimizations. Incidents are recorded as a series victimization when the respondent reports experiencing six or more similar incidents within the same interview but cannot provide full details for each one individually (BJS, 2014). In such cases, the number of incidents is recorded, a Crime Incident Report is completed for the most recent incident, and questions regarding the similarity of the incidents in the series are asked. Excluding series victimizations can severely underestimate the number of victimizations occurring in the U.S. (Planty & Strom, 2007; Lauritsen, Owens, Planty, Rand, & Truman, 2012). Additionally, IPV incidents account for a large portion of series victimizations (Dodge, 1987; Lauritsen et al., 2012). Therefore, they will be included in this study, though they will have more of an impact on incidence estimates than prevalence, given that prevalence considers if an incident occurred rather than how many incidents occurred (Lauritsen & Rezey, 2013).

For series victimizations where the respondent reported up to 10 incidents, each incident is counted separately and the details provided for the most recent incident are applied to all incidents in the series (BJS, 2014). Respondents are asked additional questions for series victimizations, including how many times the type of incident

occurred, if the offender was the same person in each incident, if each incident occurred in the same location, whether the same thing happened each time, and how the incidents differed. If the respondent reported a series containing more than 10 incidents, only 10 incidents are counted using the details provided for the most recent incident. While previous work revealed that respondents could recall specific details for up to six separate incidents (a threshold for determining a “series” that was adjusted in the redesign), after 10 incidents, respondent recall becomes less reliable (Dodge, 1987; Lauritsen et al., 2012). There is some concern that the details from the most recent incident are not entirely representative of the details for the rest of the incidents in the series, but women have reported that the same thing happened each incident for 86% of IPV series victimizations (Lauritsen et al., 2012). While this suggests that the incidents covered in a series victimization report will be similar on important measures like reporting to the police and offender arrest, it is not possible to know for sure, as details for each specific incident are not captured.

Nonresponse. There are three types of nonresponse in the NCVS: household, person, and item (BJS, 2014). Household nonresponse occurs when no one at a sampled HU completes an interview, either because all members of the household refused or the HU is temporarily or permanently ineligible for the survey (e.g., it is vacant or has been demolished). Person nonresponse occurs when a household member refuses or is unable to participate, but at least one other person in the household did provide an interview. Item nonresponse occurs when the response for one or more questions is missing from an otherwise complete interview and can be the result of a respondent or interviewer error.

Household and person response rates are available in Appendix B, but item response rates are unavailable for the study period.

Households with nonresponse may be categorized as a Type A, B, or C noninterview (BJS, 2014). For Type A noninterviews, people live in the household but did not participate in the survey. Type B noninterviews involve the household being temporarily ineligible for the survey (e.g., the household is currently vacant), while Type C noninterviews involve addresses that are permanently ineligible (e.g., the household has been demolished). Although HUs with Types B and C household nonresponse have a higher likelihood of experiencing victimization at some point (Saphire, 1984), they are at least temporarily ineligible and are excluded from BJS estimates. Type A household nonresponse, and the possibility of selection bias in household estimates, is handled through weighting procedures.

One concern with the panel design of the NCVS is the possibility for testing effects, which occur when prior exposure to the survey causes respondents to alter future responses (Thornberry & Krohn, 2003). If a respondent does not report a victimization during the screening questions, the survey usually takes less than five minutes to complete (BJS, 2014). If a Crime Incident Report is needed, the survey takes approximately 25 minutes to complete. Respondents may learn that reporting a victimization to interviewers triggers extensive questioning and tailor their responses to prevent such questioning or simply refuse to participate in the future, which is a phenomenon known as respondent fatigue (Thornberry & Krohn, 2003).

Prior research using data from the NCS found that the number of victimizations a panel reported decreased as their exposure to the survey increased, which supports the

idea of respondent fatigue (Lehnen & Reiss, 1978). Research using data from after the redesign that allowed the authors to follow individuals rather than a panel of respondents found that while respondents who had been interviewed more than once did report less victimizations, respondents who reported victimizations in the past (i.e., were exposed to the incident report) were no less likely to report victimizations in the future (Hart, 2006). When using nonresponse instead of reported victimizations as a measure of fatigue, victimization predicts nonresponse until demographic variables are added as controls (Hart, Rennison, & Gibson, 2005). Evidence from the NCVS suggests that age, race, and gender predict nonresponse, as well as victimization (Hart et al., 2005). Therefore, the current estimates use weights to adjust for person nonresponse, with underrepresented populations receiving higher weights.

Item nonresponse may occur if a respondent does not answer a question, if a response is inconsistent with the responses to related questions, or if an interviewer or the technology used during the interview makes an error (BJS, 2014). When demographic characteristics are missing, the data are imputed during the Census Bureau's editing process when possible. If item nonresponse is present in the public-use file, it is treated as missing at random and no further adjustment is made (Rubin, 1976).⁹

Measures

⁹ The effect of item nonresponse in the NCVS appears to be a relatively new interest, and for the most part, "nothing is currently done to address item nonresponse" (Berzofsky, Creel, Moore, Smiley-McDonald, & Krebs, 2014, p. 1). The NCVS codebook, as of the 2016 release, includes information on imputation rates for variables like household income and person race. In some multivariate analyses using the NCVS, missing data is controlled through the use of additional variables (e.g., Dugan [2003]). Baumer and Lauritsen (2010) excluded cases with missing data, but their study used all violent and property crimes. In an effort to retain as much data as possible, any item nonresponse is treated as missing at random, though future research is needed to determine if this is the best strategy for missing IPV data in the NCVS.

Intimate partner violence includes any threatened, attempted, or completed rape or sexual assault, aggravated assault, or simple assault as well as any attempted or completed robbery committed by a current or former spouse, boyfriend, or girlfriend. Incidents with multiple victims are included to capture potential incidents where others, like children, were victimized as well. Incidents with multiple offenders are also included as long as one of the offenders was an intimate partner.

An incident was considered to have been *reported* to the police if respondents answered “yes” to the question, “Were the police informed or did they find out about this incident in any way?” This measure includes information on incidents reported to the police by respondents and third parties as well as incidents where the police were already at the scene and incidents where the offender was a police officer. An offender was considered to have been *arrested* if respondents answered “yes” to the question, “As far as you know, was anyone arrested or were charges brought against anyone in connection with this incident?” This study, like previous work, assumes that the person arrested was the offender (Dugan, 2003). To ensure that the police response being evaluated was that of law enforcement agencies in the U.S., incidents that occurred outside of the U.S. are excluded from the analyses.¹⁰ The reported and arrested measures used here are broad, including incidents not reported to the police by the respondent and potentially incidents where the offender was charged but not arrested, but they provide insight into the general question of how police knowledge of and response to incidents of IPV have changed over time.

¹⁰ Fewer than 1.0% of IPV incidents each year occurred outside of the U.S.

A final consideration of this study is whether changes in reporting and arrest have been similar for incidents of varying severity over time. Severity is operationalized by the level of physical injury sustained by the victim. An incident resulted in *no injury* if respondents reported they were not physically harmed in any way. An incident resulted in *minor injury* if respondents reported experiencing minor cuts and bruises or some other minor physical injury. An incident resulted in *serious injury* if respondents reported experiencing wounds from a gun or knife, internal injuries, unconsciousness, broken bones or teeth, injuries from a rape or sexual assault, or some other serious physical injury.

Analytic Strategy

The first step in the analysis is to describe the extent of IPV victimization over time. Incidence rates will be calculated for each year by summing the incidents reported by all respondents during each six-month period to estimate the average number of IPV incidents experienced by a person drawn at random from the population (Equation 1). Prevalence rates will be calculated for each year by counting the number of people victimized at least once during the year, or at least once across both six-month periods, to estimate how many people experienced an IPV victimization (Equation 2).¹¹ Given that IPV is unevenly distributed among some repeat victims, prevalence rates provide additional information on a person's estimated risk level by distinguishing between repeat and one-time victims in the data (Lauritsen & Rezey, 2013).

$$\text{IPV Incidence Rate}_T = \frac{\text{number of IPV incidents}_T \text{ experienced by people age 12+}}{\text{number of people in the population}_T} \times 1,000 \quad (1)$$

¹¹ Due to the rotating panel design of the NCVS, some people entering or exiting the sample are only interviewed once during the collection year. The person weights are used to adjust for potential differences in victimization risks between those respondents only interviewed once.

$$\text{IPV Prevalence Rate}_T = \frac{\text{number of unique people age 12+ experiencing at least one incident}_T}{\text{number of people in the population}_T} \times 1,000 \quad (2)$$

Next, the incidents in which police were notified will be summed and the rate multiplier will be changed from 1,000 to 100 to estimate the percent of IPV incidents that were reported to the police (Equation 3), while prevalence percentages will be calculated to determine the number of people who reported an incident to the police at least once during the year (Equation 4). Just as some people are more likely to experience repeat IPV, some victims may be more likely to report incidents to the police. Incidence percentages provide information on how common reporting was in incidents of IPV, whereas prevalence percentages provide information on how common reporting was among victims. Prevalence percentages help distinguish between victims who reported multiple incidents and those who reported only once over the year.

$$\text{Reporting Incidence \%}_T = \frac{\text{number of incidents reported}_T}{\text{number of incidents}_T} \times 100 \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Reporting Prevalence \%}_T = \frac{\text{number of unique victims who reported at least once}_T}{\text{number of victims}_T} \times 100 \quad (4)$$

Incidence and prevalence percentages will also be calculated to estimate the probability that offenders were arrested when the police were notified (Equation 5 and 6, respectively). While incidence percentages at this point provide information on how many incidents end in arrest, prevalence percentages provide information on how many victims experienced an incident that ended in arrest. These percentages will also be calculated to estimate the probability that a reported incident ends in arrest and the probability that victims who report experienced an incident that ends in arrest (Equation 7 and 8, respectively).

Though the victim is the unit of analysis, the incidence and prevalence percentages calculated here can give insight into different information on an offender's risk of arrest. Incidence percentages provide insight into how likely it is that an offender will be arrested if they commit an act of IPV, and prevalence percentages provide insight how likely it is that they as an offender will be arrested. If only a small portion of offenders is arrested, it can be assumed that one's own perceived risk of arrest will be lower, making arrest an unlikely deterrent factor (Waldo & Chiricos, 1972). Prevalence percentages indicate how common arrest is among the victims' offenders in the sample. Additionally, these rates are examined over the course of 22 years as society's approach to and attitudes regarding IPV have changed, so arrest may be more common—and more of a deterrent—now.

$$\text{Arrest Incidence } \%_T = \frac{\text{number of incidents ending in arrest}_T}{\text{number of incidents}_T} \times 100 \quad (5)$$

$$\text{Arrest Prevalence } \%_T = \frac{\text{number of unique victims with one incident ending in arrest}_T}{\text{number of victims}_T} \times 100 \quad (6)$$

$$\text{Arrest Incidence } \%_{RT} = \frac{\text{number of incidents ending in arrest}_T}{\text{number of incidents reported}_T} \times 100 \quad (7)$$

$$\text{Arrest Prevalence } \%_{RT} = \frac{\text{number of unique victims with one incident ending in arrest}_T}{\text{number of victims who reported}_T} \times 100 \quad (8)$$

Finally, incidence and prevalence rates for each of the steps above will be disaggregated by level of physical injury (no injury, minor injury, or serious injury). The likelihood that incidents brought to the attention of the police end in arrest has increased over time, and it is reasonable to hypothesize that this change varies by the severity of the incidents (Dugan, 2003; Greenfeld et al., 1998; Reaves, 2017). Presumably, reporting and

arrest have been more constant for offenders who cause serious injuries or for incidents where the victim sustained serious injuries.

