

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

Document Title: Victim Satisfaction With Criminal Justice Case Processing in a Model Court Setting

Author(s): Gerald T. Hotaling ; Eve S. Buzawa

Document No.: 195668

Date Received: April 2003

Award Number: 2000-WT-VX-0019

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

PROPERTY OF
National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)
Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20849-6000

195668

VICTIM SATISFACTION WITH CRIMINAL JUSTICE CASE PROCESSING IN A MODEL COURT SETTING

Gerald T. Hotaling, Professor*

and

Eve S. Buzawa, Professor

**Department of Criminal Justice
University of Massachusetts, Lowell
Lowell, Ma. 01854**

January, 2003

* Gerald Hotaling passed away unexpectedly on June 16, 2002. While he worked closely with Eve Buzawa at developing the conceptualization for this paper and the data set used for this research, he was unable to review this manuscript. Therefore, Eve Buzawa takes sole responsibility for any interpretations or conclusions from the data.

This project was supported by Grant # 2000-WT-VX-0019 awarded by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Abstract

This paper is part of a series of reports generated from the study of the Quincy District Court's (QDC), Massachusetts, response to domestic violence. The focus of this paper is to examine victim satisfaction. Victims were asked a series about their satisfaction with various components of the criminal justice system. A cluster analysis revealed three distinct patterns of satisfaction. The first cluster, called the "generally satisfied" contains over half of the women in the sample (56%) and was characterized by relatively high levels of satisfaction with all components of the criminal justice system. The second cluster (17% of the sample) was characterized as "generally dissatisfied" with all aspects of law enforcement and the courts. The third cluster was called "mixed" to reflect the disparity in the evaluation of components of the criminal justice system.

Initial analysis revealed that the specific actions taken by the components of the criminal justice system had little relationship with victim satisfaction. Therefore, a multinomial regression was performed using only significant bivariate relationships. This resulted in five types of variables that were selected to predict satisfaction with the criminal justice system: (1) demographic characteristics of the victim (age, race, and employment status); (2) characteristics of the study incident (sustaining injury, presence of a weapon and whether a restraining order was in effect); (3) history of offending and victimization (number of prior crimes against a person charged of the offender, number of prior restraining orders filed against the offender, and childhood physical and sexual abuse of victim); (4) effects of criminal justice system contact (whether police did everything victim expected, whether prosecutor and court gave victim a sense of control, whether the threat of prosecution made the offender scared or angry); and (5) the gap between victim preferences and criminal justice action (whether the victim preferred no arrest of offender, whether the victim wanted criminal charges different from those filed, whether the victim wanted no prosecution, but offender was prosecuted, whether the victim wanted to go to court, and whether the victim wanted a court outcome different from the actual court outcome).

Purpose

This paper seeks to further analyze the data of the Quincy District Court (QDC) Evaluation Study collected under a recently completed National Institute of Justice (NIJ) grant #95-IJ-CX-0027, *Understanding, Preventing and Controlling Domestic Violence Incidents: An Evaluation of Formal and Informal Deterrence Mechanisms*. The purpose of the original project was to examine the impact of a rigorous intervention strategy upon a population of victims and perpetrators of domestic violence. That project, completed in February, 1999, analyzed the actions of the police, prosecutors, and courts upon all 353 domestic violence cases seen by the QDC over a seven-month period. The QDC was chosen as the data collection site for this study because of its status as an acknowledged leader in implementing pro-intervention strategies in domestic violence cases, having been cited by the Department of Justice in the implementation of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) as a model jurisdiction.

One of the milestones of the original NIJ grant was linking together eight separate data sets about the domestic violence incidents we used in that study. They included the original police incident report, prosecutorial charge data on each case, as well as initial and final case dispositions, data from batterer treatment programs on attendance and completion status offenders, data from the Registry of Civil Restraining Orders on the number and types of all prior civil orders taken out in Massachusetts against all defendants in our study, data from the Massachusetts Criminal Records System Board on all prior criminal charges

accumulated by the defendants in our study, extensive interview data on 118 victims, and data from computerized files to track all 353 offenders for a 1-year period subsequent to the incident for any new criminal charges and civil restraining orders.

The original grant included victim interviews containing considerable information that is not currently available about what victims themselves have to say about the role of the police, prosecutors, victim advocates, and judges. All victims who completed the victim survey were asked to rate their satisfaction with sectors of the criminal justice system (law enforcement, prosecution, victim advocacy and the courts). Eighteen percent of respondents were somewhat or very dissatisfied with the police response they received, 35.5% of victims were dissatisfied with the prosecutor, 22.9% were dissatisfied with the victim advocate, and 27.5% of victims were dissatisfied with the court. This data set contains considerable information that was not analyzed as part of the original study but of potential significance to researchers, advocates, and policy makers.

Rarely do we consider the differential impact of criminal justice interventions upon victim satisfaction as opposed to the output (actions) taken by the agency. Initially, we believe that it is important to understand the factors predicting levels of satisfaction with various sectors of the criminal justice system. The failure to consider the impact of criminal justice intervention on victim levels of satisfaction may adversely affect victim reporting and/or non-reporting behavior. In this regard, the survey gathered valuable information on optimal actions police sometimes take including interviewing the victim, informing the

victim about the process of procuring a restraining order, informing the victim about the existence of community services, getting medical aid, if needed, searching for the offender if he or she is not physically present.

Specifically, this paper will focus on an examination of determinants of victim satisfaction in a "model court" setting and its relationship to five types of variables: (1) demographic characteristics of the victim (age, race, and employment status); (2) characteristics of the study incident (sustaining injury, presence of a weapon and whether a restraining order was in effect); (3) history of offending and victimization (number of prior crimes against a person charged by the offender, number of prior restraining orders filed against the offender, and childhood physical and sexual abuse of victim); (4) effects of criminal justice system contact (whether police did everything victim expected, whether prosecutor and court gave victim a sense of control, whether the threat of prosecution made the offender scared or angry); and (5) the gap between victim preferences and criminal justice action (whether the victim preferred no arrest of offender, whether the victim wanted criminal charges different from those filed, whether the victim wanted no prosecution, but offender was prosecuted, whether the victim wanted to go to court, and whether the victim wanted a court outcome different from the actual court outcome).

Criminal Justice Response and Victim Satisfaction

Why is victim satisfaction important? In part, the answer to this basic question is self-explanatory. While agencies may view their mission as serving the "public interest",

victims appropriately believe that it is their interests that were most harmed by the offense in question. The extent and severity of the potential conflict of agency missions and victim expectations have serious consequences, both to the victims themselves as well as to the effective processing of cases by the criminal justice system. Prior studies have shown that female victims in intimate partner assault are less satisfied with criminal justice professionals as well as with the criminal justice system in general compared to victims of non-partner assaults (Byrne, Kilpatrick, Howley, & Beatty, 1999).

While previously, evidence of dissatisfaction among some domestic violence victims might logically have been attributed to the lack of an aggressive response to domestic assault, this has changed dramatically in many, if not most, jurisdictions over the last 20 years. Now, the reasons for victim dissatisfaction may be considerably different than in the past. Clearly, the last 20 years have brought waves of new domestic violence statutes and policies. Many, if not all, police departments make far more arrests in domestic violence cases than in the past. "Presumptive" or "mandatory" arrest policies are now required in most major jurisdictions. As a result, far more cases reach the prosecutor, and in "full enforcement" jurisdictions, many more of these cases are now prosecuted, often over the objections or at least "non-cooperation" of the victim. Therefore, it is possible that current victim dissatisfaction may be due in part to the lack of victim control over case processing and disposition.

