CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE

Perceptions of Adult Witnesses to Domestic Violence of Law Enforcement Officers, and Law Enforcement Officers' Self-Perceived Competence in Handling Domestic Violence Calls

A graduate project submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of Master of Social Work

By

Jere Fernandes in collaboration with Vanessa Arteaga Rood

May 2019

The graduate project of Jere Fernandes is approved:

_____   _____
Dr. Wendy Ashley   Date

_____   _____
Dr. Susan Love   Date

_____   _____
Dr. David McCarty-Caplan, Chair   Date

California State University, Northridge

Dedication

To my husband, children and grandchildren without whose unwavering support this would not have been possible.

Table of Contents

Abstract

Perceptions of Adult Witnesses to Domestic Violence of Law Enforcement Officers, and
Law Enforcement Officers' Self-Perceived Competence in Handling Domestic Violence
Calls

By

Jere Fernandes

Master of Social Work

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between Law Enforcement

Officers (LEOs) and current adults who were witnesses to Domestic Violence (DV) as

minors, and the effect of these interactions on trust of police. This study also examined

Law Enforcement Officer's (LEO's) perceptions of training on self-perceived

competence during DV encounters. The method employed for this inquiry was a

quantitative study which intended to gather data from these two groups; witnesses to

Domestic Violence (DV) where Law Enforcement (LE) had been involved, and Law

Enforcement Officers (LEOs). The data obtained for this study was gathered from these

two groups through the distribution of a survey questionnaire and focused on examining

the levels of trust of LEOs among witnesses to DV where LE was involved, and LEO's

level of training and self-perceived competence during these interactions. Results

showed LEO perceptions of self-competence increased with the number of DV trainings

they received, and that among DV witnesses, no demographic variables other than age

and ethnicity (African American) showed significant effects on levels of trust of police.

Keywords: domestic violence, law enforcement officers, police, trust

<center>**Introduction**</center>

Domestic Violence

   Domestic Violence (DV), also known as Intimate Partner Violence (IPV), is

defined as any physical/sexual violence, emotional/psychological abuse, and/or threats

made by one intimate partner to another in order to gain power and/or control (NCADV,

2015). In the United States, DV is an epidemic which is more commonplace than most

would want to believe. Every minute, 20 people are physically abused by an intimate

partner which means that on average, there are more than 10 million victims per year

(NCADV, 2015).

   Barriers to accessing help. Awareness of the high incidence of DV and

provision of assistance to those who are victims is something which should be of

significant concern, as it is an issue which can and does affect anyone regardless of sex,

age, religion, sexual orientation, or socio-economic status (NCADV, 2015). For those

who have not been victims of DV, it may seem a simple solution for victims to call

police, have the offending partner arrested, and leave the relationship. However, research

suggests many victims of DV do not contact law enforcement for a multitude of reasons

including; feeling that the police were not needed; police would not be useful; a desire to

protect the perpetrator and/or preserve the family, or a fear of retribution from the

perpetrator in the form of more abuse or even death (Fugate, 2005). Additionally, Fluery

(2002) found that the initial response by the police greatly influenced whether or not a

victim would initiate any future contact with law enforcement. For example, if the

officer's response was helpful to the victim, they were more likely to contact them again,

but if the officer's response was not helpful, then the victim was more likely not to

<center>1</center>

initiate any future contact with local law enforcement agencies. It was also found that victims were more satisfied when the responding law enforcement officer (LEO) was empathetic to them and their situation, which also increased the likelihood of victims contacting them again. In addition, studies have shown that there are added barriers for victims of color which affect confidence in contacting law enforcement as well, particularly among African Americans, Latinx's, and communities with high numbers of undocumented individuals (Lichtenstein & Johnson, 2009; Messing, Androff, Ward-Lasher, & Becerra, 2015). These findings are problematic in that they suggest significant numbers of DV victims may not feel confident enough in law enforcement to help them during a time when they may need it most, especially if they come from particularly marginalized or underserved populations.

      Historical factors. The question then becomes not only why this is the case, but what are law enforcement agencies and officers doing to help victims of DV? Historically, DV was looked upon as a family matter and the presence or involvement of law enforcement was not necessary, which changed in the 1970's when the Women's Movement fought for equal protection. This sparked major law enforcement departments to adopt pro-arrest policies. Since then, DV is now considered to be misdemeanor criminal conduct under the pro-arrest policies (Robinson, 2000).

Law Enforcement DV Training

      Although there have been historical changes made and implemented since the pro-arrest policies were implemented, it appears there is still much left to change among law enforcement agencies and how they handle DV situations. One big discrepancy is the level of training that LEOs receive. Huisman, Martinez, and Wilson (20005) found

that there were many barriers to adequately train LEOs on DV. They stated that there was

an inadequate amount of federal and state funding being provided to law enforcement

agencies to properly train them on matters of DV and how best to respond to those calls.

Other barriers to LEO DV training. It was also found that a barrier in training

and retention of training on DV was being influenced by institutionalized sexism, along

with long-existing tension between law enforcement and battered women's advocates.

Buzawa (2003) noted that the irregular amount of training provided to LEOs on a

national level also lead to many discrepancies when it came to arrest practices, and that

law-enforcement-based arrests on situational matters which more times than not, were

due to factors unrelated to the DV situation. Additionally, in cases where the offender

was not at the scene when law enforcement arrived, which was more than 50% of the

time, LEOs did not aggressively seek out the perpetrator nor issue a warrant for their

arrest. These findings further show the importance of proper training and understanding

by LEOs when it comes to handling situations involving DV.

LEO cultural barriers. Another problem found within law enforcement agencies

is the culture which has been deeply rooted into law enforcement agencies all over the

country. Robinson (2000) discussed something referred to as the "schema theory" which

he described as "The accretion of learning of schemata [which] occurs early within the

police culture, and the occupational socialization of police officers [which] encourages

conformity and discourages change" (p. 605). As human beings, we all have learned

behaviors and LEOs are no different, but this is problematic when they allow the culture

of their agency to interfere with the lives of others. In a sense, LEOs allow the culture to

become so deeply rooted into their thinking, that they essentially become numb to what is around them (Robinson, 2000).

Research Questions

With all these factors in play, it is necessary to examine what is currently being done within law enforcement agencies not only to foster trust between victims of DV and LEOs, but to adequately train LEOs for the unique challenges faced during DV calls. To this end this study intends to examine the perceptions of LEOs by adults who witnessed DV as minors in which law enforcement was involved, and also explore LEO's perceptions of the effects of DV training on their capability during these types of interactions by addressing the following two questions: Do interactions between witnesses to domestic violence and law enforcement officers affect the level of trust witnesses have for law enforcement officers? Does the level of training provided to law enforcement officers correlate to their self-perceived competence to handle domestic violence calls? To answer these questions, an electronic quantitative survey was used to gather data from a sample of adults who witnessed DV as minors that asked questions about perceptions of the responding officer's competency in managing DV situations, and respondent trust in LEOs. A second electronic survey was administered to a sample of LEOs from various agencies, asking questions about officer training in DV, agency protocol, and experience with DV related calls. We hypothesize that interactions between witnesses to DV and LEOs does affect the level of trust victims have for LEOs, and that the level of DV training officers receive greatly influences their perception of competence, skill level, and translates into more effective interactions between LEOs and victims.