File Structure

While the public use incident-level file contains the information necessary to construct incidence estimates, the person-level file must be modified to include incident characteristics for prevalence estimation. To construct this modified file, first dummy variables were created in the incident-level file to identify incidents with relevant characteristics (e.g., offender was an intimate partner, incident was reported to the police). Second, incident dummy variables were summed for each respondent's six-month interview and merged with the person-level file, resulting in a file that aggregated the incident characteristics for each person across the six-month reference period. Third, summed variables were recoded into dichotomous variables that indicated whether the victim experienced an incident with the characteristics of interest for this study in a six-month reference period, resulting in a file allowing for prevalence estimation.¹² Though this resulting file is constructed in a way that contains data for respondents over a six-month period, person weights applied according to the description below allow for yearly prevalence estimates.

Weighting

In order to develop accurate inferences regarding victimizations among the U.S. population from the NCVS sample, the data must be weighted post-stratification to

¹² One issue that arose during this process was that the incident flags did not distinguish between incidents that were reported or ended in arrest according to their level of severity. In other words, in the prevalence file a person may have had an indicator for a reported incident, an incident resulting in major injury, and an incident resulting in no injury. The original prevalence file did not indicate whether the reported incident was the one with a major injury or the one with no injury, so the process was repeated to flag reporting and arrest variables by severity level.

correct for demographic differences between the population and the sample, as well as aspects of the data collection procedure like bounding and nonresponse. The precalculated person and incident weights provided in the public use files are used in this study. A brief description of these weights is provided below, while a detailed description of all weighting procedures can be found in the NCVS' Technical Documentation (BJS, 2014).

The person weights estimate the number of people in the population represented by each person in the sample (BJS, 2014). They are the product of six values: the base weight, weighting control factors, the household noninterview adjustment, the within-household noninterview adjustment, the first-stage ratio adjustment, and the second-stage ratio adjustment.¹³ The first-stage ratio adjustment ensures that the racial composition of the selected non-self-representing PSUs is representative of the population of the PSUs in a given state, while the second-stage ratio adjustment adjusts the weights so the entire NCVS sample is representative of the population in terms of age, race, sex, and ethnicity.

Person weights estimate representation of the sample at the time of the interview. Therefore, the weight applied to a particular respondent changes as the sample changes, meaning the weight applied to a particular respondent would be different at each of their interviews over their time in the sample. Person weights are summed across interview periods for yearly prevalence estimates.

The incident weight uses the same adjustments as the person weight, as well as a bounding adjustment and an adjustment for multiple victims (BJS, 2014). The bounding adjustment factor is used to reduce the effect of telescoping in estimates since 2007 when

¹³ Weighting control factors account for the subsampling of PSUs that contain more housing units than expected (see BJS [2014] for more information).

the first bounding interview began to be included in data. To account for the fact that one incident can have multiple victims, the incident weight (calculated to this point) is divided by the number of victims in the incident. The final weighting procedure accounts for series victimizations. As described earlier, series victimizations are counted as the number of incidents reported in the series. That number is multiplied by the incident weight to equal the final incident weight.

Standard Errors

Standards errors that take into account the effect of the stratified, multi-stage cluster sample design on the variances will be calculated using the methods employed by the BJS. The standard errors for incidence estimates are calculated using generalized variance functions (GVFs) and parameters provided by U.S. Census Bureau. GVFs calculate the variance as a function of the relationship between the estimate and its predictors (Couzens, Shook-Sa, Lee, & Berzofsky, n.d.; Wolter, 2007). Couzens et al. (n.d.) provide the formulas used to calculate standard errors using GVFs. The standard errors for prevalence estimates are calculated using direct variance estimation, which is conducted using the SPSS Statistics Complex Samples module. Complex Samples conducts direct variance estimation using the Taylor Series Linearization method. Resulting standard errors from both methods will then be used to form 95% confidence intervals around the estimates for each year.

Direct variance estimation requires all design- and victimization-related variables to be in the same file, as is the case with the prevalence file constructed here (Couzens et al., n.d.). The GVFs are simpler to use and require less data manipulation (Couzens et al., n.d.). However, the primary reason each variance estimation procedure was chosen in this

case was to allow the basic prevalence and incidence estimates to be checked against those provided in the reports in the BJS' *Criminal Victimization* series to ensure weighting and variance estimation was done correctly before more specific estimates were calculated.¹⁴

¹⁴ *Criminal Victimization* reports including prevalence estimates prior to the 2016 report did not specify that prevalence standard errors were calculated using direct variance estimation. Conversations with BJS' statisticians clarified the procedure used for variance estimation after several attempts to verify estimates failed. Additionally, the *Criminal Victimization* reports do not provide incidence estimates. However, incidence and victimization estimates (which the BJS does report) use the same file but different weights, allowing for victimization estimates to be verified and the same methods applied to incidents.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS¹⁵

The incidence and prevalence of IPV declined significantly and steadily from 1994 to 2015 (Figure 4.1). The incidence rate declined from 9.5 incidents of IPV per 1,000 people in the population in 1994 to 3.0 incidents per 1,000 people in 2015. The prevalence rate declined from 3.0 IPV victims per 1,000 people in the population in 1994 to 1.2 victims per 1,000 people in 2015. The incidence rate was consistently higher than the prevalence rate throughout the study period. However, the incidence of IPV declined more rapidly than the prevalence.

One of the contributions of this study are estimates of the prevalence of reporting and arrest in cases of IPV. Recent analyses of the NCVS using data aggregated for the years 2006–2015 have found that approximately 56% of victimizations are reported (Reaves, 2017). The current study finds similar results for incidents, which differ from victimizations because they may include cases with multiple victims: 53.8% of incidents were reported in 2015 (Figure 4.2). This estimate does not appear to have changed significantly from 50.1% in 1994.

Still, repeat victims who repetitively report incidents could be masking the prevalence of reporting to the police in the data. To address this concern, the current

¹⁵ Raw data for all figures in this section are available in Appendix D.




Figure 4.1. Incidence and prevalence of IPV.




Figure 4.2. Incidence and prevalence of reporting.

study examines the probability that a victim reports at least one incident in a year. In 1994, 54.2% of victims reported at least one incident to the police. In 2015, 69.4% reported at least one incident to the police, which is a 15-percentage-point increase accompanied by steadily increasing percentages over time. Additionally, the 95% confidence intervals for the prevalence of reporting from 1994 and 2015 do not overlap, suggesting the prevalence of reporting increased significantly over the course of the study period. When comparing the incidence and prevalence of reporting, incidence is consistently lower than prevalence, which suggests that repeat victims report less frequently, although the 95% confidence intervals overlap in this case which makes it difficult to say with certainty that the pattern seen in the sample estimates is true for the population.

With regards to arrest, Reaves (2017) found 23% of NCVS victimizations ended in arrest on average annually from 2006 to 2015. In the current study, the percentage of incidents that ended in arrest on average was slightly lower at 20.7%, but incidence was nearly identical at the beginning and end of the study period, with 17.9% of incidents ending in arrest in 1994 and 17.8% in 2015 (Figure 4.3). When comparing the incidence and prevalence of reporting, the percentage of victims who experienced an incident that ended in arrest at least once during the year was generally similar to the incidence of arrest. The prevalence of arrest increased from 19.0% in 1994 to 29.8% in 2015. Although this is an increase of 10.8 percentage points and the prevalence of arrest visually appears to have increased over the study period—with some variation from year to year—the 95% confidence intervals (shown in Figure 4.3) for 1994 and 2015 overlap, meaning it is not clear that the increase in the prevalence of arrest was statistically

significant. However, when the precision of the confidence intervals is reduced to 90%, the intervals do not overlap, suggesting the prevalence of arrest in the population likely increased over the study period.




Figure 4.3. Incidence and prevalence of arrest.

To account for the possibility that any changes in arrest patterns are simply the result of changes in reporting patterns (Brame et al., 2017), the incidence and prevalence of arrest amongst reported cases were examined. Reaves (2017) found that 42% of victimizations that are reported to the police ended in arrest. In the current study, in 2015 33.0% of incidents that were reported to the police ended in arrest compared to 35.8% in 1994 (Figure 4.4). Amongst victims who reported at least once during the year, the prevalence of arrest was 43.0% in 2015 compared to 35.1% in 1994. However, both the incidence and prevalence of arrest conditioned by reporting show dramatic year-to-year

variation and both sets of estimates have wide confidence intervals, making it difficult to discern any pattern over the study period.




Figure 4.4. Incidence and prevalence of arrest after reporting.

An additional question of interest in the current study is whether any changes in IPV trends have varied according to the severity of the incident. It was hypothesized that changes in reporting and arrest would be greater for less severe incidents, measured by the injuries sustained by the victim, as there is potentially more room for discretion by the victim and responding officer in such cases. For the severity analyses, data were aggregated across groups of three years (except for 1994–1997, which was a group of four years) to ensure reasonable unweighted prevalence sample sizes.

Trends in the incidence and prevalence of IPV resulting in no, minor, or major physical injuries to the victim are presented in Figure 4.5. These trends follow the

patterns for IPV and violence more generally, with the incidence rates of IPV resulting in major, minor, and no physical injuries all declining significantly from 1994 to 2015. The prevalence of IPV resulting in minor and no physical injuries also declined significantly. While the prevalence of IPV resulting in major injuries declined, it is unclear if the change was significant, as the 95% confidence intervals overlap (shown in Figure 4.5); however, the less precise 90% confidence intervals do not overlap, suggesting the prevalence of IPV resulting in major IPV likely declined as well. When comparing the incidence and prevalence rates across levels of severity, IPV resulting in no injury is generally the most common in both types of rates followed by minor injury and major injury, though the incidence rates of IPV resulting in no injury and minor injury are nearly identical for the last half of the study period.

The incidence and prevalence of reporting conditioned by severity are presented in Figure 4.6. The difference in reporting is not consistently significant across levels of severity, nor does it appear that the percentages have changed over the course of the study period for any of the severity levels. Additionally, it is not clear that incidence and prevalence rates are significantly different for any level of severity given the uncertainty in the data demonstrated by the wide confidence intervals.