There is already evidence that the behavioral interaction between the criminal justice system and victims have created difficulties for both. The system currently has a bias toward case processing through conviction. Estimates of

victim "non-cooperation" with such efforts are high. Even some advocates of mandatory case processing have expressed concerns. Indeed, one study reported that victims in Los Angeles County recanted their statements in more than 50% of cases (Wills, 1997). Another study using data from a pro-prosecution jurisdiction in Canada, found that prosecutors estimate that almost 60% of all decisions not to prosecute were due to victim's non-cooperation, including refusal to testify, recanting, or retracting testimony or failing to appear in court (Dawson & Dinovitzer, 2001).

The fact is that after an arrest, victims quickly realize that once a case enters the court process, they may lose control to what is perceived as an impersonal and overbearing bureaucracy. In addition, prosecution has many consequences for the victim and her family as well as the offender.

Some recent research has begun to question the underlying policy assumption that mandatory arrest and case processing is in the interests of many victims (Ford, 1993, 1996; Buzawa & Buzawa, 1999, 2002; Mills, 1999). Women's fears of offender dangerousness as a consequence of arrest are often quite accurate (Buzawa, et. al., 1999). Even the basic tenet that arrest and subsequent prosecution of domestic violence offenders is beneficial for victims has been contested. A recently published National Institute of Justice study of homicide data in 48 states reported that increased prosecution rates for domestic assault (even when controlling for a number of variables) were associated with increased levels of homicides among White married couples, Black unmarried intimates, and White unmarried women—hardly the positive result anticipated (Dugan et al., 2001). Mandatory arrest policies followed by a no-drop policy that forces prosecution certainly restricts victim autonomy. As a result, there may sometimes be an

irreconcilable dilemma. Virtually all advocates and many researchers believe that arrest and prosecution is the preferred response in cases of domestic assault. In that case, victim empowerment may not involve the offender's arrest and subsequent case processing. However, ignoring victim desires and thereby disempowering them is the antithesis of the goal of most victims and advocates.

Victim dissatisfaction may also impact future help-seeking behavior. Our original QDC study reported that dissatisfied victims were about 6 times less likely than satisfied victims to say they would probably not contact the police again for a similar incident, and in fact, were significantly less likely to re-report the incident (Buzawa, Hotaling, Klein, & Byrne, 1999). The consequences of non-reporting is that a population of victims at risk is not effectively served. Even worse, such non-reporting could create the false assumption that the domestic violence problem was successfully addressed. This danger is magnified in studies that rely on official data for measuring re-victimization.

The issue of domestic violence victim preferences is not new. Their preferences have, in fact, been rarely solicited, or when known, honored if they contravene policies (Lempert, 1989; Buzawa & Buzawa, 1996). Since victim choices normally influence the criminal justice system to some degree (and the quest for restorative justice in other areas is pushing this to the forefront), policies that remove or limit victim input into decision making may be problematic.

While many victims may not desire arrest and subsequent conviction, they may truly need law enforcement services. In the past, family, church, or friends may have provided such support. In today's society, such assistance is much more problematic making victim reliance on criminal justice agencies acute. Law enforcement also does not

only enforce its own mandates, but also serves as a critical gatekeeper to the services of other agencies. Similarly, prosecutors and judges, while perhaps not intervening in crisis situations, may affect the likelihood that victims will obtain effective assistance.

Therefore, many victims may want assistance from the criminal justice system as a strategy to mobilize resources and attain control over the batterer and re-establish their power in the relationship. Domestic violence victims are far more likely than other victims to be motivated by self-protection (and even less on vengeance) in calling police and pursuing prosecution (Gottfredson and Gottfredson, 1987).

Once an arrest has occurred, Ford (1991) found that victims cite instrumental and rational reasons rather than emotional attachments in their decision to invoke and maintain criminal justice intervention. Some victims contact the police, regardless of the decision to arrest, in order to receive assistance rather than arrest. Often, they may wish to salvage a flawed relationship where aggressive behavior (usually by both parties) is customary. Alternatively, if victims were assaulted by someone with whom their relationship has ended, they may prefer aggressive prosecution, or alternatively, simply seek to deter future abuse. Also, many domestic violence victims may want "restoration" or redress, not vengeance or absolute punishment. Therefore, unlike the criminal justice system, victims may be far less concerned with the esoteric concept of deterrence as opposed to accomplishing their personal goals of enhancing safety, maintaining economic viability, protecting children, or having an opportunity to force an abuser's participation in batterers' counseling programs. (Ford, 1991).

In addition, victims may believe that case processing may make a bad situation

worse or themselves have had negative prior experiences with the criminal justice system. A simple threat to have a person arrested or to initiate prosecution may terminate an abusive relationship. Pursuing prosecution past that point may not be in the interests of the victim since it may increase the risks of retaliation while forcing her commitment to a process with little direct benefit to her.

Victims may also be differentiated on the basis of a variety of sociodemographic factors. Demographic variables including age, race, social class, and ethnicity may be important in determining how people cognitively structure their expectations and attitudes regarding the criminal justice system (Coulter, et. al., 1999; Felson, Messner & Hoskin, 1999).

It is well known that for a variety of reasons, minorities are less likely to trust the criminal justice system (Stark, 1993; Thomas and Hyman, 1977; Scaglione and Condon, 1980; Brandyl and Horvath, 1991). Several reasons might account for such attitudes. The risks of arrest may outweigh potential benefits. These women may perceive or even actually have been the recipients of police mistreatment, or at least more impacted by previous encounters. They often have greater fears than other victims that their children might be removed, especially in states that mandate investigation of all domestic assault cases where children are present. Many arrested batterers are known to accuse victims of illegal conduct. Indeed, many are at greater risk of having their own criminal activities uncovered, e.g. substance abuse or perhaps even those that might be accused of child abuse or neglect. Therefore, the likelihood of victim arrest may increase with proactive or mandatory arrest policies aimed solely at domestic violence perpetrators (Coker, 2000).

Jurisdictions with mandatory case processing cannot hope to incorporate the

complexity of victim needs and preferences into practices. As demonstrated, victim situations are not all alike yet such policies basically view victims (and assailants) as a monolithic group. Therefore, the impact of aggressive case processing upon victims will vary considerably.

Unfortunately, it can even be said that many practitioners and policy makers consider victim preference irrelevant as the primary goal of the criminal justice system is to address offender behavior and not victim needs and satisfaction. Still others believe that victims are incapable of judging what is in their interests and that “professionals” should make these decisions.

What happens when an entire criminal justice system aggressively processes domestic violence cases? Should we expect all victims to more or less have similar (and positive) perceptions about the actions of particular criminal justice agencies or the system as a whole? Indeed, if there is little variation in the actual process with most incidents resulting in arrest and adjudication, what then accounts for variation in victim satisfaction?

