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Objectives

• Understand reasons for potential discrepancies in reported IPV data

• Identify key components regarding IPV incidents occurring in Marion County

• Discuss approaches to protecting families and mitigating injuries that may occur to them in domestically violent homes
Terminology

- **Domestic Violence** (Local Agencies)
  - Adult vs Adult

- **IPV** (Academic/Medical Literature)
  - *Intimate Partner Violence (Partner/Spouse)*
  - Interpersonal Violence (Community violence)
Intimate Partner Violence

The intentional use of physically or emotionally damaging behavior between two romantically involved adults, often to gain or maintain control of the relationship.
Risk Factors for IPV

- Low Income
- Unemployment
- Limited Education

Accumulation of Stressors
Environment of Violence

Domestic Violence

Low Income

Child Maltreatment

Limited Education

Unemployment

Inappropriate Response (Control)
DV Prevalence

• DV affects **30% to 40%** of families involved in the child welfare system

• DV calls make up as much as **50%** of all law enforcement calls

• Up to **35%** of all hospital emergency department visits attributed to DV
  – Adult victims may be more likely to seek care for child than themselves
# Intimate Partner Violence Declining?

**Criminal Victimization, 2014**

Jennifer L. Truman, Ph.D., and Lynn Langton, Ph.D., BJS Statisticians

**TABLE 1**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Violent Crime</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014*</th>
<th>Rate per 1,000 Persons Age 12 or Older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td>8,320,000</td>
<td>6,047,800</td>
<td>5,393,900</td>
<td>20.8, 21.0, 21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape/Rape sexual assault</td>
<td>207,760</td>
<td>300,170</td>
<td>284,350</td>
<td>1.1, 1.1, 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>769,150</td>
<td>645,650</td>
<td>664,210</td>
<td>3.1, 2.4, 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>5,570,890</td>
<td>5,180,610</td>
<td>4,411,010</td>
<td>24.4, 19.6, 16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated assault</td>
<td>1,281,490</td>
<td>994,220</td>
<td>1,092,090</td>
<td>5.2, 3.8, 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple assault</td>
<td>4,689,400</td>
<td>4,186,390</td>
<td>3,318,920</td>
<td>19.2, 15.8, 12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>1,242,980</td>
<td>1,116,690</td>
<td>1,098,890</td>
<td>5.1, 4.2, 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intimate partner violence</strong></td>
<td>8,160,100</td>
<td>7,486,800</td>
<td>6,694,110</td>
<td>3.3, 2.8, 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger violence</td>
<td>2,828,600</td>
<td>2,098,170</td>
<td>2,198,130</td>
<td>11.9, 7.9, 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime involving injury</td>
<td>1,759,310</td>
<td>1,463,960</td>
<td>1,375,450</td>
<td>7.2, 6.1, 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious violent crime</td>
<td>2,528,460</td>
<td>1,940,610</td>
<td>2,043,650</td>
<td>9.2, 7.3, 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious domestic violence</td>
<td>425,270</td>
<td>464,730</td>
<td>402,630</td>
<td>1.7, 1.8, 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious intimate partner violence</td>
<td>311,480</td>
<td>360,820</td>
<td>265,090</td>
<td>1.3, 1.4, 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious stranger violence</td>
<td>1,066,480</td>
<td>737,940</td>
<td>930,690</td>
<td>4.5, 2.8, 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious violent crime involving weapons</td>
<td>1,659,830</td>
<td>1,174,370</td>
<td>1,305,900</td>
<td>6.8, 4.4, 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious violent crime involving injury</td>
<td>624,800</td>
<td>739,210</td>
<td>692,470</td>
<td>3.4, 2.8, 2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problems with “self-reporting”

• Self-reported through phone or in-person interviews
  – Excludes:
    • Very poor
    • Do not speak English
    • “Chaotic” lives
    • Military families living on base
    • Individuals who are hospitalized, homeless, institutionalized, or incarcerated
Low Response Rates (DV Reports)