Figure 4.7 shows the probability that an incident ended in arrest or a victim experienced at least one incident that ended in arrest conditioned by severity. Again, these percentages do not appear to have changed significantly over the study period for any of the severity levels nor do incidence and prevalence differ significantly within severity levels. In the case of arrest, though, the incidence and prevalence of arrest when victims sustained no injuries were significantly lower than the incidence and prevalence

of arrest when victims sustained minor injuries for every group of years, with the exceptions of the 2001–2003 period for incidence and the 2004–2006 period for prevalence when the confidence intervals for no injuries and minor injuries overlap. Comparisons to the incidence and prevalence of arrest when victims sustained major injuries is more difficult, as those estimates fluctuated dramatically and had wider confidence intervals over the study period.

Results are similar when examining the incidence and prevalence of arrest specifically for cases that were reported to the police (Figure 4.8). The percentages did not change significantly over time nor are incidence and prevalence significantly different within severity levels. The incidence and prevalence of arrest given that an incident was reported when victims sustained no injuries were significantly lower than the incidence and prevalence of arrest when victims sustained minor injuries for every group of years, again with the exceptions of the 2001–2003 period for incidence and the 2004–2006 period for prevalence. Incidence and prevalence of arrest after reporting when victims sustained major injuries again fluctuated more dramatically and had wider confidence intervals than the other severity levels.




Figure 4.5. Incidence and prevalence of IPV by severity. Note the difference in scaling when comparing across severity levels.




Figure 4.6. Incidence and prevalence of reporting by severity.




Figure 4.7. Incidence and prevalence of arrest by severity.




Figure 4.8. Incidence and prevalence of arrest after reporting by severity.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Although IPV has been documented throughout recorded history, criminal justice intervention after incidents resulting in injuries short of death is relatively new. As such, research regarding both victim and criminal justice action for cases of IPV is still developing. While the probability that an IPV victimization is reported or ends in arrest is generally known, repetitive reporting or arrest patterns for a household may mask an offender's individual probability of being reported or arrested in national estimates. This study sought to address this gap in the literature by examining rates of the prevalence of arrest for IPV. Support for the hypotheses suggested in this dissertation was mixed and is discussed below. Table 5.1 provides a summary of this information.

Table 5.1
Summary of Support for Hypotheses

Hypothesis	Support
<i>H₁</i> : The prevalence of arrest has increased continuously since the early 1990s.	Partially supported
<i>H₂</i> : The prevalence of victims who reported an incident of violence has remained stable.	Not supported
<i>H₃</i> : The proportion of victims who had an incident end in arrest after it was reported to the police has increased.	Not supported
<i>H₄</i> : Changes in the prevalence of arrest should be greater for less severe incidents of violence.	Not supported

Given that society has become more aware of the consequences of IPV and the criminal justice system has become more willing to act in cases of IPV, it was hypothesized that the prevalence of arrest has increased continuously since the early 1990s (H_1). This hypothesis was partially supported: the prevalence of arrest increased overtime though only when considering the less precise 90% confidence intervals. Although the NCVS is a victim-centered survey, this result suggests that the likelihood that an offender is arrested for IPV has increased since the early 1990s. Additionally, this increase was not observed for the incidence of arrest, suggesting that the risk of arrest has dispersed to a wider pool of offenders rather than simply increasing after incidents.

The seeming increase in the prevalence of arrest and not the incidence of arrest also suggests that the change was due more to an attitudinal shift, as changes in arrest policies should impact all incidents that are brought to the attention of the police. Still, future research should consider potential changes in arrest policies and their effects on arrest patterns. This would be a substantial undertaking, particularly if examining policies across the U.S., as each state's policies would need to be identified and analyzed over time. The American Bar Association most recently compiled domestic violence arrest policies for states in 2014, but each page of the document has a warning that reads "The law is constantly changing! Please independently confirm the data you find here." Once statutes are identified, comparisons are difficult, as states vary in the force of the language used (e.g., "should" versus "shall") and in the discretion afforded to officers (Hirschel et al., 2017). Since the adoption of preferred and mandatory arrest policies in the 1980s, one known change in domestic violence policies is the addition of language

aimed at identifying the primary aggressor in most states with mandatory arrest laws (Hirschel et al., 2017).

Because the increase in the prevalence of arrest may have been due to more offenders being reported, it was hypothesized that the prevalence of victims who reported has remained relatively stable (H_2), while the prevalence of victims who had an incident ending in arrest after it was reported to the police has increased (H_3). These hypotheses were not supported by the data. The prevalence of victims who reported appears to have increased over the study period, which provides a different perspective than victimization estimates in the past that have suggested the percentage of victimizations reported to the police has remained fairly consistent for decades (Bachman, 1994; Bachman & Coker, 1995; Felson et al., 2005; Greenfeld et al., 1998; Harlow, 1991; Reaves, 2017; Rennison, 2001). Meanwhile, the prevalence of arrest after a victim reported to the police followed no discernable pattern, suggesting that the increase in the prevalence of arrest exhibited for all cases was possibly the result of an increase in the prevalence of reporting.

The unexpected increase in the prevalence of reporting could have been due to the increase in services available to victims of IPV that occurred over the study period. The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) was passed in 1994. It has been reauthorized three times, and a fourth reauthorization bill has passed the U.S. House of Representatives and is in the U.S. Senate (Congress.gov, n.d.; Office on Violence Against Women, 2016). VAWA was created to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. It aimed to do so by enhancing federal prosecution for these crimes and by providing funding to communities to develop coordinated responses through law enforcement, prosecution, and victim services (Modi, Palmer, & Armstrong,

2014). Since 1994, more than six billion dollars has been awarded to communities for this purpose (Office on Violence Against Women, 2016). Victims may be aware that there are more resources available, like shelters and advocates working with law enforcement, potentially explaining the increase in the prevalence of reporting.

While this study does not examine the period prior to VAWA's authorization and, thus, cannot examine changes in the prevalence of IPV reporting before and after VAWA's passage, it is possible to compare IPV trends to trends for violence in general over the study period. As seen in Figure 5.1, the prevalence of reporting for IPV and total violence both increased significantly over the study period. Comparing the first and last years under study, the prevalence of IPV reporting increased 15.2 percentage points, while the prevalence of reporting for all violence increased 6.0 percentage points. Prior research suggests that decreases in rape and aggravated assault after VAWA's passage can be attributed to VAWA grant funding (Boba & Lilley, 2009). The difference in the prevalence of reporting for IPV and total violence similarly suggests that the increase in reporting can be at least partially attributed to VAWA's interventions aimed at IPV, but the wide confidence intervals, particularly around the prevalence of IPV reporting, make it difficult to state this with absolute certainty.

Though the confidence intervals are wider for incidence, it is interesting to note that the incidence of IPV reporting did not increase significantly over the study period (Figure 4.2). This suggests that the increase in the prevalence of reporting may be due to more first-time victims reporting to the police, an idea supported by prior research that suggests that repeat assaults are less likely to be reported to the police (Ackerman & Love, 2014; Bachman & Coker, 1995; Reaves, 2017). This speaks to the importance of

the victim's first interaction with the police. If the victim is treated with respect and they believe their case is handled with care, they are more likely to feel comfortable calling the police again when needed in the future (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 1990; Wolf et al., 2003). The importance of the officer's behavior is not limited to that with the victim; exercising procedural justice with the offender may reduce future IPV offending (Paternoster et al., 1997). The increased prevalence of reporting also provides officers with more opportunities to link victims to services in the community, so officers should be trained on available resources.




Figure 5.1. Prevalence of reporting for IPV and total violence.

In this study, it was also hypothesized that changes in the prevalence of arrest would be greater for less severe incidents of violence (H_4). This hypothesis was not supported. There were no discernable patterns in arrest, reporting, or arrest after an

incident was reported for any levels of severity of IPV. This finding brings attention to the limitations of the NCVS data present in this study. It is possible that changes in the prevalence of arrest have not been greater for IPV that results in less severe injuries to the victim, but it is also possible that the small unweighted sample sizes, particularly for specific domains, increased the uncertainty in the results demonstrated by the large confidence intervals. For example, the smallest unweighted sample size in this study was for the prevalence of arrest in cases where the IPV victim sustained major injuries for the year group 1998–2000. For this domain, the unweighted sample size was 13, meaning 13 people in the NCVS sample reported that their IPV perpetrator was arrested for an incident where they sustained major injuries from the years 1998 to 2000. The confidence interval for this year group when examining the prevalence of arrest in cases where the victim reported spanned 35.2 percentage points. This means there is a 95% chance that the interval [14.2, 49.5] contains the true population value, which leaves little certainty about the true population value. Although the BJS recommends a cell count of at least 10 for analyses, it seems dubious to generalize to people in the U.S. population 12 and older based on a sample of 13 garnered by aggregating three years of data, regardless of the representativeness intended by the sampling design.

These small unweighted sample sizes point to another limitation of the NCVS, which is that analyses of very specific domains are not possible—or perhaps not responsible. When originally conceived, it was intended that this dissertation would also investigate different types of IPV (e.g., assault versus personal larceny, which may capture financially controlling behaviors). However, there were four personal larcenies committed by intimate partners reported in the NCVS during the 22 years under study, so

this type of analysis was not feasible. It is certainly not a bad thing that these crimes are happening at low frequencies in the sample, but it does limit the types of analyses for which the NCVS can be used, and small sample sizes are not typically associated with “the nation’s primary source of information on criminal victimization” (BJS, n.d.a, para. 1).

The small sample sizes for specific domains of IPV may be the result of low base rates of IPV generated by the NCVS compared to other surveys like the NVAWS. While the screening questions and framing of the NCVS as a crime survey may elicit fewer IPV victimizations, the methodological components used, like the bounding adjustment and the smaller reference periods, increase the reliability and validity of the survey compared to the NVAWS (Rand & Rennison, 2005). Additionally, the NVAWS was conducted over 20 years ago, so comparisons of the NCVS to the NVAWS may no longer be pertinent. New national surveys utilizing different strategies to capture IPV are needed to help establish the reliability of NCVS estimates.

The relative infrequency of IPV suggests there is also a limitation in the practicality of the information gained for the purpose of this study. IPV is important to study given that it affects over 300,000 people each year, but the prevalence of arrest for IPV may not contribute more information regarding an offender’s calculated risk of arrest simply because it is a rare event. In 2015, 0.34 IPV victims per 1,000 people in the population 12 and older reported that their offender was arrested. At that rate, it seems unlikely that an offender would be aware of another offender’s arrest. While the actions of offenders may not be influenced by the prevalence of arrest, it is still valuable to know the state of arrest for IPV within the constraints of the data.

