

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINOLOGY

Investigating the Impact of Black Population on Resources and Policies for Domestic Violence

SALONI GAUNIYAL
SPRING 2024

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for baccalaureate degrees
in Criminology and Psychology
with honors in Criminology

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Lecinda Yevchak
Associate Teaching Professor of Criminology
Thesis Supervisor

Stacy Silver
Associate Professor of Sociology and Human Development and Family Studies
Criminology Honors Advisor

Kenneth Levy
Professor and Associate Director of Clinical Training
Psychology Honors Advisor

* Electronic approvals are on file.

ABSTRACT

Using Laura Dugan's data set, *Impact of Legal Advocacy on Intimate Partner Homicide in the United States*, I examined the impact of the percentage of the population that is Black on the available resources, policies, and procedures for domestic violence in 48 of the biggest cities in the United States from 1976 to 1996. Using information from past research, I examined if these cities were adjusting their resources, policies, and procedures to fit the needs of a higher Black population by comparing across the cities. Trainings, Prosecuting Policies, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) Benefits, and Units were all significantly correlated with the percentage of the population that was Black. After running regressions, only Units and AFDC Benefits showed significant findings, but the affects were small and unclear (though both seemed to decrease slightly as the percentage of the population increased), meaning that there are likely more complex factors to be considered to better understand the relationship. These findings suggest that the resources, policies, and procedures are not adjusted depending on the percentage of the population that is Black.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ii
LIST OF FIGURES	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LITERATURE REVIEW	1
Background	1
Risk Factors.....	1
Why Women do not Report.....	2
Resources	3
The Courts, The Police, and the Laws.....	6
Conclusion.....	9
Current Study	9
METHODS	10
Data Set.....	10
Variables	11
Independent Variable	11
Dependent Variables	11
Plan of Analysis	12
RESULTS	14
Descriptive Statistics.....	14
Statistical Analysis.....	16
Arrest Policies	17
General Policies.....	18
Prosecuting Policies	18
Trainings.....	19
Units	20
AFDC Benefits.....	21
DISCUSSION.....	25
LIMITATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS.....	25
CONCLUSION.....	26
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	28

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Descriptive Statistics	14
Figure 2: Model Fitting Information for Arrest Policies.....	17
Figure 3: Goodness-of-Fit for Arrest Policies.....	17
Figure 4: Model Fitting Information for General Policies.....	18
Figure 5: Goodness-of-Fit for General Policies.....	18
Figure 6: Model Fitting Information for Prosecuting Policies.....	18
Figure 7: Goodness-of-Fit for Prosecuting Policies.....	19
Figure 8: Model Fitting Information for Trainings.....	19
Figure 9: Goodness-of-Fit for Trainings.....	19
Figure 10: Model Fitting Information for Units.....	20
Figure 11: Goodness-of-Fit for Units.....	20
Figure 12: Parameter Estimates for Units.....	20
Figure 13: Odds Ratio for Units.....	21
Figure 14: Descriptives for AFDC Benefits Regression.....	21
Figure 15: Model Summary for AFDC Benefits Regression.....	21
Figure 16: ANOVA for AFDC Benefits Regression	22
Figure 17: Coefficients for AFDC Benefits Regression	22
Figure 18: ANOVA for AFDC Benefits	23
Figure 19: ANOVA Effect Sizes for AFDC Benefits.....	23
Figure 20: Multiple Comparisons for AFDC Benefits.....	24

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Lecinda Yevchak for guiding me through this process, helping me craft my analysis, and providing me with invaluable instruction and insight into this project. She took my broad ideas and helped me narrow them down to a workable project that still addressed the topics I hold dear. I would also like to thank Dr. Stacy Silver and Dr. Kenneth Levy for their incredibly important contribution of guiding me through the Schreyer honors process and aiding me as I cemented my thesis ideas. I also extend my gratitude to Dr. Kathy Adams, who gave me valuable direction as I navigated SPSS to analyze my data.

Next, I would like to thank Professor Caren Bloom-Steidle, who constantly supported me throughout my undergraduate career. She really helped to foster my dedication to understanding and addressing sexual and domestic violence, without which the topic of this thesis would not have come to be.

Lastly, I would like to thank my friends, family, professors, and others around me who supported me through this project and my undergraduate career. Whether it was reading over my material, helping me find articles, or staying up late with me, their support made all the difference.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Background

A substantial amount of work and effort has been put into understanding and creating policies for victims of domestic and intimate partner violence. However, these policies must meet the needs of everyone. This is currently not the case, as, generally, the impact of domestic violence on minority women has not been researched to the same extent as white women (Pinn & Chunko, 1997; Bean, A. R., 2022). This creates a lack of information, especially around the unique barriers and circumstances that impact Black women (Wyatt, 1994; Bean, A. R., 2022).

This lack of information is dangerous, as Black women are at higher risk for intimate partner violence. They experience higher rates of intimate partner violence than white women experience, as well as more serious injuries; mental health diagnoses; and death due to intimate partner violence (Kelly et al., 2022). Additionally, one of the leading causes of death for Black women between the ages of 15 to 35 is intimate partner violence (Rice et al., 2021). Without adjusting domestic violence resources and procedures, we are letting those with the most need go without support—these unique needs and experiences must be addressed.

Risk Factors

Black women face a unique set of risk factors for domestic violence. Due to historical inequalities and systemic racism, Black people have been put in a system that often leaves them more at risk for abuse and death at the hands of an abuser. Coupled with this, it is well documented that there is a large intersection between socio-economic status and abuse (Meier,

1997). Given that 50% of women who receive welfare have experienced abuse (Meier, 1997), it is clear that circumstances of financial need may be putting low-income Black people at more risk than their middle-class counterparts.

