

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindor

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

2004

Abused women's perspectives on the criminal justice system's response to domestic violence.

Paula C. Barata
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Barata, Paula C., "Abused women's perspectives on the criminal justice system's response to domestic violence." (2004). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 878.
<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/878>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

Abused Women's Perspectives on the
Criminal Justice System's Response to Domestic Violence

by

Paula C. Barata

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
Through the Department of Psychology
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

2004

© 2004 Paula C. Barata



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*
ISBN: 0-612-92541-2
Our file *Notre référence*
ISBN: 0-612-92541-2

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this dissertation.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de ce manuscrit.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the dissertation.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Abstract

In the last five years a number of studies have been conducted that have given abused women voice in the discussion about whether or not the criminal justice system (CJS) can be helpful to them. These studies have used a variety of methods and examined different questions, but they have not considered how women's views of separate parts of the CJS come together in their perspectives about the system as a whole. The purpose of this study was to better understand battered women's views about the criminal justice system (CJS), and how those views are integrated into complex perspectives for individual women. Q methodology was used. Fifty-eight abused and formally abused women were recruited to represent a broad range of experiences and perspectives. They sorted 72 statements about domestic violence and the CJS on a large template that ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Principal component analysis with varimax rotation was performed and the resulting factors were analysed for meaning. A small number of women who represented each factor were interviewed to aid in this interpretation. Five perspectives were identified representing divergent views of the CJS: 1) Trust in the CJS; 2) Disappointment in the CJS; 3) Victims should have input into the CJS and be sure they want to use it; 4) The CJS cannot protect women and can make matters worse; and 5) The CJS should be used for her safety, for his rehabilitation, and for justice despite its problems. The perspectives that emerged are new in their complexity and in their substance. Overall, the emergence of multiple perspectives as opposed to one polarized perspective has theoretical, methodological, and applied implications for research and practice. The description of each of the perspectives expressed by the women in this study may also be useful in advising other women who hold similar perspectives.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the women who participated in this research by generously offering their time and openly sharing their views. Their desire to help me with my studies and to provide information that might help other women was heartening. Participants were recruited from a number of organizations, and I would like to thank the people in those organizations that took time out of their busy schedules to help me. In particular, I would like to thank Donna Miller who has taken an interest in my research from the beginning and Donna Stewart who made working while completing a dissertation feasible.

I was fortunate to have an exceptional dissertation supervisor. Charlene Senn has provided invaluable insight, practical advice, and much needed mentorship. Charlene, thank-you for taking a chance on a student who had fallen behind and still insisted on (sort of) moving away.

My committee members carefully read through a number of long drafts and offered suggestions that greatly improved the quality of this dissertation. Frank, thank-you for your encouragement and advice, not only with respect to this work, but throughout my graduate school years. Kathy, thank-you for your attention to detail and suggestions for clarity. Ruth, thank-you for providing expertise in my topic area and for challenging my word choices.

The enormity of this work inevitably leaked into my personal life. This sometimes made me cranky and on a few occasions made me unbearable to live with. Mario, thank you for not only continuing to live with me, but for accepting that this was

something I needed to do. You started hearing that I would be done in “a couple of years” five years ago, but supported me through it all anyway.

Mom and dad, thank you for always encouraging me and for making me believe that going to university was a given. You had faith in my choices even when you didn't always understand what I was doing or why I was doing it. Thank you also for generously awarding me many tuition and emergency scholarships.

Jessica, thank you for letting me live with you and your family for days at a time on a regular basis. Your hospitality made everything doable and our nightcaps and chats made it all fun.

A number of other friends encouraged throughout this process and gave me diverse kinds of support that ranged from theoretical advice on the dissertation, to cooking dinner, to clapping loudly. Thank you Brenda, Dave, Bubli, Jacquie, Lena, and Sherry.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
List of Tables.....	x
List of Appendices.....	xi
Introduction.....	1
A Historical Look at the Criminal Justice Response to Domestic Violence.....	6
Academic Perspectives on the Role that the Criminal Justice System Should Play in Domestic Violence Cases.....	13
Increase/decrease Violence.....	16
Empowerment/Disempowerment.....	18
Demonstrate the Seriousness of the Crime.....	22
Adding Survivors' Voices to Academic Perspectives.....	23
Satisfaction with the Criminal Justice System.....	24
Decision to Use or Continue to Use the Criminal Justice System.....	27
Views about Police.....	35
Views about Prosecution and the Court Process.....	39
Views About Mandatory Interventions.....	41
Views about Power and Empowerment.....	48
Strengths and Limitations of Studies that have Added Survivors' Voices.....	50
Survivor's Varying Perspectives on the Criminal Justice System as a Function of the Stage of Abuse.....	53
Theoretical Models.....	53
Four Stages of Abuse.....	61
Prelude to physical abuse.....	64
Denying the abuse and hoping for better times.....	66
Labeling the abuse and actively coping with escalating violence.....	70
Arriving at nonviolence and healing.....	74
Possible Variations of Views on the Criminal Justice System by Stages.....	79
The Justification for this Study.....	80