This dissertation also provides directions for future research. Substantively, a qualitative study investigating people's perceptions of the risk of arrest for IPV may provide better insight into the deterrent calculations potential IPV offenders may use. Additionally, this study presented a descriptive analysis of the prevalence of arrest and reporting for IPV. It did not explore the potential factors affecting these outcomes, particularly the factors affecting victims' decisions to involve the police. Prior research suggests that IPV victims make rational decisions about whether to report to the police after weighing the potential costs and benefits of that action, such as the danger of the immediate situation versus future potential harm to children (Akers & Kaukinen, 2008; Meyer, 2012). There is also evidence that suggests IPV victims are more likely to report subsequent assaults to the police when officers took the victims' preferred course of action after the first incident was reported, which suggests there is a reinforcement effect consistent with social learning theory (Hickman & Simpson, 2003). Officers' ability to comply with the victims' wishes may be limited by mandatory arrest statutes, potentially explaining why reporting incidence rates were lower than prevalence rates in the current study. Community context would also be important to consider in future studies, as collective efficacy can increase the likelihood that IPV victims will disclose their victimization with sources of support, including the police (Browning, 2002).

Statistically, there is room for further examination of the standard errors used in this study. Standard errors for incidence and prevalence estimates were calculated using two different methods. Though this is the practice employed by the BJS, it may explain why some prevalence estimates significantly changed over the study period, while the corresponding incidence estimates did not. While examining whether direct variance

estimation or GVs provide more precise estimates when examining the specific domains studied here would require time consuming data restructuring, it would provide useful information for future researchers.

Finally, it may be worthwhile to expand the sample size of the NCVS to help enhance precision with the estimates for specific domains of interest. Though such an expansion would be costly, particularly because a large increase in the sample size would be needed to capture more crimes as they are rare events, it could provide further insight into the consequences of victimization. While it is currently not possible to examine trends across more specific domains given the samples sizes, future research needs to examine whether any changes in the prevalence of IPV arrest and reporting have occurred equally across different populations. Variations in either reporting or arrest for different races, ethnicities, gender identities, sexual orientations, religions, and disability statuses would have implications for service utilization and outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, J., & Love, T. P. (2014). Ethnic group differences in police notification about intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women, 20*(2), 162-185.
- Akers, C., & Kaukinen, C. (2009). The police reporting behavior of intimate partner violence victims. *Journal of Family Violence, 24*(3), 159-171.
- American Bar Association. (2014). *Domestic violence arrest policies*. Retrieved from https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/domestic_violence1/Charts/migrated_charts/2014_Domestic_Violence_Arrest_Policy_Chart..pdf
- Addington, L. A. (2005). Disentangling the effects of bounding and mobility on reports of criminal victimization. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 21*(3), 321-343.
- Addington, L. A., & Perumean-Chaney, S. E. (2014). Fatal and non-fatal intimate partner violence: What separates the men from the women for victimizations reported to police? *Homicide Studies, 18*(2), 196-220.
- Apsler, R., Cummins, M. R., & Carl, S. (2003). Perceptions of the police by female victims of domestic partner violence. *Violence Against Women, 9*(11), 1318-1335.
- Ayyub, R. (2000). Domestic violence in the South Asian Muslim immigrant population in the United States. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless, 9*(3), 237-248.
- Bachman, R. (1994). *Violence against women: A National Crime Victimization Survey report* (NCJ 145325). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Bachman, R., & Coker, A. L. (1995). Police involvement in domestic violence: The interactive effects of victim injury, offender's history of violence, and race. *Violence and Victims, 10*(2), 91-106.
- Bachman, R., & Saltzman, L. E. (1995). *Violence against women: Estimates from the redesigned survey* (NCJ 154348). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Bachman, R., & Taylor, B. M. (1994). The measurement of family violence and rape by the redesigned National Crime Victimization Survey. *Justice Quarterly, 11*(3), 499-512.
- Bard, M. (1970). *Training police as specialists in family crisis intervention*. Washington, DC: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

- Bauer, H. M., Rodriguez, M. A., Quiroga, S. S., & Flores-Ortiz, Y. G. (2000). Barriers to health care for abused Latina and Asian immigrant women. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, 11(1), 33-44.
- Baumer, E. P., & Lauritsen, J. L. (2010). Reporting crime to the police, 1973–2005: A multivariate analysis of long-term trends in the National Crime Survey (NCS) and National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). *Criminology*, 48(1), 131-185.
- Beck, C. J. A., Anderson, E. R., O'Hara, K. L., & Benjamin, G. A. H. (2013). Patterns of intimate partner violence in a large, epidemiological sample of divorcing couples. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 27(5), 743-753.
- Berk, R. A., Campbell, A., Klap, R., & Western, B. (1992). The deterrent effect of arrest in incidents of domestic violence: A Bayesian analysis of four field experiments. *American Sociological Review*, 57(5), 698-708.
- Berk, S. F., & Loseke, D. R. (1980/81). "Handling" family violence: Situational determinants of police arrest in domestic disturbances. *Law & Society Review*, 15(2), 317-346.
- Berzofsky, M., Creel, D., Moore, A., Smiley-McDonald, H., & Krebs, C. (2014). *Imputing NCVS income data*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/bjs/grants/248563.pdf>
- Biderman, A. D., & Cantor, D. (1984). *A longitudinal analysis of bounding, respondent conditioning and mobility as sources of panel bias in the National Crime Survey*. Retrieved from https://www2.amstat.org/sections/srms/Proceedings/papers/1984_134.pdf
- Boba, R., & Lilley, D. (2009). Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) funding: A nationwide assessment of effects on rape and assault. *Violence Against Women*, 15(2), 168-185.
- Bonomi, A. E., Thompson, R. S., Anderson, M., Reid, R. J., Carrell, D., Dimer, J. A., & Rivara, F. P. (2006). Intimate partner violence and women's physical, mental, and social functioning. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 30(6), 458-466.
- Brame, R., Turner, M. G., Paternoster, R. (2017). Surveying residential burglaries: A case study of local-level crime measurement. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 28(9), 918-940.
- Brown, B., & Benedict, W. R. (2002). Perceptions of the police: Past findings, methodological issues, conceptual issues and policy implications. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 25(3), 543-580.

- Browning, C. R. (2002). The span of collective efficacy: Extending social disorganization theory to partner violence. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64(4), 833-850.
- Bui, H. N. (2003). Help-seeking behavior among abused immigrant women: A case of Vietnamese American women. *Violence Against Women*, 9(2), 207-239.
- Bui, H. N., & Morash, M. (1999). Domestic violence in the Vietnamese immigrant community: An exploratory study. *Violence Against Women*, 5(7), 769-795.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (n.d.a). *Data collection: National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS)*. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=dcdetail&iid=245>
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (n.d.b). *Supporting documents, participation rates*. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=nvat>
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2014). *National Crime Victimization Survey: Technical documentation* (NCJ 247252). Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ncvstd13.pdf>
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2017). *National Crime Victimization Survey, 2016: Technical documentation* (NCJ 251442). Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ncvstd16.pdf>
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2018). *National Crime Victimization Survey, concatenated file, [United States], 1992–2016* (ICPSR 36834) [data files and codebook]. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor]. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR36834.v1>
- Buzawa, E. S., & Buzawa, C. G. (1990). *Domestic violence: The criminal justice response*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Buzawa, E. S., Buzawa, C. G., & Stark, E. D. (2017). Mandated institutional change. *Responding to Domestic Violence: The Integration of Criminal Justice and Human Services* (5th ed., pp. 279-317). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Calton, J. M., Cattaneo, L. B., & Gebhard, K. T. (2016). Barriers to help seeking for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer survivors of intimate partner violence. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 17(5), 585-600.
- Catalano, S. (2012). *Intimate partner violence, 1993-2010* (NCJ 239203). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Catalano, S. (2013). *Intimate partner violence: Attributes of victimization, 1993-2011* (NCJ 243300). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

- Catalano, S. (2016). *Interviewing conditions in the National Crime Victimization Survey, 1993–2013* (NCJ 249682). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Catalano, S., Smith, E., Snyder, H., & Rand, M. (2009). *Female victims of violence* (NCJ 228356). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2017). *Intimate Partner Violence*. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/index.html>
- Cherubino da Siena. (1888). *Regola della vita matrimoniale* [The rules of married life]. F. Zambrini & C. Negrone (Eds.). Bologna, Italy: Presso Romagnoli-Dall'Acqua.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (2006). Patriarchy, crime, and justice: Feminist criminology in an era of backlash. *Feminist Criminology*, 1(1), 6-26.
- Coker, A. L., Davis, K. E., Arias, I., Desai, S., Sanderson, M., Brandt, H. M., & Smith, P. H. (2002). Physical and mental health effects of intimate partner violence for men and women. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 23(4), 260-268.
- Coker, A. L., Smith, P. H., Bethea, L., King, M. R., & McKeown, R. E. (2000). Physical health consequences of physical and psychological intimate partner violence. *Archives of Family Medicine*, 9(5), 451-457.
- Coker, A. L., & Stasny, E. A. (1994). *Adjusting the National Crime Victimization Survey's estimates of rape and domestic violence for "gag" factors* (NCJ 173061). Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/Photocopy/173061NCJRS.pdf>
- Conaway, M. R., & Lohr, S. L. (1994). A longitudinal analysis of factors associated with reporting violent crimes to the police. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 10(1), 23-39.
- Congress.gov. (n.d.). *H.R. 1585 – Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019*. Retrieved July 16, 2019, from <https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-bill/1585/text>
- Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design & analysis issues for field settings*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Couzens, G. L., Shook-Sa, B., Lee, P., & Berzofsky, M. (n.d.). *Users' guide to the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) generalized variance functions*. Retrieved from https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/GVF_Users_Guide.pdf
- Dasgupta, S. D., & Warrier, S. (1996). In the footsteps of "Arundhati": Asian Indian women's experience of domestic violence in the United States. *Violence Against Women*, 2(3), 238-259.

- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Dodge, R. W. (1987). *Series crimes: Report of a field test* (NCJ 104615). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Dugan, L. (2003). Domestic violence legislation: Exploring its impact on the likelihood of domestic violence, police involvement, and arrest. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 2(2), 283-312.
- Dunford, F. W., Huizinga, D., & Elliott, D. S. (1990). The role of arrest in domestic assault: The Omaha Police Experiment. *Criminology*, 28(2), 183-206.
- Engels, F. (1972). *The origin of the family, private property and the state: In the light of researches of Lewis H. Morgan*. New York, NY: International Publishers. (Original work published in 1884).
- Erez, E., Adelman, M., & Gregory, C. (2009). Intersections of immigration and domestic violence: Voices of battered immigrant women. *Feminist Criminology*, 4(1), 32-56.
- Evans, S. (1980). *Personal politics: The roots of women's liberation in the civil rights movement & the new left*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Feder, L. (1997). Domestic violence and police response in a pro-arrest jurisdiction. *Women & Crime*, 8(4), 79-98.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2015). *Murder circumstances by relationship, 2015*. Retrieved from https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2015/crime-in-the-u.s.-2015/tables/expanded_homicide_data_table_10_murder_circumstances_by_relationship_2015.xls
- Felson, R. B., Ackerman, J. M., & Gallagher, C. A. (2005). Police intervention and the repeat of domestic assault. *Criminology*, 43(3), 563-588.
- Felson, R. B., Messner, S. F., & Hoskin, A. (1999). The victim-offender relationship and calling the police in assaults. *Criminology*, 37(4), 931-948.
- Felson, R. B., Messner, S. F., Hoskin, A. W., & Deane, G. (2002). Reasons for reporting and not reporting domestic violence to the police. *Criminology*, 40(3), 617-648.
- Felson, R. B., & Paré, P. (2005). The reporting of domestic violence and sexual assault by nonstrangers to the police. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(3), 597-610.

