

Police Intervention in Cases of Domestic Violence

Sara Schuefftan
College of Liberal Arts
University of Minnesota Duluth
schue279@d.umn.edu

The researcher sought to investigate the problem of domestic violence cases and the relationship these cases have with police officers. Arrest rates, corresponding recidivism rates, as well as officer opinions on threat assessment, current policies, recidivism rates, and future policies were investigated. An open ended intervention orientated survey and a likert-style survey regarding threat assessment were distributed to the Cloquet, Minnesota and Superior, Wisconsin police agencies. Both agencies reported their most practiced intervention tactics (mandatory arrest followed by resource and domestic violence center referrals). There was a significant positive correlation between what officers look for at a scene of domestic violence and methods of intervention within the Superior agency. There was also a significant positive correlation between the effectiveness of threat assessment for predicting future criminality and the effectiveness of threat assessment impacting intervention methods within the Superior agency. These findings implicate that threat assessment has a relationship with the interventions that officers choose to use when they encounter suspected domestic violence. What officers see on the scene relates to the policies that are in place within their agency. The policies that are implemented often correspond to ways of predicting future criminality and using these responses to work towards reducing future crime.

1. Introduction

Domestic violence has always been a serious issue in society. Past research has covered some relationships between personality traits and the likelihood that one will harm their partner. A lot of research has also gone into great detail over police interventions and their effectiveness of preventing future violence within the household. By understanding what goes into threat assessment and current intervention techniques and how these impact the recidivism rate in cases of domestic violence, the author believes that one can come to an understanding about future policies that will help police intervene in high risk households and hopefully ward off domestic violence before it occurs.

In the past, researchers have looked into what traits and characteristics that offenders in cases of domestic violence have. Research has found that the most likely perpetrator of violence against a woman is her current or former male partner (Rothschild, Dimson, Storaasli, & Clapp, 1997). Alcohol abuse, violent tendencies, and a lack of self-control contribute to abusive behavior (Rothschild et al., 1997). Prior incidents of committing domestic violence were found to relate to

future incidents of perpetrating domestic violence (White & Smith, 2008). Witnessing domestic violence in the household has also been found to be related to an increased likelihood of perpetrating domestic violence (White & Smith, 2008). Patterns of domestic violence have been found to be related to the availability of community resources (Dutton, Kaltman, Goodman, Weinfurt, & Vankos, 2005).

The researcher explored various intervention methods across agencies. The Duluth model recommends educational groups that teach about how current gender stereotypes endorse violence and stress the importance of changing these values (Aymer, 2008). Some clinicians use a psychodynamic approach that encourages abusers to reflect upon how certain events in their life contribute to how they treat their partners (Aymer, 2008). Some practitioners also send these men to anger management groups with an educational focus on intimate partner abuse (Aymer, 2008). Restraining orders have often been used as a preventative for further violence. However, it has been found that obtaining a restraining order may result in further antagonizing and many reports of the restraining order being violated by the abuser (Harrell & Smith, 1996). Many states have in place a mandatory response for domestic violence situation. The response typically focuses on arresting (restraining), counseling (rehabilitating), and punishing offenders (Goodman & Epstein, 2005). Police officers are mandated to make an arrest when they have reason to believe that the suspect has committed a crime, that the suspect is in a domestic relation with the alleged victim, the suspect's acts were found to intentionally harm another, if there are any injuries present, and if the officer has any reason to believe that there is a likelihood of continued abuse against the victim. These programs are often responsive to the needs of victims; however these responses focus more on batterer treatment programs rather than victim support for prevention of future violence (Goodman & Epstein, 2005). Arresting domestic violence offenders has had mixed results (Goodman & Epstein, 2005). In some studies such as the study done in Minneapolis the mandatory arrest policy was found to significantly reduce subsequent acts of violence (Jordan, 2004). However, this hasn't always been the case. When replicated in other parts of the state and Wisconsin, the recidivism rates were not the same. In fact, there was not the same significance when it came to a reduction in offending. It has been found in some research that the mandatory arrest policy has led to more cases of battering when women aren't able to escape the situation (Goodman & Epstein, 2005). Mandatory arrest policies have been found to be more effective when paired with other intervention policies, such as driving women to shelters, offering legal and social services, and involving victims more directly in the decision to arrest (Mears, Carlson, Holden, & Harris, 2001). Protective orders have been another intervention method used across many police agencies (Mears et al., 2001).