Method

This quantitative study intended to gather data from two groups; witnesses to Domestic Violence (DV) where Law Enforcement (LE) had been involved, and Law Enforcement Officers (LEOs). The data obtained for this study was gathered from these two groups and focused on examining the levels of trust of LEOs among witnesses to DV where LE was involved, and Law Enforcement Officers' (LEO's) level of training and self-perceived competence during these interactions.

Sample

This study included two different groups from which survey data was collected. The first group surveyed (Group 1) were current adults 18 years of age or older who were witnesses to DV as minors, where LEOs had been involved. The second group are/were LEOs, active and retired (Group 2). The criteria for participation in the study required participants be currently adults 18 years of age or older who had witnessed DV when they were minors, and who came into contact with LE during the incident/s. The criteria for the second group required that individuals be currently active or retired LEOs who had responded to DV calls during the course of their careers.

Procedures

The research began with the distribution of two quantitative survey questionnaires; one created for witnesses of Domestic Violence (DV) where Law Enforcement (LE) had been involved, and one for Law Enforcement Officers (LEOs). Participants from both groups took a survey which gathered various demographic information and gauged levels of DV victims' trust of LEOs and LEO's level of DV training and self-perceived competence in handling DV situations. The survey for DV

witnesses was estimated to take approximately 10 to 15 minutes to complete, and the questionnaire for LEOs, 15 to 20 minutes to complete. Upon approval of this study by the California State University Northridge Institutional Review Board, submission number IRB-FY19-122, all data were collected electronically between February 12 and March 25, 2019. Data were collected for both groups in this study (Witnesses to DV, and LEOs) by soliciting participation in survey questionnaires, one for each respective survey group, through postings on social media platforms; namely, each researcher's own personal Facebook and Instagram pages, and solicitation posts to public group pages within Facebook and Instagram which are specific to victims of DV and LEOs. In addition to social media outreach, researchers gathered participants through a sample of convenience accessed through their personal networks via email. All study participants from both groups accessed their respective surveys through a *Qualtrics* protected site by clicking on a link which was provided in the social media solicitation posts or in the personal email solicitation letter sent (see Appendix D). The first item participants encountered when clicking their respective group link was a screening questionnaire (See Appendix E) which, for potential survey participants who had witnessed DV as minors, included questions which ensured they met the age and circumstantial requirements of having been witnesses to DV which involved LE; and, for LEOs, ensured they were active or retired LE, and had responded to calls involving DV during the course of their careers. Those participants who met the screening requirements for their respective groups were then guided to the appropriate survey for that group, each of which began with an electronic informed consent form (see Appendix A). Participants were given a choice to participate or not, as indicated by clicking on the consent form link. They were not allowed to

proceed without providing consent and only until consent was granted, were they able to access the survey for their respective group. In addition to the above referenced demographic questions, LEOs were asked questions regarding the amount of time served as a LEO, their rank, and the number of agencies worked for, as well as questions relating to the amount of DV training they had received so far, and their perceptions of their own level of preparedness when confronting DV situations. All surveys for both groups were conducted and gathered through *Qualtrics* electronic survey software. Once all data were gathered, it was transferred to SPSS Quantitative Analytic Software for analysis by the researchers. Additionally, at the end of each survey, all participants were offered the option to enter a drawing for a chance to win one of ten $30 Amazon gift cards (see Appendix A). At that time, participants were asked if they would like to enter into the drawing. If they agreed, they were asked to click on a link provided at the conclusion of the survey, which led them to a site removed from the actual survey platform, where they were then prompted to provide their contact email in order to be reached, should they be winners of one of the drawings. Subjects were notified that participation in the drawing was completely voluntary and would in no way compromise their confidentiality, and that the contest was conducted separately from the survey to ensure that no identifying information was connected to data gathered from the primary study survey. The drawing took place approximately 2 weeks after the survey became available to participants, winners were notified within 2 business days of the drawing, and gift cards were distributed within 3 business days after the winners were notified. At the conclusion of the study, the researchers wrote up the findings of this study in order to provide discussion and respond to the research questions.

Measures

All participants responded to a survey questionnaire specific to their respective groups. For the group of witnesses to DV, the survey consisted of 23 questions total (see Appendix B); for LEOs, the questionnaire consisted of 43 questions (see Appendix C).

DV Witnesses. DV Witnesses is defined as Witnesses to DV who are adults (age 18 or over) who were victims of and/or witnesses to DV when they were minors (under age 18), where LEOs were involved. For this group of participants, this study focused on measuring the effect these early experiences with LEOs during witness's exposure to DV had on their levels of trust of LE as adults. Participating DV witnesses must have met this definition in order to take the study survey.

Witness's experiences. The concept of witness's experiences is defined as recollections of adults who were exposed to DV as minors where LEOs were involved, and were measured by items 9-16 on the survey formulated by the researchers for this group of the study (see Appendix B, items 9-16). This concept was measured by questions regarding the age of first and last exposure to DV with LEO involvement as a minor, recollection of LEO engagement skills, empathy level, timeliness in responding, and competency. Examples of some the above referenced items are "How old were you when you *first* witnessed police response in a domestic violence incident?" with response choices of "Below 5 years old, 6-10 years old, 11 to under 18 years old," and "How would you rate the level of Police Officer's understanding of how to handle Domestic Violence calls?" with response choices of "Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor."

Witness trust. Witness trust is defined as the trust and confidence witnesses who were minors when they were exposed to DV which involved LEOs now feel toward LE

as adults. The concept of witness's trust was measured by questions 17-23 on the survey formulated by the researchers for this group of the study (See Appendix B, items 16-23). This concept was measured by questions gauging witness's perceptions of LEO's levels of understanding, empathy toward DV victims, efficacy, and overall confidence and trust in LEOs. Some examples of items included in the above referenced questionnaire are "Overall, How would you rate your trust of Police?" with response choices of "Extremely high, Very high, High, Somewhat high, Low, Extremely low, No trust at all" and "Do you feel that your experience as a witness to DV has directly impacted your perceptions of police?" with response choices of "Very strongly impacted, Strongly impacted, Somewhat impacted, Not impacted, Not impacted at all."

Law Enforcement Officers. Law Enforcement Officers (LEOs) are defined as LEOs who are active and/or retired who have responded to DV calls over the course of their careers. Participating LEOs must have met this definition in order to take the study survey.