- Flicker, S. M., Cerulli, C., Zhao, X., Tang, W., Watts, A., Zia, Y., & Talbot, N. L. (2011). Concomitant forms of abuse and help-seeking behavior among white, African American, and Latina women who experience intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women, 17*(8), 1067-1085.
- Frye, V., Haviland, M., & Rajah, V. (2007). Dual arrest and other unintended consequences of mandatory arrest in New York City: A brief report. *Journal of Family Violence, 22*(6), 397-405.
- Fugate, M., Landis, L., Riordan, K., Naureckas, S., & Engel, B. (2005). Barriers to domestic violence help seeking. *Violence Against Women, 11*(3), 290-310.
- Garner, J., & Clemmer, E. (1986). *Danger to police in domestic disturbances – a new look* (NCJ 102634). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Gaquin, D. A. (1977/78). Spouse abuse: Data from the National Crime Survey. *Victimology: An International Journal, 2*(3-4), 632-643.
- Gelles, R. J. (1987). *The violent home*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gerstenberger, C. B., & Williams, K. R. (2013). Gender and intimate partner violence: Does dual arrest reveal gender symmetry or asymmetry? *Journal of Intimate Partner Violence, 28*(8), 1561-1578.
- Gough, K. (1971). The origin of the family. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 33*(4), 760-771.
- Gover, A. R. (2013). Introduction: Special issue on dating violence and gender. *Women & Criminal Justice, 23*(3), 163-166.
- Gover, A. R., Brank, E. M., & MacDonald, J. M. (2007). A specialized domestic violence court in South Carolina: An example of procedural justice for victims and defendants. *Violence Against Women, 13*(6), 603-626.
- Gover, A. R., Paul, D. P., & Dodge, M. (2011). Law enforcement officers' attitudes about domestic violence. *Violence Against Women, 17*(5), 619-636.
- Gover, A. R., Tomsich, E. A., & Richards, T. N. (2015). Victimization and help-seeking among survivors of intimate partner violence. *Oxford Handbooks Online*. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935383.013.58
- Gracia, E., García, F., & Lila, M. (2014). Male police officers' law enforcement preferences in cases of intimate partner violence versus non-intimate interpersonal violence: Do sexist attitudes and empathy matter?. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 41*(10), 1195-1213.

- Greenfeld, L. A., Rand, M. R., Craven, D., Klaus, P. A., Perkins, C. A., Ringel, C., ... Fox, J. A. (1998). *Violence by intimates: Analysis of data on crimes by current or former spouses, boyfriends, and girlfriends* (NCJ 167237). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Greenfeld, L. A., & Snell, T. L. (1999). *Women offenders* (NCJ 175688). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Harlow, C. W. (1991). *Female victims of violence crime* (NCJ 126826). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Hart, T. C. (2006). *Respondent fatigue in self-report victim surveys: Examining a source of nonsampling error from three perspectives* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/2551>
- Hart, T. C., Rennison, C. M., & Gibson, C. (2005). Revisiting respondent “fatigue bias” in the National Crime Victimization Survey. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 21(3), 345-363.
- Hickman, L. J., & Simpson, S. S. (2003). Fair treatment or preferred outcome? The impact of police behavior on victim reports of domestic violence incidents. *Law & Society Review*, 37(3), 607-634.
- Hindelang, M. J. (1974). The Uniform Crime Reports revisited. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 2(1), 1-17.
- Hirschel, D. (2008). *Domestic violence cases: What research shows about arrest and dual arrest rates*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/222679.pdf>
- Hirschel, D., & Buzawa, E. (2002). Understanding the context of dual arrest with directions for future research. *Violence Against Women*, 8(12), 1449-1473.
- Hirschel, D., Buzawa, E., Pattavina, A., & Faggiani, D. (2007). Domestic violence and mandatory arrest laws: To what extent do they influence police arrest decisions?. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 98(1), 255-298.
- Hirschel, D., Buzawa, E., Pattavina, A., Faggiani, D., & Reuland, M. (2007). *Explaining the prevalence, context, and consequences of dual arrest in intimate partner cases*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/218355.pdf#page=103>
- Hirschel, J. D., Hutchinson, I. W., III, & Dean, C. W. (1992). The failure of arrest to deter spouse abuse. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 29(1), 7-33.
- Hirschel, D., McCormack, P. D., & Buzawa, E. (2017). A 10-year study of the impact of intimate partner violence primary aggressor laws on single and dual arrest.

Journal of Interpersonal Violence. Advance online publication. doi:
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517739290>

- Ho, C. K. (1990). An analysis of domestic violence in Asian American communities: A multicultural approach to counseling. *Women & Therapy, 9*(1-2), 129-150.
- Houston, C. (2014). How feminist theory became (criminal) law: Tracing the path to mandatory criminal intervention in domestic violence cases. *Michigan Journal of Gender & Law, 21*(2), 217-272.
- Hutchison, I. W. (2003). Substance use and abused women's utilization of the police. *Journal of Family Violence, 18*(2), 93-106.
- Hutchison, I. W., & Hirschel, J. D. (1998). Abused women: Help-seeking strategies and police utilization. *Violence Against Women, 4*(4), 436-456.
- Ingram, E. M. (2007). A comparison of help seeking between Latino and non-Latino victims of intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women, 13*(2), 159-171.
- Johnson, I. M. (1990). A loglinear analysis of abused wives' decisions to call the police in domestic-violence disputes. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 18*(2), 147-159.
- Johnson, I. M. (2007). Victims' perceptions of police response to domestic violence incidents. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 35*(5), 498-510.
- Johnson, M. P. (1995). Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: Two forms of violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 57*(2), 283-294.
- Johnson, M. P. (2006). Conflict and control: Gender symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence. *Violence Against Women, 12*(11), 1003-1018.
- Johnson, M. P. (2008). *A typology of domestic violence: Intimate terrorism, violent resistance, and situational couple violence*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Johnson, M. P., Leone, J. L., & Xu, Y. (2014). Intimate terrorism and situational couple violence in general surveys: Ex-spouses required. *Violence Against Women, 20*(2), 186-207.
- Johnson, R. R. (2010). Making domestic violence arrests: A test of expectancy theory. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 33*(3), 531-547.
- Karlsen, C. F. (1987). *The devil in the shape of a woman: Witchcraft in colonial New England*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

- Kaufman Kantor, G., & Straus, M. A. (1990). Response of victims and the police to assaults on wives. In M. A. Straus, & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families* (pp. 473-487). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Kaukinen, C. (2002a). The help-seeking decisions of violent crime victims: An examination of the direct and conditional effects of gender and the victim-offender relationship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*(4), 432-456.
- Kaukinen, C. (2002b). The help-seeking of women violent crime victims: Findings from the Canadian Violence Against Women Survey. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 22*(7/8), 5-44.
- Kelly, J. B., & Johnson, M. P. (2008). Differentiation among types of intimate partner violence: Research update and implications for interventions. *Family Court Review, 46*(3), 476-499.
- Klaus, P. A., & Rand, M. R. (1984). *Family violence* (NCJ 93449). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Konig, D. T. (1978). Editor's introduction: A guide to the use of the Plymouth court records. *Plymouth Court Records, 1686-1859* (pp. 1-138). Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc.
- Kruttschnitt, C., Kalsbeek, W. D., & House, C. C. (Eds.). (2014). National Crime Victimization Survey, *Estimating the incidence of rape and sexual assault* (pp. 49-70). Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Kuehnle, K., & Sullivan, A. (2003). Gay and lesbian victimization: Reporting factors in domestic violence and bias incidents. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 30*(1), 85-96.
- Langan, P. A., & Innes, C. A. (1986). *Preventing domestic violence against women* (NCJ 102037). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Langton, L., Berzofsky, M., Krebs, C., & Smiley-McDonald, H. (2012). *Victimizations not reported to the Police, 2006-2010* (NCJ 238536). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Lauritsen, J. L., Owens, J. G., Planty, M., Rand, M. R., & Truman, J. L. (2012). *Methods for counting high-frequency repeat victimizations in the National Crime Victimization Survey* (NCJ 237308). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

- Lauritsen, J. L., & Rezey, M. L. (2013). *Measuring the prevalence of crime with the National Crime Victimization Survey* (NCJ 241656). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Leacock, E. B. (1972). Introduction. *The origin of the family, private property and the state: In the light of the researches of Lewis H. Morgan* (pp. 7-67). New York, NY: International Publishers.
- Lee, J., Zhang, Y., & Hoover, L. T. (2013). Police response to domestic violence: Multilevel factors of arrest decision. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 36(1), 157-174.
- Lee, M., & Au, P. (2007). Chinese battered women in North America: Their experiences and treatment. In A. R. Roberts (Ed.), *Battered women and their families: Intervention strategies and treatment programs* (3rd ed.; pp. 529-562). New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.
- Lehnen, R. G., & Reiss, A. J. (1978). Response effects in the National Crime Survey. *Victimology*, 3(1-2), 110-122.
- Lipsky, S., Caetano, R., Field, C. A., & Larkin, G. L. (2006). The role of intimate partner violence, race, and ethnicity in help-seeking behaviors. *Ethnicity and Health*, 11(1), 81-100.
- Martin, D. (1976). *Battered wives*. San Francisco, CA: Glide Publications.
- Martin, M. E. (1997). Double your trouble: Dual arrest in family violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 12(2), 139-157.
- Massey, D. S. (1990). American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass. *American Journal of Sociology*, 96(2), 329-357.
- Massey, D. S. (2004). Segregation and stratification: A biosocial perspective. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race*, 1(1), 7-25.
- Maxwell, C. D., Garner, J. H., & Fagan, J. A. (2002). The preventative effects of arrest on intimate partner violence: Research, policy and theory. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 2(1), 51-80.
- Meyer, S. (2012). Why women stay: A theoretical examination of rational choice and moral reasoning in the context of intimate partner violence. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 45(2), 179-193.
- Miccio, G. K. (2005). A house divided: Mandatory arrest, domestic violence, and the conservation of the battered women's movement. *Houston Law Review*, 42(2), 237-323.

