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ABSTRACT

The Combined Effects of Criminal Justice Intervention on Domestic Violence: A Re-Analysis of the Minneapolis Intervention Project

by

Nadia A. Bebawy

Over the past 20 years, a plethora of research has been conducted on the effects of arrest in reducing recidivism of domestic violence offenders. The findings of such research have been varied. This study uses data from the Minneapolis Intervention Project to test the effectiveness of criminal justice sanctions (i.e., arrest, jail, counseling, and the combination) on reducing recidivism of male domestic violence offenders. Results from bivariate analysis found that the criminal justice sanction of arrest and jail was related to recidivism. However, criminal justice sanctions could not predict recidivism.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

One of the social problems that has faced our nation for many years, and continues to face our nation, is domestic violence. Women are more likely than men to become victims of domestic violence; and their injuries sustained from their intimate partners are more severe than injuries sustained from strangers (Jolin & Moose, 1997). Over the past 20 years, research has been conducted to test the effects of arrest as a deterrent to domestic violence. The results of such research have been mixed. For example, Sherman and Berk (1984) concluded from their Minneapolis Domestic Violence experiment that arrest deterred recidivism. However, replication studies could not find the same results (Dunford, 1992; Hirschel & Hutchison, 1992). In this thesis, I test the effects of arrest, arrest and jail, arrest and counseling, and the combination of arrest, jail, and counseling on recidivism among batterers.

Historical Overview of Domestic Violence

Domestic violence has been prevalent since the inception of the United States. Our forefathers imported the idea of wife abuse from England. Under English common law, once a man and woman married they became a single legal entity. “For, as he is to answer for her misbehaviors, the law thought it reasonable to entrust him with the power of restraining her by chastisement” (Feder, 1998, p. 336). Accordingly, the wife lost all legal standings and the husband acquired control over his wife’s behavior.

American courts emphasized the importance of family autonomy and privacy and refused to invade such privacy unless the husband exceeded the limits of chastisement.
In 1824, the Mississippi Supreme Court issued a ruling limiting the punishment to *moderate chastisement* and suggested that the man should not “be subjected to *vexatious prosecution* by his wife for exercising that right, and that courts should not reveal private conduct to the public” [emphasis added] (Schneider, 2000, 14). In 1836, a New Hampshire court ruled that although they condemned a husband for beating his wife, more than that, it abhorred a wife’s rebellion against her husband’s exercise of his authority over her (Schneider).

The courts held the belief that, “if no permanent injury has been inflicted, nor malice, cruelty or dangerous violence shown by the husband, it is better to draw the curtain, shut out the public gaze, and leave the parties to forget and forgive” (Feder, 1998, p. 336). Husbands were often given formal and informal immunities from prosecution in order to protect and promote *domestic harmony* (Schneider, 2000). During the 19th century, feminist activism called for reform of marriage laws and thus a judicial shift took place and most states disallowed wife beating (Schneider).

Also, during the 19th century, public and judicial opinion regarding wife abuse began to change. In 1871, an Alabama court ruled that a husband and wife had equal civil and political rights and privileges. In that same year, a Massachusetts court ruled “…even a drunken or insolent wife deserves protection from her husband’s abuse” (Schneider, 2000, p. 16).

During the early 20th century as the family court system emerged, judges believed that family preservation was important and necessary and that abuse could be cured (Schneider, 2000). Courts continued to fail both to protect domestic violence incidents and to protect abused women. Schneider claimed that by the 1930s, social and
economic pressure lead women who experienced domestic violence to mask such incidents and instead complain about their husband’s lack of support in order to gain help from social service agencies.

The feminist movement that emerged during the 1960s brought with it a revival of domestic violence awareness. Safe houses and battered women’s shelters began to emerge during the early 1970s. By 1976 there was no more than five or six shelters in the United States; twenty years later there are 1,200 shelters for battered women (Gelles, 1997). Initially, shelters were designed to provide refuge for domestic violence victims. Today, shelters provide short-term crisis intervention through the variety of services they provide such as: support groups, hotlines, group and individual counseling, legal advocacy, child care, services for children of abused women, transitional housing, and job training (Gelles).

In 1975, the National Organization of Women created a task force to examine domestic violence (Gelles, 1997). Since that time, social and legal changes have affected the issue of domestic violence. Congressional acts during the mid-1980s and early 1990s brought public awareness to domestic violence. Examples include the National Domestic Violence Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 13701), the 1994 Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act which included Title IV, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) (Gelles). Finally, the U.S. Department of Justice established the Violence Against Women Office to handle the issues surrounding domestic violence.

Domestic violence is no longer a private matter but rather a public one; it has also changed from a social problem to a criminal justice problem. Legal reform now protects women against such acts, as well as, legal ramifications for the offender. In response to
public pressure, state and federal governments have enacted laws to change civil and
criminal procedure. These changes include mandatory arrest guidelines for police
departments, firearm restrictions for perpetrators, custody provisions, and protective
order regulations (Jenkins & Davidson, 2001). Ultimately, such initiatives influence
prosecution and sentencing of domestic violence offenders. Violations of protective
orders that were once confined to a county are now enforced across state lines (Jenkins &
Davidson). Laws also restrict owning, transporting, or receiving firearms for those
convicted of a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence (Jenkins & Davidson). Federal
laws and federal penalties (e.g., five years to life imprisonment) prohibit crossing state
lines to commit a domestic violence crime (Jenkins & Davidson).

Defining Domestic Violence

Domestic violence is prevalent, yet relatively hidden and ignored. Such violence
is a pervasive violation of human rights denying equality, security, dignity, self-worth,
and other fundamental liberties to women. This thesis uses data collected from the state
of Minnesota; thus, Minnesota’s legal definition of domestic violence is integral to this
project. Minnesota’s definition is then compared with the federal definition of domestic
violence.

According to the Minnesota Statutes, domestic violence is defined as:

An offense committed against a family or household member by a family
or household member to include the following: physical harm, bodily
injury, or assault; the infliction of fear of imminent physical harm, bodily
injury or assault; terrorist threats, such as threats to commit a crime of
violence, bomb threats or brandishing a firearm; criminal sexual conduct
committed against a family or household member by another family or household member (such as forced intercourse or forced sexual contact, or intercourse or any other form of sexual contact with a minor) (Minnesota Office of the Revisor of Statutes, 2002).

The statue further defines family or household members to include the following: spouses and former spouses; parents and children; persons related by blood; person who are presently residing together or who have resided together in the past; persons who have a child in common regardless of whether they have been married or have lived together at any time; a man or woman if the woman is pregnant and the man is alleged to be the father, regardless of whether they have been married, or have lived together at any time; and persons involved in a significant romantic or sexual relationship (Minnesota Office of the Revisor of Statues, 2002).

Minnesota’s legal definition is compared to the United States federal legal code to defining domestic violence.

According to the United States Code (i.e. Title 42, Chapter 46, Section 3796), domestic violence includes:

Felony or misdemeanor crimes of violence committed by a former or current spouse of the victim, by a person with whom the victim shares a child in common, by a person who is cohabitating with or who has cohabitated with the victim as a spouse, by a person similarly situated to a spouse of the victim under the domestic or family violence laws of the jurisdiction receiving grant monies or by any other adult person against a
victim who is protected from that person’s acts under the domestic or family violence laws under the jurisdiction grant monies (The Legal Information Institute, Cornell Law School).

The Minnesota definition of domestic violence is similar to the federal definition in that they both address what can be defined as *domestic*. In other words, both definitions specifically state the types of relationships that the victim and offender can have that would be considered *domestic*. The difference between the two definitions is that Minnesota outlines what offenses can be considered violence, while the federal definition focuses on defining the term domestic.

The term *domestic* refers to the type of relationship between the victim and the offender and not the place where the violent act occurred. Intimate relationships typically involve current and former spouses and can involve individuals of the same gender (Rennison & Welchans, 2000). Domestic violence occurs in homosexual relationships (Gelles, 1997). Men are victims of domestic violence, although their victimization likelihood is lower than it is for women. In this thesis, I specifically focus on abuse of women by men.

**Contemporary Reactions to Domestic Violence**

Historically, society believed that domestic violence was apart of marriage (Gelles, 1997). In 1975, Gelles conducted the first national survey on family violence; he found that one in three husbands and one in four wives believed that a couple slapping one another was normal, good, and necessary. During this time period, there was widespread culture approval of violence within families. According to Schneider (2000), domestic violence was used to oppress women and was linked to the inferior positions
held by women within the family, the absence of social support, the lack of child care, discrimination within the workplace, and wage inequality. However, as domestic violence became a public matter, it no longer was seen as a normal function of marriage. Gelles (1997) repeated the National Family Violence Survey and concluded that violence against women by their male intimate partners had declined since his original study. Gelles concluded that the approval rate of a husband slapping his wife had declined to 12% in 1992 and further declined to 10% in 1994. Gelles’ concluded that 57% of men agreed that batterers should be arrested compared to 49% who agreed in 1994. Thus, society’s approval rate of intimate partner violence has declined in the past twenty years (Gelles).

**Scope of the Problem**

For most people, the family is a symbol of love and safety, a place where an individual can seek security and shelter. Unfortunately, for many, it is a place of domination and a breeding ground for violence against women. Women are more likely to become victims of domestic violence than men, and their injuries from domestic violence are more severe than injuries received from strangers (Corcoran, Stephenson, Perryman, & Allen, 2001). According to Mills (1998), domestic violence “…kills an average of four women every day in the United States” (p. 306). It has been found that domestic violence is the leading cause of injury to women between the ages of 15 to 44 (Mills, 1998). According to Tjaden and Thoennes (2000), “Women experience more chronic and injurious physical assault at the hands of intimate partners than do men” (p. iii). FBI reports indicate that more than one quarter of all female victims of murders were slain by their husbands or boyfriends (Feder, 1998).
It is important to keep in mind that these official statistics come from reports that have been filed by local police departments; there are many cases that go unreported each year. Tjaden and Thoennes (2000) found “Approximately one-fifth of all rapes, one-quarter of all physical assaults, and one-half of all stalkings perpetrated against female respondents by intimates were reported to police” (p.v). It has been estimated that, if the current abuse patterns continue, 50% of all women will become victims of domestic violence at some time in their lives (Mills, 1998). Thus, it is important to address the current prevalence of domestic violence to understand the domestic violence problem in our society.

Prevalence of Domestic Violence

According to a recent report by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2001), 85% of the 790,000 victims of intimate partner violence were women; women ages 16 to 24 were the most vulnerable. This study found that 6 per 1000 females 12 and older were victims of intimate partner violence during 1999. The Bureau of Justice Statistics (2001) also found that females were more likely to be victimized by an intimate while men were more likely victimized by a stranger. It was also found that in more than 6 in 10 rapes or sexual assaults, the victim stated that her perpetrator was an intimate (Bureau of Justice Statistics).

In regard to homicide, historically, females are more likely to be victims of murder than males. During 1999, 74% of victims murdered by an intimate partner were females (Bureau of Justice Statistics). An intimate was responsible for 32% of homicides of women ages 20-24 and almost 40% of homicides of women 35-49 during the years 1993 to 1999. (Bureau of Justice Statistics). During 1999, the Bureau of Justice Statistics
(2001) found that, women between the ages of 35 to 49 were murdered by an intimate partner at rates greater than any other age group. In contrast to this finding, women in the youngest (i.e., 12-15) and oldest (i.e., 50 or older) had the lowest rates of homicide by an intimate partner (Bureau of Justice Statistics).

Demographic Distribution of Domestic Victimization

There are three methods of data collection to determine demographic distributions of crime and victimization. First, there are official records that are collected by the local police that give basic information about serious crimes that are committed. An example of an official record is the Uniformed Crime Report, which provides information about the most serious crimes committed throughout the U.S. (Reiss & Roth, 1993). Second, there are victimization reports, such as the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) (Reiss & Roth). The NCVS conducts national samples of all persons in households who are 12 years and older to recall and describe any recent victimizations (Reiss & Roth). Third, there are self-report data given by offenders. An example of self-report data is questionnaires given to offenders by researchers conducting studies in the field of domestic violence (White, Gondolf, Robertson, Goodwin, & Caraveo, 2002).

Characteristics of Victims

Race

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (2001) also found similar rates of intimate partner violence between black and white women. Rates peaked between the ages of 20 to 24 for both blacks and whites and decreased for older age groups. The Bureau of Justice Statistics found similar patterns between intimate partner violence rates for females of other races (Asians, Native Hawaiians, other Pacific Islanders, Alaska Natives, and
American Indians) and the victim’s age was similar to the rates of black and white females. For non-Hispanic women between 20 to 34 had significantly higher rates of intimate partner violence than Hispanic women of the same age (Bureau of Justice Statistics).

**Marital Status**

Women who were separated experienced intimate partner violence at a higher rate than women in any other marital status category (Bureau of Justice Statistics). Women who were separated between the ages of 20-24 and 25-34 were found to have the highest annual average rates of intimate partner victimization (151 and 118 per 1,000 women in each category, respectively). The second highest rates of victimization were divorced women. Women between the ages of 20-34 who were divorced had an average of 78 intimate partner victimization per 1,000 females of this age between 1993 to 1999 (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2001). Females who never married experienced violence at a higher rate than those who were married but lower than those who were separated (Bureau of Justice Statistics).

In regards to victim-offender relationships, it was found that over a majority of victims of intimate partner violence (53%) were victimized by a current or former boyfriend (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2001). Women between the ages of 25 to 34 who were victims of domestic violence were victimized by a spouse or by a current/former boyfriend at rates of 39% and 44%, respectively (Bureau of Justice Statistics). Women who were 35 or older were more likely to experience violence at the hands of a spouse than a former spouse or boyfriend (Bureau of Justice Statistics).
Psychological Profile of the Victim

Researchers in the field of intimate violence have developed a psychological theory known as “learned helplessness” to describe why the victim would continue to endure such abuse. Women who experience abuse in their intimate relationships develop a much lower self-concept than women who do not experience abuse (Gelles, 1997). Repeated violence along with a lower self-concept leaves women feeling that they have no control over their lives and that they are unable to protect themselves from future violence. Eventually, battered women learn that they are helpless in preventing the abuse that occurs in their lives (Gelles).

The concept of learned helplessness has been further developed into the concept of the battered woman syndrome (Gelles). According to Gelles battered woman syndrome is a pattern of psychological symptoms known as post-traumatic stress disorder. Post-traumatic stress disorder includes: (a) experiencing stress (battering) that causes a traumatic response, (b) psychological symptoms lasting more than a month, (c) measurable memory and cognitive changes, (d) at least three measurable avoidance symptoms, (e) at least two measurable arousal symptoms such as an exaggerated startle response or hypervigilance (Gelles). Researchers argue that these psychological effects caused by repeated intimate violence experiences lead victims reluctant to leave their batterer or decisions to kill their batterer (Gelles).

Demographic Profile of the Batterer

In the majority of domestic violence cases, the batterer is male (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2001). In this thesis, it is a given that the batterer is male. Peterman and Dixon (2001) note that in 95% of all domestic violence cases the male is the abuser. The
batterer can belong to any ethnic, economic, social, professional, educational, and religious group (Peterman & Dixon). Thus, it is difficult to provide a demographic profile of a typical batterer using official data; however, a demographic profile can be given using victimization and self-report data.

