

IS THERE A DIFFERENCE IN LAW ENFORCEMENT PERCEPTION IN THE ABILITY TO
IDENTIFY THE PRIMARY AGGRESSOR IN A FAMILY VIOLENCE DISPUTE BY
GENDER, RACE, AND RANK?

by

SHERI DENISE BROCK

THEISIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in Criminology at
The University of Texas at Arlington
December, 2016

Arlington, Texas

Supervising Committee:

Jaya Davis
Kent Kerley
John Rodriguez

Abstract

When law enforcement responds to a family violence incident, it is not always clear who the primary aggressor was at the incident and it typically ends up being a “he said, she said” incident. The purpose of this study is to understand factors associated with determining the primary aggressor when responding to family violence. The introduction is covered in chapter one and it describes the issues that law enforcement officers have when they respond to a family violence call and if law enforcement responses to the questions being analyzed vary based on gender, race, and rank. Chapter two offers a literature review. The literature review is an overview and analysis of law enforcement perceptions of family violence victims, mandatory arrest policies and factors that influence likelihood of arrest and dual arrests. Chapter three covers the research methods for this project and includes several sections: research design, setting and participants, measures, activities, and data analysis techniques. Chapter four identifies the results of the study. Within the results chapter, figures and tables are provided that help identify the results of the study. Chapter five covers the discussion and goes into further detail about the results of the study.

Copyright by
Sheri Denise Brock
2016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to say thank you to Dr. Davis, Dr. Kerley, and Dr. Rodriguez. Through the years, even when I didn't think that I could, you knew that I would. You all have inspired me, motivated me, and helped me achieve my goals and my dreams. Without you, I would not be here today.

I thank Dr. Davis for access to her collection of work that allowed me to complete this project. Without her hard work and dedication to her research, I wouldn't have been able to complete this study. When I wanted to give up, you did not let me. When I thought that I was not going to complete my study, you ensured that I did. Thank you for your words of encouragement when they were needed the most.

Thank you for all of your support and dedication to my success.

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my mother, Nena P. Laput, who is no longer physically here with me. My success is because of you. You always pushed me to be great and because of you, I AM great.

I would also like to dedicate this work my husband, Raymond L. Brock who supported me throughout this journey. You pushed me every day and night in order to get to this point. When I didn't believe in myself, you believed in me, and because of that, I am more than grateful.

And last but not least, I dedicate this work to my beautiful daughters, Naya A. Slater, Malaya B. Johnson, Raylin L. Brock, and Kylie J. Brock. It is because of you four that I strive to be the best that I can be. I strive to show you where hard work and dedication can take you. Thank you all for being my driving force and support through this time.

Table of Contents

Title Page	i
Abstract	2
Table of Contents	6
Table of Tables	7
Chapter 1 Introduction	8
Chapter 2 Literature Review	12
Chapter 3 Methods	29
Chapter 4 Results	33
Chapter 5 Discussion	39
Chapter 6 Conclusion	43
References	44
Appendix	47
Biography	52
Academic Honesty Statement	53

Table of Tables

Table 1 Demographics of law enforcement officers survey participants	34
Table 2 Ability to identify aggressor by Gender	35
Table 3 Ability to identify aggressor by Race/Ethnicity	36
Table 4 Ability to identify aggressor by Rank	37

Chapter 1

Introduction

Problem Statement

Family violence is an ongoing concern for law enforcement officers. Law enforcement officers are required to respond to calls concerning family violence and they are required to assess situations and make determinations about who the aggressor is and who should be arrested. Law enforcement officers are of varying races, ranks, and gender. This study seeks to determine if a law enforcement official's gender, race, or rank effects his or her decision to identify the primary aggressor during a family violence dispute. Several questions were posed to law enforcement officers in an effort to determine if these factors play a role in their decision making process of identifying the primary aggressor during a family violence incident.

Background

Finn (2006) states in her research that in the 1970s and 1980s, family violence was a secret which no one knew about. Law enforcement did not intervene in family violence incidents and family violence incidents were not seen as illegal. Family violence was viewed as a private matter and best handled through mediation by a social services worker, not by law enforcement.

According to Finn, "Several civil liability cases against police agencies (Bruno v. Codd, 1977; Thurman v. City of Torrington, 1984) resulted in the loss of millions of dollars for their failure to intervene and protect victims" (p. 270), which then resulted in changes within law enforcement agencies and the way family violence was handled.

In 2014, the crime statistics showed that there were a total of 185,817 family violence incidents reported in Texas compared to 185,453 in 2013 which was an increase of 0.2 percent in

2014, compared to the previous year, 2013 (p.35). In the incidents that were reported in 2014, there were 201,051 victims in 2014 compared to 199,752 victims in 2013. There was an increase of victims in 2014 by 0.7 percent (p. 35). In 2014, there was also an increase of offenders by 0.4 percent. Compared to the 194,756 offenders in 2013, there were 195,511 offenders in 2014 (p. 35). When the crime statistics were studied in 2014 by the Texas Department of Public Safety, it was determined that the “largest percentage of family violence reports was between other family members. The second most commonly reported relationship among offenders and victims was married spouses and the third most common relationship was common law spouses” (p. 35).

In many states, there are mandatory arrest policies. According to the American Bar Association, in the states where mandatory arrest policies are in effect, “When a law enforcement officer responds to a domestic violence situation and has probable cause to believe that a crime has been committed, the officer shall exercise arrest powers provided, that the officer shall arrest and take into custody the alleged perpetrator of the crime.”

Of the 50 states in the United States, not all states have mandatory arrest policies. In many states, officers have the discretion to make an arrest during a family violence incident.

According to the Texas Criminal Code, pursuant to Vernon's Ann.Texas c.c.p. art. 14.03 (a)(4):

Art. 14.03. AUTHORITY OF PEACE OFFICERS. (a) Any peace officer may arrest, without warrant:

(1) persons found in suspicious places and under circumstances which reasonably show that such persons have been guilty of some felony, violation of Title 9, Chapter 42, Penal Code, breach of the peace, or offense under Section 49.02, Penal Code, or threaten, or are about to commit some offense against the laws;

(2) persons who the peace officer has probable cause to believe have committed an assault resulting in bodily injury to another person and the peace officer has probable cause to believe that there is danger of further bodily injury to that person;

3) persons who the peace officer has probable cause to believe have committed an offense defined by Section 25.07, Penal Code, if the offense is not committed in the presence of the peace officer;

(4) persons who the peace officer has probable cause to believe have committed an offense involving family violence;

(5) persons who the peace officer has probable cause to believe have prevented or interfered with an individual's ability to place a telephone call in an emergency, as defined by Section 42.062(d), Penal Code, if the offense is not committed in the presence of the peace officer; or

(6) a person who makes a statement to the peace officer that would be admissible against the person under Article 38.21 and establishes probable cause to believe that the person has committed a felony.

There are no mandatory arrest policies in Texas; however, many departments throughout the state model mandatory arrest policies. Although the model of mandatory arrest policies are followed, law enforcement officers still are able to use their discretion when deciding when to make an arrest of an aggressor during a family violence call.