- Modi, M. N., Palmer, S., & Armstrong, A. (2014). The role of Violence Against Women Act in addressing intimate partner violence: A public health issue. *Journal of Women's Health*, 23(3), 253-259.
- Morgan, R. E., & Kena, G. (2017). *Criminal victimization, 2016* (NCJ 251150). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Nelson, W. E. (1978). Introductory essay: The larger context of litigation in Plymouth County, 1725–1825. *Plymouth Court Records, 1686–1859* (pp. 1–138). Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc.
- Neter, J., & Waksberg, J. (1964). A study of response errors in expenditures data from household interviews. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 59(305), 18-55.
- O'Faolain, J., & Martines, L. (1973). *Not in God's image: Women in history from the Greeks to the Victorians*. New York, NY: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Office on Violence Against Women. (2016). *Twenty years of the Violence Against Women Act: Dispatches from the Field*. Retrieved from <https://www.justice.gov/ovw/file/866576/download>
- Okun, L. (1986). *Woman abuse: Facts replacing myths*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Ollen, E. W., Ameral, V. E., Reed, K. P., & Hines, D. A. (2017). Sexual minority college students' perceptions on dating violence and sexual assault. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 64(1) 112-119.
- Oppenlander, N. (1982). Coping or copping out. *Criminology*, 20(3-4), 449-465.
- Parnas, R. I. (1967). The police response to the domestic disturbance. *Wisconsin Law Review*, 1967(4), 914-960.
- Pate, A. M., & Hamilton, E. E. (1992). Formal and informal deterrents to domestic violence: The Dade County Spouse Assault Experiment. *American Sociological Review*, 57(5), 691-697.
- Paternoster, R., Brame, R., Bachman, R., & Sherman, L. W. (1997). Do fair procedures matter? The effect of procedural justice on spouse assault. *Law & Society Review*, 31(1), 163-204.
- Pence, E., & Paymar, M. (1993). *Education groups for men who batter: The Duluth Model*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.

- Penick, B. K. E. (Ed.). (1976). *Surveying crime*. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences.
- Planty, M., & Langton, L. (2014). *The nation's two crime measures* (NCJ 246832). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Planty, M., & Strom, K. J. (2007). Understanding the role of repeat victims in the production of annual US victimization rates. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 23(3), 179-200.
- Pleck, E. (1983). Feminist responses to "crimes against women," 1868-1896. *Signs*, 8(3), 451-470.
- Pleck, E. (1987). *Domestic tyranny: The making of social policy against family violence from colonial times to the present*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Pleck, E. (1989). Criminal approaches to family violence, 1640 – 1980. *Crime & Justice*, 11, 19-57.
- Rand, M. R., & Rennison, C. M. (2005). Bigger is not necessarily better: An analysis of violence against women estimates from the National Crime Victimization Survey and the National Violence Against Women Survey. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 21(3), 267-291.
- Reaves, B. A. (2017). *Police response to domestic violence, 2006-2015* (NCJ 250231). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Reina, A. S., Lohman, B. J., Maldonado, M. M. (2014). "He said they'd deport me": Factors influencing domestic violence help-seeking practices among Latina immigrants. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(4), 593-615.
- Rennison, C. M. (2001). *Intimate partner violence and age of victim, 1993-99* (NCJ 187635). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Rennison, C. M., & Welchans, S. (2000). *Intimate partner violence* (NCJ 178247). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Robinson, A. L., & Chandek, M. S. (2000). The domestic violence arrest decision: Examining demographic, attitudinal, and situational variables. *Crime & Delinquency*, 46(1), 18-37.
- Rubin, D. B. (1976). Inference and missing data. *Biometrika*, 63(3), 581-592.
- Sampson, R. J. (2010). Gold standard myths: Observations on the experimental turn in quantitative criminology. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 26(4), 489-500.

- Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 277(5328), 918-924.
- Saphire, D. G. (1984). Estimation of victimization prevalence using data from the National Crime Survey. In D. Brillinger, S. Fienberg, J. Gani, J. Hartigan, & K. Krickeberg (Series Eds.), *Lecture Notes in Statistics* (Vol. 23). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Schultz, L. G. (1960). The wife assaulter. *Journal of Social Therapy*, 6, 103-111.
- Shannon-Lewy, C., & Dull, V. T. (2005). The response of the Christian clergy to domestic violence: Help or hinderance?. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 10(6), 647-659.
- Sherman, L. W. (1992). The influence of criminology on criminal law: Evaluating arrests for misdemeanor domestic violence. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 83(1), 1-45.
- Sherman, L. W., & Berk, R. A. (1984). The specific deterrent effects of arrest for domestic assault. *American Sociological Review*, 49(2), 261-272.
- Sherman, L. W., & Cohn, E. G. (1989). The impact of research on legal policy: The Minneapolis domestic violence experiment. *Law and Society Review*, 23(1), 117-144.
- Sherman, L. W., Schmidt, J. D., Rogan, D. P., Gartin, P. R., Cohn, E. G., Collins, D. J., & Bacich, A. R. (1991). From initial deterrence to long-term escalation: Short-custody arrest for poverty ghetto domestic violence. *Criminology*, 29(4), 821-850.
- Sherman, L. W., Smith, D. A., Schmidt, J. D., & Rogan, D. P. (1992). Crime, punishment, and stake in conformity: Legal and informal control of domestic violence. *American Sociological Review*, 57(5), 680-690.
- Siddique, Z. (2013). Partially identified treatment effects under imperfect compliance: The case of domestic violence. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 108(502), 504-513.
- Skiff, D., Horwitz, S. H., LaRussa-Trott, M. L., Pearson, J., & Santiago, L. (2008). Engaging the clergy in addressing the impact of partner violence and their faith communities. *Journal of Spirituality in Mental Health*, 10(2), 101-118.
- Skogan, W. G. (1981). *Issues in the measurement of victimization* (NCJ 74682). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Snell, J. E., Rosenwald, R. J., & Robey, A. (1964). The wifebeater's wife: A study of family interaction. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 11(2), 107-112.

- State v. Oliver, 70 N. C. 60 (1874).
- State v. Rhodes, 61 N. C. 453 (1868).
- Steinmetz, S. K. (1977/78). The battered husband syndrome. *Victimology: An International Journal*, 2(3-4), 499-509.
- Straus, M. A. (1977/78). Wife beating: How common and why?. *Victimology: An International Journal*, 2(3-4), 443-458.
- Straus, M. A., (1990a). Injury and frequency of assault and the “representative sample fallacy” in measuring wife beating and child abuse. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families* (pp. 75–89). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publications.
- Straus, M. A., (1990b). The National Family Violence Surveys. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families* (pp. 3–16). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publications.
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law & Society Review*, 37(3), 513-548.
- Tatum, K. M., & Pence, R. (2015). Factors that affect the arrest decision in domestic violence cases. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 38(1), 56-70.
- Taylor, B. M. (1989). *New directions for the National Crime Survey* (NCJ 115571). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Terrill, W., & Paoline, E. A., III. (2007). Nonarrest decision making in police-citizen encounters. *Police Quarterly*, 10(3), 308-331.
- Thompson, M. P., & Kingree, J. B. (2006). The roles of victim and perpetrator alcohol use intimate partner violence outcomes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21(2), 163-177.
- Thompson, R. S., Bonomi, A. E., Anderson, M., Reid, R. J., Dimer, J. A., Carrell, D., & Rivara, F. P. (2006). Intimate partner violence: Prevalence, types, and chronicity in adult women. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 30(6), 447-457.

- Thornberry, T. P., & Krohn, M. D. (2003). Comparison of self-report and official data for measuring crime. In J. V. Pepper & C. V. Petrie (Eds.), *Measurement problems in criminal justice research: Workshop summary* (pp. 43-94). Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Ting, L. (2010). Out of Africa: Coping strategies of African immigrant women survivors of intimate partner violence. *Health Care for Women International*, 31(4), 345-364.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). Prevalence and consequences of male-to-female and female-to-male intimate partner violence as measured by the National Violence Against Women Survey. *Violence Against Women*, 6(2), 142-161.
- Tourangeau, R., & McNeeley, M. E. (2003). Measuring crime and crime victimization: Methodological issues. In J. V. Pepper & C. V. Petrie (Eds.), *Measurement problems in criminal justice research: Workshop summary* (pp. 10-42). Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Truman, J. L., & Morgan, R. E. (2016). *Criminal victimization, 2015* (NCJ 250180). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why people obey the law*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2015). *Annual estimates of the resident population for selected age groups by sex for the United States, states, counties, and Puerto Rico commonwealth and municipios: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2015*. Retrieved from https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=PEP_2015_PEPAGESEX&prodType=table
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2012). *National Crime Victimization Survey: CAPI interviewing manual for field representatives*. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/manual12.pdf>
- Vidales, G. T. (2010). Arrested justice: The multifaceted plight of immigrant Latinas who faced domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 25(6), 533-544.
- Waldo, G. P., & Chiricos, T. G. (1972). Perceived penal sanction and self-reported criminality: A neglected approach to deterrence research. *Social Problems*, 19(4), 522-540.
- Walker, L. E. (1977/78). Battered women and learned helplessness. *Victimology: An International Journal*, 2(3-4), 525-534.
- Wilson, W. J. (1987/2012). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

- Wolf, M. E., Ly, U., Hobart, M. A., & Kernic, M. A. (2003). Barriers to seeking police help for intimate partner violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 18*(2), 121-129.
- Wolter, K. M. (2007). *Introduction to variance estimation* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Springer Science+Business Media.
- Xie, M., & Lynch, L. P. (2017). The effects of arrest, reporting to the police, and victim services on intimate partner violence. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 54*(3), 338-378.
- Xie, M., Pogarsky, G., Lynch, J. P., & McDowall, D. (2006). Prior police contact and subsequent victim reporting: Results from the NCVS. *Justice Quarterly, 23*(4), 481-501.
- Yu, Q., Stasny, E. A., & Li, B. (2008). Bayesian models to adjust for response bias in survey data for estimating rape and domestic violence rates from the NCVS. *The Annals of Applied Statistics, 2*(2), 665-686.
- Zelcer, A. M. (2014). Battling domestic violence: Replacing mandatory arrest laws with a trifecta of preferential arrest, officer education, and batterer treatment programs. *American Criminal Law Review, 52*(2), 541-561.
- Zlotnick, C., Johnson, D. M., & Kohn, R. (2006). Intimate partner violence and long-term psychosocial functioning in a national sample of American women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21*(2), 262-275.