**Race**

According to research conducted by Hamberger and Hastings (1986), it was found that the majority of abusers in their sample were Caucasian. The initial sample consisted of 83.8% white abusers compared to 13.1% African American, 1.9% Hispanic, and 1% Native American (Hamberger & Hastings, 1986). The replication sample found similar findings with Caucasians being 85.9% of the abusers, African Americans were 7.7%, Hispanics were 3.8%, and Native American were 2.6% (Hamberger & Hastings). Recent studies on the demographic profile of batterers found changes in the racial makeup of batterers. A study conducted by White et al., found that minorities are the majority of abusers in their sample. White et al., sample consisted of 42% African Americans, 36% were Caucasian, and 22% were Hispanic. These figures reflect the changes in the demographic profile of batterers in the past 20 years.

**Marital Status**

In Hamberger and Hastings’ (1986) initial sample, it was found that the majority of batterers were separated from their victim. Separated batterers made up 41%, 25.7% of batterers were married, 14.3% were divorced, and 19% were never married (Hamberger & Hastings, 1986). In the replication sample, Hamberger and Hastings (1986) found a change with an increase of married batterers. The sample consisted of: 38.5% were married, 29.5% were separated, 12.8% were divorced, and 19.2% were never
married. The percentages for married batterers increased, while the percentages for separated and divorced decreased. These percentages reflect the difficulty in determining a demographic profile of the typical batterer.

**Psychological Profile of the Batterer**

The discrepancies in providing a demographic profile of the typical batterer lead researchers such as Dutton (1995) and Gondolf (1995) to argue that a psychological profile transcend a demographic profile. Either way, a psychological profile provides a psycho-social description of a typical batterer. Combining a demographic and psycho-social profile of a typical batterer provides a broader range of comparison of batterers.

Dutton (1995) argues that most batterers do not have criminal records and are almost never violent with anyone besides their partner. The batterer is perceived as a law-abiding citizen, good provider, and a loving father to those outside of the family. However, he usually has a dual personality that is unpredictable, manipulative, jealous, unrealistic, possessive, and controlling (Dutton). Dutton also argues that the batterer tends to blame others for his problems and exhibits low self-esteem. He has a tendency to fear abandonment such as imaged infidelity, separation, and divorce and resorts to violence as solutions to his problems (Dutton).

According to Gondolf (1992) there are three types of batterers: typical batterer, socio-pathic batterer, and the anti-social batterer. The typical batterer usually has no criminal record, has no diagnosable personality disorder or mental illness, is no more likely to have a substance abuse problem than anyone else, and usually is not violent with anyone outside the family (Gondolf, 1992). The socio-pathic batterer is unlikely to have a criminal record because he does not get caught very often. He views violence as an
acceptable way to solve his problems, he may have a diagnosable personality disorder or mental illness and is likely to have a substance abuse problem (Gondolf, 1992).

According to Gondolf (1992), the socio-pathic batterer’s violence is more severe than the typical batterer because he is more likely to use weapons and injure his victims. He is not apologetic about his behavior and has a tendency to make sexual demands after his violence. Gondolf (1992) states that the socio-pathic batterer may justify his violence with religious beliefs and uses power and control in many aspects of his life. The anti-social batterer’s violence is more severe and frequent, they are more likely to get caught and thus have criminal records (Gondolf, 1992). They usually have diagnosable personality disorders and mental illnesses and substance abuse problems (Gondolf, 1992).

**Consequences and Cost of Domestic Violence to the Victim**

**Monetary Costs**

The monetary costs associated with domestic violence are very high. Corcoran, Perryman and Allen (2001) noted that “monetary costs are estimated at between $5 to $10 billion each year in medical costs, police and legal expenses, shelters and foster care, and job absenteeism and non-productivity”. Jolin and Moose (1997) argue that the annual aggregate cost of domestic violence can be estimated at $67 billion. When children are added into this equation, the $67 billion jumps to $164 billion a year (Jolin & Moose). Jasinski and Williams argue that these numbers are actually much higher because domestic violence is under-reported; thus, the total economic costs are undiscoverable. The *true* economic costs associated with domestic violence are likely to exceed the given estimates (Jasinski & Williams).
UNICEF (2000) reports that domestic violence costs can be broken down into four socioeconomic categories: direct costs, non-monetary costs, economic multiplier effects, and social multiplier effects. Direct costs take into account the monetary expenditures that are involved in domestic violence. For example, these costs include psychological counseling and medical treatment, police services including time spent on responding to domestic violence calls and arrest; rather than state expenditures for prosecution and prison, and housing and shelters for women and their children.

Collateral Costs

Non-monetary costs involve expenses that do not draw upon medical services but in turn take a toll on the victims of domestic violence. For example, non-monetary costs increase morbidity and mortality through homicide and suicide and increase dependence on drugs and alcohol. Economic multiplier effects include lower earnings, reduced production, and decreased female labor participation. It has been reported, that in the U.S. 30% of abused women lost their jobs as a direct result of the abuse they encountered (UNICEF). Domestic violence also affects the future capacity of children to obtain adequate employment. UNICEF notes that the direct costs on the school system are the result of children from violent homes performing badly and having to repeat grades. Social multiplier effects impact interpersonal relations and quality of life, and include the erosion of social capital, the inter-generational impact of violence on children, reduced quality of life and reduced participation in democratic processes (UNICEF). While these effects are difficult to measure, the impact of these costs is substantial in terms of our society’s economic and social development.
Another non-monetary cost due to domestic violence is the cost on the criminal justice system. The criminal justice system, especially police departments, is heavily burdened by domestic violence (Jasinski & Williams, 1998). Corcoran et al., note that domestic violence calls are more common than the combination of all other violent crime calls; and that such calls require more time because the tasks involved in handling these cases go beyond routine law enforcement duties. In addition to the costs to police departments, the court system is also heavily taxed by domestic violence cases. Jasinski and Williams argue that the courts devote their scarce resources to prosecute assailants, following up perpetrators, trying to protect victims, giving protection orders, and housing the most serious offenders.

Physical and Mental Health

The consequences and costs of domestic violence for women and their children are detrimental and sometimes fatal. Domestic violence against women leads to both physical and psychological health risks. Physical injury represents the most visible aspect of domestic violence. UNICEF (2000) reported that in the U.S., 37% of all women who sought medical care in hospital emergency rooms for violent-related injuries were injured by a current or former spouse or partner. Injuries can range from intermittent bruises and fractures, and internal organ injury to chronic disabilities (e.g., loss of hearing or vision, possible disfigurement, etc.). In worst cases, domestic violence can escalate and result in the death of the woman-murdered by her current or former intimate partner.

Intimate partner violence also has an impact on the victim’s mental health and can lead to severe psychological consequences. According to UNICEF (2000), women who
are battered have high incidence of stress-related illness such as panic attacks, elevated blood pressure, post-traumatic stress syndrome, sleeping and eating disturbances, low self-esteem, alcoholism, and drug abuse. For some women, the effects of these disorders lead them to believe that the only escape from their abusers is suicide (UNICEF).

Intergenerational Transmission of Domestic Violence

When children are involved in households where domestic violence occurs the costs are even greater. Children who have witnessed domestic violence exhibit a variety of problems (e.g., weight, eating, and sleeping behavior). They may also suffer academically and socially in school where they may find it hard to develop friendships (Jolin & Moose, 1997). Another possible outcome of children who are exposed to domestic violence may have a tendency to run away or commit suicide (UNICEF, 2000). Such disturbances include anger, sadness, withdrawal, and a lack of social skills. It is also common for children to feel guilt or blame themselves for the violence that takes place between their parents (Corcoran et al., 2001).

Ultimately, all this can lead to children being involved in violent relationships when they become adults. Men who experienced domestic violence as children have an increased risk of becoming violent in their own households (estimates run as high as 30%) (Buel, Candib, Dauphine, Sassetti, & Sugg, 1993). A woman who witnessed violence in her family of origin may have an increased risk of becoming a victim in her household (Buel et al.). This intergenerational cycle affects those involved by creating an association between violence and power which leads survivors to believe that domestic violence is normal and that such behavior is unavoidable; thus, these children grow up
having a difficult time understanding that such behavior is neither normal or unavoidable (Buel et al.).

**Objectives of this Project**

The objective of this thesis is to determine which criminal justice response to domestic violence will reduce the recidivism rates of offenders. In many ways, this thesis is a re-analysis of previous research that has been conducted on recidivism among domestic violence offenders. The criminal justice responses that are tested include arrest, arrest and jail, arrest and counseling, and arrest, jail, and counseling. Because past research on arrest has not been successful (Dunford, 1992; Hirschel & Hutchison 1992), I believe that the combination of arrest and counseling will be the most effective response in reducing the recidivism rates of domestic violence offenders. The purpose of this thesis is to contribute to the vast amount of literature on domestic violence that has been conducted in the field of criminal justice.

**Limitations of the Project**

The limitations of this project are, of course, based on those that Maryann Syers and Jeffrey Edleson noted during their data collection. According to Syers and Edleson (1992) the data collection relied on reports by a variety of informants including police, victims, and battered women’s advocates. It was often found that the reporting was incomplete, which caused the depletion of a number of cases available for final analyses and limited the strength of their findings. Syers and Edleson also state that the dependent variable tends to classify men as non-repeaters when they are actually repeaters. The researchers address this issue by only analyzing subsamples found at 6 and 12 month follow-ups. However, they argue that even follow-ups up to one year cannot guarantee
that all the incidents of violence that were observed during their data collection were observed by at least one of the informants. Thus, the findings of this thesis are limited by the methodological problems noted by Syers and Edleson. A final limitation to this project is the age of the data; the data were collected over fifteen years ago.

**Importance of this Project**

The importance of this study is to shed some light on the “multiple components of system responses that appear to contribute to lowering perpetrator recidivism rates” (Syers & Edleson, 1992, 492). With the continued prevalence of domestic violence, it is important to find possible effects that will reduce future victimization. It is important to apply such effects into the criminal justice procedure as they handle domestic violence cases. It is also important to cross validate findings by re-analysis of secondary data. A re-analysis of these data can provide an opportunity to build on previous findings and conduct trend studies (Kiecolt & Nathan, 1985). Finally, this study can contribute to the research already available on this topic.

**Summary of Chapter**

Domestic violence has been prevalent in the United States since the establishment of this country. The idea of wife abuse was imported to the U.S. from England (Feder, 1998). Historically such violence in families was seen as a private matter and the public should not become involved. However, over the years, legal reform has changed so that domestic violence is now seen as a public matter with legal sanctions placed on domestic violence perpetrators. With the increase in domestic violence, as well as, the costs associated with domestic violence, I want to test the effects of arrest and counseling in regard to reducing recidivism among domestic violence offenders.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This thesis tests the effects of arrest and counseling on recidivism rates of male batterers of domestic violence. This chapter addresses the theoretical background of deterrence and rehabilitation. An overview of how each theory can be applied to reducing recidivism of domestic violence offenders is discussed. A review of the extant literature about the effectiveness of arrest and counseling is given. Finally, there is a discussion on the integration of deterrence theory and rehabilitative philosophy on the effects of recidivism of batterers of domestic violence.

Deterrence Theory

Deterrence theory stems from the classical school of criminology. Classical criminology developed as a response against spiritual explanations of crime (Vold, Bernard, & Snipes, 2002). Spiritual explanations were based on the idea that natural law could be seen through faith, based on human’s natural tendency to do good rather than evil (Vold et al.). Therefore, it was believed that when an individual committed a crime (i.e., violated criminal law) he or she also violated the natural law (i.e., sin). These spiritual ideas formed the basis of the criminal justice policies in pre-Modern Europe (Vold et al.). Vold et al. states, that because crime was identified with moral sin, the government had the moral authority, because it was acting in the place of God, to subject criminals to cruel and unusual punishment.

Cesare Beccaria protested the spiritual explanations to crime and instead further developed the ideas behind Thomas Hobbes’ social contract (Vold et al.). Instead of arguing that people naturally do good than evil, which is what followers of the spiritual
explanation to crime believed, Hobbes argued that people pursue their own interests regardless of whether they hurt anyone else (Vold et al.). Beccaria (1764) argues that by sacrificing a portion of one’s liberty this enables society to enjoy security and tranquility, thus each member of society develops a social contract with the government. Each member of society only needs to give up a small portion of their personal liberties, only what is needed to protect society (Beccaria). Giving up a small portion of one’s personal liberties constitutes the right to punish those who break the law (Beccaria). Beccaria states that punishment exceeding what is necessary to establish the social contract bond is unjust.

Beccaria states four consequences to his principles of legal punishment. First, he states that the legislator, who represents the people in the social contract, may decree punishments for crimes committed against the state. Second, every member of society is bound to society; likewise, society is bound to every member by a contract that places both parties under obligation to the contract (Beccaria). The purpose of this obligation is that it is in everyone’s interest that the contract is observed by the greatest number (Beccaria). Third, excessive punishment is contrary to justice and the nature of the social contract (Beccaria). The fourth consequence is that the interpretation of laws must rest with criminal judges (Beccaria).

The classical school of criminology formed the basis of the rational choice paradigm in criminal justice (Vold et al., 2002). The premise of this paradigm is that crime results from individual choices. Rational choice theory also encompasses the idea of utilitarianism: that all humans are hedonistic, each individual will weigh the costs and benefits of a criminal act and will repeat benefits. (Vold et al.). In other words, criminals
make choices based on maximizing their benefit and reducing their cost. Utilitarianism states that all human beings desire happiness, they seek pleasure over pain (Bentham, 1970). The basic assumptions of the classical school of criminology are that if humans are free to make their own choices and seek pleasure over pain then they can be held responsible for their behavior. (Bartollas, 1985). Therefore, based on the assumptions of the classical school, Beccaria (1764) argues that crime can be deterred by punishment that increases the cost to the criminal. Thus, crime can be prevented or controlled through punishment or the threat of punishment.

According to Beccaria (1764), there are three elements to punishment: certainty, celerity (speed), and severity. Certainty refers to the idea that as the likelihood of apprehension and punishment increases law breaking should decrease (Beccaria). It was believed that there would be a decrease in norm violations, as the certainty of punishment increased. In order for deterrence to prevent criminals from offending, Beccaria argued that punishment should be swift. The sooner the punishment is administered, the less likely the laws will be violated. Finally, Beccaria stated that the punishment should be costly and unpleasant to the offender in order to reduce the pleasure sought by the offender; however the punishment should not exceed the crime. Beccaria believed that the element of severity was less important than certainty and celerity because he felt that the certainty of punishment would always make a stronger impression on the offender than the fear of how moderate or severe the punishment might be. Beccaria argued that through proper manipulation of these elements, crime could be prevented.

There are two distinct types of deterrence: general deterrence and specific deterrence (Brown, Geis, & Esbensen, 2001). General deterrence involves punitive
sanctions, whether they are real or perceived, that are designed to influence the behavior of those who are not being punished (Beccaria, 1764). The punished offender serves as an example to those who have yet to commit criminal activity of the consequences of criminal acts; those who might contemplate criminal activity refrain from committing such activity through rational choice assumed by deterrence theory. General deterrence is based on the premise that a potential offender will refrain from offending because of the stigma and social disapproval associated with being arrested (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1990). Those punished for law-breaking behavior serve as an example to prevent future criminal activity of those who would otherwise consider breaking the law. According to Beccaria the key to general deterrence is publicity. Publicity is important to general deterrence because the more individuals that are aware of the sanctions that are imposed on such behavior, the more effective those sanctions will impact the general public (Beccaria).