When law enforcement responds to a family violence incident, it is not always clear who the primary aggressor was at the incident and it typically ends up being a "he said, she said" incident. When there are not multiple parties available to identify who the aggressor was during the family violence incident, it is then left to the law enforcement officer to try to identify who

the primary aggressor was and to decide who to arrest. The purpose of this study is to identify if gender, race/ethnicity, and rank makes a difference when identifying the primary aggressor at a family violence incident.

Significance

This research will help law enforcement officers make better determinations of who the primary aggressor is when responding to a family violence incident. Continued research is vital for law enforcement agencies to help make the right decisions when responding to a family violence call in order to protect the victim. It is important that law enforcement officers make the right decision when making an arrest during a family violence incident because it also lessens the chance that the victim will be re-victimized. This study will help law enforcement officers see the importance of making the right decision in identifying the primary aggressor when responding to family violence incidents.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Overview of Family Violence

Unless one can be there when the family violence occurred from beginning to end, there is no positive way to identify what caused the incident or who caused the incident. Without knowing what or who caused the family violence incident to occur, unless there are bystanders to witness what happened, it is left to law enforcement officers to determine who the primary aggressor was and who to arrest; however, this can be a difficult task to complete. Jackson discussed several factors surrounding the history of domestic violence:

The Violence against Women Act (VAWA) of 1994 helped pave domestic violence concerns into legislative matters. Historically, family violence was handled through informal measures often resulting in mishandling of cases... The law has recognized that victims of domestic violence deserve recognition and resolution. Law enforcement agencies may be held civilly accountable for their actions in domestic violence incidents. Mandatory arrest policies have been initiated helping reduce discretionary power of police officers. (xx, 2007)

Being unable to identify the aggressor when responding to a family violence incident is a barrier when law enforcement officers are trying to do their job and arrest the aggressor to provide safety to the victim. It has been determined that there are a number of factors that play into a law enforcement officers' decision making when attempting to determine who the aggressor is and who to arrest. According to Garcia, García, and Lila (2008):

Police response policies to intimate partner violence against women can be organized into three categories: (a) meditative policies in which the police act as a

peacemaker or mediator, offering conversation, giving advice, or maintaining a presence until the offender calms down or the situation otherwise dissipates; (b) pro-arrest policies that encourage arrest in domestic violence cases but leave the discretion to the officers; and (c) mandatory arrest policies that dictate that arrest must take place whenever probable cause exists, even in misdemeanor offenses. (p. 698)

Types of Violence

Johnson and Leone (2005) state that, “there are two distinct forms of male violence against female partners. The basic pattern in what he called patriarchal terrorism (which we will refer to as intimate terrorism, as he does in more recent articles) is violence that is embedded in a general pattern of controlling behaviors, indicating that the perpetrator is attempting to exert general control over his partner” (p. 322-323). It was suggested by Johnson that domestic violence, wife beating, and spousal abuse are terms that are associated with intimate terrorism.

Johnson and Leone defined intimate terrorism as “the attempt to dominate one’s partner and to exert general control over the relationship, domination that is manifested in the use of a wide range of power and control tactics, including violence. Although many authors working in the feminist tradition have described this general pattern of controlling behavior” (p. 323).

Johnson and Leone (2005) also describe another form of violence which is called situational violence. According to Johnson and Leone, “the intimate partner violence that he called common couple violence (which we will refer to as situational couple violence, as he does in more recent articles) is violence that is not connected to a general pattern of control. He describes this violence as involving specific arguments that escalate to violence but showing no relationship-wide evidence of an attempt to exert general control over one’s partner” (p. 323).

Situational couple violence, according to Johnson and Leone, is “defined as intimate partner violence that is not embedded in such a general pattern of controlling behaviors. Its particular causes may vary from couple to couple and across different incidents of violence experienced by the same couple, but there is no relationship-wide pattern of controlling behaviors. This form of intimate partner violence is not rooted in a general pattern of control but occurs when specific conflict situations escalate to violence” (p. 324).

There are two types of theories that Johnson associates with intimate partner violence. The first theory that Johnson associates with intimate partner violence is feminist theory. Johnson and Leone (2005) state that, “Feminist theory conceptualizes intimate partner violence as a matter of control, rooted in patriarchal traditions of male dominance in heterosexual relationships, especially marriage. Family violence theory sees intimate partner violence as a matter of conflict, rooted in the everyday stresses of family life that produce conflicts that may or may not escalate to violence (Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980; Straus & Smith, 1990)” (p.323).

Victims Help Seeking

Leone et al. (2007) state that victim background characteristics are not necessarily associated with help seeking and the findings are not consistent. According to the research by Leone et al., “Some findings suggest that Hispanic and African America women are more likely than White women to call the police in response to partner violence (Hutchinson & Hirschel, 1998; Krishnan, Hilbert, & Leeuwen, 2001), whereas other studies show that they are less likely (Richie, 1996). Yoshioka, Gilbert, El-Bassel, and Baig-Amin (2003) found no differences among African American, Hispanic, and Asian women’s formal help seeking. More specifically, about 30% called the police or counselor, or both, and less than 4% contacted a doctor” (p. 428).

Data shows that victims of intimate terrorism search for assistance from formal sources, such as police, shelters, counselors, and medical services. “More specifically, about 45-60% call the police, 30-40% contact a shelter/counselor, and about 30% contact medical services” (Leone et al, 2007, p. 429). The data for situational couple violence do not utilize formal sources as much as intimate terrorism. “7-30% of victims call police, 11-22% contact a shelter, and about 16% contact a medical agency” (Leone et al, 2007, p. 429).

Family Violence Laws

Thirty-four (Hirschel and Deveau, p. 3) out of fifty states in the United States of America enforce mandatory arrest laws. Texas does not have mandatory arrest laws, however several law enforcement agencies in Texas have policies that reflect mandatory arrest laws. Law enforcement agencies in Tarrant County support mandatory arrest. Champagne stated the following:

Mandatory arrest laws require police to arrest someone at the scene of a domestic violence incident whether the officer believes arrest is appropriate or not. These mandatory policies are necessary because leaving the decision to police officers about whether to arrest someone at the scene of a domestic violence incident often results in no arrest at all. Sometimes an officer will incorrectly determine that there was a mutually combative situation and leave the victim with the abuser. This level of discretion can result in further harm and possibly in the death of the victim. Mandatory arrest deescalates violent situations and creates a level of accountability for abusive people. (Vol. 16 Issue 1, p2-6. 5p.)

Mandatory arrest laws serve several purposes, and due to these laws, victims are not left with their abusers after an incident of violence and there is a greater chance that the aggressor will be

prosecuted. Many jurisdictions also implement No-Drop prosecution policies as well.

Champagne states, “No-drop prosecution policies require the state prosecutor to go forward with the prosecution of a domestic violence perpetrator regardless of whether the victim wants to continue with the process or not” (Vol. 16 Issue 1, p2-6. 5p.).

Hirschel and Deveau stated that, “To lessen the likelihood that victims are unjustly arrested with offenders, states began to pass primary aggressor laws designed to ensure that police officers appropriately assess who is the “real” offender and arrest only that party, distinguishing, for example, between the infliction of “defensive” as opposed to “offensive” injuries. The first state in the United States to enact a primary aggressor law was Washington State in 1985” (p. 3).