2. Purpose of Research

The researcher sought to investigate the problem of domestic violence cases and the relationship these cases have with police officers. The researcher sought to investigate what threat assessment entailed and how that tied in with arrests and other forms of intervention. The researcher also felt it was important to measure officer opinions and distributed surveys to find out how they felt about current policies and their ideas about future policy implications. All of these aspects are important to examine because they reflect upon the effectiveness of current policies and how they are impacting the systems in which they are upheld.

3. Hypotheses

3.1. Intervention Survey Hypotheses

H₁: There will be a positive correlation between the factor regarding what threat assessment consists of and the factor regarding what the most practiced form of intervention is.

This hypothesis stems from the idea that because there are certain aspects of a situation that require an officer to make an arrest, such as seeing an injury. This is a part of the mandatory arrest intervention. So the idea is that other matters that are investigated will relate to arrest and other forms of intervention.

H₂: There will be a positive correlation between the factor regarding thoughts on likelihood of recidivism and the factor regarding officer opinions on future policies that could be implemented.

This hypothesis came about from the idea that if the officer thinks that recidivism rates are high then officers may be more likely to have thoughts and ideas that may work more effectively than current intervention methods.

3.2. Threat Assessment Survey Hypotheses

H₃: There will be a positive correlation between the factor regarding the effectiveness of threat assessment in predicting future criminality and the factor regarding arrest and its ability to lower recidivism.

This hypothesis surfaced from the idea that if threat assessment is successful at predicting future criminality then arrest will also be more likely to reduce recidivism.

H₄: There will be a positive correlation between the factor regarding threat assessment and its effectiveness at impacting police intervention and the factor regarding the effectiveness of threat assessment in predicting future criminality.

The idea for this hypothesis came from the idea that if threat assessment is effective at predicting future criminality it will also be more effective at impacting police intervention methods because the interventions will have to be responsive to the predicted criminality.

4. Research Methodology

4.1. Participants

Patrol officers in Superior and Cloquet were recruited to participate in the research. Duluth police had also been invited to participate in the research and although there were responses there was trouble getting all of the information needed. Those participants' data were not included in further analyses. There was no compensation for participating in the study.

Materials and Procedures

There were two different surveys. There was an open ended survey that was focused on intervention methods and was referred to as the intervention survey. There was also a likert-style survey that inquired about threat assessment and was referred to as the threat assessment survey. Twenty of each of these surveys were distributed to the three different agencies. The intervention survey had four questions. One such question was as follows: When you arrive at the scene of a case of domestic violence what do you look for? The survey had four factors that it examined and they are as follows: What threat assessment consists of (one question measured, 20 themes found, $\alpha = -.27$ for Superior, $\alpha = -.18$ for Cloquet), the most practiced intervention methods in the agency (one question measured, 8 themes found, $\alpha = .53$ for Superior, $\alpha = .57$ for Cloquet) , opinions on future policies and their implementation (one question measured, 8 themes found, $\alpha = -1.44$ for Superior, $\alpha = 0$ for Cloquet), and thoughts on the likelihood of recidivism (one question measured and one theme found). Appendix A displays the full survey. The researcher also distributed twenty risk/threat assessment surveys that were formatted in a likert-scale style with five questions. The options for responses went from one being strongly disagree to five being strongly agree. The researcher received thirteen responses from Superior and four responses from the Cloquet. This survey had statements such as the following: Threat assessment is useful in predicting future domestic violence. The survey examined three different factors that are as follows: The effectiveness of threat assessment in predicting future criminality (two scale items, $\alpha = .82$ for Superior, $\alpha = .60$ for Cloquet), the effectiveness of threat assessment on impacting police intervention methods (two scale items, $\alpha = -.42$ for Superior, $\alpha = .63$ for Cloquet), and the impact of arrest on recidivism (one scale item). Appendix B displays the full survey. The researcher then collected arrest data from both Superior and Cloquet. Since the researcher was unable to gather the arrest data from Duluth, the four survey responses were excluded from the content analysis because there wasn't a way to examine the recidivism rate of the domestic violence arrests. The study consisted of a total of $n = 17$ officers. 13 of the officers partook in the intervention survey (so the intervention survey had $n = 13$). Out of these $n = 4$ were Cloquet respondents and $n = 9$ were Superior responses. The entirety of the 17 officers partook in the threat assessment survey ($n = 17$). Out of these $n=4$ were Cloquet respondents and $n = 13$ were Superior respondents.