Specific deterrence intends to discourage the offender from engaging in future criminal activity (Beccaria, 1764). Specific deterrence is designed to affect the law breaking individual by teaching him or her a lesson and not the general public. Like general deterrence, specific deterrence is based on the ideology that human beings are hedonistic, however, the focus for specific deterrence is on the experience of the individual who is receiving the punishment and not about the public’s knowledge of the punishment. This thesis is a test of specific deterrence.
Studies Involving Arrest as a Deterrent

Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment (1984)

Multiple studies have been conducted to test the effects of arrest as a criminal justice response to deter batterers of domestic violence. Sherman and Berk’s (1984) Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment changed police department’s responses to domestic violence. Sherman and Berk conducted a random experiment between March 17, 1981 and August 1, 1982, in Minneapolis, Minnesota. The research was conducted in Minneapolis precincts with the highest density of domestic violence reports and arrest. The design of this experiment called for random assignments of three possible treatments: arrest, separation, and some form of advice (Sherman & Berk).

Cases that were chosen for this experiment involved simple misdemeanor domestic assaults where both the victim and offender were present at the scene when police arrived (Sherman & Berk, 1984). To ensure randomization, Sherman and Berk (1984) required each officer to carry a pad of report forms that were color coded for the three different police actions (arrest, separation, and advice). When an officer encountered a domestic violence assault that meets the requirements of their study, they applied the action that appeared on the report pad (Sherman & Berk). According to Sherman and Berk each form was numbered and arranged in a random order for each officer. Once police action was taken, the officer filled out a brief report and submitted the report to the research staff for follow-up (Sherman & Berk). The research staff than contacted the victim for a face-to-face interview that was followed by a telephone interview every two weeks for 24 weeks (Sherman & Berk). To determine recidivism,
Sherman and Berk conducted a six-month follow-up with each victim to measure the seriousness and frequency of domestic violence after each police response.

Sherman and Berk (1984) found the following results of their experiment: there was a total of 330 cases; the sample consisted of 314 cases with complete official outcome measures. Sherman and Berk found a pattern of violence that consisted of a disproportionate number of unmarried couples with low education levels, who were disproportionately minorities and mixed races (Black males/White females) and who had prior violent incidents with police as well as a high rate of suspect unemployment rate. Among the three treatments that were applied to this experiment, using a linear probability approach and a logistic model, Sherman and Berk found that the arrest treatment reduced recidivism by a statistically significant amount. Sherman and Berk concluded from police data that separation produced the highest recidivism, arrest produces the lowest, and that the impact of advice is indistinguishable from the other two effects.

Sherman and Berk (1984) state three cautions of their Minneapolis Experiment. First, they argue that both outcome measures (police reports and victim reports) have uncertain construct validity. Second, Sherman and Berk argue that initial arrest may have been an undesirable intervention to the victim. They believe that instead of facing the prospect of another arrest from a new incident, victims might decide not to involve police sanctions. Third Sherman and Berk argue that Minneapolis does not represent all urban areas, thus their findings may not be generalized to all urban areas throughout the U.S. The findings from the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment were well received by law enforcement, and the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) funded research in six
Replication Studies of the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment

Omaha, Nebraska (1986)

The purpose of the Omaha study was to present findings of a 12 month study to assess the failure in the replication of the Minneapolis Experiment and to use the Omaha data to better understand the amount of time required to assess recidivism accurately in domestic violence cases that are known to police (Dunford, 1992). Domestic violence cases were randomly assigned to one of the following treatments: mediation, separation, or arrest (Dunford). According to Dunford, mediation consisted of restoring order. Separation involved sending one of the parties away. Arrest involved sending the perpetrator to jail where he or she remained until bond was posted or released by the court.

Outcomes were measured at six and twelve months after the initial incident (Dunford, 1992). According to Dunford, recidivism was measured by official police records, as well as victim interviews that were conducted after the initial offense, at 6 months, and at 12 months. Eighteen percent of the sample of victims did not complete initial interviews; the overall interview completion rate was 76% at 6 months and 72% at 12 months (Dunford). Analysis was conducted to test the effects that randomized treatments had on recidivism using six-month follow-ups (Dunford). At the six-month follow-up, Dunford found that arrests were no more effective in reducing recidivism than mediation and separation. The same result was found for 12 month follow-ups (Dunford). Dunford does not address demographic characteristics and their effects on
recidivism in the Omaha study. According to Dunford, the Omaha study was not able to replicate the findings of the Minneapolis Experiment, where Sherman and Berk (1984) found arrest deterred recidivism.

**Milwaukee, Wisconsin (1987)**

Sherman et al. (1992) conducted a randomized experiment in the use of arrest for misdemeanor domestic assault in the Milwaukee. Sherman et al. used four measures to determine recidivism. The first was “hotline” reports that were called in by all police officers in Milwaukee to women’s shelters whenever an officer encountered a domestic dispute, irrelevant of whether or not the officer was going to make an arrest (Sherman et al.). According to Sherman et al. the second and third test of recidivism was arrests of the suspects for repeat violence (against any victim) and offense reports of repeat violence by the same suspect against the same victim. The fourth test of recidivism was face-to-face interviews with the victim (Sherman et al.). The initial interview was conducted after the incident, then follow-up interviews were conducted at 6 and 12 months (Sherman et al.).

Sherman et al. (1992) used a main effects model of the randomized experiments between the three treatment groups and found no evidence of an overall long-term deterrent effect of arrest on recidivism. The researchers of the Milwaukee experiment found strong evidence that arrest has different effects on different individuals (Sherman et al.). For example, Sherman et al. found suspects who are employed, married, high school graduates, of Caucasian race are less likely to have an incident of repeat violence reported to the hotline if they are arrested than if they are not.
Charlotte, North Carolina (1987)

Hirschel and Hutchison (1992) conducted the Charlotte replication experiment to investigate the effectiveness of three police responses to domestic assault. The first response was advising and separation; the second was issuing the offender a citation (the offender had to appear in court to answer specific charges); and third was arresting the offender (Hirschel & Hutchison). This experiment involved the entire police force of Charlotte, North Carolina. One of the three treatments was randomly assigned to each case, than a six-month follow-up was used to determine recidivism (Hirschel & Hutchison).

According to Hirschel and Hutchison (1992), recidivism was measured using official police records and victim interviews that were conducted shortly after the initial incident of violence and again six months after the initial incident. Outcome analyses were conducted from police reports and self-reports obtained from victim interviews (Hirschel & Hutchison). Hirschel and Hutchison found no statistically significant differences between the three treatments conducted in their study. The researchers of the Charlotte experiment argue that arrest is not any better at deterring recidivism than separation/advise or citation (Hirschel & Hutchison). In regards to race, age, employment status, prior record, and victim-suspect relationship, Hirschel and Hutchison found that prior record was the strongest demographic predictor of recidivism. Hirschel and Hutchison did not find race, age, or employment status to be predictors of recidivism. The Charlotte replication study found that prevalence and incident rates of total victim reports indicated no significant differences between the three treatments; thus, Hirschel
and Hutchison concluded that arrest is not a significant deterrent for misdemeanor spouse abuse.

**Colorado Springs, Colorado (1987)**

The Colorado Springs experiment began in June of 1987 with the assignment of 1,658 suspects of misdemeanor spouse abuse to four possible treatments (Berk, Campbell, Klap, & Western, 1992). The four possible treatments were as follows: a) an order of protection for the victim and arresting the suspect; b) order of protection for the victim and immediate crisis intervention for the suspect; c) order of protection for the victim; and d) restraining order at the scene. Using prior information obtained from the Omaha and Milwaukee studies with Bayesian and logistic regression, Berk et al. found that arresting suspects for domestic violence has a deterrent effect for a large subset of “good risk” offenders. Berk et al. found that without the Omaha and Milwaukee data, the evidence moderately favors arrest. When the researchers include data from Omaha and Milwaukee the evidence strongly favors arrest.

In regards to arrest increasing violence, Berk et al. (1992) found that when data from Omaha and Milwaukee is added to the analysis, “…the odds of new violence are increased by a multiplier of 1.1; that is, the odds of new violence are one hundred and ten percent of what they would have been without an arrest, even as the ninety percent confidence region shrinks” (p. 194). Overall, Berk et al. found that arrest reduces recidivism rates for those offenders who have much to lose. Berk et al. argues that conclusions are sensitive to data analysis and that it is difficult to draw conclusions that determine policy. Berk et al. conclude that statistical evidence from Omaha, Milwaukee, and Colorado Springs suggests that arrest has a deterrent effect on offenders who have a
stake in the community; while arrest for offenders who do not have a stake in the community may increase recidivism.

Dade County, Florida (1989)

The purpose of the Dade County Spouse Assault Experiment was to test the deterrent effect of arrest in domestic violence cases (Pate & Hamilton, 1992). Eligible cases were randomly assigned to an arrest or no-arrest response. Pate and Hamilton used logistic regression analysis and found that arrest had no statistically significant effect on the occurrence of recidivism for domestic violence offenders. Pate and Hamilton tested the interaction effect of arrest, marital status, and employment status and found a significant interaction effect between arrest and employment status; however, there was no statistically significant effect between the interaction of arrest and marital status.

Pate and Hamilton (1992) found that arrest had a deterrent effect among employed suspects, while arrest had led to an increase in violence among unemployed suspects. “Among unemployed suspects, 7.1% of those not arrested had a subsequent assault compared to 16.7% of arrestees. Among the employed suspects, however, the results were reversed: 12.3% of those assigned to the no-arrest response had a subsequent assault compared to 6.2% of arrestees” (Pate & Hamilton, p. 695). In regards to arrest and relationship status, Pate and Hamilton found a statistically significant interaction. This finding indicates a strong mediating effect between employment status and marital status to produce a moderate effect (Pate & Hamilton). Overall, Pate and Hamilton found that arrest has an effect on employed suspects, while arrest increases recidivism of unemployed suspects. Pate and Hamilton found no differences with respect to marital status.
Other Studies Involving Arrest

There have been other studies conducted on the effects of arrest on recidivism of domestic violence offenders. Jolin and Moose (1997) state that it was believed that arresting the batterer would expose him to negative sanctions; these negative sanctions would counteract any pleasure associated with abuse. Therefore, arrest would deter the batterer from any future abuse. Jolin and Moose also argue that proponents of deterrence believed that the general public’s knowledge of arrest as the primary criminal justice response to domestic violence, would deter anyone from committing a domestic violence offense. However, the research on arrest as deterring future domestic violence has been mixed.

Sherman et al. (1991) conducted multiple analyses on the outcomes in three different time periods: after the initial interview, after the follow-up interview, and comparing before and after period within 33 months of surveillance. Their results concluded that there was an initial deterrent effect on short-custody arrest as well as evidence of an initial deterrent effect after a full arrest (Sherman et al.). Sherman et al. concluded that the outcome of victim interviews showed that both full and short arrest decreased the risk of any repeat violence by two-thirds compared to the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment (Sherman & Berk, 1984). The findings of this study support the underlying assumption of deterrence theory in that individual want to avoid pain.

Sherman, Smith, Schmidt, and Rogan (1992) tested the effects of whether or not arrest reduced recidivism based on the demographic characteristics of the offender. The researchers concluded that repeat violence was significantly higher among offenders who
had prior records, were unemployed, were unmarried, and were black (Sherman et al., 1992). “However, results indicate that whether the subject was arrested or simply warned had no significant association with the occurrence or number of subsequent violent incidents” (Sherman et al., 1992, p.685). In a main effects model, Sherman et al. (1992) found arrest to have a significant positive effect on recidivism when controlling for marital status, employment status, prior violence, education, and race.

**Rehabilitative Philosophy**

Rehabilitation, as a form of punishment in the criminal justice system, stems from the positivist school of criminology. The theory of positivism developed out of a response to the classical school of criminology (Vold et al., 2002). Positive theorists believe that behavior develops outside the realm of the individual’s control, contradicting the classical theorist belief that people are hedonistic and have free will (Akers, 1997). According to the theory of positivism, crime is seen as a disease and those individuals who commit criminal acts are seen as *sick*. Treatment in this theory is viewed as punishment; therefore, criminal behavior is cured through rehabilitation (Akers).

The idea of rehabilitation developed during the Progressive Era (1900-1920) (Bartollas, 1985). Before this time, offenders were placed in a penitentiary where they received a structured environment which enabled offenders to repent for their wrongdoings and become useful citizens when they returned to the community (Bartollas). The goal of rehabilitation is to change an offender’s attitudes, character, and behavior patterns so their criminal propensity can be diminished (Von Hirsh, 1976). Bartollas argues that there are three models that form the rehabilitative philosophy. They are: the medical model, the adjustment model, and the reintegration model.
Medical Model

The medical model has traditionally been identified with the rehabilitative ideal (Bartollas, 1985). The medical model assumes that the offender is sick (physically, mentally, or socially); his offense is a symptom of his illness. Basic to this model is the idea that rehabilitation can affect the criminogenic factors that are within the offender (MacNamara, 1977). There are four basic assumptions to the medical model. First, “…human behavior is the product of antecedent causes” (Bartollas, p. 26). The second assumption of the medical model is that it is the obligation of the scientist to discover the antecedent causes of human behavior. Third, human behavior is possible to control once the antecedent causes are known. Finally, the treatment the offender is subjected too should be designed to effect changes in the offender’s behavior in the interests of the offender’s own satisfaction, health, and happiness (Bartollas).

In general, the medical model argues that crime is caused by factors that are identified, isolated, treated, and cured (Bartollas, 1985). Proponents of the medial model argue that punishment should be avoided because it only reinforces the negative concept offenders have of themselves and does nothing to solve the offender’s problems (Bartollas). Bartollas states that the medical model assumes that the offender lacks the ability to use reason or exercise freedom of choice.

Adjustment Model

During the 1960s and 1970s, the medical model was scrutinized for assuming the offenders lack of ability to exercise freedom of choice and to use reason (Bartollas & Miller, 1978). Proponents of the adjustment model argued that offenders are able to be responsible and to make law-abiding decisions (Bartollas, 1985). According to Bartollas,
the adjustment model is based upon four assumptions. First, it assumes that offenders need treatment to conform to the expectations of society. Second, it assumes that offenders have the ability to live a crime-free life, and thus, correctional treatment should emphasize the belief that offenders are responsible for their actions. Third, individual interaction with the social environment is an important factor in understanding anti-social behavior. Fourth, punishment only increases the offender’s alienation and behavioral problems (Bartollas, 1985). According to Bartollas (1985), the primary concern of the adjustment model is with helping offenders make socially acceptable adjustments to society.

Reintegration Model

The premise behind the reintegration model is that the offender must change through community-based corrections (Bartollas, 1985). According to Bartollas, the first assumption of the reintegration model is that the offender’s problems begin in the community and that these problems must be solved in the community. The second assumption is that society must take responsibility for its own problems and that it can fulfill this responsibility by helping offenders reintegrate themselves back into the social order. A third assumption is that in order for the objectives of reintegration to be achieved there needs to be meaningful community contacts. Finally, the fourth assumption of the reintegration model is that all offenders, except for the *hardcore* offenders, be offered community-based corrections (Bartollas). Proponents of this model believe that those offenders who must be institutionalized should be offered opportunities to be involved in choosing their prison programs, be offered a variety of reentry
programs, and be provided services to enable the offender to obtain employment, education, and restore family ties (Bartollas).