Law Enforcement Officer's training. Law Enforcement Officer's (LEO's) training is defined as any official training received as a Law Enforcement Officer (LEO) in Domestic Violence (DV) and how to respond to calls involving DV. The concept of LEO DV training received was measured by items 12 - 15 (See Appendix C, items 12-15) of the survey questionnaire formulated for the LEO group of this study. This concept was measured by questions which solicited specific information regarding the amount of training received, if any, and if so, when it was received. Examples of such questions are "Have you received training regarding DV? (If yes, please answers questions 13 and 14. If no, please skip to question 15)" with response choices of "Yes, No." If the participant

answered "Yes," they proceeded to answer questions 13 and 14, which solicited information regarding how much training was received and when it was received. If the participant answered "No," they skipped to question 15, which asked "Have any of your training experiences directly addressed how to respond to the needs of children in a DV situation?" with response choices of "Yes, No, I am not sure." For the purposes of gauging the other variable of the study for this group, it was useful to distinguish between those LEOs who had received DV training from those who had not.

Law Enforcement Officer's self-perceived competence. Law Enforcement Officer's (LEO's) self-perceived competence is defined as LEO's perceptions of the effects of Domestic Violence training they received-or did not receive, on their perceptions of their own competence in situations involving DV. The self-perceived competence of LEOs was measured by items 16-43 (See Appendix C, items 16-43) of the survey questionnaire for the LEO group of this study. This concept was measured by questions gauging the LEO's attitudes toward factors such as determining the validity of DV calls and/or situations, the amount of autonomy/latitude extended to them when handling such calls, their level of preparedness and confidence when in DV situations, the likelihood of making arrests, and their own ability to de-escalate a DV situation. An example of such questions is "I feel that my time could be better spent on calls other than those of DV" with response choices offered in the form of a Likert scale from 1 to 5; 1 being "Strongly disagree," 3 being "Don't agree or disagree," and 5 being "Strongly agree." Another example is "I feel that it is best to arrest both parties in a DV call" with Likert scale responses ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). A last example, which is an item which specifically measured LEO's perceptions of self-

efficacy when handling DV calls was "On a scale from 1 to 5, 1 being not at all prepared and 5 being extremely prepared, how well do you feel the training you have received has prepared you to properly handle the needs of minors within a household during a DV call? Again, the response choices provided were presented in Likert scale form with 1 being "Not prepared at all," 3 being "Somewhat prepared," and 5 being "Extremely prepared."

Demographic Information. This study measured demographic information, such as age, race/ethnicity, sexual identity, etc. The demographics were measured by items 1-6 (See Appendices B and C, items 1-6) of the survey questionnaire for both the DV and LEO questionnaires. Demographic information was measured by asking questions such as "What is your age?" which allowed the participant to fill-in their response, and "What is the race/ethnicity you most strongly identify with? (Please check only one)" with response choices of "African American/Black, Caucasian/white, Latino/Hispanic non-white, Pacific Islander or Native American, Asian, Other, Mixed." These questions were similar for both groups, with the exception of two questions that were not asked on the LEO questionnaire, as the researchers did not feel they were needed for purposes of this study. The questions, asking for yearly household income and immigration status, were measured by items 7-8 (See Appendix B and C, items 7-8) of the DV questionnaire. These questions were measured by asking "What is your yearly household income?" with response choices of "Below 10,000 Dollars, 10,000-20,000 Dollars, 20,000-35,000 Dollars, 35,000-50,000 Dollars, 50,000-70,000 Dollars, 70,000 +" and "What is your immigration status?" with response choices of "Born U.S. Citizen, Naturalized U.S. Citizen, Undocumented, Work Visa, DACA

recipient." These demographics helped to distinguish differences between these specified groups.

Analysis Plan

Data for Group 1 and Group 2 of the study were downloaded from the *Qualtrics* electronic survey program and converted into a form compatible with SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software for analysis. All cases were then checked for eligibility requirements, with those not meeting study criteria being eliminated. For Group 1 (Witnesses to DV), responses were used to explore the relationship between DV witness's experiences as minors and their level of trust in LEOs as adults. For Group 2, (LEOs), responses were used to examine the relationship between the amounts of DV training (if any) received by LEOs and their perceptions of DV training or the lack thereof, on their self-perceived competence in DV situations. For both groups, relationships between each participant's respective group variables were examined through application of the linear regression for multiple variables method as well as descriptive and frequency statistical applications.

Results

This study included examination of data garnered from two groups: DV

Witnesses and active and retired LEOs. The DV Witness group consisted of 86 (n=86)

participants, the LEO group consisted of 233 (n = 233), with a total 319 (n = 319) study

participants.

DV Witnesses

Descriptive Results. This study sample consisted of the following self-identified

genders represented in this group: 84.9% Female, 13.9% Male, 1.3 N/G (Non-Gender).

The races/ethnicities represented in this group were 65.8% White, 26.6% Latinx, 5.1%

African American, and 2.5% Other (see Appendix F, Table 1). The mean age of

participants was 38 years (SD = 12.013) with the minimum age being 20 years and the

maximum being 68 years (See Appendix F, Table 2). The highest number of participants

experienced 2-5 incidents of witnessing DV at 53.2% for this category, with 33.8%

having had 1 experience, and 13% having experienced 6 or more incidents (see Appendix

F, Table 4), with descriptive calculations of number of incidents experienced measuring

at M = 2, SD = .656, min = 1, max = 6 (see Appendix F, Tables 3).

The mean score of DV witness trust was 2.87 (with 1 being "extremely low," 3

being "somewhat high," and 5 being "very high"), which reflects that the average number

of witnesses had less than somewhat high trust of LEOs (SD = 1.38, min = 1, max = 5)

(see Appendix F, Table 5). Frequency percentage of trust scores of LEOs showed that

among witnesses, 15.2% had extremely low trust, 29.1% had low trust, 13.9% had

somewhat high trust, 15.2% had high trust, 16.5% very high trust, and 0% reported

extremely high trust. A cumulative percentage of approximately 50% of participants rated

13

police trust in the 1-2 range, Extremely Low and Low, respectively, on the DV Witness

trust measure (See Appendix F, Table 6).

Regressions. A series of linear regressions were conducted to answer the

researchers' primary questions regarding DV witness trust of police. When running a

linear regression to examine if the number of times a DV witness comes in contact with

police during DV incidents predicts their trust of police, our results indicated no

significant relationship between the two primary variables (R^2 = .005, F = .347, p = .558).

When conducting a linear regression to examine whether race/ethnicity, identified

gender, sexual orientation or age predicts trust of police, results showed being African

American significantly predicted lower levels of trust of LEOs compared to White

participants [β = -.565, p = .054]) (See Appendix F, Table 7). Additionally, with regard to

participant age, results showed that as age increased, so did participant trust of police (B

= .032, p = .035).

LEOs

Descriptive Results. The self-identified genders identified among participants for

this group of the study were 83.3% male, 16.3% female, and 0.4% trans female. Among

some of the races/ethnicities represented in this group of the study, 83.7% of participants

self-identified as white, 9% as Latinx, and 0.4% African American/Black (see Appendix

F, Table 1). The mean age of participants was 47.56 years (*SD* = 12.27) with the

minimum age being 20 years and the maximum age being 81 years (See Appendix F,

Table 8).