4.2. Data cleaning

The intervention survey was opened ended. The researcher conducted conventional content analysis to find the main themes related to participant responses. To do this the researcher went through all of the surveys and looked for themes in the answers given. The researcher then had an individual unrelated to the research to go over and find themes in the survey responses to further attempt to make the process objective. The researcher then examined the themes that were found and developed a list of themes to measure all of the surveys with. For the first intervention survey question regarding what officers look for when they arrive at a scene of domestic violence the themes consisted of the following: injuries, property damage, signs of struggle, house and valuables in disarray, evidence of domestic relations, predominant aggressor, history of violence, interviewing involved parties, examining interview inconsistencies, weapons, any children in the house, alcohol, illicit drugs, witnesses, any crime committed, any physical evidence, threats, fear for personal safety, any medical attention needed, and accounting for all people present. The second intervention question regarding what forms of intervention are currently most practiced had themes that consist as follows: Mandatory arrest, domestic violence

shelter referrals, separate involved parties, mediation, resource referrals, involving police response teams, involving medical assistance, assistance with legal aid and protective orders. The third intervention question about other intervention methods that officers think should be implemented in the future had themes that consisted of the following: More temporary residences for victims, no other intervention needed, more resources for both genders, more alcohol treatment programs that are available and affordable, mandatory prosecution of offenders, harsher sentences for DV offenses, mandatory restraining orders, and more advocacy. For the final intervention survey question, the researcher had a variety of answers for how likely officers felt that offenders would recidivate. The researcher cleaned the data as follows: Answers that said 0-20% or clearly said very unlikely, 21-49% or clearly said unlikely, 50-70% or clearly said likely, or 71-100% or clearly said very likely were put into such categories accordingly. If the participant instead said that it depends on the situation then they were put into the neutral category. The researcher then would examine the frequency of themes in all of the responses.

5. Results

The total arrest rates for cases of domestic violence in the year of 2013 were examined for both Superior and Cloquet police agencies. Superior had a total of 182 arrests for domestic violence offenses. Out of these 182 arrests there were 19 rearrests. The primary recidivism rate (first subsequent re-arrest for domestic violence offense) for Superior was 10.44%. Cloquet on the other hand had 42 total arrests for domestic violence offenses. Out of these 42 there were four rearrests. The primary recidivism rate for Cloquet was 9.52%. These rates appear to be on the lower side when examined independently (the researcher didn't have access to arrest rates of past years). It is also interesting to see that there was a difference of .92% between the recidivism rates of these two agencies. More research is needed to make any conclusions on whether these rates are low for either agency. The researcher did however collect data on both agencies methods of intervention, what they look for when they arrive at a scene, their opinions on future policies, their own views of recidivism rates, and also their overall feelings about threat assessment and its relation to their intervention tactics.

The results of the intervention survey showed that when officers in the Superior agency arrive at a scene of domestic violence they look for injuries (66.7 % of responses), property damage (33.3% of responses), signs of struggle (22.2% of responses), house and valuables in disarray (22.2% of responses), weapons (22.2% of responses), and any crimes committed (22.2% of responses). Officers in the Cloquet agency look for injuries (100% of responses), signs of struggle (75% of responses), interviewing involved parties (75% of responses), all people present (75% of responses), property damage (50% of responses), children in the household (50% of responses), and witnesses (50% of responses). Table one displays the frequency of results for this question.