According to the reintegration model, change occurs through a process known as internalization (Bartollas, 1985). The reintegration model states that offenders must be given such options as education, employment, recreation, and any other activity that provides the offender with alternatives to criminal behavior in order to achieve internalization. Proponents of this model argue that through a process of experimentation, offenders will learn how to meet their needs in law-abiding ways. Offenders internalize change, which leads to an alteration in their socially unacceptable values and behavior (Bartollas). Although not exhaustive, these theoretical models illustrate the rehabilitative philosophy.

### Studies Involving Counseling

#### Group Intervention for Batterers

Treatment of offenders is a direct outgrowth or application of the rehabilitative ideal. The lack of society’s involvement in the abuse of women was seen as a primary example of the violation of women’s rights (Edleson & Tolman, 1992). This lead to the women’s movement of the 1970s to focus on the plight of battered women (Gondolf, 1997). According to Edleson and Tolman the first group treatment for men developed in 1977 from eight men who were friends of women’s activists in the Boston area. The eight men formed a group called EMERGE which became the first organization to offer group treatment for men who batterer (Edleson & Tolman). Within five years following the establishment of EMERGE, several hundred group treatments for men who batter were founded (Edleson & Tolman). Gondolf states that these consciousness-raising
groups developed exercises and techniques from cognitive and behavioral therapy. By the mid-1980s batterers’ treatment groups began to draw upon therapy developed by social workers and clinical psychologists (Gondolf). According to Edleson and Tolman, currently most group treatment programs are psycho-educational. According to Gondolf, current batterer treatment groups focus on cognitive behavior where “…men are confronted with the consequences of their behavior, hold responsible for their abuse, have their rationalizations and excuses confronted, and are taught alternative behaviors and reactions” (p. 84). The batterer programs vary in length; however, most are short-term, ranging from 6 to 32 weeks in length (Edleson & Syers, 1990).

**Dimensions of Group Intervention**

Group intervention for male batterers varies depending on the framework (therapy or education), the structure of the group, the length of the group, whether the group is open-ended or close-ended, and the type of agency that sponsors the group (Edleson & Tolman, 1992). Programs vary in their characterization either as therapy or education (Edleson & Syers, 1990). Group intervention that is characterized as therapy implies that batterers have a psychological problem that needs to be cured through treatment (Edleson & Syers). Categorizing group intervention as education supports the idea that batterers can learn to change their behavior; batterers are not faulty individuals but men who have learned destructive behavior (Eldeeson & Tolman). Group structure refers to design of the activities offered during the group sessions (Edleson & Tolman). According to Edleson and Tolman, the advantages of structured group sessions include teaching important safety skills in an organized, clear manner, keeping abuse as the primary focus of the sessions, and limiting negative male bonding.
Rehabilitative programs can vary depending on whether or not they are open or closed memberships and whether or not they are time-limited or open-ended groups (Stordeur & Stille, 1989). According to Stordeur and Stille programs that have closed membership structures are groups where members begin and end their group experience together within a specific number of counseling sessions. On the other hand, open-ended memberships allow new members into an existing program as other members leave (Stordeur & Stille). Programs vary in the number of sessions required of each member of a group (Edleson & Tolman, 1992). Edleson and Tolman state that most batterer’s programs meet once or twice a week for approximately two hours, and that the program generally ranges from 10 to 30 session.

These batterer programs are offered through a variety of agencies (Eldeson & Tolman, 1992). Furthermore, the basis of these batterer treatment programs can vary from programs that are affiliated with battered women’s shelters to programs that are within mental health clinics or family services (Gondolf, 1997). Batterers can become involved with a batterer rehabilitation program through their own willingness to attend or through court mandated referrals; such referrals range from a plea bargain, pretrial diversion, or from condition of bond conviction and sentence or probation (Gondolf).

There has been extensive research on the effects of therapeutic intervention for batterers of domestic violence. Research has been reviewed to determine what types of counseling can provide the best benefit to the batterer as well as determining whether or not counseling reduces recidivism. Counseling sessions for batterers can involve group counseling and couples therapy. Feazell, Mayers, and Deschner (1984) argue that there is a strong incentive for those involved in domestic abuse to get the batterer to treatment.
They go on to state that the treatment must begin to meet the batterer’s needs in order for him to continue treatment (Feazell, et al.).

Feazell et al. (1984) state that the batterer needs to know that he is not the only male who batterers; a target of treatment needs to be the batterer’s low self-esteem; and the batterer must learn new ways of expressing his anger. According to Bernard and Bernard (1984), there are three phases to group counseling. The first stage is the most crucial phase, it involves “…getting past Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde” (p.546). This is the phase where the counselor is able to penetrate the façade held by the batterer that he does not need therapy. The second phase begins when a) the façade has been penetrated; b) the batterer’s denial has been replaced by the reality of his abusive behavior; and c) the batterer begins to accept personal responsibility for his violence. The third phase, known as the resolution phase, occurs when the batterer has learned to control his violence, communicates more effectively with his partner, and has developed increased self-understanding (Bernard & Bernard).

Extensive research has been reviewed on completion rates of counseling by adults in abusive relationships (Faulkner, Cogan, Nolder, & Shooter, 1991). Baekeland and Lundwell (1975) found that completion rates are greater for batterer’s with higher socioeconomic status, less social isolation, and greater anxiety and depression. Hamberger and Hastings (1988) found that men in abusive relationships have an increase in sociopathy and narcissism. Hamberger and Hastings (1988) also found that 56% of men who entered treatment completed treatment. It was found that men who completed treatment had a tendency to be older, were educated, were more likely to be employed, and had fewer drug-related criminal offenses (Hamberger & Hastings).
The most frequently asked question with regards to batterers programs is do batterer programs work? (Gondolf, 1997). Researchers argue that it is difficult to determine an answer to this question. According to Gondolf (1997), the more accurate question that needs to be addressed is “What kinds of men are more likely to change their behavior and under what circumstances?” (p.85). Pandya and Gingerich (2002) argue that attrition rates make it difficult to determine the overall effectiveness of batterer treatment programs. Taylor, Davis, and Maxwell (2001) argue that methodological problems such as: a) lack of focus on treatment variables, b) failure to consider attrition rates, c) reliance on self-reported recidivism when self reports have generated low response rates, and d) inadequate follow-up period lengths leads to ineffective measures of batterers treatment programs. Gordon and Moriarty (2003) argue that success of treatment programs should be based on completion rates of each program.

**Attrition**

One of the earliest studies conducted on completion and dropout rates of batterers in treatment programs was conducted by Pirog-Good and Stets-Kealey (1986). The researchers found that rehabilitation programs that had the greatest completion rates were ones that used referrals from the legal system, were short in length, and provided services for a reduced or no fee. In this study, Pirog-Good and Stets-Kealey concluded that dropouts were more likely to be working-class, unemployed, and Caucasian. Hamberger and Hastings (1989) conducted a study that compared completers and dropouts of batterers programs and tried to predict program completion based on demographic characteristics of offenders. Their study concluded that batterers who were younger,
were working-class, had higher levels of borderline and schizoid tendencies, and higher levels of police contact for drug and alcohol offenders had higher dropout rates.

Saunders and Parker (1989) conducted a study with an intervention program that was a 12 week cognitive-behavioral oriented group. The results of this study concluded that clients who were older than 25 and who had more than a high school education were seven times more likely to complete assessment and treatment programs than younger, less educated clients (Saunders & Parker). Saunders and Parker conducted a second analysis and concluded that completers of batterers programs were significantly more likely to be older, be employed, and have higher incomes.

DeMaris (1989) conducted a study on court-referred batterers to a cognitive-behavioral program where completers and dropouts were compared on social and demographic variables and seriousness of the violence they committed. DeMaris concluded that younger men, with lower incomes, those who were unemployed, had prior records, had little motivation to stop battering, and who identified themselves as drinkers were more likely to dropout. He also found that men who were not married to their victim, had younger partners, and who abused their partners before they were married were also likely to dropout of their treatment program (DeMaris).

Faulkner et al. (1991) tested the relationship of variables that are related to domestic violence to the completion rate of offenders involved in therapy. The treatment program that Faulkner et al. tested was a cognitive/behavioral program that emphasized the issues of anger management, assertiveness training, the development of problem-solving skills, and communication skills. The specific goals of the program included reducing shame, depression, guilt, and level of violence, while increasing levels of self-
esteem, assertiveness, intimacy, and communication. Using multivariate analysis of variance, Faulkner et al. found that of the fourteen court-referred men, ten men (all Hispanic or Black) completed the program. Faulkner et al. found no difference between those who completed the program and those who did not in regards to age, ethnicity, education, or marital status. The results of this study did not find any relationship between anxiety, depression, and paranoia and completion rates; the findings suggest that court-referrals were a predictor of higher completion rates for males (Faulkner et al.).

Cadsky, Hanson, Crawford, and Lalonde (1996) conducted a study that looked at attrition rates from a ten-week cognitive-behavioral program. Out of their sample, 25 percent completed the 10 week program. Cadsky et al. found dropouts to be younger, court mandated, witnessed parental violence or were abused, had prior records, drank more, and had low self-esteem. DeHart, Kennerly, Burke, and Follingstad, (1999), conducted an attrition study on a 12 week support group for batterers. Out of their sample, 90% failed to complete the program. DeHart et al. concluded that completers had traveled further to attend meetings and were more likely to have someone monitoring their attendance. Gerlock’s (2001) study on attrition rates found that men who were being monitored by the court were more likely to complete the program. He also found that batterers who entered the program only to have orders of protection dropped or who had recent police involvement dropped out of treatment (Gerlock).

Rehabilitation and Recidivism Rates

There has been an emphasis on counseling as treatment for reducing recidivism of domestic violence offenders (Edleson and Grusznski, 1988). This emphasis has lead to research on the effectiveness of group treatment for batterers. Edleson, Miller, Stone,
and Chapman (1985) evaluated three treatment groups of male batterers. Using self-reports by the batterers, Edleson et al. found that seven of the nine men reported no use of violence during their follow-up sessions of up to 13 months following treatment. Shupe, Stacey, and Hazelwood (1986) reported, in their study of male batterers who were involved in group treatment, that 55% of the men who completed the program were found not to be violent during follow-up period up to one year; these findings were reported by their female partners.

Edleson and Grusznski (1988) conducted three studies, each covering a different time period, on males involved in group treatment. In the first study, they found no difference in comparing men who completed the program with those who did not complete the program in regards to demographics such as age, race, marital status, religion, occupation, and income. Edleson and Grusznski did find that those men who completed the program have significantly more education than those who did not complete treatment. Results of Eldeson and Grusznski first study found that 67% of males who completed treatment were reported to be non-violent since the end of treatment, compared to 54% of men who did not complete treatment had been nonviolent since dropping out. Additionally, Edleson and Grusznski found 7% of those completing treatment and 36% of non-completers of treatment have committed violent acts against their partners since their last session. Overall, completers of the program were found to be less often violent towards their partners and often nonviolent than those individuals who did not complete the treatment program.

In the second study, Edleson and Grusznski (1988) found out of the 42 partner reports at follow-up, 24% of the batterers were nonviolent and non-threatening at follow-
Overall, Edleson and Grusznski found 68% of batterers in treatment reported nonviolent at follow-up. Similar results were found in the third study. Edleson and Grusznski reported that men who completed the treatment program were 59% more likely to be nonviolent at follow-up compared to 52% of non-completers of the treatment program.

Some researchers in the field of domestic violence advocate conjoint marital therapy after batterers have attended group treatment programs and the violence has stopped (Philpot, 1991). Johannson and Tutty (1998) point out that most conjoint counseling programs focus on anger management with social learning theory as the theoretical background for treatment. The principles of such treatment involve eliminating violence; abusive behavior is learned; abusive behavior is a relationship issue; violence is ineffective in the long run; violence is never justified; and abusive behavior escalates if it is not treated (Johannson & Tutty).

Deschner, McNeil, and Moore (1986) found that out of 15 couples that participated in couple’s therapy, 8 were nonviolent at an eight-month follow-up. In another study, Deschner and McNeil (1986) found that 47 couples reported that violent behavior had been reduced by half after they attended a couples treatment program. A study conducted by Neidig, Friedman, and Collins (1985) involving couples group treatment, it was found that out of 100 couples, 87% were nonviolent at follow-up.

According to Johannson and Tutty (1998), the focus of couples’ after-treatment programs is to assist couples in integrating conflict resolution skills that were previously learned in gender-specific groups, communication skills, problem solving skills, and conflict resolution skills. The major goal of couples’ treatment is to help them
communicate their needs, wishes, and wants in a nonviolent manner. Johannson and Tutty report in their couples after-treatment program that women indicated a significant decrease in psychological abuse between pretest and posttest. Their results suggest that couples after-treatment programs are a possible intervention mechanism for couples to maintain nonviolent behavior and to enhance relationship skills (Johannson & Tutty).

A study conducted by Gordon and Moriarty (2003) to determine the influence of batterer treatment programs on recidivism rates of domestic violence offenders found that treatment was not a significant variable in predicting recidivism. Specifically, they found that those who were court ordered into treatment do not have a significantly lower likelihood of recidivism than those batterers who were not court ordered for treatment (Gordon & Moriarty, 2003). However, in regards to test variables, it was concluded that the higher the number of treatment sessions a batterer attends, the less likely he will recidivate upon release of the program (Gordon & Moriarty, 2003). Gordon and Moriarty also found that prior record for domestic violence assault was a factor in predicting recidivism rates of batterers.

Feazell et al. (1984) state that a batterer’s abusive behavior tends to cease while he is in counseling. Feazell et al. found that 90% of batterer’s who were in counseling and after one-year follow-ups upheld their nonviolent contracts; and 66% to 75% of the couples reported that the violence in their relationship had ceased. Feazell et al. state the following as criteria of long-term change for the battering male: a) the batterer changes his attitude and value of what it means to be a man and a woman; b) the batterer self-esteem increases; c) the batterer expresses his anger and anxiety in a non-abusive
manner; and d) the batterer’s need for excessive control of himself and his spouse decreases.

Integration of Deterrence and Rehabilitation

Deterrence theory and the rehabilitative ideal differ in many ways. First, deterrence theory assumes offenders are rational and hedonistic individuals who should be responsible for their criminal behavior (Beccaria, 1764). On the other hand, the philosophy of rehabilitation assumes that crime is caused through a psychological or biological deficiency in the offender or through a sociological factor within society (Bartollas, 1985). Deterrence theorists believe that the purpose of the criminal justice system is to protect society and establish order through punishment (Beccaria; Bartollas). Rehabilitative philosophers believe that the purpose of the justice system is to provide treatment to the offender so their propensity for criminal behavior can be cured (Bartollas).

The rationale behind deterrence theory in regards to domestic violence is part of a trend in criminal justice that stresses that prevention of future criminal behavior can only be achieved through deterrence because of the ineffectiveness of rehabilitation (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1990). Von Hirsch (1985) argues that the rehabilitation movement of the 1960s and early 1970s as the favored treatment model of offenders had shifted to a model of deterrence. The challenge to rehabilitation provided a void for deterrence theorist to fill.