In many states, law enforcement officers have discretion when deciding to make an arrest during a family violence incident. As Garcia stated in the first category, law enforcement officers can act as a mediator or peacemaker. With this approach, the officer can assume talks between both the aggressor and the victim to calm things between the two. If the situation is to become calm and both parties can talk and resolve the issue, it is more than likely that the law enforcement officer will not make an arrest. In most incidents where there are no signs of a physical altercation and more of verbal altercation, this would be the approach that most likely would be taken. In this situation, if the victim does not want to pursue charges, it is more than likely that the officer will not take any action aside attempting to be the mediator.

In the second category described by Garcia, there are agencies that have pro-arrest policies in place that heighten the likelihood of an arrest. With departments that have pro-arrest policies in place, the officers can arrest whomever they determine is the aggressor. However, with pro-arrest policies in place, the law enforcement officer has the discretion of making an

arrest or not. Although the agency that the law enforcement officer has pro-arrest policies in place, the pro-arrest policies are not mandatory and do not mandate that an arrest be made. It is at the discretion of the law enforcement officer that is responding to the incident. If the law enforcement officer determines that the situation cannot be diffused, in the culture of their agency, it would be best that an arrest be made due to their pro-arrest policies. Like the previous category, if the victim does not want to pursue charges, the officer has the discretion to decide to pursue charges or not.

The third category described by Garcia speaks of agencies that have mandatory arrest policies. Mandatory arrest policies have been implemented by many states; however, they are not implemented in every state. In the states that have implemented mandatory arrest policies, when a law enforcement officer responds to a family violence incident, they are required, by the policies that have been put into place, to make an arrest. When law enforcement officers respond to family violence incidents in states where there are mandatory arrest policies, even if the victim does not want to move forward with pursuing legal actions, the officer has a duty to make an arrest, unlike the two previous categories. Jackson described research surrounding mandatory arrest and police discretion. Jackson stated, "Research shows that officers often do not arrest even if state law requires that they arrest when probable cause exists... Because there are no clear guidelines on when probable cause is met, mandatory arrest statutes cannot mandate arrest in all cases and do not eliminate police discretion" (p. 544). Therefore even when mandatory arrest laws or policies exist, police discretion may account for lack of arrests by law enforcement officers responding to domestic violence incidents.

Situations Involving Arrest of Both Parties

There are situations where both parties are arrested during incidents of domestic violence. Often law enforcement officers are in situations where they are uncertain who the primary aggressor is after an incident of domestic violence, and officers may decide to arrest both parties. Frye, Haviland, and Rajah (2007) ascertain that mandatory arrest laws created four unintended consequences, including “unwanted,” “dual,” “retaliatory,” and “no” arrest (p. 397). Law enforcement officers are expected to make quick and sound judgements with regard to who they should arrest after arriving at a domestic violence altercation. With regard to dual arrests, Jackson detailed the following concern:

Dual arrests, where both partners are arrested, have been identified as a problem because such arrests often punish the victims for using physical aggression in self-defense. Some states have implemented primary aggressor laws that encourage officers to arrest only the main perpetrator and not persons who may have used physical aggression to protect themselves. (p. 543)

Unfortunately, sometimes mandatory arrest laws result in the victim being arrested, even if the victim was claiming self-defense. Frye, Haviland, and Rajah (2001) suggest that under this mandatory arrest provision, two patterns develop, “dual arrest (when perpetrator and victim are both arrested because of conduct in the same event) and retaliatory arrest (when victims are arrested as a result of a false complaint filed by the abuser as retaliation against the victim)” (p. 86).

Dual arrest policies are applicable, according to Finn, when law enforcement officers have multiple ideas of how the statutory language is applied by their department. Finn states, “Some officers operate under the belief that in domestic violence situations where both parties make verbal claims of injury or display injuries, their department supports the arrest of both

parties (dual arrest policy). Whereas other officers operate under the belief that when both parties are injured or make counterclaims in a domestic violence incident, their department expects them to make efforts to determine who was the primary aggressor and to arrest only that party (general arrest policy). Still other officers report that the decision of whether and who to arrest is left to their individual judgment (open arrest policy)” (p. 566).

With dual arrest policies being open for interpretation, it poses issues for law enforcement officers when determining to make a dual arrest. When law enforcement officers do not operate under the same belief when applying the dual arrest policy, law enforcement officers’ discretion then become applicable. When the law enforcement officers’ discretion becomes applicable, the law enforcement officer is no longer following the policy. However, according to Finn, there are three reasons why law enforcement officers do follow the dual arrest policies (p. 567-586):

1. Officers may be reluctant to conduct more extensive investigations in family violence cases because they lack the training or resources to do so.
2. Officers may believe that such issues of who instigated the violence and who is acting in self-defense are better left for the courts to decide.
3. Officers fear liability if they fail to arrest, and another incident of violence occurs.

Thus, arresting both may be viewed as prudent and cautious step in incidents where each party claims the other was the aggressor and/or both have injuries. Furthermore, police often minimize the negative effects that arrest may have on victims, as they view dual arrest may have on victims, as they view dual arrests as providing for victim safety and motivating victims to see help for the abuse.

With dual arrests policies being created, there have been negative consequences that have been brought to light. Finn's research indicates that the negatives consequences are, "such as making irrelevant battered women's preferences regarding arrest (Coker, 2001; Mills, 1998), creating higher arrest rates in minority populations than in White populations (Bohmer, Brandt, Bronson, & Hartnett, 2002; Coker, 2001; Zorza & Woods, 1994), and increasing the number of battered women being arrested with their batterers (Jones & Belknap, 1999; Martin, 1997; Robinson, 2000; Saunders, 1995; Zorza & Woods, 1994) (p. 566-567).

Difficulty of Identifying the Primary Aggressor

Domestic violence incidents are often some of the most dangerous calls that law enforcement officers can respond to due to the unknown nature of the call. It is often difficult to determine the difference between the primary aggressor and the victim. Waldrep and Bellesiles state:

The term "victim" implies innocence, but it seems in this society the term "innocence" implies some sort of guilt, and nowhere is that attitude more apparent than in our current judicial system where it has become a common practice for defense lawyers to blame victims for their own assault and suffering, or at least destroy a victim's credibility and dignity before the trial process is over. (p. 384)

There is great importance for law enforcement officers to maintain neutrality when attempting to determine the identity of the primary aggressor of a domestic violence incident. Jackson detailed how many law enforcement officers utilize their beliefs and attitudes when deciding whom to arrest. Jackson stated, "Officers are clearly selective about following policies and are more likely to follow policies that are consistent with their beliefs and attitudes. Moreover, officers do

not consistently use legal criteria and expand their focus to include other situational and disputants' characteristics" (p. 544).