Officers in the Superior agency reported that the most commonly practiced intervention methods within their agency are mandatory arrest (88.9% of responses), domestic violence shelter referrals (77.8% of responses), separation of involved parties (55.6% of responses), and involving a police response team (33.3% of responses). Officers in the Cloquet agency reported that the most commonly practiced intervention methods within their agency are domestic violence shelter referrals (75% of responses), resource referral (75% of responses), mandatory

arrest (50% of responses), and assistance with legal aid and orders for protection (50% of responses.) Table two displays the frequency of results for this question.

Superior had results for the third intervention survey question that inquired about future policies as follows: mandatory prosecution of offenders (44.4% of responses), harsher punishment and sentences for offenses (22.2% of responses), and more alcohol treatment options (22.2% of responses). Cloquet had responses that go as follows: no other intervention needed (75% of responses), and offer more resources for both genders (25% of responses). Table three displays the frequency of results for this question.

The last intervention survey question asked officers how likely it was that they thought offenders would recidivate after intervention. The majority of Superior officers thought that it was very likely that offenders would recidivate (44.4% of responses). $M=4.22$ (4=likely), $SD=.83$. The majority of Cloquet officers thought that it really depends on the situation (100% of responses). $M=3.0$ (3 being neutral/ depends on situation), $SD=0$. Table four displays the frequency of these results.

The threat assessment survey was a likert-style survey that had responses from 1 being strongly disagree to 5 being strongly agree. For the superior agency, officers had $M=3.38$, $SD=.77$ that using info from threat assessment is useful for predicting future criminal behavior, $M=3.46$, $SD=.88$ that threat assessment is useful in predicting domestic violence, $M=3.38$, $SD=.96$ that threat assessment can help with police intervention techniques, $M=3.38$, $SD=.96$ that individuals who are high threat are more likely to be arrested in cases of suspected domestic violence, and $M=3.08$, $SD=1.19$ that arresting offenders does lower the recidivism rate in cases of domestic violence. For the Cloquet agency, officers had $M=2.25$, $SD=.50$ that using info from threat assessment is useful for predicting future criminal behavior, $M=2.25$, $SD=.96$ that threat assessment is useful in predicting domestic violence, $M=2.75$, $SD=1.26$ that threat assessment can help with police intervention techniques, $M=3.25$, $SD=.50$ that individuals who are high threat are more likely to be arrested in cases of suspected domestic violence, and $M=2.25$, $SD=.96$ that arresting offenders does lower the recidivism rate in cases of domestic violence. Table five displays the descriptive statistic results from this survey.

The researcher ran a number of Pearson r correlation tests for between factors for both surveys that were distributed. The intervention survey between factor analyses for the Superior agency revealed one significant correlation. There was a significant positive correlation of $r = .71$, $p < .05$ between factor one (what threat assessment consists of) and factor two (the most practiced forms of intervention.) The other correlations between factors were not found to be significant. The correlation between factor one and factor three (opinions on future policies) was found to be $r = .37$, $p > .05$. The correlation between factor one and factor four (thoughts on the likelihood of recidivism) was found to be $r = -.01$, $p > .05$. The correlation between factor two and factor three was found to be $r = .53$, $p > .05$. The correlation between factor two and factor four was found to be $r = -.54$, $p > .05$. The correlation between factor three and factor four was found to be $r = -.23$, $p > .05$. The between factor analyses for the Cloquet intervention survey revealed no significant correlations. The correlation between factor one and factor two was $r = -.42$, $p > .05$. None of the other factors had any correlations that could be analyzed because at least one

variable was found to be constant among responses. The results of these correlations can be found in table six.

The between factor analyses for Superior's threat assessment survey revealed one significant correlation. There was a significant positive correlation of $r = .56$, $p < .05$ between factor one (the effectiveness of threat assessment in predicting future criminality) and factor two (the effectiveness of threat assessment on impacting police intervention.) There were no other significant findings. There was a correlation of $r = -.22$, $p > .05$ between factor one and factor three (the impact of arrest on recidivism.) There was a correlation of $r = .18$, $p > .05$ between factor two and factor three. The between factor analyses for Cloquet's threat assessment survey revealed no significant correlations. There was a correlation between factor one and factor two was found to be $r = .95$, $p > .05$. A correlation of $r = .41$, $p > .05$ was found between factor one and factor three. A correlation of $r = .43$, $p > .05$ was found between factor two and factor three. The results of these correlations can be found in table seven.