However, Buzawa and Buzawa (1990) argue that even if arrest serves as a deterrent to domestic violence, without rehabilitation of the offender’s tendency towards violent outbursts, the effects of deterrence will only be to displace the offender’s
behavior. If the possibility of displacement is considered, without rehabilitating the offender and having the offender perceive the increased costs in abusing their partner due to mandatory arrests policies, the offender could terminate their current abusive relationship and enter into a relationship with a potential for a new victim (Buzawa & Buzawa). Elliot (1989) argues that there is a strong possibility that an un-rehabilitated offender could continue to abuse with every new relationship; thus, deterrence without rehabilitation does not justify an increased role for arrests.

Summary of Chapter

This chapter focuses on the theoretical background that is used in this study. Both deterrence theory and the rehabilitative ideal will be tested to determine which criminal justice response or combination of criminal justice responses will reduce recidivism of male batterers. A literature review of both studies involving arrest and counseling was examined in this chapter. The next chapter will discuss the methodology of the data that will be used for this study.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the method that is used in this study for the collection of data. The data used in this thesis come from the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) and were funded by the National Institute of Justice. The principal investigators were Maryann Syers and Jeffrey Edleson. This chapter focuses on data collection, a discussion of the sample, as well as a discussion of the hypotheses and independent and dependent variables being used in this thesis.

Background Information on Intervention Procedure

The Minneapolis Intervention Project (MIP) was one of several Community Intervention Projects established by the Domestic Abuse Project in Minneapolis. The initial purpose of the Minneapolis Intervention Project was to establish a network of new policies and procedures within the criminal justice system and among social service agencies to which offenders were referred following prosecution. Advocates of MIP worked with local police administrations to set up policies that required officers to arrest offenders either when probable cause indicated that a domestic violence dispute had occurred or when a restraining order had been violated (Syers & Edleson, 1992).

In cases in which the perpetrator was arrested, an agreement was made by local jails to hold the perpetrator for several hours or until the arraignment had been made. While the perpetrators were held, trained staff conducted telephone interviews with victims or visited them at home. It was the responsibility of these advocates to offer support to these women as well as provide information to them about subsequent court proceedings, shelters, and other services available to her. When time permitted,
advocates attempted to reach women in homes where an arrest did not occur (Syers & Edleson, 1992).

Advocates also worked with prosecuting attorneys in an attempt to establish procedures for handling domestic violence cases and “work out agreements whereby prosecutors would aggressively pursue these cases when an arrest occurred or a complaint was filed” (Syers & Edleson, 1992, p. 494). It was the intent of MIP advocates to obtain judicial outcomes that were helpful to ending violence and increasing the victim’s safety and satisfaction with the criminal justice system’s response.

Once the offender entered a guilty plea or the court obtained a conviction, judges assigned each offender to a pre-sentence investigator. During these inquiries, probation officers compiled information about the history of the batterer’s violence and the battered victim’s wishes as to the pre-sentence recommendation to the court. Syers and Edleson (1992) noted that, “Judges and referees were asked to pronounce a sentence that included imprisonment and then to stay part of or all of the sentence pending successful completion of a batters’ treatment program as a condition of probation” (p. 495). Often, these offenders were sentenced to court-mandated treatment programs.

Secondary Data

The data for this study come from the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR). ICPSR is the largest social science data archive with a collection of criminal justice studies (Dowdall, Logio, Babbie, & Halley, 1999). The study was called the Minneapolis Intervention Project. The principal investigators of this study were Maryann Syers and Jeffrey L. Edleson. According to Edleson and Syers, the data provide an opportunity to evaluate the impact of police actions and court ordered
abuser treatment on the continued abuse of victims. Their study employed a longitudinal, three-wave, observational design. The data were drawn from police records of all domestic abuse cases reported over a 13-month period from February 1986 to March 1987 in two police precincts in Minneapolis, Minnesota (Syers & Edleson, 1994).

According to Syers and Edleson (1992) the data were collected from multiple sources including reports filed by police following the incident and records kept by the legal advocates as cases moved through the criminal justice system; therefore, there are two sources of data: police reports and victims surveys. They remarked “In addition, follow-up telephone interviews were conducted with as many female victims as could be reached immediately following a police visit and at both 6 and 12 months after police contact” (Syers & Edleson, p. 495). However, all victim interviews were strictly voluntary. Police reports were made shortly after a visit to the location of the incident and copies were sent to the Minneapolis Intervention Project staff (MIP). Syers and Edleson described the reports as including “minimal demographic data, a location and description of the incident, the number and gender of the victims and perpetrators, and the outcome of the police intervention (arrest or non-arrest)” (pp. 495-496). The research staff kept additional records based on the victims reports that provided information about the incident, the perpetrator’s past history of assaultive behavior, the court process for past assaults and the current one, and the court outcome for the current incident (Syers & Edleson).

The initial post-police visit interview and both 6-and-12-month follow-up interviews provided further demographic information about the victims and their abusers as well as information on the following areas: previous history of police intervention for
violence and specific information about the violence suffered and the resulting injuries (Syers & Edleson). The 6 and 12 month interviews contained additional questions about the change in the victim’s relationship status since the last interview, continued abuse, criminal justice system involvement, and the use of support services (i.e. shelters, support groups, therapy) by the victim (Syers & Edleson).

**Limitations of Secondary Data**

According to Kiecolt and Nathan (1985) there are several limitations to secondary data. First, researchers must be aware of exactly what they are analyzing in order for a data set to be useable. Inadequate documentation makes it difficult or impossible to locate needed information (Kiecolt & Nathan). To avoid this problem, Kiecolt and Nathan suggest data be checked by comparing a subset of variables with those reported by the original investigators. Second, Kiecolt and Nathan point out that errors made during the original data collection are no longer visible; and it is impossible to differentiate errors of coding, interviewing, and keypunching. Also, the original researchers may not have sufficiently documented survey procedures to enable secondary analysts to test data errors. A third limitation, according to Kiecolt and Nathan, is that the quality of data may be poor. For example, invalidity should be a concern to the extent that survey items can be imprecise measures of what the secondary analysts had in mind for their study.

Data sets rarely contain all the variables that the secondary analyst is interested in studying (Kiecolt & Nathan, 1985). In other words, the secondary researcher must make due with measures that are not precisely those he or she desire. Finally, according to Kiecolt and Nathan, a limitation of secondary data analysis is the loss of creativity. They
argue that the repeat use of data sets thwarts scientific progress to an extent. Globally, the continued use of same data could limit the scope of social science research (Kiecolt & Nathan).

**Original Sample**

The sample was drawn from police records of all domestic abuse cases reported over a 13-month period from February 1986 to March 1987 in two police precincts in Minneapolis, Minnesota. In regard to victims, “Almost all were female (the researchers discarded any male victims for the purpose of their analysis), ranged from 15 to 70 years of age, and were mostly white, African American, or Native American. Among perpetrators, most were male, ranged from 18 to 71 years of age, and were mostly white and African American” (Syers & Edleson, 1994, p. 10).

The original sample included 528 incident reports from police. Once the researchers eliminated the few female perpetrators, repeat incidents of violence, and cases for which minimal data were collected, 358 cases were included as part of their study. Follow-up data were collected from victims, with the number located and interviewed varying by time period. Syers and Edleson (1992) report the following:

At the 6-month follow-up, 196 victims (54.8%) were interviewed and at the 12-month follow-up, 121 (33.8%) were interviewed. As these figures indicate, there were significant missing data in this study. Police incident reports and agency records often contained incomplete information (p. 492).

Syers and Edleson (1992) found that, when they compared cases containing sufficient data, those in which initial and six month data were available, and data up to and including the 12 month follow-ups were available showed few differences. “Data on
men who were better educated (chi-square=9.94, df=4, p.=.04) and had higher incomes (chi-square=9.77, df=4, p.=.04) were more likely to be gathered during follow-ups” (Edleson & Syers, p. 493). Syers and Edleson believed that men and their partners in higher socioeconomic groups are less transient and thus easier to find than those in lower socioeconomic status categories.

Sample for this Study

The sample that was used in this thesis was modified from Syers and Edleson’s (1992) original sample because of the significant amount of missing data. Changes were made to the data set to obtain an appropriate sample size. First, I did not test any cases at the 12 month follow-up because of the insufficient response rate. Second, female perpetrators were eliminated from my sample. Finally, I collapsed and recoded the following independent and dependent variables: income, employment, education, race, and jail. A description of these recoded variables is discussed later in this chapter.

Sources of Information

Syers and Edleson (1994) collected data from police reports filed following each arrest or intervention and from records kept by victim advocates as cases were processed through the criminal justice system. Police reports, in both arrest and non-arrest cases, were made shortly after each incident and copies of these reports were sent to MIP staff. Edleson and Syers also collected data from telephone and personal interviews conducted with the victims.

Response Rates

Syers and Edleson (1994) found that the rate at which subjects involved in this study 90.7% (479) were interviewed immediately after police contact, 54% (285) were
interviewed during the six-month follow-up, and 33.9% (179) were interviewed at the 12 month follow-up. This reduction in sample size makes it difficult to generalize the findings of this study. It may also bias the results by increasing the chances of a Type I error.

**Research Hypotheses**

H1: There is a relationship between recidivism and arrest.

H2: There is a relationship between recidivism and the combination of arrest and jail.

H3: There is a relationship between recidivism and the combination of arrest and counseling.

H4: There is a relationship between recidivism and the combination of arrest, jail, and counseling.

H5: When controlling for race, income, education, prior record, and criminal justice intervention, as age increases the log odds of recidivism decrease.

H6: When controlling for age, income, education, prior record, and criminal justice intervention, whites are less likely to recidivate than non-whites.

H7: When controlling for age, race, education, prior record, and criminal justice intervention, as income increases the log odds of recidivism decrease.

H8: When controlling for age, race, income, prior record, and criminal justice intervention, as education increases the log odds of recidivism decrease.

H9: When controlling for age, race, income, education, and criminal justice intervention, subjects with a prior record are more likely to recidivate than those without a prior record.
H10: When controlling for age, race, income, education, and prior record, subjects who received criminal justice system intervention are less likely to recidivate than those who did not receive criminal justice system intervention.

The general equation tested by hypotheses H5 through H10 is as follows:

$$\log(\text{Recidivism})_i = B_0 + B_1(\text{age})_i + B_2(\text{race})_i + B_3(\text{income})_i + B_4(\text{education})_i + B_5(\text{prior record})_i + B_6(\text{criminal justice sanction})_i + e_i$$

**Dependent and Independent Variables**

This study tests three dependent variables and nine independent variables. The dependent variable in this study is recidivism. Recidivism is tested using the following variables: “abused/assaulted again in the last six months”, “partner in jail in the last six months”, and “arrested and/or re-jailed in the last six months”. Recidivism was measured after a six-month follow-up. The independent variables are: age, race, income, education, prior record, and criminal justice intervention (i.e., arrest, the interaction of arrest and jail, the interaction of arrest and counseling, the interaction of arrest, jail, and counseling).

Syers and Edleson (1994) measured domestic violence recidivism as “Abused/Assaulted again in last six months” (p.47). This dichotomous variable was coded as follows: 0 was coded as “NO” and 1 was coded as “YES”. Recidivism is also operationalized with a general recidivism variable defined as “Partner in jail in the last 6 months” (p.48). This variable is coded as follows: 0 was coded as “NO” and 1 was coded as “YES”. The variable “abused and/or re-jailed” was created by combining “abused/assaulted again in the last six months” and “partner in jail in the last six months” and was coded as follows: 0 was coded as “NO” and 1 was coded as “YES”.
Criminal justice sanctions were also measured in a similar manner. Syers and Edleson (1994) operationalize arrest as “Perpetrator arrested this incident” (p. 23). This variable is coded as follows: 0 was coded as “NO” and 1 was coded as “YES”. Syers and Edleson (1994) operationalized jail as “Sentence” (p. 35). The variables was coded as: 1 being “CONTINUE FOR DISMISSAL”; 2 was coded as “STAY OF IMPOSITION”; 3 was coded as “JAIL TIME STAYED”; 4 was coded as “JAIL TIME ORDERED”; and 5 was coded as “FINE”. Jail was collapsed into the following categories: continue for dismissal, stay of imposition, and fine were collapsed and coded as 0 for “NO JAIL”, while jail time stayed and jail time ordered were collapsed and coded as 1 for “JAIL”. The researchers operationalize counseling as “Conditions of sentence: Counseling” (Syers & Edleson, p. 36). This variable is coded as follows: 0 was coded as “NO” and 1 was coded as “YES”.

The remaining independent variables were mostly qualitative (i.e., nominal or ordinal) as well. Household income of the offender is operationalized as “Perpetrator’s Income” and is coded as follows: 1 was coded as “UNEMPLOYED”, 2 was coded as “UNDER $9,999”, 3 was coded as “$10,000 - $19,999”, 4 was coded as “$20,000 – 29,999”, 5 was coded as “$30,000 - $39,999”, 6 was coded as “$40,000 and UP” (Syers & Edleson, 1994, 39). This variable is recoded and labeled as PERP EMPLOYMENT. This variable is coded as follows: 0 is coded as UNEMPLOYED and the other categories are collapsed into one variable labeled EMPLOYED and coded as 1.

Education level of the offender was measured as “Perpetrator’s Level of Education” (Syers & Edleson, 1994, p. 39). This variable is coded as follows: 1 was coded as “UNDER 12 YEARS”, 2 was coded as “HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA”, 3 was
coded as “VOC-TECH SCHOOL”, 4 was coded as “SOME COLLEGE”, 5 was coded as “COLLEGE GRAD”, 6 was coded as “POST-GRAD” (Syers & Edleson, 1994). For the purposes of my study, this variable will be recoded by collapsing high school diploma, voc-tech school, some college, college grad, and post grad into one variable labeled “HIGH SCHOOL GRAD”. The variable “UNDER 12 YEARS” will be left alone and be coded as 0, while “HIGH SCHOOL GRAD” will be coded as 1.

Race of offender is operationalized as “Race of the Perpetrator” and it is coded as the following: 1 was coded as “ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER”, 2 was coded as “BLACK”, 3 was coded as “HISPANIC/LATINO”, 4 was coded as “NATIVE AMERICAN”, 5 was coded as “WHITE”, 6 was coded as “OTHER” (Syers & Edleson, 1994). For the purposes of my study, I will recode the race variables for Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, Hispanic/Latino and Native American by collapsing these variables into one variable labeled “NON-WHITE”. The variable “WHITE” will be coded as 1 and the recoded variable “NON-WHITE” will be coded as 0.

Prior record is operationalized as “How many previous assaults” (Syers & Edleson, 1994, 31). This variable is assigned a raw number depending on the victims report. Age is operationalized as “Perpetrator’s age” (Syers & Edleson, p. 25). This variable is assigned a raw number depending on the offender’s age.

Funding

Data used in the publication of the Minneapolis Intervention Project was made available by the Data Resources Program of the National Institute of Justice, Sociometrics Corporation. Syers and Edleson (1992) remark, “Data collection was funded by the National Institute of Justice under Award No. OJP-88-M-196. Funding
support for preparing the revised documentation for public distribution was provided by a contract (OJP-89-C-008) between the U.S. Office of Justice Programs and Sociometrics Corporation” (p. 5).