Financial means are not the only area where a difference in opportunity puts Black people at risk. A difference in education levels between two partners, which could easily arise due to a lack of support or interactions with the criminal justice system, leads to a backlash effect for Black people (Dugan et al., 2001). Given that this effect is only seen in Black communities, it is likely to go unnoticed when support people (advocates, attorneys, or other court personnel) are evaluating an individual's risk for domestic violence.

Compared to their white counterparts, Black victims have a unique experience of having to deal with internalized and institutionalized racism. This internalized and institutionalized racism can lead to a lower self-esteem which could cause them to stay in an abusive relationship because they feel like they deserve to be mistreated (Brice-baker, 1994). The different identities of a victim (specifically Black vs. white and married vs. unmarried) can influence the impact of various domestic violence responses, with Black unmarried women being the most at risk of facing retaliation (Dugan et al., 2004). This is why it is imperative to consider the effectiveness of resources (hotlines, shelters, legal aid, etc.)

Why Women do not Report

Before a victim can use a resource, they must be willing to make a report either to the police or a given resource. Research shows that people are more likely to report if they have had past positive experiences reporting (Conaway & Lohr, 1994). In fact, past negative experiences

with police, advocates, or other legal officials explains why women do not report far more often than shame of guilt (Fleury et al., 1998). Unfortunately, many people, especially minorities like Black people, have negative experiences reporting due to institutional discrimination, which would thus make them less likely to report in the future (Davis & Henderson, 2003; Brunson, 2007).

Minority women also do not report out of fear of racism, victimization at the hands of the system, and their cultural influences (Garcia, 1985). Even within the Black community, the importance of culture was clearly demonstrated: “US Black” and African American women were far more likely to reach out to support systems than Caribbean Black women due to the cultural impacts (Lacey et al., 2021). Much like with prior experience with the police, there is a historical and cultural mistrust of the police by Black communities. This is clearly demonstrated by the fact that there exists a cultural emphasis of support within Black communities, yet many Black women fear losing that support – via ostracization by their communities– if they choose to report (Sullivan & Rumpitz, 1994). This means that victims are put in a position where they have to decide whether to rely on a resource they do not trust, knowing that if something goes wrong they may lose the only other support they have. How can we expect them to make that choice and put everything on the line?

Resources

Further affecting the impact of resources is the fact that many avenues within the system are not set up to have different departments and agencies work together to create long-term harm-reduction policies (which is further exasperated by the lack of cultural awareness)

(Hampton et al., 2008). One example of this is that Black women leaving domestic violence shelters were found to need a wide range of resources that they did not always receive (Sullivan et al., 1992). Given that formal resources make up only a small aspect of the way that Black women cope with domestic violence (St. Vil et al., 2017), these resources being unable to work with other types of support (formal or informal) would leave many people vulnerable.

When considering why the system is unable to help Black women the same way it helps white women, it is important to start broad. At this level, it becomes quite clear that the needs are simply different, but because the needs of white women have been studied more, it is assumed that those are everyone's needs. Unlike white women, Black women benefit significantly from Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) expense benefits to the point where only unmarried Black women were put in harm's way when their benefits were cut (Dugan et al., 2013). It has also been shown that the intersection between class and race once again plays a role in the resources that Black women can access.

The difference in access to resources is one of the reasons why Black women themselves are less likely to choose to engage with resources. Black women simply do not have the same access to resources (Sullivan et al., 1992). In general, there are fewer resources in disadvantaged areas, and the resources that are present are not specified for domestic violence (Crenshaw, 1991). This means that Black people, who have been historically and systemically disadvantaged, are not going to receive the same level of care when it comes to domestic violence because the resources may not have the time, energy, or know-how to assess and address their needs.

Indeed, poor women of color are often overlooked by and have issues utilizing resources because the resources fail to acknowledge their unique cultural needs or vulnerabilities (Cooker,

2000). One must consider how abuse is a major cause of poverty for women, but the poverty and domestic violence movements are at odds due to how each wants to portray the individuals involved in order to avoid the stereotypes typically associated with their demographic (Meier, 1997).

However, this means that victims may not have access to the same number of resources because they may be pushed to follow either the domestic violence aid path or the poverty aid path. Engaging in one path would mean that they are putting themselves at odds with the other, which may make them feel (or they may not be allowed to) engage with those resources and agencies. It may also be a situation where engaging in one assumes that path will help with everything: that the domestic violence shelter will be able to serve all poverty-related needs as the victim is seen as been “engaged in the system.” This is especially concerning when one remembers that it is the monetary benefits that are most influential to Black women (Dugan et al., 2013), so the loss of poverty-specific resources could be especially detrimental.

Research has also found that Black women are disadvantaged in acquiring and utilizing shelters (Donnelley et al., 1999). The explanation brings up the second reason why Black women do not use the traditional domestic resources: they do not feel supported by them (Garcia, 1985; Brice-Baker, 1994). Many shelters are located in “white areas” where most of the workers are white. This could make a Black woman feel like the shelter is not for them (Donnelly et al. 1985). Additionally, Black women are aware of how they can face both racism and sexism, and many fear how they can be harmed by the response of resources like shelters (Taylor, 2005).

This fear changes who Black women would feel most supported by, which would in turn change who they chose to reach out to. Black women who have faced abuse are more likely to reach out to informal supports (their communities) rather than formal supports (resources), and

Black women who have not faced abuse did not think they would be comfortable reaching out at all to either their communities or resources (Fraser et al., 2002). It is highly likely that Black women feel (or know) that they are more likely to be believed and less likely to be stereotyped if they reach out to their own communities who share far more of their experiences than the white resources do.