APPENDIX A

EXAMPLE SCREENING QUESTIONS IN THE NCS AND THE NCVS

Table A.1

Example Changes to Screening Questions for Violent Crime after the Redesign

<i>NCS</i>	<i>NCVS</i>
1. Did anyone beat you up, attack you, or hit with something, such as a rock or bottle?	1. Has anyone attacked or threatened you in any of these ways— a. With any weapon, for instance, a gun or knife— b. With anything like a baseball bat, frying pan, scissors, or stick— c. By something thrown, such as a rock or bottle— d. Include any grabbing, punching, or choking, e. Any rape, attempted rape or other type of sexual assault— f. Any face to face threats— OR g. Any attack or threat or use of force by anyone at all? Please mention it even if you were not certain it was a crime.
2. Were you knifed, shot at, or attacked with some other weapon by anyone at all?	
3. Did anyone THREATEN to beat you up or THREATEN you with a knife, gun, or some other weapon, NOT including telephone threats?	
4. Did anyone TRY to attack you in some other way?	2. Incidents involving forced or unwanted sexual acts are often difficult to talk about. Have you been forced or coerced to engage in unwanted sexual activity by— a. Someone you didn't know before b. A casual acquaintance OR c. Someone you know well?

Note. Table does not include all screening questions for the NCS or NCVS. Adapted from *Violence against Women: Estimates from the Redesigned Survey* (p. 8), by R. Bachman and L. E. Saltzman, 1995, Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Table A.2

Example Changes to Screening Questions for All Types of Crime after the Redesign

<i>NCS</i>	<i>NCVS</i>
1. Was anything stolen from you while you were away from home, for instance, at work, in a theater or restaurant, or while traveling?	1. People often don't think of incidents committed by someone they know. Did you have something stolen from you OR were you attacked or threatened by— a. Someone at work or school— b. A neighbor or friend— c. A relative or family member— d. Any other person you've met or known?
2. Did you call the police to report something that happened to YOU that you thought was a crime?	2. Did you call the police to report something that happened to YOU which you thought was a crime?
3. Did anything happen to YOU that you thought was a crime, but did NOT report to the police?	3. Did anything happen to you which you thought was a crime, but did not report to the police?

Note. Table does not include all screening questions for the NCS or NCVS. Adapted from *Violence against Women: Estimates from the Redesigned Survey* (p. 8), by R. Bachman and L. E. Saltzman, 1995, Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

APPENDIX B

NCVS SAMPLE SIZES

Table B.1
Sample Sizes and Response Rates

Year	Eligible Households Sampled	Households Interviewed	Household Response Rate (%)	Eligible Persons Sampled	Persons Interviewed	Person Response Rate (%)
1994	99,817	94,978	95.2	196,865	181,205	92.0
1995	100,824	95,504	94.7	197,366	179,816	91.1
1996	97,692	90,779	92.9	188,010	170,655	90.8
1997	90,536	85,821	94.8	177,603	158,939	89.5
1998	91,402	86,309	94.4	177,654	157,797	88.8
1999	91,831	85,789	93.4	175,524	155,501	88.6
2000	92,934	86,800	93.4	177,924	159,420	89.6
2001	93,935	87,360	93.0	179,059	159,900	89.3
2002	91,669	84,685	92.4	174,252	152,105	87.3
2003	91,296	83,659	91.6	172,703	149,040	86.3
2004	92,423	84,361	91.3	173,796	148,577	85.5
2005	85,072	77,224	91.0	158,988	134,041	84.3
2006	83,604	75,979	90.9	157,108	135,264	86.1
2007	91,774	82,905	90.3	170,869	147,296	86.2
2008	84,186	76,128	90.4	155,704	134,179	86.2
2009	84,410	77,455	91.8	157,796	137,329	87.0
2010	88,823	81,948	92.3	167,444	146,567	87.5
2011	88,583	79,802	90.1	162,867	143,122	87.9
2012	106,720	92,389	86.6	187,684	162,937	86.8
2013	107,378	90,629	84.4	182,699	160,044	87.6
2014	108,204	90,379	83.5	181,178	158,089	87.3
2015	117,324	95,758	81.6	189,711	163,879	86.4

Note. From *Supporting Documents, Participation Rates*, by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=nvat>

APPENDIX C

NCVS ROTATING PANEL DESIGN

NCVS ROTATION CHART January 2012-December 2014												
Year/Month	J25				J26				J27			
2012 JAN	13	14	15	16	11	12	13					
FEB	23	24	25	26	21	22	23					
MAR	33	34	35	36	31	32	33					
APR	43	44	45	46	41	42	43					
MAY	53	54	55	56	51	52	53					
JUNE	63	64	65	66	61	62	63					
JULY		14	15	16	11	12	13	14				
AUG		24	25	26	21	22	23	24				
SEPT		34	35	36	31	32	33	34				
OCT		44	45	46	41	42	43	44				
NOV		54	55	56	51	52	53	54				
DEC		64	65	66	61	62	63	64				
2013 JAN			15	16	11	12	13	14	15			
FEB			25	26	21	22	23	24	25			
MAR			35	36	31	32	33	34	35			
APR			45	46	41	42	43	44	45			
MAY			55	56	51	52	53	54	55			
JUNE			65	66	61	62	63	64	65			
JULY				16	11	12	13	14	15	16		
AUG				26	21	22	23	24	25	26		
SEPT				36	31	32	33	34	35	36		
OCT				46	41	42	43	44	45	46		
NOV				56	51	52	53	54	55	56		
DEC				66	61	62	63	64	65	66		
2014 JAN					11	12	13	14	15	16	11	
FEB					21	22	23	24	25	26	21	
MAR					31	32	33	34	35	36	31	
APR					41	42	43	44	45	46	41	
MAY					51	52	53	54	55	56	51	
JUNE					61	62	63	64	65	66	61	
JULY						12	13	14	15	16	11	12
AUG						22	23	24	25	26	21	22
SEPT						32	33	34	35	36	31	32
OCT						42	43	44	45	46	41	42
NOV						52	53	54	55	56	51	52
DEC						62	63	64	65	66	61	62

Figure C.1. Example of the NCVS rotating panel design. The first digit in a pair of numbers indicates the panel, while the second digit indicates the rotation group. From *National Crime Victimization Survey: Technical Documentation* (p. 11), by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2014.

APPENDIX D

DATA FOR RESULTS FIGURES

Table D.1
Incidence and Prevalence of IPV

Year	Prevalence Weighted <i>N</i>	Prevalence Rate (SE)	Incidence Weighted <i>N</i>	Incidence Rate (SE)
1994	648,624	3.04 (0.16)	2,031,066	9.53 (0.73)
1995	608,029	2.83 (0.16)	1,979,199	9.20 (0.72)
1996	546,377	2.52 (0.16)	1,731,940	7.97 (0.72)
1997	593,642	2.70 (0.19)	1,779,217	8.09 (0.79)
1998	626,637	2.82 (0.21)	1,507,127	6.79 (0.67)
1999	501,580	2.23 (0.17)	1,356,683	6.04 (0.65)
2000	425,273	1.88 (0.16)	873,025	3.85 (0.48)
2001	430,479	1.88 (0.15)	1,060,090	4.62 (0.49)
2002	362,462	1.57 (0.14)	902,850	3.90 (0.51)
2003	347,134	1.45 (0.15)	984,760	4.12 (0.49)
2004	401,884	1.66 (0.16)	980,772	4.06 (0.43)
2005	323,057	1.32 (0.15)	743,986	3.04 (0.40)
2006	455,448	1.84 (0.14)	1,279,706	5.18 (0.55)
2007	369,656	1.48 (0.13)	888,146	3.55 (0.45)
2008	367,649	1.46 (0.13)	1,073,173	4.25 (0.53)
2009	425,378	1.67 (0.15)	1,030,389	4.05 (0.56)
2010	344,820	1.35 (0.12)	759,038	2.97 (0.43)
2011	361,911	1.41 (0.13)	789,885	3.07 (0.40)
2012	385,498	1.47 (0.13)	808,494	3.09 (0.36)
2013	369,305	1.40 (0.12)	738,731	2.79 (0.42)
2014	319,950	1.20 (0.12)	623,672	2.34 (0.33)
2015	310,094	1.15 (0.13)	796,388	2.95 (0.40)

Table D.2
Incidence and Prevalence of Reporting

Year	Prevalence Weighted <i>N</i>	Prevalence Rate (SE)	Incidence Weighted <i>N</i>	Incidence Rate (SE)
1994	351,527	54.20 (2.77)	1,016,785	50.06 (2.93)
1995	370,350	60.91 (2.79)	962,653	48.64 (2.91)
1996	312,393	57.18 (2.82)	828,857	47.86 (3.27)
1997	359,216	60.51 (3.18)	828,523	46.57 (3.62)
1998	390,214	62.27 (3.65)	806,587	53.52 (3.55)
1999	318,681	63.54 (3.29)	648,876	47.83 (3.96)
2000	296,128	69.63 (3.74)	455,610	52.19 (4.52)
2001	271,357	63.04 (3.99)	574,886	54.23 (4.04)
2002	215,303	59.40 (4.05)	516,185	57.17 (4.69)
2003	223,813	64.47 (4.39)	575,583	58.45 (4.41)
2004	264,988	65.94 (4.42)	544,939	55.56 (4.13)
2005	211,937	65.60 (4.78)	409,443	55.03 (5.00)
2006	302,740	66.47 (3.75)	568,342	44.41 (3.93)
2007	221,381	59.89 (3.92)	442,299	49.80 (4.27)
2008	235,418	64.03 (3.93)	617,976	57.58 (4.85)
2009	299,089	70.31 (3.73)	587,026	56.97 (5.08)
2010	252,267	73.16 (4.08)	496,799	65.45 (5.09)
2011	241,226	66.65 (4.04)	486,649	61.61 (4.69)
2012	255,090	66.17 (4.14)	430,551	53.25 (4.69)
2013	241,008	65.26 (4.55)	419,264	56.75 (5.35)
2014	204,291	63.85 (5.02)	358,418	57.47 (5.40)
2015	215,180	69.39 (4.07)	428,609	53.82 (5.21)

Table D.3
Incidence and Prevalence of Arrest

Year	Prevalence Weighted <i>N</i>	Prevalence Rate (SE)	Incidence Weighted <i>N</i>	Incidence Rate (SE)
1994	123,362	19.02 (1.93)	364,238	17.93 (2.05)
1995	125,670	20.67 (2.44)	256,335	12.95 (1.70)
1996	118,904	21.76 (2.54)	250,383	14.46 (2.02)
1997	141,619	23.86 (2.38)	297,232	16.71 (2.43)
1998	137,590	21.96 (2.95)	340,503	22.59 (2.68)
1999	99,833	19.90 (3.04)	230,139	16.96 (2.68)
2000	134,277	31.57 (3.91)	183,034	20.97 (3.34)
2001	107,957	25.08 (3.28)	267,499	25.23 (3.29)
2002	97,676	26.95 (3.74)	178,512	19.77 (3.33)
2003	134,894	38.86 (4.84)	255,422	25.94 (3.62)
2004	116,720	29.04 (3.75)	236,540	24.12 (3.33)
2005	81,751	25.31 (4.65)	147,027	19.76 (3.67)
2006	145,183	31.88 (3.97)	232,926	18.20 (2.82)
2007	89,493	24.21 (3.80)	133,669	15.05 (2.53)
2008	84,448	22.97 (3.94)	253,147	23.59 (3.90)
2009	131,810	30.99 (4.14)	245,067	23.78 (4.00)
2010	119,945	34.78 (4.39)	239,624	31.57 (4.58)
2011	77,283	21.35 (4.34)	136,728	17.31 (3.21)
2012	115,563	29.98 (3.40)	180,819	22.36 (3.69)
2013	110,002	29.79 (4.09)	219,973	29.78 (4.59)
2014	89,416	27.95 (4.24)	116,478	18.68 (3.88)
2015	92,450	29.81 (4.37)	141,364	17.75 (3.63)