Several factors may influence a law enforcement officer's ability to identify the primary aggressor. For example, the gender of the responding law enforcement officer may play a role in who is determined to be the primary aggressor. Scarborough and Collins propose that "The most common type of resistance identified by the respondents was male officers' attitudes that women should remain in more stereotypical roles, and their blatant unwillingness to work with female officers" (p. 115). This implies that a responding male officer may be more apt to make an arrest than a female. It also implies that if a male officer responds first they may not call for backup if a female officer would be the responding officer. Finally, this implies that if male and female officers arrive on scene, the male officer may not take the advice of whom to arrest depending upon the beliefs of the male officer. Jackson explored stereotypes held by law enforcement officers and how those stereotypes affect an officer's decision making when it comes to making an arrest. Jackson stated, "Officers also use stereotypes about domestic violence, battered women, and categories of people based on social class, mental illness, race, gender, and other salient categories" (p. 545). In addition, Jackson discussed more seasoned officers, or possibly officers with a higher rank, and how they make determinations upon whom to arrest. Jackson stated, "Research has found that experienced officers considered their stereotypic beliefs about battered women's propensity to use self-defense in arriving at their arrest decisions" (p. 545). While there are different beliefs when it comes to gender, race, and rank, Robinson and Chandek, (2000) state that:

Researchers have found that the race of any officer does not affect his or her proclivity to make arrests (Walker, Spohn, and DeLeone 1996), but the gender of

an officer was found to be related to arrest---female officers made fewer arrests than their male counterparts (see Martin 1993 for a review). Researchers have also found that older or more experienced officers made fewer arrests than younger officers (Bittner 1990; Muir 1977; Staland and Finn 1995). (p. 20).

In the study completed by Robinson and Chandek, they stated that, “past research has shown that female officers make arrests less often than male officers (see Martin 1993)” (p. 32). Robinson and Chandek found that this was the same in their study, but said that, “This may be the result of overrepresentation of males in the sample, but it could also could be that female officers were more likely to adhere to victims’ preferences than to policy mandates (Homant & Kennedy 1985; but see Worden 1993) (p. 32).

According to Gover, Paul, and Dodge (2011), “female officers are more likely than male officers to show trust and compassion when interacting with the general public. Similarly, Sun’s (2007) observational study found that female officers responding to domestic violence incidents were more likely to provide support to citizens compared to their male counterparts. In direct contrast, recent research by Rabe-Hemp (2008) reported no differences between male and female officers in terms of showing supportive behaviors during citizen encounters. The findings, however, suggested that female officers were less likely than male officers to use “extreme controlling behavior” (p. 431). Other research suggests that female officers are more inclined than male officers to use verbal solving skills to deal with offender behavior (Tewksbury & Collins, 2006)” (p. 622).

It can be assumed that a female law enforcement officer would be more compassionate when dealing with a family violence incident; however, this does not always prove to be true. It has been found that male and female law enforcement officers do not show differences when

responding to family violence incidents; however, their tactics may be a little different. Female law enforcement officers may not be as forceful as male law enforcement officers and female law enforcement officers are more likely to use verbal commands to de-escalate the situation.

Additionally, the race of the responding law enforcement officer may play a role in who is determined to be the primary aggressor. If both the law enforcement officer and the suspect are the same race, it is more likely that the law enforcement officer will make a determination of who the primary aggressor is and make an arrest. In many instances, African Americans are arrested at a higher rate than other races. Russell stated the following:

Race-based policies pit law enforcement against minorities and create an unbreakable cycle: racial stereotypes may motivate police to arrest Blacks more frequently. This in turn generates statistically disparate arrest patterns, which in turn form the basis for further police selectivity by race. What many Whites view as the police 'doing their job' is viewed by many Blacks as harassment (p. 45).

Due to the relationship based upon race of the responding law enforcement officer and the offender, if they are of the same race, an arrest is more likely. In addition with regard to race, African American females are more likely than females of other races to be victims of violent crime. Russell identified that "...the [victimization] rates for Black women (51.3) are almost one-third higher than the rates for White women (37.6) and almost three times higher than the rates for Asian women (17.4)."

According to Gover, Paul, and Dodge, "Paoline et al. (2000) noted that minority officers may be less likely to subscribe to stereotypes present inside the police culture and are therefore less estranged from minority communities. Overall, police officers may react to the demographic

characteristics of the parties involved in domestic violence disputes, which may vary according to police officer demographic characteristics” (p. 623).

This also goes to show that race relations do exist and coincide with one another. If one law enforcement officer can relate to the race of the individuals involved in the family violence incident, it is more than likely that an action will be taken other than arrest. Minority officers believe in order to continue with community policing and continue good relationship with those in the community, alternate approaches are taken and everything remains positive within the community and the law enforcement officer.

Finally, the rank of the responding law enforcement officer may play a role in who is determined to be the primary aggressor. Officers with a higher rank typically have more experience responding to and making determinations on the primary aggressor during domestic violence situations. Due to this experience of higher ranking officers, they more than likely make more arrests. Waldrep and Bellesiles state, "The belief is expressed by competent observers that corruption and influence protect certain suspects; that fear of reprisal protects others, and that this protection due to fear of reprisals is increasing" (p. 293). Consequently, lower ranking officers may affect fewer arrests due to the inability to properly identify the primary aggressor.

Hargan identified the important factors that many incidents of domestic violence are not reported, and those incidents of domestic violence involving police officers as the aggressor lack data. Hargan stated, "Research has revealed that domestic violence by the general population is underreported and domestic violence by police officers is believed to lack sufficient statistical data partially due to the police policing themselves; thus resulting in a lack of data of how many police officers engage in domestic violence" (p. 10-11).

Gover, Paul and Dodge discuss the impact of rank, family violence incidents and the likelihood of an arrest. It was stated in their research that:

Similar to race and other demographic characteristics, an officer's level of experience may influence responses to domestic violence calls. Logan, Shannon, and Walker (2006) found that novice officers were more likely to support more punitive sanctions for domestic violence offenders than seasoned officers. Saunders (1995), however, reported no differences in the likelihood of arrest based on officers' age, race, rank, years of service, or Experience before entering policing.

Clear Evidence of Injury Supporting Arrest

In the states where law enforcement officers have the discretion as to whether they want to make an arrest or diffuse the situation, there are many factors that play into an officer's decision. According to Logan, Shannon, and Walker, (2006), law enforcement officers decide how to approach family violence incidents depending upon injuries, witnessing violence occur, previous reports at the same location, if the use of illegal substances or other substances, and characteristics of the neighborhood.

If a law enforcement officer responds to situations where there are visible signs of injuries, or arrive on scene where the incident is continuing to occur, it is likely that the officer will make the arrest. Also, if there have been previous reports of family violence at the residence, an arrest will more than likely occur. Lee, Zhang, and Hoover, (2013) state in their research that, "Klinger (1997) theorized that an impression of a dilapidated neighborhood may generate a presumption among officers that their intervention would not be effective in reducing problems. Also, a high frequency of minor problems in a poor neighborhood would beget

callousness among responding officers and, consequently, they would not use vigorous force to the extent it might be used in an affluent neighborhood" (p. 158).

Although it would not be assumed that a neighborhood would have an impact on an officer's decision making when deciding to arrest, it has been proven that it does have an impact. When a neighborhood is old, run down, and dilapidated, it has been proven repeatedly that this is where higher incidents of crime take place. In order to prevent crime continuing to occur, as a result, more arrests would be made in poorer neighborhoods versus richer neighborhoods.

Law enforcement officers often focus on evidence in order to make arrests in cases involving domestic violence. It has proven difficult to prosecute domestic violence cases without evidence, and evidence in domestic violence cases often insinuates that there is a victim with an injury. These scenarios are further complicated in situations where the victim refuses to press charges. Hoyle stated the following:

Even if the police believe that a domestic dispute has taken place and believe that they know who has committed an offence, they cannot charge the alleged perpetrator if they can gather no evidence to support their beliefs. So, whilst officers can arrest persons without evidence of a criminal offence, these are not likely to be 'good arrests'. As the law stands it would be easy to charge a suspect with violence even where there is no injury if the victim and the suspect both made statements which said that the victim had been assaulted by the said suspect. However, officers would only be likely to get such evidence if they initially made an arrest. They are only likely to do this if they are presented with legally relevant evidence. The best evidence of an offence is physical injury. Not surprisingly, therefore, evidence of injuries to victims was correlated with the decision to

arrest, (1998).