Our operating hypothesis is that assumptions of a monolithic victim response to criminal justice interventions is simplistic. Not only are victims a diverse population, but the offenders they confront, the nature and seriousness of the assault, and their personal circumstances vary considerably.

What are some of these key differences?

! Victims vary in their perceptions of the level of danger, threat and harm that an offender presents. The victim’s history with the offender often makes threats of retaliation more credible.

! The degree of victim (and witness) intimidation varies considerably.

Typically, only unsuccessful acts of intimidation and/or subsequent violence are reported to the police. Nevertheless, there is reason to believe that domestic violence intimidation is pervasive among many victims. (Healey 1995). Ptacek (1999) interviewed 50 women with restraining orders in Quincy, Massachusetts (under the jurisdiction of the QDC) and 50 women in Dorchester, Massachusetts. He found that about 10% in each jurisdiction reported that further abuse appeared to be direct retaliation for the woman having called the police or threatening to obtain a restraining order.

! Minor children may present significant issues for some victims with regard to their protection and at times her desire for an intact family structure. Many victims find they are subjected to retaliation by threats toward children. Klein (1994b) noted that 25% directly threatened kidnapping the couple's children if legal action was pursued. Abusers also usually threatened to lie or exaggerate the victim's personal problems as a parental caregiver to child protective services.

! Financial impact (intensified by recent welfare reforms) may make some victims critically dependent on an abuser's financial support for minor children, a factor at odds with strict punishment models. Some victims may believe they need to remain in an abusive situation for economic as well as emotional survival (Barnett, 2000, Byrne, Resnick, Kilpatrick, Best, and Saunders, 1999; Hart, 1993).

Even in model courts, batterers often fans such fears of economic retaliation. Klein (1994) reported that in his earlier research on the impact of the QDC, monetary threats were made by 42% of abusers. In that study, 31% of the victims were unemployed

and 67% earned under \$10,000, making a threatened loss of financial support critical.

Direct economic harm to the victim from prosecuting offenders may also result if she is required to take time from her own job and/or arrange for child care to support prosecution by making court appearances. In many cases, scheduling forces her to wait for hours to give a few minutes of testimony or, as often happens, to have her time be totally wasted when the case is continued to a later date.

In addition, it is unclear whether the specific response of the criminal justice system as an aggregate is determinative in predicting victim satisfaction with case processing. Instead, we believe that victims who want to exert control over the processes of the various components may be most dissatisfied by the application of mandatory policies if they do not agree with the actions such policies demand. Hence, we hypothesize that victim satisfaction may not be best predicted by the specific actions taken by the system nor even the outcome as measured by actual re-offending or revictimization, but instead as a function of the gap between victim preferences and criminal justice actions. Therefore, it is possible that victims who are most satisfied are those victims who initially wanted arrest (in a pro-arrest jurisdiction) and hence are most likely to be compliant with the wishes and orientation of a full enforcement intervention.

Methodology

Sampling Decisions and the Sample Size Issue

Data used in this report are based upon 7 months of history of domestic violence cases that resulted in arrest and arraignment before the Quincy District Court.

All consecutive arrests for domestic violence involving male defendants and female victims that occurred between June, 1995 and February, 1996 were initially examined for inclusion. From that pool, we eliminated all cases involving defendants and primary victims who were under the age of 17, cases involving same-sex relationships, and cases involving male victims and female defendants. The final sample was composed of 353 cases of male-to-female domestic violence.¹

Study Design

As discussed earlier, the purpose of this paper is to better understand factors impacting on victim satisfaction with the criminal justice system. In order to achieve these objectives, we undertook three tasks. First, we tracked a sample of cases from their initial point of contact with the formal criminal justice system through their final disposition. Second, we tracked these same cases for a 1-year period following arraignment to examine the extent of re-offending. Third, we interviewed victims about their experience with the criminal justice system (currently and in the past) and about their prior history of victimization.

To facilitate this design, information was needed from multiple sources and perspectives covering data from significant periods of time both before and after the occurrence of the incident that led to its inclusion in our sample. In addition to procuring these data, an additional challenge was to link together information from several sources

¹ Even so, the representativeness of this sample of all male-to-female domestic violence cases cannot be fully determined. First, although we have reason to believe most cases resulted in arrest, little is known about cases that may not have resulted in arrest. Second, even though cases in this sample show little variation in numbers or on key characteristics on a month-to-month basis, there may still be seasonal variations in the nature of cases. Third, and perhaps most importantly, our sample size does vary from analysis to analysis due to the availability of data from the primary sources used in this study, i.e., official records and self-report surveys. Consequently, we are often reporting results from a sub-sample of offenders and victims, raising questions about the generalizability of the study findings.

into one coherent data file. Sources of data used in this study are first described below. They include offender criminal history data, records of civil restraining orders, probation department data on prosecutorial charges, case disposition and risk assessment, data on offender treatment program participation, police incident reports, and self-report victim survey data.

Data Sources

1. Offender's Criminal History Data. The QDC's Department of Probation, provided criminal biographies for all 353 defendants in the sample. For this research each defendant's criminal activity was analyzed both prior to the study incident and for 1-year subsequent to that incident.²

2. Civil Restraining Order Data. In September, 1992, the State of Massachusetts implemented the Registry of Civil Restraining Orders: the first statewide, centrally computerized record keeping system on restraining orders. This registry is primarily designed to provide the police and courts with accurate and up-to-date information on the existence of active orders. The QDC Department of Probation provided information from this registry on the number and type of civil restraining orders, if any, taken out in Massachusetts against all 353 defendants both before the occurrence of the study incident and for a 1-year period following the study incident.³

² These records contain all criminal charges filed against a defendant by any Massachusetts Court during his lifetime, the dates of occurrence and court locations of each charged offense, as well as the defendant's age at time of first offense. These data were coded into several categories including the age of the defendant at time of first criminal charge, the overall number of prior criminal charges, the total number of prior criminal charges for crimes against a person, property crimes, public order offenses, sex offenses, motor vehicle offenses, and alcohol and drug charges.

³ From this data source, we were able to construct measures on 1) the number of restraining orders taken out on the study defendant prior to the study incident; 2) the number of different female victims who have taken out restraining orders against the study defendant; 3) whether a restraining order was in effect at the time of the study incident and; 4) whether a new restraining order was taken out against the study defendant subsequent to the study incident by the same woman in the study incident and/or by another

3. Prosecutor's Office/District Court Data. The QDC Department of Probation also provided us with information on all 353 defendants concerning prosecutorial charges. For each defendant in our study information was provided on up to three domestic violence related charges for our study incidents and any additional non-domestic violence related charges. This information enabled us to compare police charges to prosecutor charges on their number, severity and type and to understand the link between prosecution charges and court handling of cases.

Data from the Quincy District Court on initial and final dispositions and their dates enabled a determination of the amount of elapsed time between arraignments and dispositions as well as the number of defendants who violated the conditions of their initial dispositions.

4. Data on Study Defendants and Batterer Treatment Programs. Many study defendants had to enroll in a batterer treatment program as a condition of probation. We contacted the Directors of the two batterer treatment programs that serve the QDC and received defendants' treatment completion status at the end of our study period.

5. Police Incident Reports. A key data source used in this study were the police reports for the study incidents from the seven departments served by the QDC. These reports were used to measure the officer's perspective and actions taken about the incident, what the call for service involved, characteristics of the incident, socio-demographics of the participants and their narrative description of the incidents and their stated response.