**Summary of Chapter**

This chapter provides background information regarding the data set being used in this thesis. The data for this study come from the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR). The title of the study was called the Minneapolis Intervention Project. The principal investigators involved in the Minneapolis Intervention Project were Jeffrey Edleson and Maryann Syers. This thesis tests the effects of arrest, jail, counseling, and the combination of these legal sanctions on the recidivism of domestic violence offenders using data collected from the Minneapolis Intervention Project. The next chapter involves various statistical analyses of the variables described in this chapter.
CHAPTER 4
DATA ANALYSIS

This study examined whether legal interventions (i.e., arrest, jail, counseling, or some combination) reduce the recidivism among domestic violence offenders. This chapter analyzes the data using univariate, bivariate, and multivariate statistics. Univariate statistics provide a description of the independent and dependent variables in the study. Bivariate statistics test relationships between the independent and dependent variables. Multivariate statistics measure the association between multiple variables. First, I tested the effect of arrest on three measures of recidivism. Then I looked at the combination of arrest with other criminal justice sanctions such as jail and rehabilitative counseling. These effects on recidivism were also analyzed.

Univariate Analysis

Independent Variables

Table 4.1 provides descriptive statistics for the univariate analysis. The independent variables that were analyzed in this thesis are: age, race, education, employment, prior record, and criminal justice sanctions (i.e., arrest, arrest/jail, arrest/counseling, arrest/jail/counseling). The mean age of the perpetrator is 31.7 years with 30 as the most frequent age appearing in the sample. Forty-four percent of the sample (N=146) consisted of white perpetrators while the non-white perpetrators made up 55% of the sample (N=182). The perpetrator’s level of education in this sample consisted of 89 (29%) subjects with less than a high school education and 211 subjects (70%) with a high school diploma and beyond. Almost 34% of the sample (N=118) was
not employed while 66% of the sample was employed. In regards to prior record, 50% of the perpetrators in this sample had one prior assault while less than 1% of the sample had seven or more prior assaults.

Almost 70% of the perpetrators in this sample (N=241) were arrested at the initial incident, whereas 30% of the sample (N=111) were not arrested during the initial incident. The majority (47.7%) of the perpetrators did not receive the criminal justice sanction of arrest and jail, while 15% of the perpetrators received arrest and jail as a sanction. Seventy percent of the sample (N=135) did not receive arrest and counseling as a criminal justice sanction, whereas 30% of the sample (N=59) did receive arrest and counseling. One hundred and eight-three perpetrators (89.3%) did not receive arrest, jail, and counseling as a criminal justice sanction while 22 (10.7%) of the perpetrators did receive such a sanction.

**Dependent Variables**

The first variable to test recidivism is “abused or assaulted again in the last six months”. The sample consisted of 80% (N=147) of perpetrators who did not assault again in the last six-months. Twenty percent of the sample (N=38) consisted of perpetrators who did assault again in the last six months. The second variable to test recidivism is “partner in jail in the last six months”. The sample consisted of 111 (79.9%) of the perpetrators not being in jail in the last six months. Twenty percent (N=28) of the perpetrators in this sample were in jail in the last six months. Finally, the third variable to test recidivism is “abused or re-jailed in the last six months”, and eighty-eight (63.8%) of the perpetrators did not abuse or were not re-arrested in the last six
months. Thirty-six percent of the perpetrators in this sample did abuse and were re-arrested in the last six months.

**Bivariate Analysis**

Bivariate analyses was used to test the relationship between three recidivism variables and arrest. Types of bivariate analyses include Chi-square, Pearson’s r (correlation), and lambda. Chi-square is a test of association between two nominal variables that compares the observed count in each cell of a crosstabulation with the expected count (Dowdall, Logio, Babbie, Halley, 1999). This statistic tests the extent to which the observed frequencies in the contingency table are significantly different from the expected frequencies when we assume the two variables are unrelated (Bachman & Paternoster, 1997). The Chi-square test does not determine the strength of the relationship.

According to Bachman and Paternoster (1997), to reject the null hypothesis there must be large differences between the observed and expected frequencies. The formula for calculating Chi-square is as follows:

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(\text{Observed cell frequency} - \text{Expected cell frequency})^2}{\text{Expected cell frequency}}.$$  

To calculate this formula, for each cell, calculate the expected count by multiplying the number of cases in the cell’s row by the number of cases in the cell’s column and dividing the results by the total count. Once the difference between the observed and expected counts is found, the difference is squared. Then divide the squared difference by the expected count for the cell. These steps must be completed for each cell. The chi-square is determined once the results of each cell are totaled.
First, I examined the relationship between recidivism and arrest. Then the combination of arrest and jail is tested. Bivariate analysis was also used to test the relationship between recidivism and the combination of arrest and counseling. Finally, I used Chi-square to test the relationship between recidivism and the combination of arrest, jail, and counseling. To test the statistical relationship of these variables I used cross-tabulations and computed a Pearson’s chi squared statistic for each cross-tabulation.

Hypothesis One

Hypothesis one addressed the relationship between recidivism and arrest. A cross-tabulation was run comparing initial arrest and the three recidivism variables. The recidivism variable known as “abused/assaulted again in the last six months” was compared with initial arrest. The cross-tabulation was found to be non-significant with a chi-square of .078 and a significance level of .780. In other words, no relationship was found between initial arrest and “abused/assaulted again in the last six months”. Results are in Table 4.2.

The cross-tabulation comparing recidivism defined as, “partner in jail in the last six months”, with initial arrest was found to be non-significant with a chi-square of 2.730 with a significance level of .098. As indicated in Table 4.3, there is no relationship between “partner in jail in the last six months” and initial arrest. The cross-tabulation comparing recidivism defined as, “abuse and/or re-jailed in the last six months”, with arrest had a chi-square of .925 with a significance of .336. This finding is non-significant; therefore, there is no relationship between “abuse and/or re-arrested in the last six months” with initial arrest. Results from this cross-tabulation can be seen in Table 4.4.
Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis two tested the relationship of the recidivism variables with the combination of initial arrest and jail. As seen in Table 4.5, there is no significant relationship between “abused/assaulted again in the last six months” and initial arrest and jail. The chi-squared is .682 with a significance level of .409. The combination of initial arrest and jail and the recidivism variable “partner in jail in the last six months” produced a significant relationship. The significance level of .010 produced a significant chi-square of 6.586, which indicates that there is a relationship between arrest and jail recidivism. Results of this chi-square are in Table 4.6. As shown in Table 4.7, there was no significant relationship between “abuse and/or re-jailed in the last six months” with the combination of initial arrest and jail. The chi-square for this non-significant relationship is 2.219 with a significance level of .136.

Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis three compared the relationship between recidivism and the combination of initial arrest and counseling. There was no significant relationship between “abused/assaulted again in the last six months” and initial arrest and counseling. Table 4.8 indicates that the chi-square for this relationship is non-significant with a 1.434 and a significance level of .231. The relationship between “partner in jail in the last six months” and the combination of initial arrest and counseling was non-significant with a chi-square value of .077 with a significance level of .782. Results can be seen in Table 4.9. The combination of initial arrest and counseling and the recidivism variable “abuse and/or re-jailed at six months” produced a non-significant relationship. Results from
Table 4.10 indicate, that the chi-square for this non-significant finding is 2.150 with a significance level of .143.

**Hypothesis Four**

Hypothesis four analyzed the relationship between recidivism and the combination of initial arrest, jail, and counseling. There was no significant relationship between “abused/assaulted again in the last six months” and the combination of initial arrest, jail, and counseling. The chi-square for this relationship is .096 and a significance level of .757. Results are in Table 4.11. As shown in Table 4.12, there was no significant relationship between “partner in jail in the last six months” and the combination of initial arrest, jail, and counseling. The chi-square for this relationship is .487 and a significance level of .485. The combination of initial arrest, jail, and counseling and the recidivism variable “abuse and/or re-jailed in the last six months” produced no significant relationship. The chi-squared for this relationship is .007 with a significance level of .931. Results from this cross-tabulation can be seen in Table 4.13.

**Multivariate Analysis**

Logistic regression is used to analyze hypotheses five through ten. Logistic regression tests the relationship between multiple independent variables and a single dependent variable (Sweet & Grace-Martin, 2003). This statistic requires binary dependent variables that are coded 1 or 0 to indicate whether an event did or did not occur (Sweet & Grace-Martin). For example, this thesis uses recidivism as the dependent variable, which is coded as 0 (No) and 1 (Yes). These codes constitute an either/or condition; a subject can only fall into one group.
Logistic regression examines the relationship between the independent variables and a function of the probability of occurrence (Bachman & Paternoster, 1997). In other words, logistic regression is used to estimate the probability that an event will occur. According to Grimm and Yarnold (1995), there are five assumptions in logistic regression. First, it is assumed that the variable is dichotomous. Second, the outcomes must be statistically independent of one another. In other words, each case can only be represented in the data set only once. Third, the model must consist of all required predictors and must not have any irrelevant predictors. Fourth, the categories that are being analyzed must be mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive. Finally, larger samples are required in testing logistic regression than would be needed in testing linear regression.

Recidivism Variable: Abused/assaulted Again in the Last Six Months

For the recidivism variable, “abused/assaulted again in the last six months”, the following are the logistic equations that are tested:

\[
\text{LOG(abused/assaulted again)}_i = B0 + B1(\text{age})_i + B2(\text{race})_i + B3(\text{income})_i + B4(\text{education})_i + B5(\text{prior record})_i + B6(\text{initial arrest})_i + e_i
\]

\[
\text{LOG(abused/assaulted again)}_i = B0 + B1(\text{age})_i + B2(\text{race})_i + B3(\text{income})_i + B4(\text{education})_i + B5(\text{prior record})_i + B6(\text{initial arrest and jail})_i + e_i
\]

\[
\text{LOG(abused/assaulted again)}_i = B0 + B1(\text{age})_i + B2(\text{race})_i + B3(\text{income})_i + B4(\text{education})_i + B5(\text{prior record})_i + B6(\text{initial arrest and counseling})_i + e_i
\]

\[
\text{LOG(abused/assaulted again)}_i = B0 + B1(\text{age})_i + B2(\text{race})_i + B3(\text{income})_i + B4(\text{education})_i + B5(\text{prior record})_i + B6(\text{initial arrest, jail, and counseling})_i + e_i
\]
Logistic regression was run for hypotheses five through ten to assess the effects on recidivism of each independent variable (i.e., age, race, income, education, prior record, and criminal justice intervention) while holding age, race, education, prior record, and arrest constant. While controlling for the other independent variables, income was found to significantly affect the chances of recidivism (i.e., “abused/assaulted again in the last six months”). The log-odds coefficient (B) (-.676) has a negative relationship, indicating that as income increases, recidivism decreases. The odds ratio \( \text{Exp}(B) \) for income is (.509) which means for each one-unit increase in income, the odds of recidivism decrease by 49.1%. As shown in Table 4.14, this finding supports hypothesis seven which predicted that as income increases recidivism decreases when controlling for age, race, education, prior record, and criminal justice intervention.

When the independent variable, jail, was added to the model, none of the predictor variables affected recidivism. Results of this logistic regression can be seen in Table 4.15. However, age was also a significant predictor of recidivism when counseling was substituted for jail as an independent variable. The log-odds coefficient (B) (-.185) has a negative relationship, indicating that as age increases, recidivism decreases. Thus, hypothesis five is supported. The odds ratio \( \text{Exp}(B) \) for age is .831, which indicates that for each one-unit increase in age, the odds of recidivism decrease by 16.9%. This finding supports hypothesis five, which predicted that as age increases, recidivism would decrease when controlling for race, income, education, prior record, and arrest and counseling. The logistic regression for this finding can be seen in Table 4.16.

Age was also found to be significant in affecting the chances of recidivism using “abused/assaulted again in the last six months”, when controlling for other demographic
variables and the criminal justice intervention of initial arrest, jail, and counseling. The log-odds coefficient (B) (-.165) has a negative relationship, meaning that as age increases, recidivism decreases. Therefore, hypothesis five is also supported. As seen in Table 4.17, the odds ratio \( \text{Exp}(B) \) for age is .848, which indicates that for each one-unit increase in age, the odds of recidivism decrease by 15.2%.

**Recidivism Variable: Partner in Jail in the Last Six Months**

The following are the logistic equations that are tested for the recidivism variable, “partner in jail in the last six months”:

\[
\text{LOG}(\text{jail in last six months})_i = B_0 + B_1(\text{age}) + B_2(\text{race})_i + B_3(\text{income})_i + B_4(\text{education})_i + B_5(\text{prior record})_i + B_6(\text{initial arrest})_i + e_i
\]

\[
\text{LOG}(\text{jail in last six months})_i = B_0 + B_1(\text{age}) + B_2(\text{race})_i + B_3(\text{income})_i + B_4(\text{education})_i + B_5(\text{prior record})_i + B_6(\text{initial arrest and jail})_i + e_i
\]

\[
\text{LOG}(\text{jail in last six months})_i = B_0 + B_1(\text{age}) + B_2(\text{race})_i + B_3(\text{income})_i + B_4(\text{education})_i + B_5(\text{prior record})_i + B_6(\text{initial arrest and counseling})_i + e_i
\]

\[
\text{LOG}(\text{jail in last six months})_i = B_0 + B_1(\text{age}) + B_2(\text{race})_i + B_3(\text{income})_i + B_4(\text{education})_i + B_5(\text{prior record})_i + B_6(\text{initial arrest, jail, and counseling})_i + e_i
\]

Logistic regression was again used to analyze the effects of demographic variables and types of criminal justice sanctions on the recidivism variable, “partner in jail in the last six months”. Age was found to significantly decrease the chances of recidivism when controlling for the criminal justice intervention of initial arrest, as well as, the other demographic variables. As seen in Table 4.18, the log-odds coefficient (B) (-.127) has a negative relationship, indicating that as age increases, recidivism decreases.
The odds ratio \( \{\text{Exp}(B)\} \) for age is 0.881, means that for each one-unit increase in age, the odds of recidivism decrease by 11.9%. This finding supports hypothesis five.

“Partner in jail in the last six months” was also regressed on demographic variables and the criminal justice intervention of initial arrest and jail. As indicated in Table 4.19, none of the variables in the logistic regression model were found to significantly affect recidivism.

Logistic regression was used to test the effects of the criminal justice sanction of arrest and counseling and the demographic variables on “partner in jail in the last six months”. Age was found to significantly affect the chances of recidivism when controlling for the criminal justice sanctions, as well as, the demographic variables. Results from Table 4.20 show the log-odds coefficient (B) (-.296) has a negative relationship, meaning that as age increases, recidivism decreases. Therefore, this finding supports hypothesis five with the odds ratio \( \{\text{Exp}(B)\} \) for age being 0.744, which indicates that for each one-unit increase in age, the odds of recidivism decreases by 25.6%.

The recidivism variable, “partner in jail in the last six months” was also regressed on demographic variables and the criminal justice intervention of initial arrest, jail, and counseling. None of the variables in the logistic regression model are significant. Results can be seen in Table 4.21.