Method.....	84
Q Methodology.....	84
Participants.....	87
Materials.....	91
The Q Sort.....	91
Identification of Stages.....	94
Background Questionnaire.....	96
Interview.....	96
Procedure.....	97
Results.....	99
Participant Demographics and Experiences.....	99
Check for Participant Diversity: P-Set Structure.....	99
Participants' Experiences with the Criminal Justice System.....	99
Stages of Abuse.....	101
Participants' Use of Victim Services.....	102
Q Analysis.....	102
Interpretation of Factors.....	104
Factor One: Trust in the Criminal Justice System.....	109
Positive attitude toward people in the CJS.....	109
The CJS can be trusted to work in the victim's best interest.....	113
Using the CJS demonstrates the seriousness of abuse.....	116
Women should use the CJS.....	118
Demographics and experiences of factor one.....	120
Summary of factor one.....	121
Factor Two: Disappointment in the CJS.....	121
The CJS has the potential to demonstrate the seriousness of abuse with strong actions.....	122
The CJS does not treat wife abuse as seriously as it should.....	123
A negative view of the CJS and the people who work in the system.....	125
Most Women should use the CJS, but with some trepidation.....	127
Demographics and experiences of factor two.....	129
Summary of factor two.....	130
Factor Three: Victims Should Have Input into the CJS, And be Sure They Want to Use it.....	130
Forcing the CJS on victims will not help, but individualized responses might.....	130
Women should be sure before they engage the CJS.....	134
Emotional issues affecting views on CJS.....	135
Not against using CJS.....	137

Demographics and experiences of factor three.....	139
Summary of factor three.....	139
Factor Four: The CJS Cannot Protect Women and Can Make Matters Worse...	140
The CJS is not a deterrent and cannot protect women.....	140
The CJS cannot be trusted to work in the victim's best interest.....	142
CJS does not provide justice coupled with negative attitude toward police...	144
Emotional issues affecting views on CJS.....	146
Would not use the CJS, especially for prosecution.....	150
Demographics and experiences of factor four.....	151
Summary of factor four.....	152
Factor Five: The CJS Should be Used for Her Safety, for His Rehabilitation, and for Justice Despite its Problems.....	152
Using the CJS can stop the abuse.....	153
The CJS should be used for justice (punishment) and rehabilitation.....	157
Court experience and Crown attorneys are viewed negatively.....	161
Women should use the CJS despite its problems.....	164
Demographics and experiences of factor five.....	165
Summary of factor five.....	166
Comparing Stages of Abuse to Factors.....	166
Discussion.....	171
Issues that Stood Out in the Women's Perspectives.....	172
Satisfaction with the Criminal Justice System.....	172
Views about the People in the Criminal Justice System.....	175
Views about Mandatory Intervention.....	179
Demonstrating the Seriousness of Abuse.....	183
Punishment and Rehabilitation.....	185
Who Will Use the CJS? The Influences of Past Experiences.....	186
Survivors' Varying Perspectives on the Criminal Justice System as a Function of the Stage of Abuse.....	188
Limitations and Strengths.....	194
Implications of the Perspectives that Emerged.....	197
The 'Trust in the CJS' Perspective.....	205
The 'Disappointment in the CJS' Perspective.....	206
The 'Victims Should Have Input Into the CJS and be Sure They Want to Use it' Perspective.....	208
'The CJS Cannot Protect Women and Can Make Matters Worse' Perspective..	209
'The CJS Should be Used for her Safety, for his Rehabilitation, and for Justice Despite its Problems' Perspective.....	211
Conclusion.....	212