6. The Victim Survey. In addition to official criminal justice system data

person.

concerning our study incidents, we needed to capture the perspective of the victims on study incident. The interviews had three primary goals: (1) to obtain the victim's point-of-view about what she wanted from the criminal justice system, and how the criminal justice system responded to the domestic violence incident in which she was involved; (2) to get details about the study incidents and the context of the victim-offender relationship that are not typically available in official statistics; and (3) to hear directly from victims about the defendant's re-offending behavior.

Because one of the chief aims of the survey was to tap into the victim's perspective about experiences with the criminal justice system, victim interviews did not take place until approximately 12 months after the occurrence of the study incident. Our use of a 1-year time-frame was dictated to us by the fact that we had to wait until victims passed through contact with the prosecutor's office and court and our interest in self-reports about re-offending behavior 1-year after the study incident.

This delay clearly had a severe effect on response rates and we were able to complete usable surveys with 118 victims in this study, 35% of eligible study respondents. However, a more important question is the extent to which those who completed the survey are different from both "refusals" and those women we were unable to locate. On the basis of official record information (police incident reports and criminal history information) we compared those who completed the survey to refusals and to those we could not locate on the basis of victim, offender, and study incident characteristics. For most comparisons, there were no major differences between victims according to their status on our survey. We were originally concerned that those victims we did not interview were involved with more dangerous men or in more serious

domestic violence incidents. This concern was not borne out. Those who completed the survey were, in fact, more likely to have been in incidents involving severe violence and the use or threat of guns and knives and were abused by men whose criminal histories were as extensive as offenders whose victims who did not (Buzawa, et. al., 1999).

We sought direct data from victims as a check on the accuracy of "official data". Respondents were asked about events that occurred at different points over the past year (i.e., police involvement, talking to a victim advocate, going to the prosecutor's office, going to court). The most distant event in that time span was the incident that led to their inclusion in the sample. If memory problems did affect the quality of the information gathered, we would expect that this problem would be most apparent for that event. There was a very high level of agreement between victims and the police on a number of details concerning the study incident. Victims accurately recalled specifics details about the incident in terms of participants, location, dynamics of the incident and police actions.

RESULTS

The Study Incident

In 72% of the study incidents, a physical assault brought women into contact with the criminal justice system. Among these assaulted women, 44% experienced very severe violence, including being hit with an object, being choked or stabbed. Given this, it is not surprising that those who experienced violence, 53% were injured. More than four of five

injured women sustained bruises, cuts, swellings and soreness. For 19% of assault victims, the most serious injury involved broken bones and noses, severe lacerations, internal injuries and loss of consciousness.

Those women not experiencing violence in the study incident (28% of the sample) were subjected primarily to restraining order violations (88%) as well as to other threats and harassment (12%). The extent of fear expressed by women, whether physically assaulted or not, was pervasive. Close to 70% of women reported to us that they thought they were going to be seriously injured in the course of the study incident and 56% feared that they would be killed.

Criminal Justice Agency Contact

Women came into contact with the police either through her directly calling for assistance, going in-person to a police station, or through a third-party initiating law enforcement help. The victim herself initiated police action in 73% of the study incidents. According to police records, in those incidents in which the police responded to a location (n=111), over half were responded to in less than 5 minutes, 17% within 10 minutes, and 31% within 20 minutes.

Typically, two police officers responded to the call for help ($\bar{x}=1.7$; s.d.=0.73) but between 3 and 6 officers responded in 11% of the study incidents. In general, based on a 4 point scale, women thought the police response was somewhat or very beneficial ($\bar{x}=3.15$; s.d.= 0.94).

In only 26% of the study incidents was this the first time the police were called by the women about the study offender. Police contact had previously occurred for close to

three-quarters of the sample and, among those with prior contact, the modal number of prior police calls was 2-3 times.

About 55% of the women talked directly to the prosecutor and the modal amount of time spent with him/her was 30-45 minutes. More women reported talking to the victim advocate (80%) and, most typically, for 30-45 minutes.

According to Probation Department records, about 27% of the study incidents were not successfully prosecuted (dismissed, nolle prossed). The remainder were prosecuted resulting in either no court supervision, i.e., continued without a finding (32%), court supervision, e.g., probation (29%) or jail time for the offender (12%).

Satisfaction with the Criminal Justice System

In general women were "somewhat" to "very satisfied" with the police response to study incidents ($\bar{x}=3.39$; s.d.=0.99). Women were also relatively satisfied with the response of the victim advocate ($\bar{x}=3.29$; s.d.=0.94). Overall, about 37% of the women found their dealing with the prosecutor's office beneficial in terms of making them feel safer. Eight percent weren't sure whether the contact enhanced their feeling of safety and over half did not feel safer due to their dealings with the prosecutor.

As a group, women were "somewhat satisfied" with the court ($\bar{x}= 3.06$; s.d.=1.12) and were between "somewhat satisfied" and "somewhat dissatisfied" in their dealings with the prosecutor's office ($\bar{x}=2.89$; s.d.=1.04).

A simple additive score did not appear to be adequate to capture the distinctions made by women about their varied experiences with the criminal justice system. Rather than using a linear score to represent the level of women's satisfaction, cluster analysis

was used in an attempt to identify distinct patterns across criminal justice components. Four Likert-type items, each measuring satisfaction with a different aspect of the criminal justice response, were used in an agglomerative cluster method to identify initial groupings. Identified initial cluster centers were then used with a K-means iterative clustering procedure. Five iterations produced three identifiable clusters. Final cluster centroids and a dendrogram showed maximal between- cluster differences. The three cluster solution yielded interpretable results and, because of the relatively small sample size used here, the most equitable distribution of cases (28%, 56% and 17%).

Table 1 presents the cluster centroids for each of the three clusters. The first cluster, called the "generally satisfied" contains over half of the women in the sample (56%) and is characterized by relatively high levels of satisfaction with all components of the criminal justice system. Women in this cluster were "somewhat" to "very satisfied" with the response of the entire system. In contrast, 17% of the sample could be characterized as "generally dissatisfied" with all aspects of law enforcement and the courts. On average, these women were "very dissatisfied" with the prosecutor and with the police and only somewhat less disgruntled with the court process. Cluster centroids were slightly higher in their evaluation of the victim advocate but still could be characterized as largely "somewhat dissatisfied". The third cluster was called "mixed" to reflect the disparity in the evaluation of components of the criminal justice system. In general, the "mixed" were more satisfied with the more supportive components of the criminal justice system. These women were "very satisfied" with the response of law enforcement to their plight and "somewhat satisfied with the victim advocate. The "mixed" were as disappointed in the actions of the prosecutor as were the "generally

dissatisfied (“somewhat” to “very dissatisfied”) and “somewhat dissatisfied with the court.