Promoting Good Practices

It is vital that law enforcement officers receive proper and up-to-date education surrounding domestic violence laws and procedures. Victims of domestic violence should not be placed in situations that would place them in further jeopardy, including situations where the alleged perpetrator does not get arrested and therefore still has access to the victim. Frydl and Skogan (2004), pointed out the following:

The first observational study of domestic violence incidents (Worden and Pollitz, 1984) found that officer decisions were affected by the same situational factors that affect arrests generally, concluding that police do not treat domestic and other disputes differently. This conclusion was supported by Klinger's (1995) finding that the odds of arrest were no lower in spousal assault than in other assault cases. Observational studies of police responses to intimate partner (or domestic) disturbances or violence also found that encounters involve far more than a simple arrest/no arrest decision. Confirming this differential would once again raise important questions regarding police discretion and the factors that most influence officers in situations that require relatively quick and important decisions.

Impartiality and innovation are important for law enforcement officers when responding to domestic violence incidents. Research suggests that "police have to be innovative to adapt successfully to the wide variety of problems they face," (Frydl & Skogan, 2004). With frequent and proper training, law enforcement officers will be better equipped to handle domestic violence incidents. Law enforcement officers should always be aware of how their gender, race,

and rank could influence their decisions and outcome when handling incidents of domestic violence.

Summary

It is important to recognize the importance of domestic violence laws and how they are interpreted and enforced by law enforcement officers. Each law enforcement officer responding to a domestic violence situation has their own perspective on the situation that may be based upon their gender, race, and/or rank. In order to better understand domestic violence and to better identify the primary aggressor in domestic violence situations, it is imperative that law enforcement officers understand what influences them when they reach the conclusion of who to arrest as the primary aggressor. Many perpetrators of domestic violence use power and control in order to gain compliance from their victims which makes it less likely that victims will pursue legal ramifications for the perpetrator. Champagne (2015) argues that, "Mandatory arrest and no-drop policies have been employed in many jurisdictions and have created positive changes for victims, for communities, and sometimes even for abusers. These statewide policies will help ensure that batterers recognize that intra-family violence will not be tolerated" (p. 5).

The three questions from the survey that were analyzed focus on law enforcement perceptions on being able to identify the aggressor and therefore who to arrest when responding to a family violence incident.

Chapter 3

Methods

Research Questions:

The purpose of this study is to examine if there was a difference between law enforcement officers' perception when responding to a family violence incident based on gender, race, and rank. The following survey items were used in this study:

1. If it is unclear who the aggressor is in a family violence call, it is often best to arrest both parties.
2. Identifying the primary aggressor at a family violence call can be difficult.
3. Police should make an arrest in family violence cases only when there is clear evidence of injury.

Methods

Although researchers have investigated areas related to the research question, there remains questions regarding how gender, race/ethnicity, and rank effect the research question. There are attempts to better understand if gender, race/ethnicity, and rank effect the ability for law enforcement to identify a primary aggressor during a family violence incident.

Design/Sample

The data that is being used in this study is secondary data. The original data was collected by a university researcher.

There is little research on specific demographics that address the likelihood of arrest at the scene of a family violence incident. To address this question, law enforcement agencies from Tarrant County, TX were recruited to allow their officers to complete a survey related to law enforcement perceptions of family violence.

Eleven law enforcement agencies agreed to participate in this research. Law enforcement agencies were contacted through a domestic violence advocacy organization in Tarrant County, TX, as well as a university researcher. Initial proposals to law enforcement agencies requested that officers complete a paper form of the survey and return to university researcher for analysis. Instructions were delivered to each participating law enforcement agency with the requested number of surveys for completion. Instructions for completion of the survey can be found in the appendix (appendix A).

A law enforcement designee, typically a shift supervisor or other administrative personnel appointed by chief of the law enforcement department, read the instructions to participants prior to completing the paper survey. Participants were provided informed consent and requested to give consent before completing any research related to this project. Participants were instructed to remove the informed consent and signature page from the survey before completing. Once participants completed survey, they were instructed to keep informed consent and submit the signature page in one envelope and the survey in another envelope. The university researcher made arrangements to collect all surveys and consent forms.

The largest two agencies of the 11 the participated, requested for surveys to be delivered electronically to the participants in their organization. The university researcher modified the original IRB protocol to reflect an alternative mode of survey delivery. The questions that were included in the paper surveys were input into Survey Monkey using the same language and format. A link to the electronic version of the survey was provided to a deputy chief in both law enforcement organizations. Consent language was included in the electronic format of the survey. Survey links were then distributed to law enforcement personnel of each agency by the

deputy chiefs. Responses were collected in aggregate, electronic format for each of these agencies.

Responses from surveys were entered into SPSS 19.0. Aggregate electronic data collected from each agency was merged with the respondent data in SPSS creating one data set for respondents from all 11 agencies. From the 11 law enforcement agencies that participated in this research, 498 (n=498) participants responded to the paper or online survey. The scope of the survey was to measure law enforcement perceptions of victims of family violence, this research is focused on law enforcement officer's ability to identify the primary aggressor at a family violence incident based on gender, race/ethnicity, and rank. Three items from the original survey were analyzed in response to the current research question.

Data

Participation included responses from 498 law enforcement officers across 11 agencies. Of the participants, 402 were male (81%), 81 were female (16%), while the other 1 percent did not identify their gender. Of the participants, 9 were Asian (2%), 36 were Black (7%), 58 were Hispanic (12%), 13 were Native American (3%), 336 were White (68%), 18 were Other (4%), and 14 did not identify themselves (3%). However, the Other and those who did not identify themselves were not included. Due to few responses in some racial/ethnic categories, responses were recoded as white and non-white. Responses indicating Asian, black, Hispanic, and Native American were recoded and collapsed into one category as non-white. The participants identified their rank to as either Officer or Supervisor. The rank of Officer included patrol officer, police officer, officer, corporal, and POI. The rank of Supervisor included sergeant, lieutenant, commander, major, POII, and POIII. Of the participants, 318 were Officers (64%), 139 were Supervisors (28%), and 36 (7%) did not identify their rank.

Analysis

To analyze the data collected, SPSS 19 was used. A comparison of means, (*t*-test), was used to assess similarities and differences between participants on personal characteristics on gender, race/ethnicity, and rank to understand the impact of these factors on law enforcement decision making regarding family violence arrests.

Chapter 4

Results

The main purpose of this study was to determine if there is a difference in law enforcement perception in the ability to identify the primary aggressor in a family violence dispute by gender, race/ethnicity, and rank. This study will be helpful to law enforcement agencies that want to improve the ability to identify the primary aggressor when responding to a family violence incident. The goal of this study is to help law enforcement officers better identify the primary aggressor when responding to a family violence dispute and to arrest the primary aggressor.