The mean score of LEOs perception of DV training received was 3.86, which

reflects that that the average LEO felt somewhat prepared to handle DV calls, based on

training received (SD = .9, min = 1, max = 5) (See Appendix F, Table 9). Frequency

percentage of self-perception of preparedness scores of LEOs was 1 = .9%, 2 = 2.7%, 3 =

34.7%, 4 = 32.9 %, 5 = 28.8%. Approximately 34.7% of LEO participants rated their

training prepared them for managing calls involving DV within range 3, with 3 being

"Somewhat prepared" (See Appendix F, Table 10). Results showed a significant portion

of participants reported that based on their training, they felt they were adequately

prepared to handle DV calls.

LEO participants were also asked if they felt racial minorities were more likely

than whites to be involved in a DV situation. The mean score was 2.30, which reflects

that the average LEO disagreed with this statement (SD = .994, min = 1, max = 5).

Frequency percentage of LEOs who felt that racial minorities were more likely to be

involved in a DV situation than Whites was 1 = 27.4%, 2 = 24.5%, 3 = 41.5%, 4 = 4.2%,

5 = 2.4%. The greatest percentage of the participants, 41.5%, answered with 3, "Neither

agree nor disagree," followed by 27.4% who answered with 1, "Strongly disagree."

Additionally, LEO participants were asked if they felt their agency had sufficient

policies regarding DV calls. The mean score was 4.05, which reflects that LEOs agreed

that their agency had adequate DV policies in place (SD = .933, min = 1, max = 5).

Frequency percentage of LEOs who agreed or disagreed with this statement was 1 =

0.5%, 2 = 7.5%, 3 = 15.6%, 4 = 39.6%, 5 = 36.8%. Approximately 39.6% responded

within the 4 range, "Agree," and 36.8% responded with 5, "Strongly agree."

Regressions. A series of linear regressions were conducted to answer the

researchers' primary questions regarding LEO's perceptions of training and to measure

effects of various independent variables such as race, gender, and age. When conducting

a linear regression to examine if there was a relationship between the number of trainings LEO participants received and their feelings of preparedness in handling DV calls, results showed that there was a significant relationship between the number of trainings received and LEO's self-perceptions of preparedness (R^2 = .057, F = 12.494, p<.01). More specifically, as the number of trainings LEOs received increased, so too increased their self-perceptions of preparedness (β = .019, p <.001).

Discussion

Our study found that over half of DV witness participants (n = 86) reported low trust of police despite findings which show a preponderance LEOs (n = 233) have high self-perceived competence in DV situations. It is not surprising that even a small study such as this would show such a high frequency of low trust of law enforcement. Indeed, as many leaders from local, state, and federal entities have lamented, public mistrust of law enforcement is widespread, particularly as of late, as a result of several high-profile incidents of police-induced deaths of unarmed citizens, such in the case of Michael Brown, Jr. of Ferguson, Missouri, Eric Garner of New York City, and Trayvon Martin of Miami Gardens, Florida. Researchers pose that this type of mistrust of police is the result of what are perceived as "significant racial disparities in the administration of justice" (Mistrust, 2014) and perpetuate a corrosion which worsens already present barriers to accessing help from law enforcement for those who may need it most, such as victims of DV (Mistrust, 2014). Our findings are congruent with this concern, as a particularly low level of trust of police was found among African American DV witnesses. While our findings substantiated earlier studies with regard to African American witness respondents, it was surprising to find that among Latinx participants, there did not appear to be a significant relationship between race/ethnicity and trust of police. However, it is important to note that a substantial majority of study participants for both DV witness and LEO groups were White (n = 247, 77%), which could account for the unexpected results regarding Latinx communities and other communities of color.

Linear regression tests also showed an insignificant relationship between the number of times a witness comes in contact with police and their trust of police. This was

17

surprising as well, since earlier studies showed distrust of law enforcement to be high among underserved communities, in which a high frequency of interactions with police occurred routinely (Stoutland, 2001). Surprisingly, the only demographic factor which showed a significant relationship with regard to shifting trust of LEOs was participant age, in that as age increased so too did trust of police. This was not a surprising finding in itself, as earlier studies show that younger demographics tend to be more negative in their assessments of police (Hurst, 2007); however, it was interesting that age was the most significant variable affecting DV witness' trust of police.

This study found that 34.7% of LEO participants reported feeling at least somewhat prepared to properly handle a DV call based on training received. Given the reported frequency of the incidence of DV in the U. S., it is concerning that a preponderance of LEOs report feeling only "somewhat prepared" when responding to DV calls. It is also a commentary on the state of both the quantity and quality of DV training LEOs receive, in that the highest percentage of LEOs only feel somewhat prepared to handle DV calls. Indeed, linear regression analyses showed the amount of trainings received was significantly related to competence with DV calls when controlling for race and gender, in that as trainings increased, self-perceived competence also increased, substantiating our hypothesis that the more quality training LEOs received, the more confident they were in their ability to effectively handle calls which involved DV incidents. This finding which reflects that more trainings are commensurate with higher confidence validates the need for more frequent, quality DV training for LEOs. There were no significant differences found in competency between different genders or racial categories, however, it is important to note that the majority of LEO

respondents were White (83.7%) and male (83.3%), which limited the available data from which differences among a more diverse LEO pool could have been examined.

When LEO participants were asked if they felt racial minorities were more likely than Whites to be involved in a DV incident, the majority of respondents (n = 146, 68.9%) did not agree, with 41.5% (n = 88) answering "Neither agree nor disagree," and 27.4% (n = 58) answering "Strongly Disagree." These results, along with the majority of DV participants being White (65.8%) is surprising, in that, national statistics show that the largest group of reported DV victims are American Indian/Alaska Native, compared to other races, ethnicities, and sexes nationally, followed by those who identify as multiracial (NCVRW, 2018). Additionally, LEO participants were asked about DV policies at their respective agencies.

The largest group of participants (n = 84, 39.6%) agreed with the statement "I feel that my agency has sufficient policies regarding DV calls." Although, given the high level of agreement by the LEO participants expressed, the low level of trust by the DV witnesses shows a disconnect between the two population groups sampled in this study. It is important to note that, each state and LE agency varies with the policies and procedures that they implement for their officers, which could alter the perception of how each participant feels and defines what "sufficient policies" may or may not look like; however, the clear divide between these two groups which this study reveals substantiates the need for further steps to be taken to lessen the gap between LEO's perceptions that their respective agencies have sufficient policies in place and the overall low trust of DV victims. Possible strategies which could be implemented to bridge this divide could include needs assessments by law enforcement agencies of the communities they serve,

community action forums which include LEOs, LE administrators, and members of the community, and collaboration of LEOs and community members in developing relevant DV training curriculum which reflects a community's needs. Additionally, DV trainings that are not only mandated, but that also occur more frequently (i.e. bi-yearly), could potentially aid in LEOs feeling better prepared to handle DV calls, which in turn could help elevate the levels of trust of LEOs by the members of the communities they serve.

Limitations. Among limitations were that neither LEO nor DV participants were asked which state they were from, which could have had a significant effect on their responses and could have been an important factor in examining any relationships between LEO's self-perceived competence/DV witness's trust, and state of residence, particularly given the current political climate in the nation. Future studies which gauge trust of LEO among witnesses of DV or LEO's self-perceived competence in handling DV incidents which compare data from state to state would render significant results which would better inform these issues.