Table D.4
Incidence and Prevalence of Arrest after Reporting

Year	Prevalence Weighted <i>N</i>	Prevalence Rate (SE)	Incidence Weighted <i>N</i>	Incidence Rate (SE)
1994	123,362	35.09 (3.17)	364,238	35.82 (3.52)
1995	125,670	33.93 (3.92)	256,335	26.63 (3.11)
1996	118,904	38.06 (3.96)	250,383	30.21 (3.68)
1997	141,619	39.42 (3.81)	297,232	35.87 (4.42)
1998	137,590	35.26 (5.03)	340,503	42.22 (4.16)
1999	99,833	31.33 (4.57)	230,139	35.47 (4.77)
2000	134,277	45.34 (4.68)	183,034	40.17 (5.37)
2001	107,957	39.78 (4.47)	267,499	46.53 (4.98)
2002	97,676	45.37 (5.39)	178,512	34.58 (5.09)
2003	134,894	60.27 (5.80)	255,422	44.38 (5.21)
2004	116,720	44.05 (4.39)	236,540	43.41 (5.04)
2005	81,751	38.57 (5.96)	147,027	35.91 (5.82)
2006	145,183	47.96 (5.47)	232,926	40.98 (5.20)
2007	89,493	40.42 (5.42)	133,669	30.22 (4.38)
2008	84,448	35.87 (5.94)	253,147	40.96 (5.82)
2009	131,810	44.07 (5.32)	245,067	41.75 (5.96)
2010	119,945	47.55 (5.55)	239,624	48.23 (5.91)
2011	77,283	32.04 (6.07)	136,728	28.10 (4.75)
2012	115,563	45.30 (4.64)	180,819	42.00 (5.87)
2013	110,002	45.64 (5.59)	219,973	52.47 (6.39)
2014	89,416	43.77 (6.22)	116,478	32.50 (6.02)
2015	92,450	42.96 (6.08)	141,364	32.98 (5.94)

Table D.5
Incidence and Prevalence of IPV by Severity

Year	Prevalence Weighted <i>N</i>	Prevalence Rate (SE)	Incidence Weighted <i>N</i>	Incidence Rate (SE)
No Injury				
1994–1997	1,320,245	1.53 (0.06)	3,855,619	4.46 (0.26)
1998–2000	891,217	1.32 (0.08)	2,029,832	3.01 (0.29)
2001–2003	611,859	0.87 (0.06)	1,427,119	2.04 (0.23)
2004–2006	579,905	0.79 (0.06)	1,283,297	1.75 (0.16)
2007–2009	718,910	0.95 (0.06)	1,727,485	2.28 (0.26)
2010–2012	661,030	0.85 (0.06)	1,426,463	1.84 (0.18)
2013–2015	533,454	0.67 (0.05)	973,267	1.22 (0.14)
Minor Injury				
1994–1997	1,035,687	1.20 (0.05)	2,955,532	3.42 (0.22)
1998–2000	629,856	0.94 (0.07)	1,417,790	2.11 (0.23)
2001–2003	484,455	0.69 (0.05)	1,291,901	1.85 (0.22)
2004–2006	555,624	0.76 (0.06)	1,495,311	2.04 (0.18)
2007–2009	402,020	0.53 (0.05)	957,352	1.27 (0.17)
2010–2012	389,102	0.50 (0.05)	702,341	0.91 (0.11)
2013–2015	419,857	0.52 (0.04)	870,519	1.09 (0.13)
Major Injury				
1994–1997	217,620	0.25 (0.03)	689,954	0.80 (0.08)
1998–2000	110,017	0.16 (0.02)	286,531	0.43 (0.08)
2001–2003	80,998	0.12 (0.02)	223,644	0.32 (0.07)
2004–2006	101,598	0.14 (0.02)	225,856	0.31 (0.05)
2007–2009	119,431	0.16 (0.03)	301,551	0.40 (0.08)
2010–2012	107,701	0.14 (0.02)	228,613	0.29 (0.05)
2013–2015	126,637	0.16 (0.03)	315,005	0.39 (0.07)

Table D.6
Incidence and Prevalence of Reporting by Severity

Year	Prevalence Weighted <i>N</i>	Prevalence Rate (SE)	Incidence Weighted <i>N</i>	Incidence Rate (SE)
No Injury				
1994–1997	662,788	50.20 (2.13)	1,729,486	44.86 (2.21)
1998–2000	527,604	59.20 (3.08)	976,759	48.12 (3.57)
2001–2003	357,078	58.36 (3.36)	808,184	56.63 (4.28)
2004–2006	348,628	60.12 (3.63)	625,809	48.77 (3.60)
2007–2009	440,721	61.30 (3.21)	927,316	53.68 (4.24)
2010–2012	430,372	65.11 (3.33)	801,952	56.22 (3.65)
2013–2015	313,534	58.77 (4.02)	530,091	54.47 (4.39)
Minor Injury				
1994–1997	670,826	64.77 (2.12)	1,601,053	54.17 (2.47)
1998–2000	447,788	71.09 (3.43)	834,457	58.86 (4.05)
2001–2003	325,550	67.20 (3.20)	705,282	54.59 (4.44)
2004–2006	385,247	69.34 (3.53)	756,548	50.59 (3.40)
2007–2009	284,098	70.67 (3.61)	537,933	56.19 (5.21)
2010–2012	297,902	76.56 (3.57)	555,028	79.03 (3.98)
2013–2015	281,550	67.06 (4.07)	527,028	60.54 (4.53)
Major Injury				
1994–1997	107,666	49.47 (4.61)	291,518	42.25 (4.20)
1998–2000	47,656	43.32 (7.19)	97,176	33.91 (6.80)
2001–2003	47,846	59.07 (7.48)	153,186	68.50 (8.15)
2004–2006	62,397	61.42 (8.31)	140,366	62.14 (7.18)
2007–2009	62,257	52.13 (8.48)	178,695	59.26 (8.04)
2010–2012	48,767	45.28 (7.61)	57,020	24.94 (6.15)
2013–2015	86,293	68.14 (6.88)	149,172	47.36 (6.72)

Table D.7
Incidence and Prevalence of Arrest by Severity

Year	Prevalence Weighted <i>N</i>	Prevalence Rate (SE)	Incidence Weighted <i>N</i>	Incidence Rate (SE)
No Injury				
1994–1997	177,921	13.48 (1.47)	398,060	10.32 (1.18)
1998–2000	150,873	16.93 (2.39)	265,079	13.06 (2.11)
2001–2003	119,670	19.56 (3.04)	286,013	20.04 (3.15)
2004–2006	123,887	21.36 (3.39)	158,020	12.31 (2.15)
2007–2009	130,974	18.22 (2.46)	237,890	13.77 (2.58)
2010–2012	139,016	21.03 (2.93)	243,129	17.04 (2.50)
2013–2015	92,023	17.25 (2.68)	117,106	12.03 (2.54)
Minor Injury				
1994–1997	275,997	26.65 (1.98)	590,966	19.20 (1.82)
1998–2000	212,712	33.77 (2.85)	439,552	31.00 (3.59)
2001–2003	194,791	40.21 (3.36)	345,577	26.75 (3.71)
2004–2006	181,956	32.75 (3.35)	374,832	25.07 (2.81)
2007–2009	140,427	34.93 (3.81)	316,586	33.07 (4.74)
2010–2012	154,531	39.71 (4.12)	276,477	39.37 (4.54)
2013–2015	160,415	38.21 (4.02)	285,173	32.76 (4.15)
Major Injury				
1994–1997	63,596	29.22 (4.18)	177,044	25.66 (3.61)
1998–2000	15,178	13.80 (4.46)	49,045	17.12 (5.19)
2001–2003	26,065	32.18 (7.32)	69,841	31.23 (7.79)
2004–2006	39,519	38.90 (8.84)	83,641	37.03 (7.00)
2007–2009	38,858	32.54 (7.93)	74,051	24.56 (6.69)
2010–2012	28,329	26.30 (7.14)	37,565	16.43 (5.16)
2013–2015	44,875	35.44 (6.42)	75,535	23.98 (5.52)

Table D.8

Incidence and Prevalence of Arrest after Reporting by Severity

Year	Prevalence Weighted <i>N</i>	Prevalence Rate (SE)	Incidence Weighted <i>N</i>	Incidence Rate (SE)
No Injury				
1994–1997	177,921	26.84 (2.70)	398,060	23.02 (2.39)
1998–2000	150,873	28.60 (3.64)	265,079	27.14 (3.91)
2001–2003	119,670	33.51 (4.57)	286,013	35.39 (4.87)
2004–2006	123,887	35.54 (4.76)	158,020	25.25 (4.00)
2007–2009	130,974	29.72 (3.96)	237,890	25.65 (4.36)
2010–2012	139,016	32.30 (4.46)	243,129	30.32 (3.98)
2013–2015	92,023	29.35 (4.38)	117,106	22.09 (4.32)
Minor Injury				
1994–1997	275,997	41.14 (2.76)	590,966	36.91 (2.92)
1998–2000	212,712	47.50 (3.50)	439,552	52.68 (4.91)
2001–2003	194,791	59.83 (4.13)	345,577	49.00 (5.50)
2004–2006	181,956	47.23 (4.40)	374,832	49.55 (4.43)
2007–2009	140,427	49.43 (5.11)	316,586	58.85 (6.42)
2010–2012	154,531	51.87 (4.80)	276,477	49.81 (5.17)
2013–2015	160,415	56.98 (5.04)	285,173	54.11 (5.53)
Major Injury				
1994–1997	63,596	59.07 (6.67)	177,044	60.73 (6.06)
1998–2000	15,178	31.85 (8.98)	49,045	50.47 (11.48)
2001–2003	26,065	54.48 (9.81)	69,841	45.59 (10.00)
2004–2006	39,519	63.33 (10.09)	83,641	59.59 (8.92)
2007–2009	38,858	62.42 (10.66)	74,051	41.44 (9.78)
2010–2012	28,329	58.09 (13.74)	37,565	65.88 (12.81)
2013–2015	44,875	52.00 (8.25)	75,535	50.64 (9.18)