



Honor College at Salisbury University

Honors Thesis

An Honors Thesis Titled

Understanding Police Response to Domestic Violence

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Honors Designation to the

Honors College

of

Salisbury University

in the Major Department of

Psychology

by

Rebecca Pfeffer

Date and Place of Oral Presentation: SUSRC April 2018

Signatures of Honors Thesis Committee

Mentor:

Dani Lloyd

Diane Illig

Reader 1:

[Signature]

Michele Schlehofer

Reader 2:

[Signature]

Deneen Long-White

Dean:

Signature

Print

Abstract

Domestic violence affects one-third of women nationwide at some point in their lives. However, 46 percent of domestic violence incidents where women are the victim go unreported. Among the most commonly disclosed reasons women choose not to report domestic violence to the police are fear of police hostility or indifference (American Civil Liberties Union, 2015). This study aimed to determine whether or not ambivalent sexism, the mix of both benevolent and hostile sexism, is a possible explanation for negative attitudes and behaviors shown by officers when responding to domestic violence with female victims. It was hypothesized that higher scores on the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory would predict more negative attitudes about domestic violence among officers. Ambivalent sexism scores and attitudes towards domestic violence were collected from 87 officers and analyzed in order to establish a correlation between the two inventories. The data did support the hypothesis, although officers in this study scored lower on domestic violence attitudes and ambivalent sexism than anticipated. Data analyses indicated that there was a significant relationship between scores on the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory and domestic violence attitudes. Trends in the data suggest that increased years on the force may affect participants' scores, representing positive change in police response to domestic violence over time.

Introduction and Literature Review

What is Domestic Violence?

While domestic violence (DV) can look drastically different from case to case, it is generally defined as “willful intimidation, physical assault, battery, sexual assault, and/or other abusive behavior as part of a systematic pattern of power and control perpetrated by one intimate partner against another” (National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, 2017). Other behaviors that are typically considered domestic violence include financial withholding, stalking, harassment, psychological intimidation, emotional abuse, and attempted homicide. A perpetrator of domestic violence can be a spouse, relative, child, co-parent, co-inhabitant, or any individual that a victim has had a sexual relationship with in the previous six months (National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, 2017). According to the Center for Disease Control (CDC), one in four women in the United States experience severe physical violence from an intimate partner at some point in their lives and up to 57.2 percent of women experience psychological aggression from an intimate partner (“Violence Prevention,” 2017).

Reporting Domestic Violence

With nearly a quarter of women experiencing severe domestic violence at some point in their lives, some may find it surprising that approximately 46% of domestic violence incidents in which women are the victims go unreported to police (American Civil Liberties Union, 2015). The low reporting rates associated with incidences of domestic violence can be explained by many different contributing factors. Foremost, over a quarter of women who were victims of domestic violence did not report the incident for fear of retaliation and/or fear of getting the perpetrator in trouble (American Civil Liberties Union, 2015). The next most commonly cited reason that women do not report domestic violence is embarrassment, followed by fear of officer

hostility or indifference (American Civil Liberties Union, 2015). Many women are also reluctant to report domestic violence and/or leave their abuser due to financial dependence, inability to provide for their children alone, or fear of difficulty navigating the legal system (Felson & Pare, 2005).

Domestic Violence as a Gender Based Crime

The rates of domestic violence are nearly identical among men and women, with one in three women and one in four men experiencing some sort of domestic violence. However, women are more likely to be seriously injured, sexually assaulted, stalked, or murdered by a heterosexual intimate partner than men (National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, 2017). One of the most widely accepted theories as to why men are more likely to be the perpetrators of sexual assault, stalking, and homicide against an intimate partner is strict adherence to traditional gender roles (Reidy, Berke, Gentile, & Zeichner, 2014). Specifically, socialization in currently or historically patriarchal cultures, such as the United States, emphasizes the notion that men are supposed to be strong, aggressive, sexual, dominant, and prideful. In contrast, common ideas of femininity include passiveness, submissiveness, fragility, and all in all, weakness. Lifelong exposure to stereotypical views of gender groom men and women to try and uphold even the most extreme forms of masculinity and femininity. Therefore, when a woman displays traits or behaviors that a male may interpret to be threatening to their dominance and masculinity, it is their perceived duty to regain their power. In extreme cases, this can lead to abuse in order for one partner to maintain control over the other (Reidy, et al., 2014).