6. Discussion

A few of the hypotheses were supported. For the intervention survey, hypothesis one was partially supported. Hypothesis one had stated that there will be a positive correlation between the factor regarding what threat assessment consists of and the factor regarding what the most practiced form of intervention is. A significant correlation was found between factors one and two for the superior agency. However the Cloquet analyses didn't find any significant result and actually displayed a negative correlational trend. This could be related to the low reliability of the survey items in general (as indicated by the low alphas of factor one $\alpha = -.27$ for Superior, $\alpha = -.18$ for Cloquet and factor two $\alpha = .53$ for Superior, $\alpha = .57$ for Cloquet). The second hypothesis for the intervention survey wasn't supported at all. The second hypothesis stated that there will be a positive correlation between the factor regarding thoughts on likelihood of recidivism and the factor regarding officer opinions on future policies that could be implemented. From the Superior analyses, there was in fact a negative trend found in the correlation rather than the positive trend that was hypothesized. Again, this could have been from low alpha values. It could also be related to small sample size. For the threat assessment survey, hypothesis four was partially supported. Hypothesis four stated that there will be a positive correlation between the factor regarding threat assessment and its effectiveness at impacting police intervention and the factor regarding the effectiveness of threat assessment in predicting future criminality. The Superior analyses found a significant positive correlation. The Cloquet analyses displayed a positive trend with the correlation as well. Hypothesis three wasn't supported by statistical significance. Hypothesis three stated that there will be a positive correlation between the factor regarding the effectiveness of threat assessment in predicting future criminality and the factor regarding arrest and its ability to lower recidivism. There was a negative trend found within the superior agency whereas there was a positive trend found within the Cloquet agency. These conflicting findings couldn't support the hypothesis in any way.

Strengths

The procedures were kept consistent. All the officers were given the same surveys and instructions. The study shed light on officer thoughts on current policies and their thoughts on

recidivism rates. Officers uphold these policies every day and their feelings are important when future policies are being considered.

Limitations

The researcher had some roadblocks in terms of methodology. There were many low alpha values on both surveys. This means that the survey wasn't able to gather the data in a reliable way that it was intended. This could have impacted the findings. Many of the agencies were on tight schedules. There were also problems with what information they were able to present to the researcher. Since the study was voluntary not many officers participated. The researcher couldn't run correlations between the threat assessment and intervention surveys for Superior because the surveys were returned at separate times to the researcher and there wasn't a way to evaluate if the responses were from the same respondent for each survey. With the Cloquet surveys, however, they were returned at the same time and were attached together (therefore both surveys belonged to the same respondent). However since a comparison couldn't be made between the two agencies the researcher didn't run these correlations. There was also an extremely small sample size. This could mean that results are difficult to generalize to other agencies and the officers who work in them.

7. Implications

If recidivism rates are truly low that could indicate that current forms of intervention are indeed related to arrest and recidivism rates. In terms of the correlational findings, it would seem that there is relationship between what officers look for at a scene of suspected domestic violence (what threat assessment entails) and the interventions that agencies most commonly use. There are specific things that officers look for that are related to how they respond. The findings implicate that threat assessment has a relationship with the interventions that officers choose to use when they encounter suspected domestic violence. What officers see on the scene relates to the policies that are in place within their agency. The policies that are implemented often correspond to ways of predicting future criminality and using these responses to work towards reducing future crime.

8. Future Research

Future research could entail a long-term case study of the police agencies. One could examine arrest rates and officer opinions in varying years. One could also examine how many individual officers made arrests and correlate that with both their own personal opinions and even overall arrest rates for that agency. One could also try and get more details on those arrested (gender, age, ethnicity, relationship to victim) as well as collect demographic information on the victims and use that information to investigate the dynamics between offender and victim and the situations surrounding those relationships. Another interesting aspect to examine in future research would be to follow individuals entering the system and exiting the system to examine the impact of treatment on recidivism and such.