Findings

Demographics of law enforcement officers participating in the study (n = 498) is shown in Table 1. The three groups identified in the study are not similar, as there were far more males than females, whites than non-whites, and officers than supervisors that participated in the study.

Both men and women were more likely to agree that there is a degree of difficulty when attempting to identify the primary aggressor at a family violence incident. However, there was no significant difference based on gender. Table 3 displays the results based on race. Whites were significantly more likely to find it difficult to identify the primary aggressor than Non-whites. Interestingly, Whites and Non-whites alike disagreed that both parties should be arrested if the primary aggressor is unclear and arrests should be made only with clear evidence of injury. Results displayed in Table 4 suggests that there is no significant difference regarding rank with regard to the difficulty of identifying the primary aggressor, as they agreed upon this concept. Additionally, with regard to rank shown in Table 4, there was no significant difference regarding arresting either parties or clear evidence of injury as they both disagreed with these statements.

Table 1 Demographics of law enforcement officers survey participants (N=498)

	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	402	81%
Female	81	16%
Un-Identified ^a	15	1%
Race/Ethnicity		
Asian	9	2%
Black	36	7%
Hispanic	58	12%
Native American	13	3%
White	336	68%
Other ^a	14	3%
Rank		
Office	318	64%
Supervisor	139	28%
Un-Identified	36	7%

Total percentages may not equal to 100 due to rounding. Un-Identified^a includes respondents who did not identify themselves with a specific gender. Other^a includes respondents who did not identify themselves with a specific race.

The category of other was not included. There was a disparity in the number of males and females that participated in the research; with more males participating than females. There was also a disparity in race, with far more whites that participated than any other race. There were more individuals in that identified themselves as officers than supervisors that participated in the research.

Table 2 Ability to identify aggressor by Gender

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	<i>t</i>
Identifying the primary aggressor at a family violence call can be difficult	male	402	0.58	0.814	-0.105
	female	81	0.59	0.877	
If it is unclear who the aggressor is in a family violence call, it is often best to arrest both parties	male	402	1.54	0.780	1.288
	female	81	1.42	0.878	
Police should make an arrest in family violence cases only when there is clear evidence of injury	male	402	1.33	0.907	-0.613
	female	81	1.40	0.890	

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$

Males and females that participated in the research were more likely to agree that identifying the primary aggressor at a family violence call can be difficult. This indicated that when law enforcement officers, both male and female, have issues identifying the primary aggressor when responding to a family violence dispute. The findings were not significant.

Both males and females disagreed that if it was unclear who the aggressor is in a family violence call, it is often best to arrest both parties as shown in Table 2. This showed that both male and female law enforcement officers do not believe that it is best to arrest both parties when responding to a family violence incident. There was no significant difference between genders.

Table 2 also displays that males and females disagreed that police should make an arrest in family violence cases only when there is clear evidence of injury. The research implied that male and female officers believe that even if there is no clear evidence of an injury, that an arrest should be made. This also implies that it is possible that an incident of domestic violence

occurred even if there is no clear evidence of injury. There was no significant difference between genders.

Table 3 Ability to identify aggressor by Race/Ethnicity

	WnW	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	<i>t</i>
Identifying the primary aggressor at a family violence call can be difficult	.00 1.00	336 116	0.53 0.72	0.791 0.919	2.152***
If it is unclear who the aggressor is in a family violence call, it is often best to arrest both parties	.00 1.00	336 116	1.54 1.53	0.768 0.839	-0.116
Police should make an arrest in family violence cases only when there is clear evidence of injury	.00 1.00	336 116	1.36 1.33	0.911 0.892	-0.294

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$

Whites and non-whites agreed that identifying the primary aggressor can be difficult when responding to a family violence call; however, whites were significantly more likely to agree that it is difficult to identify the aggressor than non-whites. Therefore whites have more difficulty identifying the primary aggressor than non-whites when responding to incidents of domestic violence.

Both whites and non-whites disagreed that if it is unclear who the primary aggressor is, that both parties be arrested. There was no significant difference noted. Therefore both whites and non-whites are unlikely to make an arrest of both parties when they are unable to identify the primary aggressor while investigating incidents of domestic violence.

Furthermore, both whites and non-whites disagreed that an arrest should only be made when there is clear evidence of injury, with no significant difference. Both whites and non-

whites agree that arrests should be made even if there is no clear evidence of injury. Non-whites were more likely to disagree with this question than whites.

Table 4 Ability to identify aggressor by Rank

	Rank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	<i>t</i>
Identifying the primary aggressor at a family violence call can be difficult	Officer	318	0.56	0.791	0.560
	Supervisor	139	0.52	0.783	
If it is unclear who the aggressor is in a family violence call, it is often best to arrest both parties	Officer	318	1.50	0.777	-0.633
	Supervisor	139	1.55	0.818	
Police should make an arrest in family violence cases only when there is clear evidence of injury	Officer	318	1.34	0.892	0.484
	Supervisor	139	1.30	0.866	

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$

It was agreed by both officers and supervisors that identifying the primary aggressor during incidents of domestic violence can be difficult. Table 4 displayed the responses for law enforcements ranking. There was no significant difference by rank regarding identification of the primary aggressor. Both officers and supervisors disagreed that if it is unclear who the aggressor is, arresting both parties is the best course of action. Officers disagreed slightly more so than supervisors based on these findings, however both agree that both parties should not be arrested in the event they find it difficult to identify the primary aggressor during incidents of domestic violence.

In addition, both officers and supervisors disagreed that an arrest should only be made where there is clear evidence of injury. Supervisors disagreed slightly more so than officers

according to this research, but not significantly so. Both officers and supervisors believe that arrests may be made even if there is no clear evidence of injury.

Based on the results of this research, it has been determined that when it comes to gender and rank, there was no significant difference in perception of difficulty of identifying the primary aggressor at a family violence call. With regard to race/ethnicity however, there was a significant difference noted with whites agreeing more so than non-whites that it is difficult to determine the identity of the primary aggressor. The research showed that there was no significant difference between gender, race/ethnicity, and rank when determining to arrest both parties when it is unclear the primary aggressor. Furthermore, the research showed that there was no significant difference between race/ethnicity and rank when determining arrest based primarily upon clear evidence of injury. Interestingly, males and females, whites and non-whites, and officers and supervisors all agree that it is difficult to identify the primary aggressor when responding to incidents of domestic violence. Furthermore, males and females, whites and non-whites, and officers and supervisors all disagree that it is often best to arrest both parties if the primary aggressor is unclear and all disagree that police should only make arrests when there exists clear evidence of injury.

Chapter 5

Discussion

This research was centered around law enforcement officer's perceptions and their ability to identify the primary aggressor when responding to a family violence dispute based on gender, race/ethnicity, and rank. The questions were input to SPSS 19 in order to analyze the data collected from the participating law enforcement agencies. A *t*-Test was completed in SPSS 19 to obtain the results. It was determined that a mean over 1 indicated that those participating in the research did not agree with the question that was asked and a mean under 1 indicated that those that participated agreed with the question that was asked.