Additionally, both DV witness and LEO surveys solicited information from a retrospective point of view, which could have been from years or decades ago; particularly for participants who were witnesses to DV as children but are adults now. As has been shown time and again, memory is highly subjective and in constant flux, which could infer unreliability and place the credibility of the data in question. This limitation alone could warrant further study, perhaps utilizing a qualitative, narrative study which focuses on a more in-depth, anecdotal approach or a longitudinal study which focuses on identifying trends in the relationships which exist between DV witness trust and LEO trainings over a longer period of time.

While our hypothesis which posed that interactions between minor witnesses to DV and LEOs does affect the levels of trust witnesses have for LEOs was substantiated, it is important to note that while our hypothesis appears to have been substantiated, it is impossible to say whether the levels of distrust of LEOs among DV witnesses were specific to their personal interactions with LEOs or whether our results were simply a reflection of previously cited studies which show current trends toward high levels of mistrust of LEOs in underserved communities, where the incidence of DV is high (Wood, 2003). This could be an area for further study; one in which queries posed could include those from which information specific to possible sources of witness distrust could be solicited, such as in the case of qualitative, narrative data.

It is also important to note that, as the vast majority of DV participants were white, this does not reflect national DV statistics which show that American Indian/Alaskan Native women experience the highest rates of DV than any other race in the United States (NCVRW, 2018). Reasons behind the underrepresentation of this particular racial group, for purposes of this study, is unknown, but it can be assumed that reasons such as stigmatization of speaking out about such personal issues along with limitations to accessibility to social media could be contributing factors. This could warrant further studies to ensure a more diverse and representative sample size by using methods other than social media that would make such studies more accessible to underprivileged populations.

Conclusion

The findings of this study substantiate that there continues to exist low levels of trust of police among witnesses to DV in spite of high levels of self-perceived competence among LEOs when handling DV calls. It was also found that increased numbers of DV trainings were commensurate with increased feelings of self-perceived competency among LEOs when responding to DV calls. Further, it is important to note that over the past few decades, awareness of the co-occurrence of DV and child maltreatment has increased and that a sizable portion of DV and child maltreatment victims are from the same families. It is estimated that in 30 to 60 percent of families where DV exists, child maltreatment is also identified (Bragg, 2003). Indeed, children who live in an environment where DV is present face numerous risks which have been shown to lead to negative outcomes for them, making DV not only a crisis for the criminal justice system, but for Child Welfare systems as well, whose mandate it is to ensure the safety and well-being of children. This not only places additional pressures on an already taxed Child Welfare system, but it broadens the scope of practice for Social Workers and substantiates the need for further DV training for them as well, in order to develop skills which enhance interventions and better help children who are also victims of DV. Despite findings which identify children as victims of DV, we have only recently begun to view children as co-equal victims in DV situations and as such, have begun to focus on treatment interventions for them. It is hoped that this research will help law enforcement agencies see the importance of properly training their officers in how to respond to DV calls not only to help DV victims and their families, but also to ensure they have the proper skills, attitudes, and knowledge to build positive relationships

between law enforcement agencies and foster trust of law enforcement in communities. With the prevalence of DV and the collateral, sometimes irreparable harm it does to adults and particularly to children, it is vital that the main societal bulwark for victims; namely our LEOs, not only be easily accessible and trustworthy, but competent and empathetic to the complex needs of this unique population. Ultimately, when victims of DV are serviced by LEOs who are readily accessible and adequately trained to be sensitive to the needs of DV victims, both victims and LEO's benefit, as do Child Social Welfare professionals.

References

Bragg, H. L. (2003). *Child protection in families experiencing domestic violence*. US Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth, and Families, Children's Bureau, Office on Child Abuse and Neglect.

Buzawa, E. S., & Buzawa, C. G. (2003). *DV: The Criminal Justice Response* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Fleury, R. E. (2002). Missing Voices. *Violence Against Women, 8*(2), 181-205. doi: 10.1177/10778010222183008

Fugate, M., Landis, L., Riordan, K., Naureckas, S., & Engel, B. (2005). Barriers to Domestic Violence Help Seeking. *Violence Against Women, 11*(3), 290-310. doi: 10.1177/1077801204271959

Huisman, K., Martinez, J., & Wilson, C. (2005). Training Police Officers on DV and Racism. *Violence Against Women, 11*(6), 792-821. doi: 10.1177/1077801205276110

Hurst, Y. G. (2007). Juvenile attitudes toward the police: An examination of rural youth. *Criminal Justice Review*, *32*(2), 121-141.

Lichtenstein, B., & Johnson, I. (2009). Older African American Women and Barriers to Reporting DV to Law Enforcement in the Rural Deep South. *Women & Criminal Justice, 19*(4), 286-305.

Messing, J. T., Androff, D. K., Ward-Lasher, A., & Becerra, D. (2015). Latinas' perceptions of law enforcement: Fear of deportation, crime reporting, and trust in the system. *Journal of Women and Social Work, 30*(3), 328-340.

Mistrust of police, law enforcement corroding America. (2014, September 29). *Legal
 Monitor Worldwide*. Retrieved from http://link.galegroup.com.libproxy.csun.
 edu/apps/doc/A383975531/ITOF?u=csunorthridge&sid=ITOF&xid=3213b6bd

NCADV | National Coalition Against DV. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://ncadv
 .org/statistics

NCVRW | National Crime Victims' Rights Week Office for Victims of Crime. (2018).
 Intimate Partner Violence. Retrieved from https://ovc.ncjrs.gov/ncvrw2018/info
 _flyers/fact_sheets/2018NCVRW_IPV_508_QC.pdf

Robinson, A. L. (2000). The Effects of a DV Policy Change on Police Officer's
 Schemate. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 27*(5), 600-624.
 doi: 10.1177/0093854800027005004

Stoutland, S. E. (2001). The multiple dimensions of trust in resident/police relations in
 Boston. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, *38*(3), 226-256.

Wilson-Doenges, G. (2015). SPSS Research Methods: A Basic Guide. New York, NY:
 W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Wood, D. (2003). Effect of child and family poverty on child health in the United
 States. *Pediatrics-Springfield, 112*(3; ISSU 2), 707-711.

Participant Information Form

**"Perceptions of Adult Witnesses to Domestic Violence of Law Enforcement Officers,
and Law Enforcement Officers' Perceptions of the Effects of Domestic Violence
Training on Outcomes"**
Subject Information Sheet

You are being asked to participate in a research study about the **perceptions of adult
witnesses to domestic violence of law enforcement officers, and law enforcement
officers' perceptions of the effects of domestic violence training on outcomes.** The
researcher is required to provide an information sheet such as this one to tell you about
the research, to explain that taking part is voluntary, to describe the risks and benefits of
participation, and to help you to make an informed decision. You should feel free to ask
the researcher any questions you may have.