Police Officer's Roles in Domestic Violence

Police protocol for responding to domestic violence varies from state to state. However, for the vast majority of agencies, officers are required to respond to the location that the

domestic incident has taken place. Most agencies suggest officers respond to DV calls with at least one other officer as abusers can be violent and uncooperative (“Domestic Violence Arrest Policies,” 2014). Approximately 18 U.S. states and territories including Alaska, Colorado, Washington D.C, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Mississippi, Nevada, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin, operate under mandatory arrest laws for domestic violence. Mandatory arrest laws state that if an officer has sufficient reason to believe that domestic abuse is occurring, or if the victim has clearly been assaulted, officers are mandated to arrest the abuser. Other states in the nation have varying arrest laws, some which leave whether an arrest should be made completely up to the responding officer’s discretion (“Domestic Violence Arrest Policies,” 2014). In two in five domestic violence cases across the nation, the offender is arrested or charges are filed (Reidy, et al., 2014).

After the abuser has been arrested or has left the scene, ten states including Maryland, require that officers complete a Lethality Assessment Program (LAP) form with the victim. The LAP assessment determines how likely a victim is to be killed by their intimate partner. In states where officers participate in LAP, the results of the assessment are then reported to the local domestic violence and rape crisis centers so that they may contact high-risk victims and help connect them with the appropriate resources in their community (“Lethality Assessment Program,” 2005).

Unfortunately, having protocol for how to respond to domestic violence does not always ensure that officers will be respectful of all parties. According to the American Civil Liberties Union’s (2015) survey of domestic violence victims, 88% of respondents indicated that police officers sometimes or often do not believe victims of DV or have a tendency to blame them for the abuse that has occurred. Further, 85% of respondents stated that the police were sometimes

or often demeaning to the victims of abuse (American Civil Liberties Union, 2015). Gover, Paul, Dodge (2011) studied approximately 300 police officers, and found that up to 83.5% of participants felt as though DV calls take up too much of police officer's time and energy. Negative attitudes and behaviors displayed by officers in response to domestic violence calls can discourage victims from seeking legal help again in the future for fear of further harassment and victimization (American Civil Liberties Union, 2015).

Police Officers as Domestic Abusers

It is important to note that police officers are not exempt from the high rates of domestic violence. Johnson, Todd, and Subramanian (2005) found over 40% of polled officers admitted to being violent in some way with their spouse in the previous six months before the survey took place. While there is little research on police perpetrated domestic violence due to lower than normal reporting rates, some studies estimate that rates of abuse among officers are two to three times higher than in the general population (Cheema, 2016). High rates of domestic abuse perpetrated by police officers is attributed to high job stress, exposure to violence, authoritarian attitudes, alcoholism, post-traumatic stress disorder, and regular use of weapons/force. Additionally, officers are less likely to lose their jobs due to domestic violence complaints than due to other types of complaints (Goodmark, 2015). Accordingly, the perception of police officers as abusers may contribute to abused women's reluctance to seek help from police and may incite more permissive attitudes towards domestic violence among officers.

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory

In most patriarchal cultures, women are viewed by men as powerless and submissive, which can often explain gender-based violence such as domestic abuse. One way of quantifying

the beliefs held by men about women is through sexism inventories. Hostile sexism inventories measure malicious attitudes about women that often manifest themselves in anger, objectification, and discrimination (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Benevolent sexism inventories measure attitudes about women that may be perceived as benign or even complementary but subtly indicate gender biases (Glick & Fiske, 1996). For example, the statement “women are pure and need to be protected by a man” may seem harmless but upon deeper inspection implies that women are the weaker sex who need to be protected by men, the “superior” sex. Ambivalent sexism is the combination of both hostile and benevolent attitudes. The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) measures both hostile sexism and benevolent sexism through a single 22 item questionnaire; with 11 questions dedicated to each type of sexism. The ASI was developed by Glick and Fiske (1996) and has been used as the primary method of evaluating individual sexism ever since. The ASI asks to rate how much they disagree/agree with each item on a scale of 0 to 5; 5 being strongly agree and 0 being strongly disagree. The higher the individual’s score, the more sexist attitudes they hold.