According to the literature reviewed for this research, several factors influence law enforcement officer's ability to determine the primary aggressor in incidents involving domestic violence. Those factors include the gender, race/ethnicity, and rank of law enforcement officers. Domestic violence laws have changed drastically over the years. Gover, Paul, and Dodge (2011) stated that, "Significant differences were found in officers' responses for two attitudinal variables. Supervisors were more likely to agree that identifying the primary aggressor at a domestic violence incident was difficult" (p. 629). However, in this study that was conducted in Tarrant County, both Officers and Supervisors, regardless of rank believed that it was difficult to identify the primary aggressor during a family violence call with no significant difference. Furthermore, many states have laws or policies that require law enforcement officers to initiate mandatory arrests. Other states mandate dual arrest laws or pro-arrest policies. Officer discretion plays a large role when determining whom to arrest during an incident of domestic violence. Jackson (2007) detailed the difference between mandatory arrest and pro-arrest policies:

The lack of officer discretion is an important distinction between mandatory and pro-arrest policies. Pro-arrest policies provide officers with significantly more discretion and allow an arrest to be made when the officer deems it necessary. Police agencies that adopt this approach typically encourage arrests through policy but ultimately leave the decision to the officers who will be responding to the calls for service. (p. 462)

According to a study by Gover, Paul, and Dodge (2011), they determined that 75% of officers disagree with dual-arrest policies regarding incidents of domestic violence. The current research supports this finding, when asked about dual arrests, whites and non-whites, males and females, and officers and supervisors, disagreed that if the aggressor could not be identified, both parties should be arrested.

Many jurisdictions strive for arrests that will most likely result in a successful prosecution. Due to this factor, many law enforcement officers desire supporting evidence before making an arrest. Therefore many agencies require clear evidence of injury to support an arrest. Gover, Paul, and Dodge (2011) disclosed that, "Females were significantly more likely than males to disagree with the statement, 'Police should arrest in DV cases only when there is clear evidence of injury'" (p. 628). The study that was conducted in Tarrant County asked the same question to both males and females, but unlike previous research, current research showed that females were not significantly more likely than males to disagree with the same statement.

Limitations

It is possible that the responses for this research show similarities or differences due to the low number of responses that were provided. There were a total of 11 agencies that were asked to participate in this research; however, one agency did not participate in the research. Of

the 11 law enforcement agencies that participated in the research, 2 of them were large agencies, while the others were not as big. With smaller agencies participating, this limited the number of participants in the research.

Another limitation is that the research was only completed in Tarrant County and did not include responses from other law enforcement agencies in other counties. If the scope was broadened, the results could have been different.

The method in which the surveys were administered is another limitation. When the surveys were completed by law enforcement officers, they were not supervised in which there was no way to ensure that the officers did not have an open discussion regarding the survey and their responses. Also, although the research here only examined a portion of the larger survey, it is possible that respondents did not answer truthfully due to the length of the survey or the nature of the questions.

Implications

Research conducted in the future should compare attitudes of law enforcement officers across multiple departments. When conducting the research, speak directly with law enforcement officers in-depth to gauge their attitudes to family violence. The in-depth interviews with law enforcement officers at random may help with the understanding of the officers' attitudes regarding family violence.

The results and conclusions of this study are important because law enforcement agencies can see how trying to identify a primary aggressor when responding to a family violence dispute can affect the law enforcement officer's decision making. With this, law enforcement agencies can provide better training and more information to assist law enforcement officers when responding to a domestic violence dispute. New trainings and information provided to law

enforcement officers can assist the officers to making better decisions when making an arrest, but also preventing victims from being blamed and re-victimized.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

Based on the results of this research, it has been determined that when it comes to gender, race/ethnicity, and rank, all three groups agreed that identifying the primary aggressor at a family violence call can be difficult. The research showed that all three groups based on gender, race/ethnicity, and rank, disagreed that both parties should be arrested if it is unclear who the aggressor is. It was also found respondents, regardless of gender, race/ethnicity, or rank, disagreed that police should make an arrest in family violence cases only when there is clear evidence of injury. Law enforcement officers should always be cognizant of how their gender, race/ethnicity, and rank could influence their decision making ability in determining whom to arrest during incidents of domestic violence.

Recommendations for Future Research

For future research, other law enforcement agencies from other counties could be involved in this research to obtain more data and gather more information. With more law enforcement officers providing their thoughts on being able to identify a primary aggressor when responding to a family violence dispute, it can help further advance trainings on family violence.

References

- Buzawa, E. S., & Austin, T. (1993). Determining Police Response to Domestic Violence Victims: The Role of Victim Preference. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 36(5), 610-623.
- Champagne, F. (n.d.). Retrieved November 01, 2016, from <http://apps.americanbar.org/litigation/committees/criminal/articles/fall2015-0915-prosecuting-domestic-violence-cases.html>. Criminal Litigation. Vol. 16 Issue 1, p2-6. 5p.
- Finn, M. A. (2004). Dual Arrest Decisions in Domestic Violence Cases: The Influence of Departmental Policies. *Crime & Delinquency*, 50(4), 565-589.
- Finn, M. A. (2006). Punitive Action or Gentle Persuasion: Exploring Police Officers' Justifications for Using Dual Arrest in Domestic Violence Cases. *Violence Against Women*, 12(3), 268-287.
- Frydl, K., Skogan, W. G., & National Research Council, (. (U.S.). (2004). Fairness and Effectiveness in Policing : The Evidence. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Frye, Victoria; Haviland, Mary; Rajah, Valli. *Dual Arrest and Other Unintended Consequences of Mandatory Arrest in New York City: A Brief Report*. Journal of Family Violence. August 2007, Vol. 22 Issue 6, p397-405. 9p.
- Frye, V., Haviland, M., & Rajah, V. (2007). Dual Arrest and Other Unintended Consequences of Mandatory Arrest in New York City: A Brief Report. *Journal of Family Violence*, 22(6), 397-405.
- Gracia, E., Garcia, F., & Lila, M. (2008). Police Involvement in Cases of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women: The Influence of Perceived Severity and Personal Responsibility. *Violence Against Women*, 14(6), 697-714.
- Gover, A. R., Paul, D. P., & Dodge, M. (2011). Law Enforcement Officers' Attitudes About

- Domestic Violence. *Violence Against Women*, 17(5), 619-636.
- Hargan, Victoria, M.A. (January 27, 2012). Police Personality and Domestic Violence: A Forensic Psychological Approach. Vol. 1, 114p.
- Milivojevic, S. (2003). Carolyn Hoyle: Negotiating domestic violence: Police, criminal justice and victims, Oxford University Press, Oxford - New York, 2000. *Temida*, 6(2), 83-85.
- Jackson, N. A. (2007). *Encyclopedia of Domestic Violence*. New York: Routledge.
- Retrieved November 01, 2016, from <http://dps.texas.gov/crimereports/14/citCh5.pdf>
- Retrieved November 01, 2016, from
- Johnson, M. P., & Leone, J. (2005). The Differential Effects of Intimate Terrorism and Situational Couple Violence: Findings From the National Violence Against Women Survey. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26(3), 322-349.
- Leone, J. M., Johnson, M. P., & Cohan, C. L. (2007). Victim help seeking: Differences between Intimate Terrorism and Situational couple violence. *Family Relations*, 56(5), 427-439.
- Roark, Jennifer. Policing. *Predictors of dual arrest for offenders involved in heterosexual domestic violence arrests*. 2016, Vol. 39 Issue 1, p52-63. 12p.
- Robinson, A. L., & Chandek, M. S. (2000). The Domestic Violence Arrest Decision: Examining Demographic, Attitudinal, and Situational variables. *Crime & Delinquency*, 46(1), 18-37.
- Russell, K. K. (1998). *The Color of Crime: Racial Hoaxes, White Fear, Black Protectionism, Police Harassment, and Other Macroaggressions*. New York: New York University Press.
- Saunders, D. G. (1995). The Tendency to Arrest Victims of Domestic Violence: A Preliminary Analysis of Officer Characteristics. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 10(2), 147-158.
- Scarborough, K. E., & Collins, P. A. (2002). *Women in Public and Private Law Enforcement*.

Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Jeffreys-Jones, R. (2008). Christopher Waldrep and Michael Bellesiles (eds.), Documenting American Violence: A Sourcebook (Oxford: Oxford University Press.). *Journal of American Studies*, 42(01).

(2015). Retrieved November 14, 2016, from Texas Department of Public Safety,

<http://dps.texas.gov/crimereports/14/citCh5.pdf>

Domestic Violence Arrest Policies by State. (n.d.). Retrieved November 14, 2016, from

http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/domviol/docs/Domestic_Violence_Arrest_Policies_by_State_11_07.pdf

Appendix

	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
3. Too many family violence calls are only verbal family arguments.			
4. If it is unclear who the aggressor is in a family violence call, it is often best to arrest both parties.			
5. Arresting someone at a family violence call seldom helps reduce future family violence incidents.			
6. Police should make an arrest in family violence cases only when there is clear evidence of injury.			
7. Family violence calls take too much of officers' time and effort.			
8. Identifying the primary aggressor at a family violence call can be difficult.			
9. Family violence is best handled as a private matter, rather than by police.			
10. I am less likely to make a family violence arrest if the suspect is cooperative at the scene.			
11. A mandatory arrest policy is the best approach to family violence calls.			
12. Many family violence victims could easily leave their relationships, but don't.			
13. Substance and/or alcohol abuse is the main cause of family violence.			
14. One of the important outcomes of responding to a family violence call is arresting a suspect.			
15. I am more likely to make family violence arrests when children are present.			
16. Family violence offenders should be arrested even when the victims don't feel it is necessary.			
17. It's often hard to decide whether there is probable cause for arrest in family violence cases.			

	Agree	Disagree	Neutral	N/A
18. Most family violence incidents stem from abusers' need for power and control over victims.				
19. I am more likely to make an arrest if the victim is cooperative at the scene.				
20. Women are just as likely as men to engage in family violence.				
21. Family violence is higher among minorities compared to Whites.				
22. Family violence is higher among people from lower class than middle or upper class.				
23. Men abused by their partners are less likely than abused women to report family violence.				
24. Minority victims of family violence are more likely to call the police than White victims.				
25. More training would help me assess family violence scenes.				
26. Gay and lesbian family violence occurs for the same reasons it does in heterosexual relationships.				
27. One of the most important outcomes of responding to a family violence call is offering assistance to the victim.				
28. The most deadly time for the victim of family violence is when the perpetrator is separated from the victim (i.e. victim leaves or perpetrator returns after being arrested).				
29. Family violence mandatory arrest policies increase likelihood of future victimization.				
30. Family violence mandatory arrest policies increase likelihood of future reporting of victimization.				
31. Family violence mandatory arrest policies increase likelihood of police injury when responding to a call.				
32. Family violence mandatory arrest policies improve perception of police.				
33. One of the most important outcomes of responding to a family violence call is reducing escalation of further violence.				
34. I always fill out the family violence packet at the scene of a family violence incident.				
35. Completing the family violence packet at the scene hinders my ability to effectively assess the scene.				

36. Photographic evidence taken at the scene of a family violence incident is important to a successful prosecution.				
37. It is important to note when children are present in an offense report.				
38. As part of my response to family violence offenses, I interview children for details of the specific incident.				
39. I always call CPS when children are at the scene of a family violence offense.				

For items 40-48, please identify the importance of each of the following on your attitude toward credibility of a family violence offense having occurred.

	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important
40. Evidence of physical trauma				
41. Victim consumption of alcohol or drugs				
42. Victim statements				
43. Availability/credibility of witness(s)				
44. Credibility of suspect				
45. Time between alleged incident and report				
46. Victim involvement in illegal activity				
47. Victim has a criminal record				
48. History of calls of family violence				

49. How prepared do you feel in responding to Family violence disturbances?
 Very unprepared Somewhat unprepared Prepared Very prepared

50. Have you received formal training on Family violence within the last 12 months?
 Yes No Unsure

51. If yes, please select what type of training you received (mark all that apply).

- Required
- Departmental training
- Academy/Rookie training
- Voluntary training

52. Who was this training provided by?

- Victim advocate organization
- Formal training by police agency
- Consultant

- University
- Community group
- Other
- Not applicable

Please answer items 53-57 regarding your opinion of benefit of additional training in the following areas.

	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
53. Additional training in interviewing victims of family violence would benefit me.			
54. Additional training in evidence collection in cases of family violence would benefit me.			
55. Additional training in basic investigation of family violence would benefit me.			
56. Additional training in knowing available sources of referrals for victims of family violence would benefit me.			
57. Additional training in changes in laws regarding family violence would benefit me.			

Demographics

58. Gender:

- Male
- Female

59. Age:

60. What race/ethnicity do you most identify with?

- Asian
- Black
- Hispanic
- Native American
- White
- Other

61. What is the highest level of education you've completed:

- Did not graduate high school
- High school graduate/GED
- Some college
- Four year college degree
- Graduate degree

62. Have you ever been the victim of any of the following?

- Intimate Partner Violence
- Sexual assault
- Family violence (other than by an intimate partner)

63. Do you work for an agency affiliated with One Safe Place?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

64. How long have you worked in law enforcement?

Years:_____ Months:_____

65. What shift are you currently working?

- Days
- Evenings
- Midnights

66. What type of department do you work for?

- Urban
- Rural
- Suburban

67. What is your rank?

Biographical Data

Name: Sheri Denise Brock

Date and Place of Birth: November 4, 1984; Pine Bluff, Arkansas

High School: Parkview Arts and Science Magnet High School
Little Rock, Arkansas
Graduated 2003

Undergraduate College: University of Texas Arlington
Arlington, Texas
Bachelor of Arts, Criminology
Graduated 2013

Experience: Child Protective Services Investigator
Texas Department of Family and Protective Services
Dallas, Texas
2014-2016

Graduate College: University of Texas Arlington
Arlington, Texas
Master of Arts, Criminology
Expected Graduation: December, 2016

Academic honor / honesty statement:

I have read and understand the UTA Academic Honesty clause as follows. “Academic dishonesty is a completely unacceptable mode of conduct and will not be tolerated in any form at The University of Texas at Arlington. All persons involved in academic dishonesty will be disciplined in accordance with University regulations and procedures. Discipline may include suspension or expulsion from the University. ‘Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, cheating, plagiarism, collusion, the submission for credit of any work or materials that are attributable in whole or in part to another person, taking an examination for another person, any act designed to give unfair advantage to a student or the attempt to commit such acts.’(Regents’ Rules and Regulations, Part One, Chapter VI, Section 3, Subsection 3.2., Subdivision 3.22).”