PREDICTORS OF CLUSTER MEMBERSHIP

Five types of variables were selected to predict victim satisfaction with the criminal justice system:

! Demographic characteristics of the victim (age, race, and employment status), characteristics of the study incident (sustaining injury, presence of a weapon and whether a restraining order was in effect);

! History of offending and victimization (number of prior crimes against a person chargers of the offender, number of prior restraining orders filed against the offender, and childhood physical and sexual abuse of victim);

! Effects of criminal justice system contact (whether police did everything victim expected, whether prosecutor and court gave victim a sense of control, whether the threat of prosecution made the offender scared or angry); and

! The gap between victim preferences and criminal justice action (whether the victim preferred no arrest of offender, whether the victim wanted criminal charges different from those filed, whether the victim wanted no prosecution, but offender was prosecuted, whether the victim wanted to go to court, and whether the victim wanted a court outcome different from the actual court outcome.

Conspicuously absent from this list are variables having to do with actions actually taken by components of the criminal justice system. As Table 2 indicates, there was little variation across clusters in the process and outcomes of criminal justice

practice in this jurisdiction. Women in the three clusters experienced similar treatment by the police (at least in terms of response time and performing statutorily required duties) and prosecutor (number of charges filed), access to the prosecutor and victim advocate, court outcome. The mean amount of time elapsed between the target incident and its initial disposition also did not vary by cluster membership.

Because the dependent variable was categorical (cluster membership), multinomial logistical regression was used to estimate the effects of each predictor across these contrasts. For each predictor variable, four sets of contrasts were examined – one for each cluster contrast and one to test the overall pattern of effects as well as the significance of each independent variable.

Data in Table 3 estimates the overall effects of the predictor variables and their effect across the three clusters. Contrast 1 compares the “mixed” to the generally satisfied”, Contrast 2 compares the “mixed” to the “generally dissatisfied” and Contrast 3, the “generally satisfied” to the “generally dissatisfied”. Table 3 also presents data on how well the overall model fits the data and chi-square values for each predictor. Since the research was designed as an exploratory effort, both statistically significant and near-significant ($p < .10$) differences are highlighted in Table 3.

Model Evaluation

The model fit the data well as evidenced by the improvement in the -2 log likelihood function, $LR\chi^2(df = 38, N=116) = 81.597, p < .001$. Mc Fadden’s rho squared (a pseudo R^2 measure) of .359 indicates an acceptable increase in model fit relative to the null model.

The usefulness of each type of variable was also estimated in this model. The first block of variables entered into the logistic regression concerned the women's demographic characteristics (age, race and employment status). The demographic block was not significantly related to cluster membership, $\chi^2(df=6) = 6.608$, n.s.

The second block of variables entered were those concerned with the supportiveness of the criminal justice system (whether there was anything the police would not do for the victim, whether the prosecutor made the victim feel in control, whether the court made the victim feel in control and whether the threat of prosecution made the offender angry or scared him). The addition of this group of variables improved the model, but not to a significant degree, $\chi^2(df=10) = 16.285$, n.s.

The third group of variables added were those concerned with the offender's violent record and the women's victimization history (offender has 6 or more prior crimes against person charges, offender has had 2 or more restraining orders taken out against him, the victim reported physical and sexual victimization before the age of 18 years). This block of variables significantly improved the prediction of cluster membership $\chi^2(df=6) = 13.474$, $p < .05$.

The fourth block of variables entered into the equation concerned the target incident itself (the victim sustained injuries, a weapon was used and whether a valid restraining order was in effect). This group of variables, while important in themselves did not significantly improve the model, $\chi^2(df=6) = 9.450$, n.s.

The final block of variables entered was about the amount of disagreement that existed between the victim and criminal justice procedure (whether the victim told police she preferred no arrest, whether the victim disagreed with the prosecutor about the

charges, whether the victim wanted no prosecution, but offender was prosecuted, whether the victim wanted to go to court, and whether the victim disagreed with the court outcome). This group of variables significantly improved the model predicting satisfaction patterns, χ^2 (df=10) = 34.680, $p < .001$.

The Usefulness of Individual Predictors of Satisfaction With the Criminal Justice System

As can be seen in Table 3, individual variables most predictive of overall patterns of satisfaction were also examined. Significant variables that help to explain overall cluster patterns come from each of the major blocks, with the exception of demographic variables. Two variables concerned with the target incident (victim injury and the use of a weapon by the offender), one variable concerned with the offender's dangerousness (offender has 6 or more prior crimes against person charges), two variables concerned with the supportiveness of the criminal justice system (whether the prosecutor made the victim feel in control and whether the threat of prosecution scared the offender) and two variables measuring the extent to which victim preferences were ignored (victim told police she did not want offender arrested and victim and prosecutor disagreed about the criminal charges) distinguished the clusters.

Individual Predictors and Specific Cluster Contrasts

The "Mixed" vs. the "Generally Satisfied"

The model in Table 3 also allows for an examination of those variables that differentiate women's satisfaction within specific contrasts. In Column 3, the "mixed" are compared to the "generally satisfied". In terms of demographic variables, there is only a

near significant trend between age and satisfaction with “satisfied” women more likely to be 35 years and older ($e^{1.163}$ = odds ratio of 3.2). Women in the “satisfied” group were also less likely to have been in study incidents involving a weapon (odds ratio = .173; $p < .05$), but just as likely as the “mixed” to have been injured.

These two groups of women are not different from one another in terms of either the past dangerousness of the offender who assaulted them or in terms of their own victimization histories.

The two groups can be distinguished from one another in terms of their dealings with the criminal justice system. The “satisfied” were much more likely to have reported that their contact with the prosecutor was positive in terms of making them “feel more in control” (odds ratio- 10.7, $p < .01$) and in “scaring the offender (odds ratio = 3.8, $p < .05$). The “satisfied” also tended to be less likely to have disagreed with the prosecutor about the charges brought against the offender (odds ratio=.238, $p < .06$).

As was seen earlier, both of these groups of women were satisfied the response of the police in the study incident and none of the predictor variables measured here in terms of police contact distinguished among them. There was a trend, however, toward the “satisfied” feeling “less in control” following the court process (odds ratio = .233, $p < .06$).

The “Mixed” vs. the “Dissatisfied”

Cluster membership between these two groups had much to do with offender dangerousness. Women whose assailants had 6 or more prior violent criminal charges and/or who had 2 or more prior restraining orders taken out against them (by either the

women in the study incident or another person) were much more likely to be in the “dissatisfied” group than in the “mixed” group. “Dissatisfied” women appeared to be more likely to have been injured in the study incident, but the difference was not statistically significant.

The “dissatisfied” were also distinguished from the “mixed” by their reluctance to be involved with the criminal justice system. The “dissatisfied” were much more likely to have told police they did not want the offender arrested and significantly more likely to have expressed the preference that they did not want to go to court.

However, the “mixed” were significantly less likely than the “dissatisfied” to have endorsed the idea the “prosecutor made them feel in control” (odds ratio = .17, $p < .01$). This finding is in accord with the earlier discussed cluster analysis that showed women in the “mixed” group to be quite dissatisfied with the response of the prosecutor relative to other sectors of the criminal justice system, but it does not clarify why these women felt this way. One possible explanation is based on data collected in the study but not included in the final model. It appears that women in the “mixed” group were much more likely than women in the other two clusters to have wanted the prosecutor to file more severe charges against the offender than were actually filed. In fact, women in this cluster were more than twice as likely than the “dissatisfied” and more than 3 times more likely than the “satisfied” to have lobbied the prosecutor for enhanced charges.