Current Study

This study examines whether police officers’ scores on the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory are correlated to attitudes towards domestic violence. This may help explain *why* certain officers have negative attitudes towards domestic violence calls as well as towards female victims. If there is a correlation between ambivalent sexism and attitudes towards IPV, this would indicate that police responses to domestic violence may be influenced by benevolent and/or hostile sexism. It was expected that there would be a positive correlation between negative attitudes towards domestic violence and high scores on the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. This

information could potentially be used by police precincts to evaluate and address negative attitudes towards domestic violence responses in their department.

Methods

Participants

A total of 87 officers participated in the study. Seventy-seven (88.5%) of the officers who responded indicated that they were male, 7 (8.04%) of participants indicated they were female, and 3 (3.45%) chose not to indicate their gender identity. Twenty-five (28.74%) of respondents worked in Maryland, 15 (17.24%) were from Delaware, and the remaining 47 (54.02%) worked in Pennsylvania. On average, participants were 44 years of age ($SD = 9.22$) and had been officers for 19.59 years ($SD = 9.37$).

Measures

This study was conducted in the form of an anonymous online survey. Surveys took approximately 10 to 15 minutes to complete, and data was compiled, analyzed, and stored in SPSS, a statistical analysis software. In order to participate in the study, subjects were required to sign an informed consent document. Participants were then asked to confirm that they were at least 18 years of age and qualified to respond to DV calls. If a participant indicated that they were under 18 or did not consent to be involved in the study, they were redirected to the debriefing/disclosure form. The survey began with 20 questions ($\alpha = 0.71$) designed to measure police attitudes towards domestic violence and female violence victims (See Appendix A). Questions were created by the investigator and loosely based on Gover, Paul, and Dodge's (2011) study of Law Enforcement Officers' Attitudes about Domestic Violence. Survey

participants were asked to rate how much they disagree/agree with the statements in each item on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 to 5; 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree.

Subsequently, the numbers corresponding to each individual's answers were added together to get a number from 22 to 100. Some items were reverse scored. The higher the individual's score, the more negative attitudes towards responding to DV they hold.

The second section of the survey consisted of 3 tasks in which the participant ranked crimes in order of how severe they believe the crimes to be (See Appendix B). This activity served as a buffer activity between the attitudes about domestic violence questionnaire and the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. These questions had no right or wrong answers.

Next was the 22 item Ambivalent Sexism Inventory ($\alpha = 0.81$) which was used to calculate participants' hostile and benevolent sexism scores (See Appendix C). Survey participants were once again asked to rate how much they disagree/agree with the statements in each item on a 5-point Likert scale. 11 questions measured hostile sexism ($\alpha = 0.86$) and 11 questions measured benevolent sexism ($\alpha = 0.74$). The higher the individual's score, the more sexist attitudes they hold. Total ambivalent sexism scores were calculated for each participant as were hostile and benevolent sexism individually.

After the completion of the ASI, participants were taken to a short open ended demographic survey that asked for the officer's age, gender identity, state, years of DV training received, and years on the force. At this point the survey was completed and participants were redirected to a disclosure form. The investigators subsequently scored each participant's ASI and correlated these numeric values with each of the attitudes indicated in section one. The numerical data was then analyzed using SPSS, a statistical analysis program. These statistics were used to

determine the relationship between police officers' scores of ambivalent sexism and attitudes towards DV cases.

In order to assess the relationship between ambivalent sexism and domestic violence attitudes, total scores for all measures had to be calculated for each participant. Benevolent sexism and hostile sexism were analyzed separately as well as in conjunction to calculate total ambivalent sexism. Individual scores on ambivalent sexism were between 18 and 95 ($M=64.41$) with a maximum possible score of 110. Scores on domestic violence attitudes ranged from 25 to 74 ($M=42.76$) with a maximum score of 100. Higher scores on each inventory denoted more negative or sexist attitudes. Mean scores for each inventory were also calculated using participants' original survey responses ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Procedure