Research Protocol #:	**IRB-FY19-122 (IRB Approved)**
Principal Investigators:	Vanessa Arteaga Rood, MSW Candidate
	Jere Fernandes, MSW Candidate
Department/Institution:	Department of Social Work,
	California State University Northridge
	18111 Nordhoff Street
	Northridge, CA 91330-8226
Contact Information:	Vanessa Arteaga Rood: vanessa.arteaga.58@my.csun.edu
	Jere Fernandes: jere.fernandes.661@my.csun.edu
Faculty Chair/Sponsor:	David McCarty-Caplan, PhD:
	david.mccartycaplan@csun.edu

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

You are being asked to be a participant in a research study about the perceptions of adult
witnesses to domestic violence of law enforcement officers, and law enforcement
officers' perceptions of the effects of domestic violence training on outcomes.
Specifically, the researcher is interested in learning more about the perceptions of law
enforcement officers by adults who witnessed DV as minors in which law enforcement
was involved and the effects of these interactions on the level of trust these victims have
toward law enforcement officers as adults. Additionally, researchers wish to learn to what
extent, if any, law enforcement officers feel the level of domestic violence training they
received affected their level of self-competency. Your participation in this research is
voluntary. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time during the
survey completion process.

PROCEDURES

There will be two participation groups in this study: **Witnesses to domestic violence** while still
minors where law enforcement officers were involved, and active or retired **law enforcement
officers** who have responded to domestic violence calls in the line of duty. If you are in the
witnesses to domestic violence group, you will be asked to complete a short Internet-based

questionnaire about your experiences with law enforcement during situations involving domestic violence when you were a minor and your perceptions of law enforcement currently. If you are a former or active duty **law enforcement officer** who has responded to domestic violence calls, you will be asked to complete a short survey about your experiences during domestic violence calls and your perception of effects your training may have had on your own perception of competency.

For **witnesses to domestic violence,** the questionnaire consists of 23 questions and will take approximately 10 minutes or less.   For **law enforcement officers**, the questionnaire consists of 43 questions and will take approximately 20 minutes or less.

Questions are designed to gather information on various aspects regarding levels of trust between witnesses to domestic violence and law enforcement officers, and law enforcement officers' perceptions of the effects domestic violence training has/had on their level of self-competency. Through questions about demographics, past experiences, levels of trust, and levels of domestic violence training received, this questionnaire intends to examine the relationship between law enforcement officers and current adults who were witnesses to domestic violence as minors, and the effects of these interactions on trust/mistrust of Law Enforcement among witnesses of domestic violence. Additionally, this study will examine law enforcement officers' perceptions of training for such encounters and outcomes of these interactions.

ELIGIBILITY

You are being asked to participate in a research study about trust levels among adult witnesses to domestic violence when they were minors, and law enforcement officers' perceptions of the effects of domestic violence training on self-competency. In order to be eligible to participate in this study, you must (1) be 18 years old or older as of today, (2) have been a witness to domestic violence while a minor where law enforcement officers were involved, **OR** (3) be a law enforcement officer (current or retired) who has responded to domestic violence calls.

POTENTIAL RISKS

Risks are minimal for involvement in this study. However, you may feel mild emotional discomfort when asked to reflect on your experiences with domestic violence.

BENEFITS

There are no direct benefits for participants. However, it is hoped that through your participation, researchers will learn more about how to improve relationships between victims of domestic violence and law enforcement officers and advocate for prioritization of domestic violence training for law enforcement officers.

CONFIDENTIALITY

All data obtained from participants will be kept confidential and will only be reported in an aggregate format (by reporting only combined results and never reporting individual ones). No individuals who participate in this study will be identified by name in study results. All questionnaires will be concealed, and no one other than then the primary investigators listed below will have access to them. The data collected will be stored in the HIPPA-compliant,

Qualtrics-secure database until it has been deleted by the primary investigators. Online privacy can never be fully guaranteed by the researcher. However, your privacy and confidentiality will be protected to the extent that is technologically possible.

COMPENSATION

Individuals who participate in this research will be eligible to win 1 of 10 $30 Amazon.com gift cards. At the end of the survey, participants will be given an opportunity to opt in for participation in the drawing by clicking on a link provided within the main survey which will forward them to a separate Qualtrics survey. Those who chose to opt in will be asked to provide an email address where their prize award can be sent. These emails will only be used to determine prize winners, and send prize winners an Internet link where they can claim their prize. To protect the anonymity of participants, the email addresses gathered will be disassociated from survey responses and saved in a separate password protected electronic file. Once the prize winners are chosen, and their prizes are sent via email, the list of emails will be destroyed.

PARTICIPATION

Participation in this research study is completely voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at any time or refuse to participate entirely.

QUESTIONS ABOUT RESEARCH

If you have questions regarding this study, you may contact:

Vanessa Arteaga Rood: vanessa.arteaga.58@my.csun.edu and/or
Jere Fernandes: jere.fernandes.661@my.csun.edu

Data Collection Instrument
Survey for Witnesses to Domestic Violence

1) What is your age? _____

2) What is the race/ethnicity you most strongly identify with? (Please check only one)

- African American/Black
- Caucasian/white
- Latino/Hispanic non-white
- Pacific Islander or Native American
- Asian
- Other
- Mixed

3) What is your gender identity?

- Transgender Male
- Transgender Female
- Male
- Female
- Non-Gender (do not identify with a specific gender)
- Other

4) What is your sexual orientation?

- Lesbian
- Gay
- Bisexual
- Heterosexual
- No-sexual-orientation (do not identify with a specific sexual orientation)
- Other

5) What is your religious affiliation?

- No religious affiliation
- Christian
- Jewish
- Muslim
- Hindu
- Buddhist
- Other

6) What is your highest level of education?

- Some High School
- Graduated High School
- Some college
- Bachelor's degree
- Beyond bachelor's degree

7) What is your yearly household income?

- Below 10,000 Dollars
- 10,000-20,000 Dollars
- 20,000-35,000 Dollars
- 35,000-50,000 Dollars
- 50,000-70,000 Dollars
- 70,000 +

8) What is your immigration status?

- Born U.S. Citizen
- Naturalized U.S. Citizen
- Undocumented
- Work Visa
- DACA recipient

9) How many times before 18 years of age did you witness police responses in a domestic violence incident?

- 1
- 2-5
- 6+

10) How old were you when you *first* witnessed police response in a domestic violence incident?

- Below 5 years old
- 6-10 years old
- 11 to under 18 years old

11) How old were you when you *last* witnessed police response in a domestic violence incident?

- Below 5 years old
- 6-10 years old
- 11 to under 18 years old

12) In your opinion, how does police involvement affect Domestic Violence?
Police involvement:

- Makes it stop
- Makes things better
- Makes things better temporarily

- Makes little difference
- Makes no difference
- Makes it worse

13) How would you rate the level of Police Officer's understanding of how to handle Domestic Violence calls?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

14) How would you rate police response times to Domestic Violence calls?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

15) How would you rate police engagement with Domestic Violence victims?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

16) How would you rate police officers' understanding of how to talk to Domestic Violence victims?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

17) How confident are you that police will respond to Domestic Violence calls in a timely manner?