Why did women in the “mixed” group want additional charges lodged against the offender? These women were much more likely (2.5 times) to have reported to us that offenders threatened them with harm in the study incident and that neither the police nor the prosecutor charged the offender with such threat-making. Also, women in the

“mixed” group were more likely than women in the other two clusters (56% vs. 37%) to have been assaulted by men with whom they were no longer involved with (ex-partners and ex-daters).

The basis for “feeling out of control” on the part of women in the “mixed” group may have had to do with the prosecutor’s decision not to file additional charges against offenders who made threats to harm and who may have been more angry and resentful and more likely to carry out those threats because of a recent relationship break-up.

In the contrast between women in the “mixed” and “dissatisfied” groups, there was no difference found concerning “disagreement with the prosecutor about charges”. This was because women in both groups disagreed often, but in different directions. Women in the “mixed” group were more likely to have wanted the prosecutor to file more charges while it was more common among the “dissatisfied” to have wanted charges lowered or dropped.

The “Satisfied” vs. the “Dissatisfied”

Women in the “dissatisfied” cluster were much more likely than the “satisfied” to have been involved in more perilous study incidents. They were significantly more likely to have had a weapon used against them (odds ratio = 13.3, $p < .05$), to have been injured (odds ratio = 14.6, $p < .05$) and there was a trend toward them being more likely to have had an active restraining order at the time of the incident (odds ratio = 8.1, $p < .07$). Not surprisingly, women in the “dissatisfied” group were assaulted by men with more active and extensive criminal backgrounds. Their assailants were much more likely to have had 6 or more prior violence-related criminal charges on their records (odds ratio = 27.2, $p <$

.05) and a trend toward having had 2 or more restraining orders taken out against them in the past (odds ratio = 16.3, $p < .06$).

Women in the “dissatisfied” cluster were also significantly ($p < .05$) more likely to have reported a history of multiple child victimization. Specifically, these women were 16 times more likely to relate both sexual and severe physical abuse being inflicted upon them before the age of 18 years.

In addition to their extremely unsafe current circumstances and extensive victimization histories, a paramount feature of their dissimilarity to women in the “satisfied” cluster was their reluctance to become involved with the criminal justice system. “Dissatisfied” women were significantly more likely to have conflicted with the police about the arrest of the offender, with the prosecutor about the nature of the charges filed and with the prospect of going to court.

There was a trend in the direction of women in the “dissatisfied” cluster being less likely than the “satisfied” to have wanted a successful prosecution and not have gotten it (odds ratio = 7.2, $p < .07$). This difference is largely due to the fact that the “dissatisfied” were much less likely to have wanted any prosecution in the first place.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

1. Domestic Violence incidents in this study were serious criminal events.

Despite being labeled as misdemeanors, in this jurisdiction:

- 72% involved the use of violence
- 44% women experienced very severe violence and 53% were injured

- Almost 70% of the victims thought they were going to be seriously injured during the study incident and 56% feared they would be killed
- In only 26% of the study incidents was this the first time the police were called by the women about the study offender

2. Women's satisfaction varied with different components of the criminal justice system

- Women were between "somewhat" to "very satisfied" with the police response
- Women were "somewhat" satisfied with the response of the victim advocate
- Women were between "somewhat satisfied" and "somewhat dissatisfied" with the prosecutor's office

3. Victim satisfaction with the criminal justice system could be divided into 3 categories:

Generally satisfied - Victims who were "generally satisfied" with the criminal justice response consisted of over half the women in the sample (56%)

Generally dissatisfied - Victims who were "generally dissatisfied" with all aspects of the criminal justice response consisted of 17% of the sample.

Mixed - Victims who were "mixed" in their feelings about the criminal justice system (27%). In general, these women were "very satisfied" with the law enforcement response and "somewhat satisfied" with the victim advocate. However, they were "generally dissatisfied with the prosecutor and somewhat dissatisfied with the court.

4. Actions taken by the criminal justice system did not predict differences in levels of satisfaction between the groups.

Variables most predictive of overall satisfaction patterns were:

- Victim injury
- Use of a weapon by the offender
- If the offender had 6 or more prior crimes against persons charges
- Whether the prosecutor made the victim feel in control
- Whether the threat of prosecution scared the offender
- Victim's arrest preferences were ignored
- Victim and prosecutor disagreed about the criminal charges

5. The seriousness of the incident and/or dangerousness of the offender

significantly affected levels of satisfaction.

- Comparisons between victims falling into the "Mixed" cluster compared to those that were "Generally Satisfied" suggest that satisfied victims may have been involved in less serious incidents.
- Victims whose offenders had 6 or more prior violent criminal charges and/or who had 2 or more prior restraining orders taken out against them (by either the woman in the study incident or another person) were much more likely to be in the "dissatisfied" group than in the "mixed" group.

6. The degree to which the prosecutor increased victim feelings of safety and increased victim sense of control affected levels of satisfaction.

Mixed vs. satisfied victims were less likely to believe the prosecutor had increased their safety and "sense of control". This may be due to the fact that they were 2.5 times more likely to report that they were threatened with harm in the study incident and that neither the police nor the prosecutor charged the offender for threats. These victims were twice as likely as "dissatisfied" victims and 3 times more likely than "satisfied" victims to have lobbied the prosecutor for enhanced charges.

7. Victim satisfaction was related to their willingness to be involved with the criminal justice system.

- Dissatisfied victims were much more likely to have told police they did not want the offender arrested and significantly more likely to have expressed the preference that they did not want to go to court.

8. Victim agreement with charges brought by the prosecutor against the offender increased levels of satisfaction.

- Satisfied victims were more likely to have agreed with the prosecutor about the charges brought against the offender.
- Victims in the "Mixed" category were more likely to have wanted the prosecutor to file increased charges and dissatisfied victims were more likely to have wanted the charges dropped altogether. However, victims in the mixed category were far more likely to have been assaulted by men with whom they were no longer involved, whereas dissatisfied victims were likely to still reside with the offender.

9. Victims dissatisfied with criminal justice involvement have extensive histories of victimization.

- Dissatisfied victims were be more likely to currently reside with the offender compared to other victims
- Dissatisfied victims were 16 times more likely to report both sexual and severe physical abuse prior to the age of 18.
- Dissatisfied victims were assaulted by men with more active and extensive criminal backgrounds, were more likely to have been involved in an incident with a weapon, and more likely to have been injured.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We now know that while a majority of victims of domestic violence support the actions of the police and, to a lesser extent, the prosecutors, this masks the existence of many who remain profoundly uneasy with existing patterns of aggressive intervention. Our findings indicate that the seriousness of the target incident, the dangerousness of the offender, the *extent to which the criminal justice system increased the victim's sense of control, exposure of the victim to past violence and the extent to which victim preferences were followed all to some extent predicted resulting victim satisfaction.*

What do these factors as a whole suggest? Are there any policy implications?

The primary concern of victims appears to be the extent to which they feel in control--- control in the context of ending the violence in an incident, control over an offender's future conduct and even control over the criminal justice system.. In this context, a victim's prior exposure to significant violence would logically make her far more uncertain that she will be able to "control" the current outcomes when an agency "takes

charge". Such fears are not wholly irrational. For many, past interventions did not prevent subsequent victimization. Their experiences may have led them to believe that they must navigate their lives without assistance from outside assistance. Further, past experiences may have led them to distrust any bureaucracy. They may particularly lack faith in the ability of the criminal justice system to prevent future re-abuse.