Surveys were distributed to local and state police officers, as well as city sheriffs, throughout Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. Participants were through the professional social media platform LinkedIn. Investigators started by contacting individuals who were graduates of Salisbury University and have since become law enforcement officers. After establishing connections with Salisbury University graduates, investigators then started to contact officers from the surrounding area directly. Officers of all ages, genders, sexual orientations, races, and ethnicities were eligible for the study as long as they were formerly or currently law enforcement officials qualified to respond to domestic violence calls. Officers who agreed to be involved in the study were asked to pass along the survey information to other qualifying officers in their area. Involvement in the survey was strictly voluntary and participants

did not receive any compensation from the investigators nor Salisbury University. The survey was produced and distributed through Qualtrics, an online academic survey and research tool. The study examined the relationship between scores on the Fiske and Glick Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) and attitudes towards domestic violence situations with female victims. The ASI was treated as an independent variable while domestic violence was the dependent variable.

Results

Officers in this study scored significantly lower on both total ambivalent sexism and domestic violence attitudes than originally anticipated. The average of scores on questions measuring benevolent sexism was $M = 3.181$, $SD = 0.58$, meaning that overall, participants somewhat agreed with items measuring benevolent sexism. The average of scores for hostile sexism was $M = 2.730$, $SD = 0.668$, indicating that participants did not agree nor disagree with the majority of items measuring hostile sexism. The average score on the domestic violence attitudes inventory was $M = 2.132$, $SD = 0.396$. The mean of the scores on the domestic violence attitudes inventory was limited in variability and suggests that participants tended to somewhat disagree with items on the inventory. Participants' mean scores indicate that officers in this study were more likely to hold benevolently sexist attitudes towards women than outright antagonistic attitudes.

Data was further analyzed through correlations and regression analyses. Pearson bivariate correlations were calculated between hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, domestic violence attitudes, and ratio variables such as age, years of service, and hours of domestic violence training received. Results of bivariate correlations between the three attitudinal scales and officer age indicate that as officer age increases, negative attitudes towards domestic violence and

hostile sexism decrease. Table 1 shows that domestic violence attitudes ($r = -0.234, p = 0.035$) and hostile sexism ($r = -0.228, p = 0.038$) are both negatively correlated with officer age. As well, bivariate correlations between the same three attitudinal scales and years of service suggest that as years of service increases, hostile sexism decreases. Table 1 shows a negative relationship between hostile sexism ($r = -0.271, p = 0.014$) and years of service. This means that the longer an officer has served on the force, the less likely they are to report feelings of hostile sexism.

A Pearson bivariate correlation was computed to assess the relationship between domestic violence and ambivalent sexism (Table 1). Results from the correlations suggest that as scores on hostile sexism or benevolent sexism increase/decrease, scores on domestic violence should increase/decrease accordingly. While it cannot be determined if changes in hostile and/or benevolent sexism cause changes in domestic violence attitudes, or vice versa, it is relatively certain that there is a relationship between the variables. As hypothesized, there was a strong, positive correlation between domestic violence attitudes and ambivalent sexism ($r = 0.525, p < 0.001$). Correspondingly, hostile sexism separately was also positively correlated with domestic violence attitudes ($r = 0.530, p = 0.000$), and benevolent sexism was correlated with domestic violence attitudes, but only moderately ($r = 0.301, p = 0.005$).

Table 1. *Descriptive Information and Bivariate Correlations for Domestic Violence Attitudes, Hostile Sexism, Benevolent Sexism, Ambivalent Sexism, Age, Years of Service, and Hours of Training.*

	Domestic Violence Attitudes	Hostile Sexism	Benevolent Sexism	Total Ambivalent Sexism	Age	Years of Service	Hours of Training
Domestic Violence Attitudes	---	.530**	.301**	.525**	-.234*	-.211	.014
Hostile Sexism		----	.195	.806**	-.228*	-.271*	.029
Benevolent Sexism			----	.735*	.095	.004	.003
Total Ambivalent Sexism				----	-.064	-.134	-.035
Age					----	.857**	.155
Years of Service						----	.245*
Hours of Training							----
Mean (SD)	2.13 (.39)	2.73 (.67)	3.18 (.58)	64.41 (11.65)	44.14 (9.22)	19.59 (9.37)	64.56 (34.48)