This belief is not unfounded, as there is a long history of mistreatment at the hands of formal resources. Even within the fields that one would expect to be better, social work and the medical field, there is still room for improvement. Unfortunately, it has been found that when Black women reached out to medical professionals, the staff are not trained to inform women of all of their rights and options, which can lead to the victim feeling stereotypes or like the staff does not believe them (Dobash et al., 1985). Similarly, social workers were found to not directly address the violence and social issues that Black women faced when meeting with them (Eizikovits & Buchbinder, 1996), which could further lead to the victims feeling misunderstood and stigmatized.

The Courts, The Police, and the Laws

The fear of stigmatization directly ties into the last reason why Black women do not use formal resources: they fear the results of state interventions (Coker, 2004; Garcia, 1985). If they have children, they do not want to risk losing their child to the system where they fear it would be especially hard on the child. They may worry about being stigmatized and facing legal or social backlash themselves (for being a bad parent or anything they did in self-defense). There is simply a general lack of trust in the system, and if there is the presence of any sort of financial

need, then going the official channel may feel completely impossible because they may not want to take the risk of something going wrong if they do not have the means to fight it if it did.

The mistrust and fear carry over to the legal and court systems as well. Black women fear improper treatment of their partner (Sorenson, 1996; Sullivan & Ramptz, 1994). On top of this, domestic violence victims fear what could happen to them as they do not think that the system will protect them or work as it is supposed to (Bennett et al., 1999). Victims often feel upset with how slowly their cases progress (Bennett et al., 1999), which can heighten their misgivings about how effective the system will be. Additionally, the legal system is confusing to victims, and many do not know how to go about enforcement of whatever legal protections they may be granted (ex: restraining order) (Bennett et al., 1999). Not only is this confusion upsetting and demoralizing, but being unable to properly use the protections of the legal system may heighten the feeling that the system does not work.

Victims of domestic violence may also fear being stigmatized from their interactions with the criminal justice system. They face many unique challenges when they enter the system (Goodman et al., 1999), and these challenges start from the moment they report, or an officer responds to the scene. Police officers are more likely than victims or advocates to believe that women caused the abuse, and they generally do not see arrest as the best answer (Saunders & Size, 1986). This may explain why officers are unlikely to arrest even if the woman wants them to (Saunders & Size, 1986), especially when it is a Black victim and there were children at the scene, or if it was a Black victim who had been using drugs (Robinson & Chandek, 2000). The fact that officers are less likely to arrest if the victim was using drugs is important to consider, because it has been found that substance use by the victim is correlated with a lack of cooperation (Goodman et al., 1999). While it is likely that there are other factors that play a role

in this correlation, it is likely that this correlation could be at least partially attributed to stigmatization that the victim may face.

Not only do Black women face harm because of bias within the system, but even because of well-meaning policies. Though mandatory arrest policies were an effort to demonstrate believing victims and to keep them safe, they do have a few negative effects. They are a clear example of taking agency away from victims and an example of how the barriers a victim may face in the system are often not considered (Stark, 1993). Mandatory arrest policies cause a decrease in reporting (Dugan, 2000), and generally may not have enough of a deterrent effect when weighed against the risks (Coker, 2004). These risks could be retaliation from the abuser, the victim's loss of agency, or how they be taking the place of less invasive measures.

Even objectively good policies and concepts can be associated with negatives. Prosecutor willingness to press charges and pursue a conviction may generally aggravate cases (Dugan, 2000), as prosecutor willingness and specialization are associated with retaliation (Dugan et al., 2004). Similarly, legal advocacy in general is associated with more Black women being killed by their boyfriends (Dugan et al., 2001). This could be because once a case enters the legal field, the abuser either blames the victim (and thus retaliates), and/or feels like they are losing control over the victim (which is when the victim is most likely to be killed). This could be coupled with Black victim's unwillingness to use and confusion around the system and other resources, which may leave them more vulnerable than a white victim.

Conclusion

Without being able to properly understand and see how intersectionality and identity affect different groups of domestic violence victims, the system cannot properly protect everyone. The shortcomings of the system (whether perceived or actual) need to be understood so that more people feel comfortable utilizing the response available to them. Without the presence of a wide and diverse array of resources (and staff) that can work together, victims will continue to fall through the cracks. It is imperative that we continuously evaluate what is working and what needs improvement, what exists and what does not, and who is being served and who is not. Domestic violence protections cannot only be available to those who are white and middle class, which is why in this paper I seek to discover if the available resources and policies are adjusted to the needs of the populations they serve.

Current Study

The goal of this research paper is to evaluate how our systems are adapting, or failing to adapt, to the needs of the community. This paper will seek to examine if the 48 largest cities in the United States are budgeting more money and enacting policies dependent on the percentage of Black citizens in their population. The large amount of previous research will guide which policies and resources I code as helpful to Black populations. I hope to understand whether research about the needs of marginalized communities is considered while policies and budgets are created, though I hypothesize that will not be the case.

METHODS

Data Set

To examine the correlation between percent of Black people and the resources/budgets of the major cities, I will use Laura Dugan's data set, *Impact of Legal Advocacy on Intimate Partner Homicide in the United States*. Dugan's data has two parts, though I will only be using part 1. The first part, in which 48 cities responded, contains information about the local police precincts, prosecution offices and policies, and victim resources. Informants within these systems were asked to fill out a survey which provided data from 1976 to 1996. Part 2 examined state domestic violence laws in the 50 largest cities from 1976 to 1997. In total, there were 1050 cases.