Other victims will be dissatisfied if the relatively rigid protocols, seemingly inherent in criminal justice policies and procedures, appear to run directly counter to their needs. For example, victims who prefer to reside with the offender for a variety of reasons (and who also often have dependent minor children), may believe an arrest followed by mandatory case processing is detrimental to their well being and their interests. In fact, the actions of the entire criminal justice system may **lessen** the probability that a family unit remains intact, sometimes a primary goal of the victim. In these cases, it is not surprising that the initial actions of the police, e.g. removing the man when he is most abusive, would be regarded far more favorably than the actions of prosecutors who seeks to obtain convictions and convict a family member or partner of a crime.

Our understanding of the situation must therefore encompass a knowledge that victims are not a monolithic group with similar preferences and needs. Satisfied victims appeared to be more compliant, with less criminally active offenders, involved in less serious incidents, were less likely to state a preference regarding arrest or charges, were less likely to have been victimized as a child, and more likely to want their cases to go forward. Why is this the case?

In many ways, these victims represent the "ideal victim" from the perspective of the criminal justice system. Their cases are less serious, the victims are more likely to

cooperate, and the criminal justice system is more likely to be effective in intervening with criminally less active offenders (at least as measured by subsequent re-offending behavior).

Dissatisfied victims appeared to be more likely to be involved in incidents with highly dangerous offenders, e.g. 6 or more prior violent charges. Further, *over half these victims still were living with the offender.* These victims were also more likely to have disagreed with the police about the arrest of the offender and less likely to want prosecutorial and judicial involvement. What is also of significance is that dissatisfied victims were 16 times more likely to report both sexual and severe physical victimization before the age of 18 years of age compared to satisfied victims. It appears that *this group of victims may often be unwilling to leave offenders or, at a minimum, unwilling or afraid to directly confront his abuse even if separated.*

Since their likelihood of prior childhood victimization did not differ significantly from those falling into the “mixed” category, however their likelihood of living with the offender did, dissatisfied victims may be less tolerant of the offender’s continued abuse. Victims falling into the “mixed” category more likely to have been dissatisfied with the prosecutor because they wanted more serious charges filed. In other words, ***the dissatisfied victims did not want to confront batterers.*** They typically still resided with the offender, and had extensive histories of childhood victimization. Conversely, those falling into ***the “mixed” category not only wanted their batterers arrested, but prosecuted and sentenced as well.*** Unlike the dissatisfied victims, victims in the “mixed” category did not tend to still be involved with their offender and were more likely to have reported that their offenders threatened them with harm in the study

incident and that neither the police nor the prosecutor charged the offender with for these threats. These victims were the most likely category to believe that the criminal justice system had failed to empower them. This suggests that *the criminal justice system should be more responsive to victim concerns about safety and willing to include "threat" charges when appropriate.*

Prior research has shown that childhood history of victimization increases the likelihood of adult victimization (Widom, 2000, Barnett, 2001). The effects of child victimization may not stop with a future tendency to be victimized. One study reported that women who experienced childhood abuse may fear their ability to truly escape from violence (Grigsby & Hartman, 1997). Our research found that women who were the subjects of past violence perhaps ties the two early research findings together. This research suggests that previously victimized women are not only more likely to be involved in abusive relationships with more dangerous offenders compared to other victims, but they are also are more likely to tolerate their victimization and remain in abusive relationships. In such cases, until these re-victimized women can change their future expectations, any major intervention of the criminal justice system will be regarded as an intrusion on her life and current aspirations and therefore doomed to failure.

In noting this we are NOT stating that repeat victimization should somehow abrogate the criminal justice system's responsibilities to assist these victims of violence.

There are also some victims who do not want intervention yet remain with offenders because they correctly predict that leaving an offender coupled criminal justice intervention will increase danger to themselves and or their children. The initial research

in the QDC reported that a significant proportion of victims correctly predicted offender dangerousness. They believed that criminal justice intervention would not prevent their re-abuse – and they were correct, at least in this jurisdiction. Within a one year period, a significantly higher percentage of these women were re-victimized.

We typically focus on the adequacy of the criminal justice response relying on a relatively standardized set of criteria that constitute the “ideal” criminal justice response defined to include arrest, prosecution, and adjudication of offenders. Victim satisfaction with the actual *outcome* of the intervention is typically not addressed and/or is considered of secondary importance to the maintenance of “aggressive” intervention. However, **this research graphically demonstrates that the actions of the criminal justice system do not predict victim satisfaction. Instead it appears that control over the intervention is of paramount victim concern. Those that are most dissatisfied are those who want control but are unable to get it.**

In stating this we must also face the argument that it is not a primary goal of the criminal justice system to address victim needs, let alone to achieve victim “satisfaction”. Their goal instead is to apprehend and punish assailants while deterring other potential offenders. In many model jurisdictions such as the QDC, there are also efforts to “rehabilitate”, or at a minimum, change offender behavior. It is important to acknowledge the societal value of such actions. The QDC data did report that **many offenders become serial offenders rather than chronic offenders.** In cases where victims left the offender, the more serious offenders simply found a new victim (Buzawa, et. al., 1999).

Therefore, there may an irreconcilable dilemma between the interests of society in

identify and intervening with offenders while also serving the interests of victims.

Nonetheless, we believe that the criminal justice system should consider victim preferences and their satisfaction should still be a desired outcome of the process. Certainly, most would agree that we should listen to those victims in the "mixed" category (those victims who were primarily satisfied with the police, but dissatisfied with prosecutors) who perceive that their cases need to be responded to more aggressively. However, do we listen to dissatisfied victims who did not want any intervention? There are victims who tend to have a lifetime history of victimization. They are also more likely to remain in the abusive relationship, be involved with the most serious chronic offenders, and not want any criminal justice involvement. Should their preferences to have all charges dropped, be honored if that is what predicts their satisfaction? It appears that victim empowerment may not be a simple issue.

Contrary to arguments supporting mandatory arrest and case processing, it cannot be assumed that victims will always know what is in their "best interests". In addition, they may not be able to judge what is in the best interests of children residing in the household. It may also be the case that a different type of victim assistance is needed for these victims. Our current tendency is toward a generic approach in the provision of victim services. Such efforts may be misguided. As we are learning with batterers, victims are a diverse group of individuals with differing needs, and as we have learned, preferences. In the end, whose interests should be protected, how are those interests defined, and most importantly, who should have the power to decide?

At a minimum, it is important for the criminal justice listen to victims and determine their preferences as well as the reasons for their decisions. For some victims, this may

require a more flexible approach, helping them to understand what can, and cannot be accomplished by criminal justice interventions, attempting to provide greater protection for victims who need it, and/or connecting her with services that may change her current lifestyle expectations. Hopefully, these additional efforts can assist efforts at preventing re-victimization and better serve victim interests as well as those of society.

References

Barnett, Ola W. (Oct. 2000). Why battered women do not leave, Part 1: External inhibiting actors within society. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 1:4, 343-372.