Recidivism Variable: Abused and/or Re-jailed (6 Month Follow-up)

For the recidivism variable, “abused and/or re-jailed”, the following are the logistic equations that are tested:

\[
\text{LOG(abused and/or re-jailed)}_i = B0 + B1(\text{age}) + B2(\text{race})_i + B3(\text{income})_i + B4(\text{education})_i + B5(\text{prior record})_i + B6(\text{initial arrest})_i + e_i
\]
\[ \text{LOG(abused and/or re-jailed)}_i = B_0 + B_1(\text{age})_i + B_2(\text{race})_i + B_3(\text{income})_i + B_4(\text{education})_i + B_5(\text{prior record})_i + B_6(\text{initial arrest and jail})_i + \epsilon_i \]

\[ \text{LOG(abused and/or re-jailed)}_i = B_0 + B_1(\text{age})_i + B_2(\text{race})_i + B_3(\text{income})_i + B_4(\text{education})_i + B_5(\text{prior record})_i + B_6(\text{initial arrest and counseling})_i + \epsilon_i \]

\[ \text{LOG(abused and/or re-jailed)}_i = B_0 + B_1(\text{age})_i + B_2(\text{race})_i + B_3(\text{income})_i + B_4(\text{education})_i + B_5(\text{prior record})_i + B_6(\text{initial arrest, jail, and counseling})_i + \epsilon_i \]

The recidivism variable, “abused and/or re-jailed” was regressed on age, race, income, education, prior record, and criminal justice intervention. Income was found to significantly affect the chances of recidivism when controlling for the criminal justice intervention of initial arrest, as well as other demographic variables. As seen in Table 4.22, the log-odds coefficient (B) (-1.194) has a negative relationship, indicating that as income increases, recidivism decreases. The odds ratio \(\{\text{Exp(B)}\}\) for income is (.303) which means that for each one-unit increase in income, the odds of recidivism decrease by 69.7%. This finding supports hypothesis seven which predicted that as income increases the log odds of recidivism decreases when controlling for age, race, education, prior record, and criminal justice intervention.

Using the dependent recidivism variable, “abused and/or re-jailed”, logistic regression was used to test the effects of the criminal justice intervention of arrest and jail while controlling for all other variables in the model. In this logistic regression model, age was also found to significantly affect the chances of recidivism. The log-odds coefficient (B) (-.104) has a negative relationship, meaning that as age increases, recidivism decreases. The odds ratio \(\{\text{Exp(B)}\}\) for age is .901, which indicates that for each one-unit increase in age, the odds of recidivism decreases by 9.9%. Results from
Table 4.23 supports hypothesis five, which predicted that as age increases, the log odds of recidivism decrease when controlling for race, income, education, prior record, and criminal justice intervention.

The logistic regression model was changed to include the effects on abuse and or re-jailed of demographic variables and the criminal justice sanctions of arrest and counseling. Age and prior record were found to significantly affect the chances of recidivism when controlling for all other variables. The log-odds coefficient for age (B) (-0.359) has a negative relationship, indicating that as age increases, recidivism decreases. The odds ratio \( \exp(B) \) for age is 0.698, which means that for each one-unit increase in age, the odds of recidivism decrease by 30.2%. This finding supports hypothesis five. In regards to prior record, the log-odds coefficient (B) (0.490) has a positive relationship, meaning that subjects who have a prior record are more likely to recidivate than subjects who do not have a prior record. The odds ratio \( \exp(B) \) for prior record is (1.632) indicating that for each one-unit increase in prior record, recidivism increases by 63.2%. This finding supports hypothesis nine, which predicted that subjects with a prior record would be more likely to recidivate than those subjects who do not have a prior record when controlling for age, race, income, education, and criminal justice intervention. Results from these findings are in Table 4.24.

Age was found to significantly affect the chances of recidivism while controlling for the criminal justice intervention of arrest, jail, and counseling, as well as other demographic variables in the logistic regression model. The log-odds coefficient (B) (-0.192) has a negative relationship, meaning that as age increases, recidivism decreases. The odds ratio \( \exp(B) \) for age is 0.825, which indicates that for each one-unit increase
in age, the odds of recidivism decreases by a factor of 17.5%. As seen in Table 4.25, this finding supports hypothesis five, which predicted that as age increases, the log odds of recidivism would decrease when controlling for race, income, education, prior record, and criminal justice intervention.

Hypothesis six predicted that when controlling for age, income, education, prior record, and criminal justice intervention, whites would have lower recidivism than non-whites. In other words, whites are less likely to recidivate than non-whites. None of the logistic models found support for this hypothesis. Hypothesis eight predicted that when controlling for age, race, income, prior record, and criminal justice intervention, as education increases the recidivism decreased. The logistic regression models did not find support for this hypothesis. Finally, hypothesis ten predicted that when controlling for age, race, income, education, and prior record, subjects who received criminal justice intervention will have lower recidivism than subjects who did not receive intervention. In other words, subjects who received some form of criminal justice sanction should be less likely to recidivate than those who did not receive criminal justice intervention. None of the logistic regression models found support for this hypothesis.

Summary of Chapter

This chapter uses univariate, bivariate, and multivariate statistics to analyze the data and test research hypotheses. Hypotheses one through four were tested using cross-tabulations, the chi-square for hypotheses one, three, and four were found to be non-significant; therefore, these hypotheses were not supported. However, hypothesis two, using the recidivism variable “partner in jail in the last six months”, produced a significant chi-square and therefore was supported. Hypothesis five was analyzed using
logistic regression and was found to be significant. Hypothesis six was tested using logistic regression and results from the test were found to be non-significant. Hypothesis seven was examined using logistic regression and was found to be significant. Hypothesis eight was also tested using logistic regression and results were found to be non-significant. Hypothesis nine was analyzed using logistic regression and was found to be significant. Hypothesis ten was examined using logistic regression and was found to be non-significant. The next chapter will discuss policy implication of these findings and suggestions for future research in the field of domestic violence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Standard Dev.</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abused/ Assaulted</td>
<td>0=No 1=Yes</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again in last 6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner in Jail in last 6 months</td>
<td>0=No 1=Yes</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recid: Abuse And/or re-arrest</td>
<td>0=No 1=Yes</td>
<td>.3623</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.4824</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 month follow-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (perp)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>31.70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (perp)</td>
<td>0=non-white 1=white</td>
<td>.4451</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.4977</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hschool (perp)</td>
<td>0=Less than H.S. 1=H.S. or more</td>
<td>.7033</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4576</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ (perp)</td>
<td>0=No 1=Yes</td>
<td>.6648</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4727</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Record (perp)</td>
<td>0=No 1=Yes</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 Cross-tabulation Results for Abused/A Assaulted Again (in Last 6 Months) by Initial Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abused/Assaulted again in last 6 months</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46 (80.7%)</td>
<td>101 (78.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11 (19.3%)</td>
<td>27 (21.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = .078$  
df = 1  
p > .05

1Test of H$_1$

Table 3 Cross-tabulation Results for Partner in Jail (in the Last 6 Months) by Initial Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner in jail in the last 6 months</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33 (89.2%)</td>
<td>78 (76.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4 (10.8%)</td>
<td>24 (23.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = .2730$  
df = 1  
p > .05

1Test of H$_1$
Table 4 Cross-tabulation for Abuse and/or Re-Jailed (6 Month Follow-Up) by Initial Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Arrest</th>
<th>Abused and/or re-arrest (6 month follow-up)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26 (70.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11 (29.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = .925$
$df = 1$
$p > .05$

\[1\text{Test of } H_1\]

Table 5 Cross-tabulation for Abused/Assaulted Again (in Last 6 Months) by Initial Arrest and Jail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Arrest X Jail</th>
<th>Abused/assaulted again in the last 6 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72 (81.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16 (18.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = .682$
$df = 1$
$p > .05$

\[1\text{Test of } H_2\]
### Table 6 Cross-tabulation of Partner in Jail (Last 6 Months) by Initial Arrest and Jail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Arrest X Jail</th>
<th>Partner in jail (last 6 months)</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(88.3%)</td>
<td>(65.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(11.7%)</td>
<td>(34.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 6.586^* \]
\[ df = 1 \]
\[ p < .05 \]

*Test of H₂

### Table 7 Cross-tabulation of Abuse and/or Re-Jailed (6 Month Follow-Up) by Initial Arrest and Jail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Arrest X Jail</th>
<th>Abuse and/or re-arrest (6 month follow-up)</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(71.2%)</td>
<td>(55.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(28.8%)</td>
<td>(44.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 2.219 \]
\[ df = 1 \]
\[ p > .05 \]

*Test of H₂
### Table 8 Cross-tabulation of Abused/Assaulted (Again in Last 6 Months) by Initial Arrest and Counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Arrest X Counseling</th>
<th>Abused/assaulted (again in last 6 months)</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(79.2%)</td>
<td>(88.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20.8%)</td>
<td>(11.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 1.434 \]
\[df = 1\]
\[p > .05\]

\(^1\)Test of H₃

### Table 9 Cross-tabulation of Partner in Jail (in Last 6 Months) by Initial Arrest and Counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Arrest X Counseling</th>
<th>Partner in jail (in the last 6 months)</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(83.9%)</td>
<td>(86.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16.1%)</td>
<td>(13.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = .077\]
\[df = 1\]
\[p > .05\]

\(^1\)Test of H₃
Table 10 Cross-tabulation of Abuse and/or Re-Jailed (6 Month Follow-Up) by Initial Arrest and Counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Arrest X Counseling</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abuse and/or re-arrest (6 month follow-up)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(67.9%)</td>
<td>(82.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32.1%)</td>
<td>(17.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2 = 2.150$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p &gt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Test of $H_3$

Table 11 Cross-tabulation of Abused/Assaulted Again (in the Last 6 Months) by Initial Arrest, Jail, and Counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Arrest X Jail X Counseling</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abused/assaulted again (in the last 6 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(82%)</td>
<td>(78.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18%)</td>
<td>(21.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2 = .096$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p &gt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Test of $H_4$
Table 12 Cross-tabulation of Partner in Jail (in the Last 6 Months) by Initial Arrest, Jail, and Counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Arrest X Jail X Counseling</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner in jail (in the last 6 months)</td>
<td>61 (84.7%)</td>
<td>10 (76.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11 (15.3%)</td>
<td>3 (23.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\chi^2 = .487) df=1 p&gt;.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Test of H₄

Table 13 Cross-tabulation Abuse and/or Re-Jailed (6 Month Follow-Up) by Initial Arrest, Jail, and Counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Arrest X Jail X Counseling</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abused and/or re-arrest (6 month follow-up)</td>
<td>50 (70.4%)</td>
<td>9 (69.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21 (29.6%)</td>
<td>4 (30.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\chi^2 = .007) df=1 p&gt;.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Test of H₄
### Table 14 Logistic Regression on Abused/Assaulted Again in the Last Six Months on Initial Arrest and Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>e^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.404</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>1.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.676*</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>1.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priors</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>1.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest¹</td>
<td>-1.612</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.069</td>
<td>1.832</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>7.921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05
¹ Initial Arrest

### Table 15 Logistic Regression of Abuse/Assaulted Again in the Last Six Months on Arrest and Jail and Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>e^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>1.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priors</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ¹</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>1.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>1.715</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>1.516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05
¹ Initial Arrest X Jail
### Table 16 Logistic Regression of Abuse/Assaulted Again in the Last Six Months on Arrest and Counseling and Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>e^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-.538</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.386</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>1.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priors</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>1.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR(^1)</td>
<td>-1.185</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.108</td>
<td>2.434</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>60.804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*\) p<.05  
\(^1\) Arrest X Counseling

### Table 17 Logistic Regression of Abuse/Assaulted Again in the Last Six Months on Arrest, Jail, and Counseling and Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>e^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.579</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>1.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priors</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>1.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJR(^1)</td>
<td>-.690</td>
<td>1.017</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.237</td>
<td>2.296</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>25.452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*\) p<.05  
\(^1\) Arrest X Jail X Counseling
Table 18 Logistic Regression of Partner in Jail in the Last Six Months on Initial Arrest and Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>e^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.127*</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.810</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>1.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priors</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>1.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest (^1)</td>
<td>8.170</td>
<td>38.852</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>3534.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-5.522</td>
<td>38.894</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \(p<.05\)
\(^1\)Initial Arrest

Table 19 Logistic Regression of Partner in Jail in the Last Six Months on Arrest and Jail and Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>e^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>1.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.791</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>1.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priors</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>1.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ (^1)</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>1.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>2.224</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>1.283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \(p<.05\)
\(^1\)Initial Arrest X Jail
Table 20 Logistic Regression of Partner in Jail in the Last Six Months on Arrest and Counseling and Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>eᵇ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.296*</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-1.155</td>
<td>1.363</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.866</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>1.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priors</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>1.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR¹</td>
<td>-.509</td>
<td>1.212</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>6.700</td>
<td>3.943</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>812.373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05
¹ Arrest X Counseling

Table 21 Logistic Regression of Partner in Jail in the Last Six Months on Arrest, Jail, and Counseling and Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>eᵇ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.468</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>1.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priors</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>1.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJR¹</td>
<td>-.319</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.474</td>
<td>2.424</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>4.366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05
¹ Arrest X Jail X Counseling
Table 22 Logistic Regression Abused and/or Re-Jailed (6 Month Follow-Up) on Initial Arrest and Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>e^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>1.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-1.194*</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>1.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priors</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>1.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest^1</td>
<td>-2.665</td>
<td>1.368</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.073</td>
<td>2.346</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>159.716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
^Initial Arrest

Table 23 Logistic Regression of Abuse and/or Re-Jailed (6 Month Follow-Up) on Arrest and Jail and Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>e^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.104*</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>1.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.583</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>1.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priors</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>1.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ^1</td>
<td>-.434</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.268</td>
<td>2.005</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>9.662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
^Arrest X Jail
Table 24 Logistic Regression of Abuse and/or Re-Jailed (6 Month Follow-Up) on Arrest and Counseling and Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>e^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.359</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-.813</td>
<td>1.212</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.301</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>2.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priors</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>1.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR^1</td>
<td>-1.820</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>8.301</td>
<td>3.681</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>4026.889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^p<.05
^1Arrest X Counseling

Table 25 Logistic Regression of Abuse and/or Re-Jailed (6 Month Follow-Up) on Arrest, Jail, and Counseling and Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>e^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.192</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>1.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.296</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>2.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priors</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>1.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJR^1</td>
<td>-.714</td>
<td>1.108</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.073</td>
<td>2.437</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>21.604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^p<.05
^1Arrest X Jail X Counseling
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Over the past 20 years, research has been conducted to test the effects of arrest as a deterrent to domestic violence. The results of such research have been mixed. For example, Sherman and Berk (1984) concluded from their Minneapolis Domestic Violence experiment that arrest deterred recidivism. However, replication studies could not uncover the deterrent effects of arrest (Dunford, 1992; Hirschel & Hutchison, 1992). More recently, studies have been conducted to test the effects of counseling on recidivism. It has been difficult for researchers to determine such effects because of high attrition rates among offenders in counseling programs (Cadsky, Hanson, Crawford, and Lalonde 1996; Saunders & Parker 1989). This thesis is a re-analysis of previous research that has been conducted on recidivism of domestic violence offenders. I test the effects of arrest, jail, and counseling on recidivism. This chapter reviews significant and non-significant findings, offers policy implications based on these findings, and provides recommendations for future research.