Both parts of the data were collected from the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Supplementary Homicide reports, the Bureau of Census, and/or collected directly by researchers. All informants who provided data were chosen because they were best positioned to answer the questions. In the first part, the information about local policy and Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) benefits was not available for New York, NY and Charlotte, NC. New York also did have some missing information concerning their domestic violence services. Using the consumer price index, AFDC benefits were adjusted to 1983 dollars.

Variables

Independent Variable

My first independent variable will be the percentage of the population who are Black, which is denoted by PRBLACK. This variable will be examined as it is, but to aid further analysis, I also created a new variable, PRB_4, which codes the percentage of the population based off the quartiles for PRBLACK. 0 is the first quartile (0-25%), 1 is the second quartile (25% - 50%), 2 is the third quartile (50% - 75%), and 3 is the fourth quartile (75%-100%).

Dependent Variables

I will create 5 new dependent variables by grouping the existing variables (subvariables). For the presence of each subvariable, 1 point will be added, which will create a scale of 0 to n, where n with the number of subvariables in each group.

The first variable will be Arrest Policies (ArrestP). This will be composed of variables pro-arrest for probation violation (PROARREST), mandatory arrest for parole violation (MANPPOV), and mandatory arrest for DV (MANDV). This scale would range from 0 to 3. To make it so a high score on this variable would mean that the policies are well-adjusted for a high Black population, the sub variables will be inversely coded.

The next variable will be Trainings (Trainings). This would be composed of variables police recruit domestic violence training (RECRUITN) and in-service police domestic violence training (INSERVTN). The scale would range from 0 to 2. A high score on this scale would mean that it is well adjusted for a high Black population.

The third variable will be Units (Units). This would be composed of police domestic violence unit (PLDVUNIT) and DV units in prosecutor's office (PRDVUNIT). The scale would be from 0 to 2. To make it so a high score on this scale would mean these cities are well adjusted for a high Black population, the inverse of the scores will be taken.

The fourth variable will be Prosecuting Policies (PPolicies). This would be composed of prosecutor's office has a no drop policy (NODROP) and prosecutor's office has written policy on parole violations (PRSWRTPL). The scale would range from 0 to 2. So that a high score on this scale would mean that the policies are well adjusted for high Black populations, the inverse will be taken.

The fifth variable will be General Policies (GPolicies). This would be composed of eligibility beyond cohabitation (BEYCOHAB), victim custody relief (CUSTODY), no contact parole available (NOCONTACT), and firearm confiscation for violating PO (FIREARMC). This scale would be from 0 to 4. High on this scale would mean that the policies are well-adjusted for a high Black population.

The last variable will be AFDC Benefits (AFDC). I will not be changing this variable, as it already exists within the data set. The amounts are adjusted within the data set to be in the equivalent value as the amount would have been in 1983.

Plan of Analysis

I will analyze the data by using both descriptive and inferential statistics. I will do a quantitative analysis using SPSS to determine how the percentage of Black people is correlated with the victim support systems available in the area. I will examine if there is a difference in the

types or amount of support by doing a correlation/regression for each support method. Due to New York, NY and Charlotte, NC missing data, they were removed from my data, leaving me with 1007 data points.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

		Statistics							
		PERCENT OF POP WHO IS BLACK	PRB_4	ArrestP	Trainings	Units	PPolicies	GPolicies	AFDC BENEFITS AT APPROX 1983 \$
N	Valid	1007	1007	1007	1007	1007	1007	1007	1007
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		24.576680	1.4985	2.3684	.4131	1.6832	1.6276	2.1063	386.363374
Median		21.844000	1.0000	3.0000	.0000	2.0000	2.0000	3.0000	350.401600
Mode		3.5000	.00 ^a	3.00	.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	144.0408 ^a
Std. Deviation		18.4624283	1.11814	1.12283	.76592	.62419	.64255	1.23711	164.4230576
Range		82.2615	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	761.7729
Minimum		1.0000	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	141.5663
Maximum		83.2615	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	903.3392
Percentiles	25	10.378600	.0000	2.0000	.0000	2.0000	1.0000	1.0000	263.803700
	50	21.844000	1.0000	3.0000	.0000	2.0000	2.0000	3.0000	350.401600
	75	33.100000	2.0000	3.0000	.0000	2.0000	2.0000	3.0000	504.405300

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

Figure 1: Descriptive Statistics

Arrest Policies ranged from 0 to 3 points, however the median and mode both were 3, meaning that most states had all three policies. 75% of the data fell at or above 2, which meant that the mean was just above 2 at 2.3684. Trainings ranged from 0 to 2 points. Most of these data points were 0, with both the median and mode being 0 and 75% of the data points being 0. The mean was 0.4131. Units ranged from 0 to 2. Like Arrest Policies, most of the locations had both policies, as the median and mode were 2 and 75% of the data was 2. The mean was close to 2 at 1.6832. Prosecuting Policies also ranged from 0 to 2. 50% of the data fell at 2, which was both the median and mode. The mean was 1.6276, showing that most locations had at least one policy, if not both. General Policies were not missing any data points and ranged from 0 to 4. Both the median and mode were 3 and 75% of the data points fell at or below 3. The mean was 2.1063, meaning that few locations had all 4 policies. AFDC Benefits ranged from \$141.5663 to

\$903.3392. The mode was \$144.0408, but the median and mean were much higher, with the median being \$350.4016 and the mean was \$386.363374. This means that many places were providing less in benefits than the average, given that both the median and the mode were lower than the mean.