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

A linear regression analysis (see Table 2) was also conducted to predict changes in domestic violence attitudes based on hostile and/or benevolent sexism. Prior to running the analysis, data was reviewed to ensure it met all of the conditions for a regression analysis. The data was linear, normally distributed, showed little multicollinearity, was not auto-correlated, and was homoscedastic. Analyses were subsequently performed using the SPSS linear regression function. Results indicated that hostile and benevolent sexism explained 30.5% of the variance in domestic violence attitudes ($R^2 = 0.305$, $F(2, 86) = 18.467$, $p = 0.00$). Hostile sexism ($\beta = 0.506$, p

= 0.000) was a significant predictor of attitudes towards domestic violence, whereas benevolent sexism ($\beta=0.164$, $p=0.088$) was not. The unstandardized coefficient indicates that for every one-point increase in an individual's hostile sexism score, negative domestic violence attitudes will increase by 0.506 points.

Table 2. *Linear Regression Model for Benevolent Sexism Attitudes and Hostile Sexism Attitudes on Domestic Violence Attitudes*

	B	SE B	β
Benevolent Sexism	0.189	0.109	0.164
Hostile Sexism	0.506	0.099	0.483
$R^2 = 0.305$			

A few of the analyses conducted did not yield any notable conclusions. Correlations between hours of domestic violence training and benevolent sexism, hostile sexism, and domestic violence attitudes were all statistically insignificant. Correlations between years of service and benevolent sexism were also insubstantial. As well, age was only statistically related to the domestic violence attitudes scales and not benevolent or hostile sexism scales. For these reasons, age, years of service, nor hours of domestic violence training were used in further analyses.

Discussion

Overall, results from this data did confirm the hypothesis that high scores on ambivalent sexism would be correlated with high scores on negative domestic violence attitudes. Despite officers in this study scoring low on all attitudinal scales, bivariate correlations suggest a

relationship between ambivalent sexism and domestic violence attitudes. Thus, if officers were to score high on ambivalent sexism, or one of the two components of ambivalent sexism, they would likely also score high on negative attitudes towards domestic violence. While it cannot be determined whether ambivalent sexism causes negative attitudes towards domestic violence or vice versa, results from this data may suggest that testing officers' scores on ambivalent sexism may be able to predict how they will react to domestic violence calls. Additionally, the results of the multiple linear regression analysis indicate that hostile sexism is the best predictor of domestic violence attitudes. Again, this suggests that officers who score high on hostile sexism will likely have negative attitudes towards domestic violence. Therefore, one way to create more positive police response to domestic violence may be to test officers on hostile sexism. If an officer scores high on hostile sexism, they could be assigned to cases that are not domestic violence related. That way, officers who may be at the highest risk for having negative attitudes towards domestic violence will not be responsible for working with female domestic violence victims. As well, through cultivating more positive attitudes about women in general, police departments may be able to instill more positive attitudes about responding to domestic violence calls in their officers. Due to the nature of hostile sexism, and the notion that domestic violence is often a gender-based crime, one of the easiest ways to reduce negative attitudes towards female victims would be to offer education about women's issues and/or address common stereotypes and misconceptions about women.

One possible explanation for officers' low scores in this study is the extensive amount of domestic violence training that the majority of participants received. Although crosstab analysis did not suggest that there was a significant relationship between hours of training and hostile/benevolent sexism, trends in descriptive data show that a large portion of the sample

(42.5%) indicated completing 100 or more hours of domestic violence training. Despite being statistically insignificant, it seems unlikely that obtaining hundreds of hours of domestic violence training would not affect individuals' perceptions of domestic violence in some manner. It is possible that years of service may have more accurately captured the effects of domestic violence training as well as accounting for the officers' field experience. As correlation results indicated, officers in this study held more positive beliefs about women and domestic violence as age and years of service increased. This suggests that the more domestic violence incidents officers are exposed to throughout the years, the more tolerant and understanding towards women and victims they become. If this is the case, on site domestic violence training may be more beneficial to officers than traditional classroom trainings. Similarly, having older or more experienced officers accompany newer or younger officers on domestic violence calls, may help less experienced officers learn the appropriate way to interact with female victims of domestic violence. This way, newer officers can begin to form positive attitudes towards domestic violence sooner than they would have through experience only.