• National Violence Against Women Survey
  – African American Women (10%)
  – Female adults under the age of 30 years (19%)

• National Crime Victimization Survey
  – Non-Hispanic White Female (77%)
  – Residing in Urban Area (30%)
  – One or More Children in Household (30%)
INDY IPV Study

- Retrospective analysis of domestic violence information sheets (Marion County, Indiana)

- Marion County
  - Largest County in Indiana (Pop: 903,393)
  - Encompasses Indianapolis and several smaller unincorporated towns
  - Multiple Police Departments Participating
    - IMPD, Speedway, Lawrence and Beech Grove
IPV Incidents in Marion County (2015)
INDY IPV Study

- 9,355 IPV incidents documented and analyzed
  - Dec. 25, 2012 to December 2, 2015

- Incidents Involved:
  - 9,420 Suspects
  - 9,406 Victims
  - 7,591 Witnesses
### Study Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study/County Population Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Victim (n = 9420)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 29 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 54 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Incidents may have more than one victim, witness, or suspect

**Data from the U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census

***Data from updated domestic violence officer information sheet
Suspect vs Victim by Gender

- Male vs Female: 87%
- Female vs Male: 1%
- Female vs Female: 2%
- Male vs Male: 10%
IPV in Marion County

Critical Concept:

Frequency/Severity of Violence
Environment of Violence

• On average, couples with IPV history have had **10** prior, unreported incidents.

  *Average of 5 per month*
Suspect Gives Victim Black Eye

Suspect Strangles Victim

Suspect Punches Hole in Wall

Suspect Kicks Family Dog Down Stairs

Suspect Knocks Victim Unconscious in Living Room

911 Call for DV
• Annual IPV victimization rate for Marion County was 441 victims per 100,000 population aged 12 and older
Weapon Violence

• In 17% of all incidents a weapon was used
  – 35% when female was suspect and male victim

• Most common weapons were firearms and knives (51%)
  – Other weapons include bricks, chairs, hammers, pipes, tire irons, lamps, and baseball bats

• Only 1% of weapon-wielding females used a firearm compared to 24% of weapon-wielding males
Strangulation

- 10% of IPV victims strangled during incident according to existing literature
- 29% report strangulation in this study
  - 60% had visual symptoms observed by officers
  - Only 14% received medical treatment
  - 84% reported prior episodes of strangulation
- 31% of pregnant IPV victims reported strangulation
  - 17% of these pregnant victims received medical treatment
## Strangulation (Victim-Suspect History)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suspect/Victim Violence History</th>
<th>Strangulation</th>
<th>No Strangulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Prior Unreported IPV Incidents</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*At Least 10 Prior Unreported IPV Incidents</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*At Least 50 Prior Unreported IPV Incidents</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Suspect History of Following or Spying on Victim</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Suspect Is Jealous or Controlling of Victim’s Daily Activities</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Recent Death Threats by Suspect</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Suspect With History of Suicide Attempt</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Suspect Has Threatened to Kill Victim or Their Child</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Suspect Has Ever Used A Weapon Against Victim</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Victim Thinks Suspect May Kill Them</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Suspect Abused/Threatened Animals in Home</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Suspect Forced Sex with Victim</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Suspect Has Easy Access to Gun</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Officer Observations (Strangulation)

• Victim
  – Apologetic (7%)
  – Nervous (39%)
  – Afraid (51%)
  – Panicked (18%)
  – Complain of Pain (57%)

• Suspect
  – Angry (54%) – same as non-strangulation
  – Calm (35%) – greater than non-strangulation

*All descriptors significantly higher compared to non-strangulation victims
IPV in Marion County

Critical Concept:

Children as Witnesses/Victims
IPV - Threat of Harm to Children

- 678,932 children abused or neglected in U.S. during 2013 calendar year (U.S. Dept. of Health)
  - 1% of entire U.S. child population