The percentage of the population that was Black did not have any missing data points, and ranged from 1 to 83.2615, however, 75% of the data fell at or below 33.1, meaning this data was right skewed. The mode was 3.5, but the median and mode were much higher. The median was 21.844 and the mean was quite close at 24.57668. This means that many places did not have a high percentage of the population that was Black. PRB_4 was also not missing any data points. The median was 1, and the mean was slightly higher at 1.4985, meaning most of the cities did not have a large percentage of the population that was Black. This is further seen by the percentiles, where 75% of the data fell at or below 2.

Statistical Analysis

		PERCENT OF POP WHO IS BLACK	PRB_4
PERCENT OF POP WHO IS BLACK	Pearson Correlation	1	.904**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		<.001
	N	1007	1007
PRB_4	Pearson Correlation	.904**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	
	N	1007	1007
ArrestP	Pearson Correlation	-.048	-.036
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.124	.249
	N	1007	1007
Trainings	Pearson Correlation	.166**	.181**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001
	N	1007	1007
Units	Pearson Correlation	.078*	.093**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.013	.003
	N	1007	1007
PPolicies	Pearson Correlation	.127**	.134**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001
	N	1007	1007
GPolicies	Pearson Correlation	.034	.029
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.284	.354
	N	1007	1007
AFDC BENEFITS AT APPROX 1983 \$	Pearson Correlation	-.205**	-.249**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001
	N	1007	1007

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The most significant correlations, at $p < 0.01$ between the Percentage of the Population who is Black and the other variables is Trainings, Prosecuting Policies, and AFDC Benefits. AFDC Benefits is the largest correlation with percentage of the population that is Black, and it is a negative correlation, at -0.205. This means that the more people in the population who are Black, the less AFDC benefits are available. Next is Trainings, which is positively correlated with Percentage of the Population who is Black at 0.166. So, as the percentage of Black people increases, the more likely cities are to have the beneficial trainings. Lastly, is Prosecuting Policies, which was positively correlated with percentage of the population who is Black at 0.127. So, the more Black people in the population, the more beneficial prosecutor policies there

are/the lack of harmful policies. Percentage of the Population that is Black is correlated with Units, though at a 0.013 significance. It is positively correlated, at 0.078, meaning that as the percentage of the population who is Black increases, there are more helpful units.

PRB_4 shared these same correlations, though all of them were significant at $p < 0.01$. AFDC had a correlation of -0.249, Prosecuting Policies had a correlation of 0.134, Units had a correlation of 0.093, and Trainings had a correlation of 0.181. All these correlations were slightly higher than those between PRBLACK and the variables.

Arrest Policies

Model Fitting Information				
Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	123.184			
Final	107.634	15.551	3	.001

Link function: Logit.

Figure 2: Model Fitting Information for Arrest Policies

Goodness-of-Fit			
	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	42.029	6	<.001
Deviance	55.798	6	<.001

Link function: Logit.

Figure 3: Goodness-of-Fit for Arrest Policies

While the model fitting information shows a significant finding, thus demonstrating that the model fits well, the goodness of fit does not, meaning there are no significant differences in the number of arrest policies depending on the percent of the population that is Black.

General Policies

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	116.773			
Final	116.515	.258	3	.968

Link function: Logit.

Figure 4: Model Fitting Information for General Policies

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	35.659	9	<.001
Deviance	35.902	9	<.001

Link function: Logit.

Figure 5: Goodness-of-Fit for General Policies

Neither the model fitting information, nor the goodness of fit shows a significant finding, meaning that there are no significant differences in the number of general policies depending on the percent of the population that is Black.

Prosecuting Policies

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	82.285			
Final	63.344	18.941	3	<.001

Link function: Logit.

Figure 6: Model Fitting Information for Prosecuting Policies

Goodness-of-Fit			
	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	19.740	3	<.001
Deviance	23.038	3	<.001

Link function: Logit.

Figure 7: Goodness-of-Fit for Prosecuting Policies

While the model fitting information shows a significant finding, thus demonstrating that the model fits well, the goodness of fit does not, meaning there are no significant differences in the number of prosecuting policies depending on the percent of the population that is Black.

Trainings

Model Fitting Information				
Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	90.325			
Final	47.846	42.479	3	<.001

Link function: Logit.

Figure 8: Model Fitting Information for Trainings

Goodness-of-Fit			
	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	8.646	3	.034
Deviance	8.412	3	.038

Link function: Logit.

Figure 9: Goodness-of-Fit for Trainings

While the model fitting information shows a significant finding, thus demonstrating that the model fits well, the goodness of fit does not, meaning there are no significant differences in the number of trainings depending on the percent of the population that is Black.

Units

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	59.355			
Final	40.620	18.735	3	<.001

Link function: Logit.

Figure 10: Model Fitting Information for Units

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	.554	3	.907
Deviance	.555	3	.907

Link function: Logit.

Figure 11: Goodness-of-Fit for Units

Both the model fitting information and the goodness of fit shows a significant finding, meaning that there are significant differences in the number of units depending on the percent of the population that is Black, and that the model is a good fit.

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Units = .00]	-3.018	.205	217.716	1	<.001	-3.418	-2.617
	[Units = 1.00]	-1.852	.184	101.352	1	<.001	-2.213	-1.492
Location	[PRB_4=.00]	-.803	.233	11.908	1	<.001	-1.258	-.347
	[PRB_4=1.00]	-.779	.233	11.163	1	<.001	-1.236	-.322
	[PRB_4=2.00]	-.863	.231	13.940	1	<.001	-1.317	-.410
	[PRB_4=3.00]	0 ^a	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Figure 12: Parameter Estimates for Units

All the estimates are negative and significant, meaning that for each quartile of the percentage of the population that is Black, there are less trainings.