Another possible explanation for the low scores on all attitudinal scales is the possibility of a social desirability bias. Social desirability biases occur when participants answer questions in a way that will be perceived positively by others. This may include under-reporting negative attitudes or behaviors and over-reporting positive or socially acceptable behaviors and attitudes. As sexist attitudes and negative feelings towards domestic violence victims are generally not socially acceptable, officers in this study may have consciously or unconsciously chosen survey answers that would make them appear to have more positive attitudes towards women and victims. This may be especially true considering the rate of domestic abuse perpetrated by police officers. Officers may have wanted to further distance themselves from the idea that officers are

commonly abusers, and therefore may be more likely to report positive attitudes about domestic violence victims.

The results of this study were also inconsistent with previous research. While 83.5% of officers in Gover, Paul, and Dodge's 2011 study indicated that they believed domestic violence calls take up too much of an officer's time and effort, only 11.5% of officers in the current study agreed with a similarly worded question. Similarly, 71.2% of participants in the Gover, et al. study agreed with the notion that victims of domestic violence could leave their partner at any time whereas only 32.94% of participants in the current study agreed. Officers' self-reported attitudes towards domestic violence were also drastically different than victimized women's perceptions of police attitudes, as reported in the survey conducted by the ACLU. 85% of respondents in said survey believed officers were often disrespectful to victims of domestic violence. Comparatively, only 32.19% of officers in this survey believed that police officers were not always respectful to victims. Sample size and subject pool may help

Results of the ranking the severity of crimes section of the survey were seemingly consistent with the rest of the results of the study. A majority of the surveyed officers had overall positive attitudes towards women and towards domestic violence. Thus, it is to be expected that they would also rank domestic abuse related crimes as more severe than other crimes. However, it is possible that because participants in this study knew it was a survey regarding domestic violence, they may have been predisposed to choose the domestic violence related crimes.

Limitations

The possibility of a social desirability bias is one of the most prominent limitations to this study. Although all of the responses to this survey were gathered anonymously in order to make

participants feel more comfortable answering honestly, in future research it may be beneficial to implement a social desirability bias scale in order to predict how truthful a participant will be when completing the main survey.

Similarly, potential participants were told that the study was a measure of domestic violence attitudes and the implications of those attitudes on police response to domestic violence. Providing participants with this information may have discouraged officers who hold negative attitudes towards domestic violence victims from participating. As well, officers who think of domestic violence as a prominent issue in society may have been more likely to agree to take the time to complete the survey than those officers who do not see it as an urgent matter.

The size of the sample and the method by which participants were gathered may have also affected the data. The sample size was relatively small ($n=87$) and was made up of almost entirely males, so cross-gender attitudes could not be reliably assessed. The sample was also not representative of all law enforcement officials within the United States, as only three out of fifty states were included in this study, and the three states in the study were not represented equally in terms of number of participants. Furthermore, participants in this study were mainly found through LinkedIn, further limiting the sample to individuals who were proficient in social media networking.

Suggestions for Future Research

This study looked into ambivalent sexism within police officer attitudes towards domestic violence with female victims only. Future studies could further evaluate ambivalent sexism in response to domestic violence with male or LGBTQ victims. The results of these studies may differ due to the complex nature of gender roles and stereotypes. As well, similar

types of studies could be conducted with special consideration to victims' race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, educational attainment, or age.

Future research could also be helpful in determining successful hostile sexism intervention techniques and/or cultural sensitivity training practices. While there have been numerous studies finding that intervention is helpful in reducing both benevolent and hostile sexism, this research has not been applied specifically to police officers nor have any specific intervention programs been widely accepted or implemented.