- Extremely confident
- Very confident
- Confident
- Somewhat confident
- Not confident
- Not confident at all

18) How confident are you that police will treat you fairly should you ever need to call them?

- Extremely confident
- Very confident
- Confident
- Somewhat confident
- Not confident
- Not confident at all

19) If you were suspected of a potential crime, how confident would you be that police would treat you fairly?

- Extremely confident
- Very confident
- Confident
- Somewhat confident
- Not confident
- Not confident at all

20) If you were the victim of a crime, how confident would you be that police would treat you fairly?
- Extremely confident
- Confident
- Somewhat confident
- Not confident
- Not confident at all

21) Overall, How would you rate your trust of Police?

- Extremely high
- Very high
- High
- Somewhat high
- Low
- Extremely low
- No trust at all

22. Do you feel that your experience as a witness to DV has directly impacted your perceptions of police?

- Very strongly impacted
- Strongly impacted
- Somewhat impacted
- Not impacted
- Not impacted at all

23. How do you feel your experience has impacted your perceptions of police?
_____

24. Do you have any additional thoughts regarding your experience as a witness to DV and/or how police played a role?

_____

Data Collection Instrument
Survey for Law Enforcement Officers

1. What is your age? _____

2. What is your race/ethnicity? (Please check only one)

    - African American/Black
    - Caucasian/white
    - Latino/Hispanic non-white
    - Pacific Islander or Native American
    - Asian
    - Other
    - Mixed

3. What is your gender identity?

    - Transgender Male
    - Transgender Female
    - Male
    - Female
    - Non-Gender (do not identify with a specific gender)
    - Other

4. What is your sexual orientation?

    - Lesbian
    - Gay
    - Bisexual
    - Heterosexual
    - No-sexual-orientation (do not identify with a specific sexual orientation)
    - Other

5. What is your religious affiliation?

    - No religious affiliation
    - Christian
    - Jewish
    - Muslim
    - Hindu
    - Buddhist
    - Other

6. What is your highest level of education?

    - Some High School

- Graduated High School
- Some college
- Bachelor's degree
- Beyond bachelor's degree

7. What is your current rank? _____

8. How long have you been a law enforcement officer? _____

9. How many law enforcement agencies have you worked for? _____

10. How long have you worked in your current law enforcement agency? _____

11. Does your current agency have a DV unit?

- Yes
- No
- I am not sure

12. Have you received training regarding DV? (If yes, please answers questions 13 and 14. If no, please skip to question 15)

- Yes
- No

13. How many DV trainings have you received? ___

14. When was the last time you received DV training? _____

15. Has any of your training experiences directly addressed how to respond to the needs of children in a DV situation?

- Yes
- No
- I am not sure

16. On a scale from 1 to 5, 1 being not at all prepared and 5 being extremely prepared, how well do you feel the training you have received has prepared you to properly handle a DV call?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all prepared		Somewhat prepared		Extremely prepared

17. On a scale from 1 to 5, 1 being not at all prepared and 5 being extremely prepared, how well do you feel the training you have received has prepared you to properly handle the needs of minors within a household during a DV call?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all prepared		**Somewhat prepared**		**Extremely prepared**

18.   Have you responded to a DV call? (If yes, please answer question 19. If no, please skip to question 20.)

- Yes
- No

19.   How many DV calls have you responded to in your career as a law enforcement officer? _____

The following questions will use a scale for gauging your feelings towards each statement. Please use the scale to answer each statement that you MOST agree with by selecting from 1 to 5, 1 being strongly disagree to 5 being strongly agree.

20.   I feel that making an arrest at a DV call will not likely reduce future DV incidents

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

21.   I feel that during DV calls I am more likely to get injured than in any other call

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

22.   I feel that using verbal problem-solving versus physical force helps to de-escalate DV call

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

23.   I feel that if I had more freedom in handling DV calls I would be better off

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

24.   I feel that DV incidents are personal matters and do not need law enforcement involvement

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

25.   I feel frustrated when arriving to a residence who has had DV calls in the past

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

26.   I feel that too many DV calls are for verbal altercations

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

27.   I feel that my time could be better spent on calls other than those of DV

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

28.   I feel that perpetrators of DV should be arrested even if the victims do not believe so

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

29.   I feel that I must approach DV calls more carefully if I see there are children present in the home

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

30.   I feel that arrest is the best tool in responding to DV situations

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

31.   I feel that arrests should be made only if there is clear evidence of physical harm

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

32.   I feel that it is best to arrest both parties in a DV call

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

33.   I feel that I need more discretion when handling DV calls

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

34.   I feel that it is difficult to determine the primary aggressor in DV calls

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

35.   I feel that the way I respond to a DV call is dependant on the behavior of the parties involved

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

36.   I feel that many DV victims could leave their abuser but choose not to

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

37.   I feel that the main cause of DV is the use/abuse of substances

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

38.   I feel that DV offenders seek power and control over their victims

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

39.   I feel that women are less likely to be the abuser than men are

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

40.   I feel that same-sex couples should be given the same rights and protections under DV laws as heterosexual couples

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

41.   I feel that minorities are more likely to be involved in DV than whites

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

42.   I feel that my agency has sufficient policies regarding DV calls

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

43.   I feel that the current DV procedures at my agency are not realistic to real-life situations

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		**Don't Agree or Disagree**		**Strongly Agree**

Appendix D

Solicitation Scripts

Social Media Posting Script:

Hello Facebook/Instagram Friends!

For our culminating graduate project, we are conducting a study which requires the gathering of data. If you are over the age of 18, were a witness to Domestic Violence which involved contact with Law Enforcement while you were a minor, or are a current **or** retired Law Enforcement Officer, you are eligible to participate in the survey posted and for entry into our drawing for the chance to win a $30 Amazon gift card. The survey is voluntary, can be stopped and cancelled at any time during the time of completion, and is anonymous. At no time will we or anyone else be able to identify you. Please help us complete our graduate project by participating in the survey below. Should you choose to participate or not, please *do not* press "like" so as not to provide any information from which identity can be inferred. Thank you all so much for your help!!!

If you were a witness to domestic violence, please click on this link: _____

If you are an active or retired law enforcement officer, please click on this link: _____

Email Solicitation Script:

Hello _____,

I hope this email finds you well. I am reaching out to you because I am in an MSW program at CSUN and am currently working on my graduate project. The purpose of my project is to find the relationship between minors who were witnesses to domestic violence which resulted in some form of contact with law enforcement, and their trust/mistrust of law enforcement. We also want to know the perceptions and protocols of law enforcement regarding domestic violence calls. If you grew up in a home where there was domestic violence or witnessed domestic violence as a minor and there was law enforcement involvement, I am asking that you please participate in this survey. I am also looking for all law enforcement officers, active and retired, to please participate in this survey. Your identity and information will be anonymous, and it should take only about 10 minutes. If you choose to participate, you can enter for a chance to win a $30 Amazon gift card. 10 winners will be chosen at random. Please click on the link below to participate. Thank you in advance!