	Name	Estimates	Odds Ratio
Threshold	[Units = .00]	-3.018	0.048917
	[Units = 1.00]	-1.852	0.156905
Location	[PRB_4 = .00]	-0.803	0.448186
	[PRB_4 = 1.00]	-0.779	0.458937
	[PRB_4 = 2.00]	-0.863	0.421706

Figure 13: Odds Ratio for Units

All three categories have a similar odds ratio, though the second quartile of the percentage of the population that is Black is the highest, but only marginally.

AFDC Benefits

Descriptives

AFDC BENEFITS AT APPROX 1983 \$

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
.00	252	438.562243	186.1708656	11.7276622	415.465079	461.659407	141.5663	903.3392
1.00	252	433.865860	160.6918804	10.1226370	413.929729	453.801990	141.5663	745.1669
2.00	252	317.453409	140.2569006	8.8353543	300.052530	334.854288	141.5663	741.6520
3.00	251	355.449310	132.4665642	8.3612154	338.981910	371.916710	144.0408	708.2601
Total	1007	386.363374	164.4230576	5.1814103	376.195764	396.530985	141.5663	903.3392

Figure 14: Descriptives for AFDC Benefits Regression

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.249 ^a	.062	.061	159.3268724

a. Predictors: (Constant), PRB_4

Figure 15: Model Summary for AFDC Benefits Regression

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1685173.992	1	1685173.992	66.384	<.001 ^b
	Residual	25511977.531	1005	25385.052		
	Total	27197151.523	1006			

a. Dependent Variable: AFDC BENEFITS AT APPROX 1983 \$

b. Predictors: (Constant), PRB_4

Figure 16: ANOVA for AFDC Benefits Regression

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	441.214	8.398		52.537	<.001
	PRB_4	-36.604	4.493	-.249	-8.148	<.001

a. Dependent Variable: AFDC BENEFITS AT APPROX 1983 \$

Figure 17: Coefficients for AFDC Benefits Regression

The regression is significant (though small), and positive, meaning that as the percentage of the population that is Black increases, the AFDC Benefits increases. However, the coefficient is negative, and significant, which could indicate that the finding is only due to natural fluctuation in the data and the correlation is small.

Looking at the means for each quartile, it is clear that the mean for the first quartile is much larger than the mean for the fourth quartile, and that generally the means are decreasing. The means for the first and second quartile are almost the same, though the second quartile is slightly less than the first. The mean for the fourth quartile is greater than the mean for the third quartile, so all together the non-linear differences in means may account for the negative coefficient but positive R value.

ANOVA

AFDC BENEFITS AT APPROX 1983 \$

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2691782.950	3	897260.983	36.725	<.001
Within Groups	24505368.573	1003	24432.072		
Total	27197151.523	1006			

Figure 18: ANOVA for AFDC Benefits

ANOVA Effect Sizes^a

		Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
AFDC BENEFITS AT APPROX 1983 \$	Eta-squared	.099	.065	.133
	Epsilon-squared	.096	.062	.130
	Omega-squared Fixed-effect	.096	.062	.130
	Omega-squared Random-effect	.034	.022	.047

a. Eta-squared and Epsilon-squared are estimated based on the fixed-effect model.

Figure 19: ANOVA Effect Sizes for AFDC Benefits

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: AFDC BENEFITS AT APPROX 1983 \$

Tukey HSD

(I) PRB_4	(J) PRB_4	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	1.00	4.6963837	13.9249896	.987	-31.137394	40.530162
	2.00	121.1088345*	13.9249896	<.001	85.275057	156.942613
	3.00	83.1129333*	13.9388522	<.001	47.243482	118.982385
1.00	.00	-4.6963837	13.9249896	.987	-40.530162	31.137394
	2.00	116.4124508*	13.9249896	<.001	80.578673	152.246229
	3.00	78.4165496*	13.9388522	<.001	42.547098	114.286001
2.00	.00	-121.1088345*	13.9249896	<.001	-156.942613	-85.275057
	1.00	-116.4124508*	13.9249896	<.001	-152.246229	-80.578673
	3.00	-37.9959012*	13.9388522	.033	-73.865353	-2.126450
3.00	.00	-83.1129333*	13.9388522	<.001	-118.982385	-47.243482
	1.00	-78.4165496*	13.9388522	<.001	-114.286001	-42.547098
	2.00	37.9959012*	13.9388522	.033	2.126450	73.865353

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Figure 20: Multiple Comparisons for AFDC Benefits

To further test the relationship, I ran a one-sided ANOVA test, which showed significant findings, though the F score was high. Specifically, the first quartile was significantly different from the third and fourth quartile and the first quartile was significantly different from the third and fourth quartile at $p < 0.001$. The third quartile was significantly different from the fourth quartile at $p < 0.05$.

DISCUSSION

Out of my six variables, only two, Units and AFDC benefits showed a significant finding. For Units, all four quartiles showed less units, and had similar odds ratios, meaning that though it was significant, the difference between each quartile was not large. AFDC Benefits, similarly, were significant, and seemed to slightly decrease as the percentage of the Black Population increased. However, these findings were slightly mixed.

This shows that in general, the policies and procedures that would be most influential to Black populations are not present, or they are actively decreasing as the percentage of Black people in the population increases. Meaning that at least as of 1996, our policies and procedures are generally not adjusted to meet the needs of the populations they serve. This could be due to a myriad of reasons: lack of awareness around Black issues and need, lack of funding, or just a simple lack of emphasis being placed on the needs of Black individuals.

LIMITATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The largest limitation that this study had was that the data was over two decades old. Though this was the latest data of this scale and information available, further research should be conducted using more up-to-date information. Coupled with this is that more research is necessary in regard to understanding the experiences of minorities. This data set did not collect any information on ethnicities besides Black, and there was a lack of current research on the experiences of Black and other minority domestic violence victims. It is imperative that the

needs of those who are systemically disenfranchised be considered and studied, especially in the modern age of political polarization and intolerance.

Secondly, is the fact that the data did not have information from New York and Charlotte, both very large cities with large Black populations and culture. It is especially limiting to lose New York, given the history of bad blood between police and Black citizens, as well as the policies like broken-windows policing and stop-and-frisk which led to the lack of trust (Kamalu & Emmanuel, 2018). Further research into how New York approaches tailoring domestic violence could provide much insight.

Additionally, more precise, and in-depth consideration of various possible confounding variables should be considered, especially with AFDC Benefits. One of the reasons for a negative coefficient but a positive R could be that the model is more complex than the two variables, so further examination of that relationship is important, especially given the large impact AFDC benefits have on the Black domestic violence population.

Further research could also be conducted on the impact of the local shelters and domestic abuse hotlines, as well as specific supports during legal proceedings, as these were not examined in this study.

CONCLUSION

Though this data set is older, it still gives valuable insight into domestic violence, especially for minority victims. Marital rape has been made a crime in all 50 states by July 1993 (Bergen & Barnhill, 2006), three years before the end of the data set. The civil rights movement is commonly thought about as occurring from the mid-1950s to the mid-1960s (Carson, 2024), not long before the data set started.

Together, these show that this data set was taken during, or right after, a time of great focus on these specific groups (Black people and domestic violence victims). Looking at the research, the late 1980s to the early 2000s seems to be a time where there was a lot of focus on Black victims, a focus that is now lacking.

This is why it is especially disappointing why these resources do not show an adjustment for Black victims, not even over time (if anything there was a decrease). If the resources and techniques are not being addressed in cities where there is both a large concentration of minorities and resources, these findings do not bode well for those who are not in cities and may be in more rural settings, where there are less resources (Peek-Asa et al., 2011). Additionally, due to the historical context, Black and African Americans are heavily researched – especially in the medical field – but there is a lack of information on other minorities (George et al., 2014). So, if the unique needs of Black individuals are not being met, it is unlikely that the unique needs of other minorities will be.

Since the time of the data set, the domestic violence movement has grown and gained more attention, as has the understanding that different groups need different resources. There has also been an increase in the number of minorities in the United States, and acknowledgement of different groups and cultures. So, it is possible that since this data set, things have improved. However, more research is still required to recognize that the unique needs of Black victims are being met, as well as the needs of other minorities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bean, Anjerrika R. (2022). Surviving COVID19 (Increased domestic violence, marginalized communities, and innovative solutions). *Journal of Family Strengths*, 21(2), 2.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.58464/2168-670X.1451>
- Bennett, L., Goodman, L., & Dutton, M. A. (1999). Systemic obstacles to the criminal prosecution of a battering partner: A victim perspective. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 14, 761.
- Bergen, R. K., & Barnhill, E. (2006). Marital rape: New research and directions. *VAWnet.org*.
<https://vawnet.org/material/marital-rape-new-research-and-directions#:~:text=Historically%2C%20most%20rape%20statutes%20read,of%20the%20sexual%20offense%20codes>.
- Brice-Baker, J. R. (1994). Domestic violence in african-american and african-caribbean families, *Journal of Social Distress and Homelessness*, 3(1), 23-38, DOI: 10.1007/BF02087357
- Brunson, R. K. (2007). “Police don’t like black people”: African-american young men’s accumulated police experiences. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 6, 71-101. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9133.2007.00423.x>
- Carson, C. (2024). American civil rights movement. *Encyclopedia Britannica*.
<https://www.britannica.com/event/American-civil-rights-movement>
- Coker, D. (2000). Shifting power for battered women: Law, material resources, and poor women of color. University of California, Davis, *Law Review*, 33, 1009-1055

- Coker, D. (2004). Race, poverty, and the crime-centered response to domestic violence. A comment on Linda Mills's *Insult to Injury: Rethinking our responses to intimate abuse*. *Violence Against Women*, 11, 1331–1353.
- Conaway, M. R. and Lohr, S. L. (1994). A longitudinal analysis of factors associated with reporting violent crimes to the police. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 10, 23-39.
- Crenshaw K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241-1299. doi:10.2307/1229039
- Davis, R. C., & Henderson, N. J. (2003). Willingness to Report Crimes: The Role of Ethnic Group Membership and Community Efficacy. *Crime & Delinquency*, 49(4), 564-580. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128703254418>
- Dobash, R. E., Dobash, R. P., & Cavanagh, K. (1985). Contact Between Battered Women and Social and Medical Agencies. In *Private violence and public policy*. chapter, Taylor and Francis.
- Donnelly, D. A., Cook, K. J., & Wilson, L. A. (1999). Provision and exclusion: The dual face of services to battered women in three deep south states. *Violence Against Women*, 5, 710–741.
- Dugan, L. (2000). Domestic violence legislation: Exploring its impact on domestic violence and the likelihood that police are informed and arrest. Final Report. NCJ 196853, Baltimore, MD: Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, University of Maryland.
- Dugan, L., Nagin, D., & Rosenfeld, R. (2001). Exposure reduction or backlash? The effects of domestic violence resources on intimate partner homicide. Final Report. NCJ 186194