Appendix A

Assessment of Police Attitudes Towards Domestic Violence

Response options were as pictured below

1 Strongly
Disagree

2 Disagree

3 Neither Agree
nor Disagree

4 Agree

5 Strongly
Agree



1. Responding to domestic violence calls takes up too much of an officer's time and energy
2. It is important that I do as much as I can to help women who have been the victims of domestic violence
3. The majority of women who call the police to report domestic violence are just trying to get their partner in trouble
4. Responding to domestic violence calls is an important part of my job
5. Women can be the perpetrators of physical abuse against men
6. Most people who report domestic violence exaggerate the severity of the situation
7. The majority of women in domestic violence situations are not doing anything to help themselves
8. Sometimes it is necessary to be stern with victims of domestic violence in order to do my job
9. Women in abusive relationships could leave their partner at any time but choose not to
10. Weaker women are more likely to end up in abusive relationships
11. Violence against women is a prominent issue in society
12. Police intervention is necessary in most intimate partner violence situations
13. Police officers are always respectful to victims of domestic violence
14. It is hard to sympathize with people who report domestic violence
15. The legal system is easy for victims of domestic violence to navigate
16. Most victims of domestic violence tell the truth when they report to police
17. Women usually do something to provoke their partner's violence
18. Domestic violence is a private family matter
19. Intimate partner violence is a normal part of being in a relationship
20. Responding to domestic violence calls is a burden on police officers

Appendix B

Ranking the Severity of crimes

Rank the crimes in order of their severity: 1 being the most severe and 3 being the least severe

1.

1. Fraud
2. Vandalism
3. Stalking

2.

1. Perjury
2. Rape
3. Driving Under the Influence

3.

1. False Imprisonment
2. Possession of Heroin
3. Poaching

Appendix C

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory as developed by Fiske and Glick (1996)

Response options were as pictured below

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neither Agree nor Disagree	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.
2. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality."
3. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.
4. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.
5. Women are too easily offended.
6. People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.
7. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.
8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.
9. Women should be cherished and protected by men.
10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them
11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.
12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.
13. Men are complete without women.
14. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.
15. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.
16. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.
17. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.
18. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.
19. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.

20. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.
21. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men
22. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.

Works Cited

- American Civil Liberties Union. (2015, October). Sexual assault, domestic violence, and policing. October 16, 2017, retrieved from <https://www.aclu.org/report/sexual-assault-domestic-violence-and-policing>
- Cheema, R. (2016). Black and blue bloods: Protecting police officer families from domestic violence. *Family Court Review*, 54(3), 487-500. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/fcre.12226>
- “Domestic violence arrest policies.” (2014). *American bar association commission on domestic & sexual violence*, Mar. 2017, retrieved from www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/domestic_violence1/Resources/statutorysummarycharts/2014%20Domestic%20Violence%20Arrest%20Policy%20Chart.auThcheckdam.pdf.
- Felson, R., & Pare, P. (2005). The reporting of domestic violence and sexual assault by non-strangers to the police. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(3), 597-610.
doi:10.1037/e535952006-001
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 491–512.
doi:10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491.
- Goodmark, L. (2015). Hands up at home: Militarized masculinity and police officers who commit intimate partner abuse. *Brigham Young University Law Review*, 2015(5), 1183. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1837554359>
- Gover, A. R., Paul, D. P., & Dodge, M. (2011). Law enforcement officers’ attitudes about domestic violence. *Violence Against Women*, 17(5), 619-636.

doi:10.1177/1077801211407477

Johnson, L., Todd, M., & Subramanian, G. (2005). Violence in police families: Work-family spillover. *Journal of Family Violence*, 20(1), 3-12. 10.1007/s10896-005-1504-4

Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/233220500>

“Lethality Assessment Program.” (2005). *Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence*, October 17, Retrieved from lethalityassessmentprogram.org/.

National Coalition Against Domestic Violence. (2017). *NCADV - Learn More*. Retrieved October 20, 2017, from <https://ncadv.org/learn-more>

Reidy, D. E., Berke, D. S., Gentile, B., & Zeichner, A. (2014). Man enough? Masculine discrepancy stress and intimate partner violence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 68, 160-164. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.04.021

Smith, S.G., Chen, J., Basile, K.C., Gilbert, L.K., Merrick, M.T., Patel, N., Walling, M., & Jain, A. (2012). The national intimate partner and sexual violence survey (NISVS): 2010-2012 State report. Atlanta, GA: *National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*, retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/NISVS-StateReportBook.pdf>

“Violence Prevention.” (n.d.) *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*, 22 Aug. 2017, retrieved from www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/index.html.