9. Conclusion

More research in this area is certainly needed. The officer responses gave insight into how officers in their respective agencies feel about current policies and their opinions on the implementation of future policies. Officer opinions on the effectiveness of threat assessment as well as the effectiveness of arrest as a form of intervention can later be examined when new policies are being considered. Officer experiences on the scenes of domestic violence can be useful when considering policies and interventions that best respond to what threat assessment has been used to evaluate by officers responding to crises. The arrest data and recidivism rates that were gathered could be used in future research to examine how methods of intervention and rates of recidivism change as the years go by.

References

- Aymer, S. R. (2008). Beyond power and control: Clinical interventions with men engaged in partner abuse. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 36, 323-332.
- Dutton, M. A., Kaltman, S., Goodman, L. A., Weinfurt, K., & Vankos, N. (2005). Patterns of intimate partner violence: Correlates and outcomes. *Violence and Victims*, 20, 483-497.
- Goodman, L., & Epstein., D. (2005). Refocusing on women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20, 479-487.
- Harrel, A., & Smith, B. E. (1996). *Effects of restraining orders on domestic violence victims*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Jordan, C. E. (2004). Intimate partner violence and the justice system. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19, 1412-1434.
- Mears, D. P., Carlson, M. J., Holden G. W., & Harris S. D. (2001). Reducing domestic violence recidivism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16, 1260-1283.
- Rothschild, B., Dimson, C., Storaasli, R., & Clapp, L. (1997). Personality profiles of veterans entering treatment for domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 12, 259-274.
- White J. W., & Smith P. H. (2008). Covariation in the use of physical and sexual intimate partner aggression among adolescent and college-age men a longitudinal analysis. *Violence against Women*, 15, 24-43.

Project Faculty Adviser:

John A. Arthur, Professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, College of Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota Duluth. Email: jarthur@d.umn.edu

Table 1. Intervention Survey Question One

What is investigated at scene of DV	Superior	Cloquet
Injuries	6	4
Property damage	3	2
Signs of struggle	2	3
House and valuables in disarray	2	0
Evidence of domestic relations	1	0
Predominant aggressor	1	1
History of violence	1	1
Involved parties interview	1	3
Interview inconsistencies	1	1
Weapons	2	1
Children within household	1	2
Alcohol	1	1
Illicit drugs	1	0
Witnesses	1	2
Crime committed	2	0
Physical evidence	1	0
Threats	1	0
Fear of personal safety	1	1
Medical attention	1	1
All people present	1	3

Note. The results in this table were gathered from the content analysis of an open ended survey on intervention methods that the researcher had distributed to both the Superior and Cloquet police departments. The results displayed are frequencies. This table represents the question that was asked in regards to what is it exactly that officers look for when they arrive at a scene in a case of domestic violence. There was a total of nine responses from Superior and four responses from Cloquet.

Table 2. Intervention Survey Question Two

Most Practiced Intervention	Superior	Cloquet
Mandatory arrest	8	2
Referral to dv shelter	7	3
Separate involved parties	5	4
Mediation	2	1
Resource referral	1	3
Involve police response team	3	0
Involve medical attention	0	1
Assistance with setting up OFPs and HROs	0	2

Note. The results in this table were gathered from the content analysis of an open ended survey on intervention methods that the researcher had distributed to both the Superior and Cloquet police departments. The results displayed are frequencies. This table represents the question that was asked in regards to what forms of intervention are most practiced at the agency. There were a total of nine responses from Superior and four responses from Cloquet.

Table 3. Intervention Survey Question Three

Future Policies to be Implemented	Superior	Cloquet
None	2	3
More temporary residences	1	0
More resources for any gender	0	1
More alcohol treatment programs	2	0
Mandatory prosecution of offenders	4	0
Harsher punishments and sentences for dv offenses	2	0
Mandatory restraining orders	1	0
Education on dv and more advocacy	1	0

Note. The results in this table were gathered from the content analysis of an open ended survey on intervention methods that the researcher had distributed to both the Superior and Cloquet police departments. The results displayed are frequencies. This table represents the question that was asked in regards to what other interventions officers thought should be implemented in the future. There were a total of nine responses from Superior and four responses from Cloquet.