Discussion

Significant Findings

The purpose of this study was to test the effects of arrest, arrest and jail, arrest and counseling, and the combination of these interventions on three recidivism variables (i.e., “abused/assaulted again in the last six months”; “partner in jail in the last six months”; abused and/or re-jailed in the last six months”). Results from the recidivism variables indicated few significant findings. However, the criminal justice sanction of arrest and jail was found to be related to recidivism (i.e. “partner in jail in the last six months”) of
domestic violence offenders. This finding supports hypothesis two which stated that there was a significant relationship between arrest and jail and recidivism. Therefore, it can be concluded that out of all the criminal justice sanctions that were tested, the only sanction that had an effect in reducing recidivism is arrest and jail.

This study also tested the effects of criminal justice sanctions and demographic variables (i.e., age, race, income, education, prior record) on recidivism. From these demographic variables, income was found to have a significant effect on reducing recidivism (i.e., “abused/assaulted again in the last six months” and “abused and/or rejailed in last six months”) when the offender received an initial arrest. It was shown that offenders who had a higher income were less likely to recidivate when they received the criminal justice sanction of initial arrest. This finding supports hypothesis seven which predicated that perpetrators with greater income would be less likely to recidivate when they received a criminal justice sanction when compared to perpetrators with less income. However, income was not significant with any of the other criminal justice interventions or either recidivism variable.

The most reoccurring significant finding in this study was the effect age had on recidivism while controlling for criminal justice sanctions. Analysis of all three recidivism variables (i.e., “abused/assaulted again in the last six months”; “partner in jail in the last six months”; abused and/or re-arrested in the last six months”) found older offenders were less likely to recidivate than their younger counter-parts. Age was found to significantly affect recidivism when using variables “abused/assaulted again in the last six months” and “abused and/or re-arrested in the last six months”.
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Using the recidivism variable “partner in jail in the last six months” age had a significant effect on recidivism when controlling for initial arrest. Age also had a significant effect on recidivism (i.e., “abused and/or re-arrest”). These findings indicate that older offenders are less likely to recidivate than younger offenders. These findings support hypothesis five which predicated that as age of the offender increased his chances of recidivism decreased. Age is a highly predictable variable in reducing recidivism not only in domestic violence but also within all criminal activity (Vold, Bernard, & Snipes, 2002).

Prior record was found to significantly affect recidivism (i.e., “abused and/or re-arrested”) when controlling for age, race, income, education, and arrest and counseling. Perpetrators who had a prior record were more likely to recidivate than perpetrators who were first time offenders. This significant finding supports hypothesis nine which predicated that subjects with prior records would be more likely to recidivate than subjects who did not have a prior record.

Non-significant Findings

Data analysis produced several non-significant findings. There were many non-significant relationships between the recidivism variables and the criminal justice sanctions. No significant relationship was found between “abused/assaulted again in the last six months” and initial arrest. This was also true for the recidivism variable “partner in jail in the last six months”. A non-significant relationship was found between recidivism (i.e., “abused and/or re-arrest”) and the criminal justice sanction of initial arrest. These findings do not support hypothesis one which tested the relationship
between recidivism and initial arrest. Therefore, it appears that initial arrest does not reduce recidivism.

Non-significant findings were also found between two of the recidivism variables and the criminal justice sanction of arrest and jail. Using the criminal justice sanction of arrest and jail to determine if such sanctions have an effect on recidivism (i.e., “abused/assaulted again in the last six months”; “abused and/or re-arrested”) produced non-significant relationships. Therefore, recidivism was not reduced for offenders who received the criminal justice sanction of arrest and jail.

The relationship between the criminal justice sanction of arrest and counseling and recidivism produced a non-significant finding. There was no significance between “abused/assaulted again in the last six months” and arrest and counseling. This was also found for the recidivism variable “partner in jail in the last six months”. Non-significant results were also found between the relationship of “abused and/or re-arrest” and arrest and counseling. These findings conclude that hypothesis three, which tested the relationship between recidivism and the criminal justice sanction of arrest and counseling, is not supported. Therefore, it seems that arrest and counseling has no effect on reducing recidivism of domestic violence offenders, in this sample.

A non-significant relationship was found between recidivism and the criminal justice sanction of arrest, jail and counseling. There was no significant relationship between “abused/assaulted again in the last six months” and the combination of initial arrest, jail, and counseling. This finding was also true when the recidivism variable changed to “partner in jail in the last six months”. The relationship between “abused and/or re-arrest” and arrest, jail and counseling were also found to be non-significant.
Hypothesis four tested the relationship between recidivism and the criminal justice sanction of arrest, jail and counseling. The results of these findings conclude that hypothesis four is not supported; therefore, the combination of arrest, jail, and counseling did not reduce recidivism of domestic violence batterers in my sample.

Finally, non-significant results were found when predicting the effects of race, education, and criminal justice sanctions would have on reducing recidivism. Hypothesis six predicted that whites would have lower recidivism than non-whites when they received any of the criminal justice sanctions; however, race did not produce a significant effect on recidivism. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is no difference in recidivism between whites and non-whites when they receive any of the criminal justice sanctions. Non-significant results were found for hypothesis eight, which predicted that as an offender’s education increased his likelihood of recidivism would decrease. However, results indicate that increased education does not reduce recidivism; therefore, hypothesis eight was not supported. Hypothesis ten predicted that offenders who received some form of criminal justice sanction would be less likely to recidivate than offenders who did not receive any sanctions. However, this hypothesis is not supported because of non-significant results. In other words, receiving a criminal justice sanction did not effect whether or not an offender would recidivate.

Relevance of Results to Other Studies

This study found that the only criminal justice sanction that was related to recidivism was arrest and jail. Other findings in the field show mixed results for the effects of criminal justice sanctions on recidivism. For example, Sherman and Berk (1984) found that arrest was the most effective criminal justice sanction in reducing
recidivism. On the other hand, replication studies (e.g., see Dunford, 1992; Hirschel & Hutchison, 1992) could not find a deterrent effect on recidivism when offenders received the criminal justice sanction of arrest. In regards to counseling, some researchers (e.g., see Edleson & Grusznski, 1988; Shupe, Stacey, & Hazelwood, 1986) have found that counseling reduces the offender’s likelihood to recidivate; however, this study could not conclude such findings. Yet, other studies (e.g., see Edleson & Grusznski 1988; Gordon & Moriarty, 2003) have concluded that counseling does not have an effect on reducing recidivism. Therefore, it can be concluded that results of this thesis contribute to the mixed findings in the research field of domestic violence.

Results from this study found that age, income, and prior record are predictors of reducing recidivism. Older offenders who received criminal justice sanctions were less likely to recidivate. Perpetrator’s who had higher income were also less likely to recidivate when they received a criminal justice sanction. Subjects who did not have a prior record were less likely to commit another domestic violence offense than subjects who had prior records. Sherman et al. (1992), found, in their replication study, that offenders with higher income were less likely to recidivate when they received an arrest. Sherman, Smith, Schmidt, and Rogan (1992) concluded in their study that offenders with prior records would be more likely to repeat violence than those offenders who did not have a prior record. Saunders and Parker (1989) concluded, in their study of completion rates of offenders in counseling programs, that older offenders were more likely to complete the program than younger offenders. DeMaris’ (1989) study on completion rates found that younger offenders with prior records were more likely to dropout.
The independent variables of race and education were found to be non-significant in reducing recidivism of domestic violence offenders. However, Sherman and Berk (1984); Sherman et al., (1992); and Sherman et al., (1992) all found race to be a factor in recidivism, whites were less likely to recidivate once they received some form of criminal justice intervention. Sherman et al. (1992) concluded that offender’s who were high school graduates and received the criminal justice sanction of arrest were less likely to recidivate. In their study of completion rates in counseling programs, Faulkner et al. (1991) found race and education to have no effect on recidivism.

In regards to criminal justice sanctions reducing recidivism among offenders of domestic violence, the findings have been varied. The results from this study found that arrest and jail had an effect in preventing offenders from recidivating while the sanctions of arrest, arrest and counseling, and the combination of arrest, jail, and counseling had no effect in preventing offenders from recidivating. However, previous research on the effects of criminal justice sanctions has concluded conflicting result from the findings in this study. For example, Sherman and Berk (1984) found arrest to deter offenders from re-offending. In their studies involving counseling programs for offenders of domestic violence, Edleson et al. (1985); Johannson & Tutty, 1998; Neidig, Friedman, & Collins 1985) all concluded that the programs reduced recidivism rates for the majority of the batterers who completed the program.

Summary and Comparison of Original Results with Current Study’s Findings

There are a few similarities and differences between the findings of the original study conducted by Syers and Edleson (1992) and this study. First, Syers and Edleson (1992) were limited to using cross-tabulations and logistic regression, as this study was
limited too because of the categorical nature of the variables. Second, Syers and Edleson dropped cases from the analyses where there was no follow-up data available. As noted in chapter three, I also dropped cases with missing data from my analysis.

The original study found no significant relationship between recidivism and arrest at both 6 and 12 month follow-ups. This is the same finding that was concluded from my data analysis. Another similarity was found between the original study and the current study in regards to prior record. Syers and Edleson (1992) found that 73% of offenders who did not have a prior record did not repeat their violent behavior, while 44% of offenders with a prior record did repeat their violent behavior. Syers and Eldeson conclude that the most effective predictor of recidivism in their analysis was prior record, whereas the most effective predictor in my analysis was age.

A difference between findings in the original study and the current study is that Syers and Edleson (1992) concluded that education had an effect on recidivism. They found that offenders with higher education were less likely to repeat their violent behavior. However, my data analysis was unable to support this finding. A difference between the original study and the current study is that Syers and Edleson found that offenders who received an initial arrest and counseling were the least likely to recidivate; whereas I found that offenders who received arrest and jail were the least likely to recidivate. Overall, Syers and Edleson found more variables to be effective in reducing recidivism than I was able to discern. This could be because they used three waves of data while I only used two. Syers and Edleson failed to provide policy implications or recommendations for future research based on their findings.
Limitations of the study

The limitations of this project are, of course, based on those that Maryann Syers and Jeffrey Edleson noted during their data collection. According to Syers and Edleson (1992) the data collection relied on reports by a variety of informants including police, victims, and battered women’s advocates. It was often found that the reporting was incomplete, which caused the depletion of a number of cases available for final analyses and limited the strength of their findings. Syers and Edleson also state that the dependent variable tends to classify men as non-repeaters when they are actually repeaters. The researchers address this issue by only analyzing subsamples found at 6 and 12 month follow-ups. However, they argue that even follow-ups up to one year cannot guarantee that all the incidents of violence that were observed during their data collection were observed by at least one of the informants. Thus, the findings of this thesis are limited by the methodological problems noted by Syers and Edleson. Another limitation to this study is the types of data analysis that could be performed because the variables were nominal measurements. I was limited to testing the independent and dependent variable using Chi-square and logistic regression.

Policy Implication

The focus of this study was to develop an insight into which criminal justice sanction (i.e., arrest, arrest/jail, arrest/counseling, arrest/jail/counseling) was the most effective in reducing recidivism of domestic violence offenders. Although the results of this study were weak, arrest and jail was found to be an effective sanction in reducing recidivism. This result implies that the combination of arrest and jail will be the most beneficial sanction imposed on offenders of domestic violence. Therefore, if police
departments are going to implement a mandatory arrest policy, such a policy must include mandatory jail time for offenders of domestic violence.

One significant finding was the effect age had on recidivism. Many criminological theorists have argued about the relationship between age and crime. These theorists have debated over the idea behind “career criminal” and “criminal career”. A career criminal is someone who commits many crimes over a long period of time; whereas a criminal career suggest that the offender begins his or her criminal activity at a certain time in his or her life, continues for some time and than it ends (Vold et al., 2002). The discipline of criminal justice has known for a long time that crime rates rise during adolescence, peak during the late teen and early 20s, than steadily decline from there. This explains why older offenders desist from all crimes, including domestic violence. The older the offender, the less likely he will recidivate.

It may be that older offenders are more likely to be deterred and rehabilitated whereas offenders who are younger with prior records are less likely to be deterred and rehabilitated. Police departments throughout the United States may need to implement a policy of discretion in applying mandatory arrest policies in their jurisdictions. It is important to treat every domestic violence case as an individual entity and to have every police officer use his or her professional expertise in assessing domestic violence calls.

Police departments need to involve the community in a proactive approach to respond to domestic violence. This proactive approach would include police officers, other members of the criminal justice system, and other members of the community such as business, religious, media, and civic sectors to provide appropriate responses to abuse as well as monitor and evaluate interventions (Jenkins & Davidson, 2001). There must
be a joint community effort in reducing domestic violence and providing support to victims and batterers alike, police departments can only provide part of the solution to the problem the community must do the rest.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

For future research in this area, I suggest decreasing for the number of missing cases by following up with victims and offenders every month to insure proper contact information. Researchers will then know where to locate members of the study at 6 and 12 months. Future studies need to address the issue of missing data at 6 and 12 month follow-ups. Incomplete reporting seriously depletes the number of cases available in the sample size, which affects the analysis of data and limits the statistical power of the analysis. This issue is a major problem with using secondary data. The discrepancies of findings in this study as well as previous research raise concerns about the appropriateness of mandatory arrest policies. This discrepancy suggests the importance of continuing research on the effectiveness of arrest on reducing recidivism using a variety of demographic variables.

Another suggestion for future research would be to control attrition rates of counseling programs. Assessing offenders in court-ordered counseling programs can control this issue. Perhaps, an offender in such a program drops out then he or she should be required to serve a 12 week jail sentence, since most of the counseling programs are 12 weeks in length. More research is needed in testing the effectiveness of dimensions of group counseling. For example a study would be conducted to test different types of programs to analyze which would be the most beneficial in controlling batterers’ violent tendencies.
Another suggestions for future research would be to conduct a qualitative study of batterers in counseling programs. Researchers may better understand counseling by choosing five or six offenders in the program and tracking their progress throughout their 12-week program to determine whether or not there was a change in their behavior. This study could be followed up at 6 and 12 months to reveal long-term benefits of rehabilitative counseling. Finally, more studies need to be conducted on the effectiveness of combining arrest and counseling. These studies would provide more insight into the debate between deterrence and rehabilitation in regards to which is the most effective in reducing recidivism among batterers of domestic violence.

Reflections

Domestic violence has always been an interest of mine in the field of criminal justice. My impetus behind my interest in intimate partner violence is two fold. First, because it is an issue where women, no matter their race, religion, education level, or socioeconomic status, are more likely to become a victim than men. Second, because I have known women who have been exposed to violent relationships whether they have been physical, emotional, or psychological and have wondered how the discipline of criminal justice, as well as the criminal justice system reacts to domestic violence.

I expect experts in the field of criminal justice to continue to research the effects of criminal justice sanctions to determine the most effective technique for reducing recidivism among domestic violence offenders. Once such sanctions are determined, I expect the criminal justice system to take action and implement these sanctions in domestic violence cases. As research continues, I expect police departments to do their part in helping to reduce recidivism and protecting victims of domestic violence.
There is no doubt that police departments will always be in domestic violence disputes, since they are the only agency that is available twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. Therefore, I believe, that every police jurisdiction should create a domestic violence unit. Officers should be assigned to only work the domestic violence unit to provide aid to the victim and help prosecute domestic violence cases. Police departments should provide and require all officers to participate in domestic violence workshops. These workshops should provide information on the prevalence and warning signs of domestic violence, as well as information on shelters and safe havens for victims and their children.
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