- Dugan, L., Nagin, D., and Rosenfeld, R. (2004). The effects of state and local domestic violence policy on intimate partner homicide. *Violence Against Women and Family Violence: Developments in Research, Practice, and Policy*.
- Dugan, L., Nagin, D. S., & Rosenfeld, R. (2013). Policies and services designed to help victims of domestic violence appear to have two possible and opposing effects: either they decrease the abuse and risk of homicide, or they have the unintended consequence of increasing them. *Intimate Partner Violence*, 17, 229-268.
- Dugan, L. Impact of Legal Advocacy on Intimate Partner Homicide in the United States, 1976-1997. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2009-07-10. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR25621.v1>
- Eisikovits, Z., & Buchbinder, E. (1996). Pathways to disenchantment: Battered women's views of their social workers. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 11(3), 425-440. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088626096011003008>
- Fleury, R. E., Sullivan, C. M., Bybee, D. I., & Davidson II, W. S. (1998). Why don't they just call the cops?: Reasons for differential police contact among women with abusive partners. *Violence and Victims*. 13. 333-346
- Fraser, I. M., McNutt, L. A., Clark, C. et al. (2002). Social support choices for help with abusive relationships: Perceptions of african american women. *Journal of Family Violence*, 17. 363-375. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020322600490>
- Garcia, M. (1985). Double jeopardy: Battered women of color. *Wives tales: A Newsletter About Ending Violence Against Women in the Home*, 2(1), 1-2
- George, S., Duran, N., & Norris, K. (2014). A systematic review of barriers and facilitators to minority research participation among African Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans,

- and Pacific Islanders. *American journal of public health*, 104(2), e16–e31.
<https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2013.301706>
- Goodman, L. A., Bennett, L. E., & Dutton, M. A. (1999). Obstacles to victims' cooperation with the criminal prosecution of their abusers: The role of social support. *Violence and Victims*, 14(4), 427–444
- Hampton, R. L., LaTaillade, J. J., Dacey, A., & Marghi, J.R. (2008). Evaluating domestic violence interventions for black women, *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 16:3, 330-353, DOI: 10.1080/10926770801925759
- Kamalu, Ngozi C. and Onyeozili, Emmanuel C. (2018). A critical analysis of the “Broken windows” policing in new york city and its impact: Implications for the criminal justice system and the african american community. *African Journal of Criminology and Justice Studies*, 11(1), 6. <https://digitalscholarship.tsu.edu/ajcjs/vol11/iss1/6>
- Kelly, L. C., Spencer, C. M., Keilholtz, B., McAllister, P., & Stith, S. M. (2022). Is separate the new equal? A meta-analytic review of correlates of intimate partner violence victimization for Black and White women in the United States. *Family Process*, 61(4), 1473-1488.
- Lacey, K. K., Jiwatram-Negron, T., & Sears, K. P. (2021). Help-seeking behaviors and barriers among black women exposed to severe intimate partner violence: Findings from a nationally representative sample. *Violence Against Women*, 27(6–7), 952–972.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801220917464>
- Meier, J. (1997). Domestic violence, character, and social change in the welfare reform debate. *Law and Policy*, 19(2), 205–263.

- Peek-Asa, C., Wallis, A., Harland, K., Beyer, K., Dickey, P., & Saftlas, A. (2011). Rural disparity in domestic violence prevalence and access to resources. *Journal of women's health (2002)*, 20(11), 1743–1749. <https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2011.2891>
- Pinn, V. W. & Chunko, M. T. (1997). The diverse faces of violence: Minority women and domestic abuse. *Academic Medicine*, 72(1), 65–70.
- Rice, J., West, C. M., Cottman, K., & Gardner, G. (2021). The intersectionality of intimate partner violence in the black community. In *Handbook of interpersonal violence and abuse across the lifespan: A project of the National Partnership to End Interpersonal Violence Across the Lifespan (NPEIV)* (pp. 2705-2733). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Robinson, A. L., & Chandek, M. S. (2000). The domestic violence arrest decision: Examining demographic, attitudinal, and situational variables. *Crime & Delinquency*, 46(1), 18–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128700046001002>
- St Vil, N. M., Sabri, B., Nwokolo, V., Alexander, K. A., & Campbell, J. C. (2017). A qualitative study of survival strategies used by low-income black women who experience intimate partner violence. *Social Work*, 62(1), 63–71. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/sww080>
- Saunders, D. G. & Size, P. B. (1986). Attitudes about woman abuse among police officers, victims, and victim advocates. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1(1), 25–42.
- Sorenson, S. B. (1996). Violence against women: examining ethnic differences and commonalities. *Evaluation Review*, 20(2), 123–145. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X9602000201>
- Stark, E. (1993). Mandatory arrest of batterers: A reply to its critics. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 36(5), 651–681.

- Sullivan, C. M., Basta, J., Tan, C., & Davidson, W. S. II (1992). After the crisis: A needs assessment of women leaving a domestic violence shelter. *Violence and Victims, 7*, 267–275
- Sullivan, C. M. & Rumpitz, M. H. (1994). Adjustment and needs of african american women who utilized a domestic violence shelter. *Violence and Victims, 9*, 275–286.
- Taylor, J. Y. (2005). No resting place: African american women at the crossroads of violence. *Violence Against Women, 11*(12), 1473–1489.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801205280275>
- Wyatt, G. E. (1994). Sociocultural and epidemiological issues in the assessment of domestic violence. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless, 3*, 7–21.