Table 4. Intervention Survey Question Four

Likelihood of Recidivism after Intervention	Superior	Cloquet
Not likely at all	0	0
Somewhat not likely	0	0
Depends on the situation/neutral	2	4
Likely	3	0
Very likely	4	0

Note. The results in this table were gathered from the content analysis of an open ended survey on intervention methods that the researcher had distributed to both the Superior and Cloquet police departments. The results displayed are frequencies. This table represents the question that was asked about how likely offenders would recidivate after police intervention. There were a total of nine responses from Superior and four responses from Cloquet.

Table 5. Threat Assessment Descriptive

Threat Assessment Survey	Superior M(SD)	Cloquet M(SD)
Effective way to predict future criminality	3.38(.77)	2.25(.50)
Useful in predicting future dv	3.46(.88)	2.25(.96)
Can help with police intervention techniques	3.38(.96)	2.75(1.26)
High threat individuals are more likely to be arrested in dv cases	3.38(.96)	3.25(.50)
Arresting offenders lowers recidivism rates in dv cases	3.08(1.19)	2.25(.96)

Note. The results in this table were gathered from the likert-style threat assessment survey that the researcher had distributed to both the Superior and Cloquet police departments. The results displayed are the means and standard deviations (which are denoted within the parentheses.). There were a total of thirteen responses from Superior and four responses from Cloquet.

Table 6. Intervention Survey Between-Factors Pearson r Analyses

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Superior				
Factor 1	1.00	.71*	.37	-.01
Factor 2	.71*	1.00	.53	-.54
Factor 3	.37	.53	1.00	-.23
Factor 4	-.01	-.54	-.23	1.00
Cloquet				
Factor 1	1.00	-.42	a	a
Factor 2	-.42	1.00	a	a
Factor 3	a	a	a	a
Factor 4	a	a	a	a

Note. The results in this table are the intervention survey between-factor Pearson r correlations for both Superior and Cloquet. The * symbol indicates significance at .01 level. The symbol a is there to symbolize that a correlation could not be run because at least one variable is constant.

Table 7. Threat Assessment Survey Between-Factors Pearson r Analyses

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Superior			
Factor 1	1.00	.56*	-.22
Factor 2	.56*	1.00	.18
Factor 3	-.22	.18	1.00
Cloquet			
Factor 1	1.00	.95	.41
Factor 2	.95	1.00	.43
Factor 3	.41	.43	1.00

Note. The results in this table are the threat assessment survey between-factor Pearson r correlations for both Superior and Cloquet. The * symbol indicates significance at .01 level.

Appendix A: Domestic Violence Intervention

Please don't write your name on this document. These are short answer questions. Fill out as much as you are comfortable with. Thank you for participating.

1.) When you arrive at the scene in cases of domestic violence what do you look for?

2.) What forms of intervention are currently most practiced at your agency?

3.) Are there other intervention methods that you think should be implemented in the future that would be more effective?

4.) How likely do you think offenders will recidivate after intervention?

Note. Question one measured factor one (what threat assessment consists of), question two measured factor 2 (most practiced form of intervention), question three measured factor three (opinions on future policies and interventions), and question four measured factor four (thoughts on likelihood of recidivism.)

Appendix B: Domestic Violence Threat Assessment

Please don't write your name on this document.

A.) Using information from threat assessment is an efficient way to predict future criminal behavior.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neither Agree nor Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

B.) Threat Assessment is useful in predicting domestic violence.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neither Agree nor Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

C.) Threat Assessment can help with police intervention techniques.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neither Agree nor Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

D.) Individuals who are high threat are more likely to be arrested in cases of suspected domestic violence.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neither Agree nor Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

E.) Arresting offenders does lower the recidivism rate in cases of domestic violence.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neither Agree nor Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

Note. Part a and part b measured factor one (the effectiveness of threat assessment in predicting future criminality.) Part c and d measured factor two (the effectiveness of threat assessment on impacting police intervention methods.) Part e measured factor three (the impact of arrest on recidivism.)

[View Statistics](#)