If you were a witness to domestic violence, please click on this link: _____

If you are an active or retired law enforcement officer, please click on this link:_____

Appendix E

Screening Questions

Screening Questions for Witnesses of DV

1) Are you 18 years of age or older?

- Yes
- No

2) As a minor, did you witness an incident/s of domestic violence where Law Enforcement was present on at least one occasion?

- Yes
- No

Screening Questions for Law Enforcement Officers

1) Are you an active or retired Law Enforcement Officer?

- Yes
- No

Appendix F

Findings Tables

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics: DV Witnesses and LEO's

	Total (N=319)		DV's (n=86)		LEO's (n=233)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Race						
White/Caucasian	247	77.0%	52	65.0%	195	83.7%
Black/African American	13	4.0%	4	5.0%	9	4.0%
Latinex	43	13.0%	22	27.5%	21	9.0%
Multiracial					8	3.4%
Pacific Islnd/Native Am	21	9.0%	0	0.0%	0	9.0%
Asian	4	2.0%	0	0.0%	4	1.7%
Other	23	7.0%	2	2.5%	21	9.0%
Gender Identity						
Male	206	65.0%	12	13.9%	194	83.3%
Female	111	35.0%	73	85.0%	38	16.3%
Transgender/Other[b]	9	4.1%	0	0.0%	9	4.0%
No Gender (N/G)	1	0.4%	1	1.0%	0	0.4%
Sexual Orientation						
Heterosexual	283	89.0%	56	73.0%	227	97.0%
Lesbian	2	0.6%	1	1.3%	1	0.4%
Gay	3	0.9%	3	4.0%	0	0.0%
Bisexual	14	4.4%	11	14.0%	3	1.3%
Other	7	2.2%	4	5.0%	3	1.3%
Religion						
Christian	218	68.3%	31	39.0%	187	79.9%
No affiliation	81	25.4%	38	48.0%	43	18.4%
Jewish	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%
Muslim/Hindu/Buddhist	3	0.9%	0	0.0%	3	1.3%
Other	11	3.5%	11	13.8%	0	0.0%

Table 2

DV Witness Age (n=86)				
	Mean	Min	Max	SD
What is your age?	37.99	20.00	68.00	12.01

Table 3

DV Witnesses (n=86)				
How many times did you witness police responses to DV?	Mean 1.79	Min 100.0%	Max 3	SD 65.6%

Table 4

How many times…did you witness police responses in DV incidents?				
Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1 time	26	33.8%	33.8	33.8%
2-5 times	41	51.9%	53.2	87.0%
6+ times	10	12.7%	13	
Missing	2	2.5%		
Total	86			

Table 5

DV Witness Trust (n=86)				
How would you rate your overall trust of police?	Mean 2.87	Min 100.0%	Max 5	SD 138.0%

Table 6

How would you rate your overall trust of police?			
Valid	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
1 Extremely Low	12	15%	16.9
2 Low	23	29%	49.3
3 Somewhat High	11	14%	64.8
4 High	12	15%	81.7
5 Very High	13	17%	100
6 Extremely High	0	0%	
Total	79		

Table 7

Regression					
DV: Trust	B	Std. Error	β	t	p
Constant	0.51	199.1%		25.6%	0.799
African American	-3.367	171.1%	-0.565	-196.8%	0.054
Female	3.706	234.4%	1.012	158.1%	0.119
White	-2.159	155.0%	-0.758	-139.3%	0.169
Latinex	-1.429	156.9%	-0.468	-91.1%	0.366
Other	-1.668	110.7%	0.28	-150.8%	0.137
Male	3.259	229.4%	-0.859	142.1%	0.161
Lesbian	-1.204	158.7%	-0.103	-175.9%	0.451
Gay	-0.773	132.8%	-0.113	-58.2%	0.563
Bisexual	-1.12	92.4%	-0.258	-121.2%	0.23
Heterosexual	-0.725	80.6%	-0.241	-89.9%	0.372
No Orientation	-0.919	122.8%	-0.111	-74.8%	0.457
What is your age?	0.032	15.0%	-0.28	215.8%	0.035

Table 8

LEO Age (n=232)				
	Mean	Min	Max	SD
What is your age?	47.56	20.00	81.00	12.27

Table 9

LEO Perception of Training				
How do you feel your training has prepared you for DV calls?	Mean	Min	Max	SD
	3.86	1.00	5.00	3.86

Table 10

LEO Perception of Training

How well do you feel your training has prepared you for DV calls?

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
1 Not at all prepared	2	0.90	0.9
2	6	0.03	3.7
3 Somewhat prepared	76	0.33	38.4
4	72	0.31	71.2
5 Extremely prepared	63	0.27	100
Total	233		

ADDENDUM – <u>**Perceptions of Adult Witnesses to Domestic Violence of Law Enforcement Officers, and Law Enforcement Officers' Self-Perceived Competence in Handling Domestic Violence Calls**</u>

<u>**Perceptions of Adult Witnesses to Domestic Violence of Law Enforcement Officers, and Law Enforcement Officers' Self-Perceived Competence in Handling Domestic Violence Calls**</u> is a joint graduate project between <u>**Vanessa Arteaga Rood**</u> and <u>**Jere Fernandes.**</u> This document will explain the division of responsibilities between the two parties. Any additional information can be included in a separate document attached to this Addendum page.

<u>**Vanessa Arteaga Rood**</u> is responsible for all the following tasks/document sections:

- Creation and circulation of survey for law enforcement officer participants
- Collection, interpretation, and reporting of data collected from LEO participants
- Formulation of research questions and hypotheses for LEO portion of study
- Creation of base draft for literature review, and completion of LEO portions of all sections
- Quantitative data processing (data denormalization, inputting to SPSS) for LEO sample
- Quantitative data analysis (descriptives, regressions) for LEO sample
- Management and distribution of grant funds for expenditures incurred

<u>**Jere Fernandes**</u> is responsible for all the following tasks/document sections:

- Creation and circulation of survey for DV Witnesses
- Collection, interpretation, and reporting of data collected from DV Witnesses
- Formulation of research questions and hypotheses for DV Witness portion of study
- Editing of base draft of literature review, and completion of all DV Witness portions of all sections
- Quantitative data processing (data denormalization, inputting to SPSS) for DV Witness sample
- Quantitative data analysis (descriptives, regressions) for DV Witness sample

Both parties shared responsibilities for the following tasks/document sections:

- Creation of scripts for social media and personal emails soliciting participation in the study
- All submissions and correspondence necessary to the process of obtaining IRB approval
- Creation of and editing of poster for CSUNPosium presentation

- Identification and selection of most significant findings, the formulation of corresponding tables and graphs, and writing/editing of all sections collaboratively
- Final edits for all section

Jere Fernandes	Date	**Vanessa Arteaga Rood**	Date

Dr. David McCarty-Caplan   Date   **Dr. Eli Bartle**   Date
Committee Chair   **Graduate Coordinator**

Dr. Wendy Ashley   Date   **Dr. Eli Bartle**   Date
Committee Member   **Department Chair**

Dr. Susan Love   Date
Committee Member