Buzawa, E.S., Buzawa, C.G. (2003). *Domestic violence: The criminal justice response* (3rd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Buzawa, E., Hotaling, G., Klein, A., & Byrne, J. (July 1999). *Response to domestic violence in a pro-active court setting: Final Report*, Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

Byrne, C., Kilpatrick, D., Howley, S., and Beatty, D. (1999). Female victims of partner versus nonpartner violence: Experiences with the criminal justice system. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26(3), 275-292.

Byrne, Resnik, Kilpatrick, Best and Saunders (1999). Female victims of partner violence: Experience with the criminal justice system. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26:3, 275-292.

Coker, D. (2000). Shifting power for battered women: Law, material resources, and poor women of color. *U.C. Davis Law Review*, 33(4), 1009-1055.

Coulter, M.L., Kuehnle, K., Byers, R., & Alfonso, M. (1999). Police-reporting behavior and victim police interactions as described by women in a domestic violence shelter. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 14, 1290-1299.

Dawson, M & Dinovitzer, R. (2001). Victim cooperation and the prosecution of domestic violence in a specialized court. *Justice Quarterly*, 18:3, 595-622.

Dugan, L., Nagin, D., & Rosenfeld, R. (2001). *Exposure Reduction or Backlash? The Effects of Domestic Violence Resources on Intimate Partner Homicide: Final Report*. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Justice.

Felson, R.B., Messner, S.F., & Hoskin, A. (1999). The victim offender relationship and calling the police in assaults. *Criminology*, 37:4, 931-947.

Ford, D. A. (1991). Prosecution as a victim power resource: A note on empowering women in violent conjugal relationships. *Law and Society Review*, 1(2), 313-334.

Ford, D.A. (1993). *The Indianapolis domestic violence prosecution experiment: Final report*. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Justice.

Gottfredson, M.R. and Gottfredson, D.M. (1987). *Decision Making in Criminal Justice: Toward the Rational Exercise of Discretion*, 2nd Ed. New York: Plenum Press.

Hart, B. (1993). Battered women and the criminal justice system. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 36, 624-638.

Klein, A. (1994a). *Recidivism in a population of court-restrained batterers after two years*. Unpublished dissertation, Northeastern University.

Klein, A. (1994b). *Spousal/Partner assault: A protocol for the sentencing and supervision of offenders*. Boston: Production Specialties.

Lempert, R. (1989). Humility is a virtue: On the publicization of policy relevant research. *Law and Society Review*, 23, 145-161.

Mills, L.G. (1999). Killing her softly: Intimate abuse and the violence of state interventions. *Harvard Law Review*, 113, 551-613.

Ptacek, J. (1999). *Battered women in the Courtroom: The Power of Judicial Responses*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Stark, E. (1993). Mandatory Arrest of Batterers: A Reply to the Critics. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 36, 651-680.

Ursel, J. (1995). *Winnipeg family violence court evaluation*. Working Document WD1995-2e. Department of Justice, Ottawa, Canada.

Wills, D. (1997). Domestic violence: The case for aggressive prosecution. *UCLA Women's Law Journal*, 7:2, 173-182.

Table 1: Cluster Centroids for Three-Cluster Solution

<i>Cluster</i>	<i>Satisfaction</i>		<i>Satisfaction</i>		<i>Satisfaction</i>	
	<i>With Police</i>	<i>With Prosecutor</i>	<i>With Victim</i>	<i>Advocate</i>	<i>With Court</i>	
<i>Generally Satisfied</i>	3.52	3.60	3.70			3.70
<i>Generally Dissatisfied</i>		1.29	1.71	2.14		1.14
<i>Mixed</i>	3.78	1.78	2.56			2.22

Values in scale: 1(very dissatisfied); 2 (somewhat dissatisfied); 3 (somewhat satisfied); 4 (very satisfied)

Table 2: Contact With the Components of the Criminal Justice System by Cluster Membership (N=118)

Variable	Cluster Membership		
	Generally Satisfied	Mixed	Generally Dissatisfied
<i>Women Herself Initiated the Police Response:</i>	77.3	68.8	65.0
<i>Police Response Time:</i>			
< 5 minutes	58.3	41.7	50.0
5 - 10 minutes	8.3	33.3	16.7
11-25 minutes	33.3	25.0	33.3
<i>Number of Statutorily Required Actions Taken by Police:</i> (s.d.)	4.26 (1.28)	4.43 (1.21)	4.32 (1.42)
<i>Number of Criminal Charges Filed by Police in Target Incident:</i>			
One	66.7	75.0	65.0
Two	27.3	15.6	25.0
Three	6.1	9.4	10.0

Did Woman Talked With Prosecutor?

% "yes" 54.5 53.1 60.0

n

s

Did Woman Talk With Victim Advocate?

% "yes" 86.4 71.9 73.7

n

s

*Number of Months Between Target
Incident and Initial Disposition:*

(s.d.) 5.96 6.00 6.39
(4.53) (4.29) (4.10)

n

s

Court Disposition:

Not successfully prosecuted 30.6 16.7 33.3
Successfully prosecuted, no
supervision 30.6 50.0 11.2
Successfully prosecuted, under
supervision, no jail time 27.4 23.3 44.4
Successfully prosecuted, with
jail time 11.3 10.0 11.1

n

s

Table 3: Unstandardized Coefficients for the Multinomial Logistic Regression Model of Women's Satisfaction With the Criminal Justice System (N=116)

Predictor	χ^2	Contrast 1:	Contrast 2:	Contrast 3:
		Mixed vs. The Satisfied	Mixed vs. The Dissatisfied	Satisfied vs. The Dissatisfied
Intercept		0.767	-9.369	8.580
Victim age (35 years+=1)	4.581*	1.163*	-0.356	1.427
Victim race (non-white=1)	2.995	1.285	0.901	0.494
Victim employment status	2.252	0.235	1.439	1.136
Injury in target incident	6.149**	-0.708	1.778	2.584* *
Weapon used in target incident	6.132**	-1.754**	0.978	2.684* *
Restraining order in effect	4.427	-0.815	1.108	2.096*
Offender had 6+ prior violent criminal charges	8.431**	0.222	3.328***	3.304* *
Offender had 2+ restraining orders taken out on him	4.353	0.258	3.033**	2.789*
Victim reported physical and sexual child victimization	5.812*	-1.144	1.390	2.337**
Police did everything victim wanted	1.253	-0.468	-1.235	0.963
Prosecutor made victim feel in control	12.364***	2.375***		2.814* *
				1.578

Court made victim feel in control	5.326*	- 1.434*	-2.348*	0.887
Threat of prosecution made offender angry	1.212	-0.252	0.378	0.905
Threat of prosecution scared offender	6.256**	1.329**	0.325	
	1.042			
Victim told police she preferred no arrest of offender	10.048***	-0.175	3.064***	3.138*
				**
Victim and prosecutor disagreed about charges	6.633**	-1.457*	1.043	2.538*
Victim wanted no prosecution, but offender prosecuted	3.725	1.578	0.188	1.527
Victim did not want to go to court	4.812*	0.076	2.775*	2.745*
Victim wanted successful prosecution, but didn't get it	4.223	0.614	-1.133	-
				1.981*
-2 log likelihood	144.443			
χ^2	81.597***			
df	38			

*** p < .01; ** p < .05; * p > .05 but < .10