- In homes where DV occurs, prevalence of child abuse or neglect may rise to as much as 60%

- As much as 60 times the risk of child abuse or neglect
Threats of Harm to Children

- Physical Abuse
- Sexual Abuse
- Neglect
- Emotional Maltreatment
Risk for Young Children

• Less Opportunity to Identify
  – Perpetrator may restrict outside access
  – Not in school system

• More Difficult to Identify
• Overall, children were mentioned in domestic violence police reports in 59% of cases.
Indy IPV (Children)

- Children in homes when parents had formerly cohabited: 70%
- Children in homes were parents were both under 30 years old: 67%
  - Excluded from surveys?
- 71% of these children were injured or directly witnessed the event
- Over 40% of incidents involving children involved more than one child
Number of Children in Home

IPV Suspect/Victim/Incident Characteristics

- Prior Unreported IPV Incidents
- Suspect Ever Threatened to Kill Vic or Child
- Suspect Ever Tried to Strangle Victim
- Suspect Ever Used a Weapon Against Victim
- Suspect Abused Animals
- Suspect Forced Sex

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80%

No Children  One Child  Two Children  Three Children  Four Children
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation (n = 1336)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afraid</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint of Pain</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crying</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panicked</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Police Officer Observations (Victim)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation (n = 2434)</th>
<th>Victim</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afraid</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apologetic</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruises</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complaint of Pain</strong></td>
<td><strong>1288</strong></td>
<td><strong>53%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crying</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panicked</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Caregiver Threats

VIOLENT OFFENDING CAREGIVER AND NON-VIOLENT OFFENDING CAREGIVER

Both Present Unique, Individualized Risks
Victimized Caregiver

- Caregiver’s emotional needs unmet
- Caregiver unable to meet emotional needs of child
- Deterioration of caregiver-child relationship
- Behavioral difficulties in child
- Further exasperation of caregiver-child relationship
Egeland (1987)

- Longitudinal study of 267 high risk families
  - Poverty
  - Limited Education
  - Youth of Mother (40% teenagers)
  - “chaotic living conditions”

- Control group of mother’s providing adequate care
Egeland (1987)

- Four maltreatment groups
  - Physical Abusive
  - Hostile/Verbally Abusive
  - Psychologically Unavailable
  - Neglecting
Egeland (1987)

• Children who experienced emotional neglect or “psychologically unavailable parenting” suffered most dramatic consequences.

• Children victimized by maltreatment during first two years of life exhibit more negative outcomes than those victimized after reaching the age of 2 yrs.
Effects of Emotional Maltreatment

9-24 Months
- Anxiously attached to caregiver, steep decline in intellectual functioning

24 to 42 Months
- Noncompliant, unhappy, lacking in persistence, displaying little positive affect, and scoring lower than non-maltreated infants on developmental exam

Preschool
- Negativistic, impulsive, and highly dependent on teachers, nervous, and displaying self-abusive behavior

Elementary School
- Ranked by teachers to be low in peer acceptance and overall emotional health, more aggressive than peers and performing significantly worse on achievement tests

Teen Years
- Higher number of social problems, more delinquent, more aggressive, and more suicidal than peers. Majority with at least two psychiatric disorders
IPV in Marion County

Critical Concept:

Animal Maltreatment Overlap
Animal Maltreatment - IPV

- Prevalence in homes where IPV is reported to have occurred: **50-75%**
  - Particularly harmful for individuals whose primary source of emotional support is their pet
# IPV VICTIMS: Pets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Dog Cruelty (Expected)</th>
<th>DV Incidents (Expected)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46201</td>
<td>47 (12)</td>
<td>73 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46203</td>
<td>61 (16)</td>
<td>39 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46218</td>
<td>54 (12)</td>
<td>91 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46222</td>
<td>45 (14)</td>
<td>67 (33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Animal Abuse and IPV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suspect – Victim Relationship Characteristics</th>
<th>Suspect History of Abusing/Threatening</th>
<th>No Suspect History of Abusing/Threatening Pet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former Cohabitants</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Cohabitants</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim is Pregnant</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child In Common</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Victim has Child, Suspect Knows Isn’t Theirs</em></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Present During Incident or Member of Household</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Any Prior Unreported IPV Incidents Between Suspect and Victim</em></td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>More than 10 Prior Unreported IPV Incidents Between Suspect and Victim</em></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>More than 50 prior Unreported IPV Incidents Between Suspect and Victim</em></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant findings (Victim has Child, Suspect Knows Isn’t Theirs: n = 3322, $x^2 = 4.42$, p < .001; Any Prior Unreported IPV Incidents: n = 3416, $x^2=23.02$, p < .001); More than 10 Prior Unreported IPV Incidents: n = 3416, $x^2=42.30$, p < .001; More than 50 Prior Unreported IPV Incidents: n = 3416, $x^2 = 41.73$, p < .001).
Animal Abuse and IPV

• Animal Abuse as Indicator of Severity of Risk?
Animal Abuse and IPV

Law Enforcement Officer Observations of Victims

- *Afraid: 63%
- Angry: 42%
- *Apologetic: 48%
- Calm: 48%
- Crying: 48%
- *Nervous: 48%
- Panicked: 48%

Legend:
- Yellow: Suspect History of Animal Abuse (n = 106)
- Red: No Suspect History of Animal Abuse (n = 3246)
Animal Abuse and IPV

*Bruises

- Suspect History of Animal Abuse (n = 106): 35%
- No Suspect History of Animal Abuse (n = 3246): 20%

*Complaint of Pain

- Suspect History of Animal Abuse (n = 106): 63%
- No Suspect History of Animal Abuse (n = 3246): 52%
IPV in Marion County Review

- Incidents occur frequently and are often quite severe
- Children are often present for the incident or a member of the household in which it occurs
- Allegations of strangulation, having multiple children in the home, or a suspect history of animal maltreatment appears to increase risk/severity
What Can We Do?

• Effective Interventions?
  – Catch Early (“Natural Advantage”)
  – Safe and Secure Environment
  – Mental Health Services/Social Support
  – Reduce Caregiver Stressors
  – Sense of Routine
Effective Intervention

• Law Enforcement Response
  – Arrests/Protective Orders
  – Suspects on Scene?
    • DUI (59%)
  – Baker One Project (NC)

ASSESSMENT:
Repeat calls decreased by 98.9% at seven target locations. During first year of project, domestic assaults remained flat in Baker One, while rising 29% in rest of city. In 105 cases with indictor crimes, only three victims later reported a domestic assault. Only 14.8% of domestic violence victims in project reported repeat victimization as opposed to national average of 35%. Additionally, no Internal Affairs complaints were generated by officer contacts with suspects.
Effective Intervention

- Multi-Disciplinary Approach
  - Mi Escuelita (CA)

**Mi Escuelita Helps Break Cycle of Family Violence**

According to a University of California San Diego five-year study, Mi Escuelita Therapeutic Preschool, a preschool funded in part by First 5 San Diego, is helping children who've been exposed to family violence.

The new data results were shared at a data briefing on Friday, December 5, 2014, presented by Congresswoman Susan Davis (CA-53) and local leaders, showing that investing in quality academic support systems positively changes the trajectory for at-risk children. The briefing highlighted data in academic advancements for children who attended Mi Escuelita Therapeutic Preschool. The early learning program has helped produce better reading and math scores when the children move on to elementary school, making it less likely to ever be placed in special education classes.

Mi Escuelita Therapeutic Preschool, operated by South Bay Community Services, is the only one of its kind designed especially for children affected by domestic violence and abuse. The school opened in 2006 with 40 children, and now serves nearly 72 children ages 3 to 5 for full-day therapeutic quality early education with three full-time therapists and specialized staff. Since its opening, the preschool has served more than 200 children.
Questions?


20. C.Nelson (2000). Graph from the Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University