References.....	213
Appendix A: Concourse.....	228
Appendix B: Q Sort Statements.....	238
Appendix C: Q Statement Template.....	244
Appendix D: Record Sheet.....	245
Appendix E: Relationship Events.....	246
Appendix F: Definitions of Stages.....	250
Appendix G: Background Questionnaire.....	252
Appendix H: Interview Guide.....	256
Appendix I: General Instructions.....	257
Appendix J: Informed Consent Letter.....	258
Appendix K: Card Sorting Instructions.....	260
Appendix L: Definitions of Criminal Justice Terms.....	262
Appendix M: Relationship Events Questionnaire Instructions.....	263
Appendix N: Background Questionnaire Instructions.....	264
Appendix O: Debriefing Form.....	265
Appendix P: Informed Consent for Meeting.....	266
Appendix Q: Prototype Factor Q Sorts.....	268
Appendix R: Standard Errors.....	287
Appendix S: Statements that Significantly Differentiate Between Factors.....	288
Vita Auctoris.....	293

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	P-Set Structure.....	88
2	Balanced Block Design: Number of Q sort items followed in parenthesis by the number of items in the concrete concourse.....	93
3	Participant Demographics.....	100
4	Factor Loadings.....	105
5	Overall Chi-square Analysis of the Number of Women in Each Factor by Stage of Abuse.....	168
6	Individual Chi-square Analysis for Factor Four and Five Separately - Number of Women in Each Factor by Stages of Abuse.....	169
7	Overall Chi-square Analysis of the Number of Women in Each Factor by Experience with the Criminal Justice System.....	170

List of Appendices

<u>Appendix</u>		<u>Page</u>
A	Concourse.....	228
B	Q Sort Statements.....	238
C	Q Statement Template.....	244
D	Record Sheet.....	245
E	Relationship Events.....	246
F	Definitions of Stages.....	250
G	Background Questionnaire.....	252
H	Interview Guide.....	256
I	General Instructions.....	257
J	Informed Consent Letter.....	258
K	Card Sorting Instructions.....	260
L	Definitions of Criminal Justice Terms.....	262
M	Relationship Events Questionnaire Instructions.....	263
N	Background Questionnaire Instructions.....	264
O	Debriefing Form.....	265
P	Informed Consent for Meeting.....	266
Q	Prototype Factor Q Sorts.....	268
R	Standard Errors.....	287
S	Statements that Significantly Differentiate Between Factors.....	288

Introduction

What role should the criminal justice system play in cases of domestic violence against women? This question has been discussed at length in academic literature in the last 20 years, but it is important to note that the discussions are relatively new in comparison to the history of the criminal justice system itself. Despite early efforts to curtail domestic violence through laws, violence in the home was usually considered a private matter that was ignored or, if unusually severe, dealt with by family or friends. The extent of the problem in contemporary society was not well known until activists in the 1970s made a concentrated effort to bring the problem to the attention of the public in Canada, Britain, and the United States (Dobash & Dobash, 1992) and researchers began describing the kind of abuse that women suffered (Dobash & Dobash, 1979). Relatively recent research in Canada suggests that 29% of ever married or common law women have experienced physical assault by an intimate partner in their lifetime (Johnson & Sacco, 1995). A more recent survey found that 8% of women had experienced intimate partner violence in the previous five years (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000). During the 1970s, the criminal justice system started to be seen as an area of potential utility for victims. Advocates argued that battered women should be given an opportunity for justice, that existing laws against assault should be enforced, and that new laws stressing the criminal nature of battering were needed (Dobash & Dobash, 1992). Domestic violence against women was no longer a hidden phenomena but visible, opening a path to productive, passionate, and sometimes contentious discussion about what should be done to eliminate the problem.

Particularly controversial is the continuing debate about the role that the criminal justice system should play in cases of domestic violence against women. Different viewpoints came from researchers with psychological (Walker, 1984), sociological (Straus & Gelles, 1986), or societal (Yllo, 1993) perspectives. Similarly, criminal justice officials and victim advocates brought in new perspectives. Adding to the complexity, two individuals who approach domestic violence against women from a similar perspective can reach different conclusions about the criminal justice system's ability to help victims. As I will demonstrate in the literature review, academics have voiced many opinions and reached few decisive conclusions about how best to proceed. Women who have been abused add a particularly important perspective because their views are shaped by their own efforts to secure their safety and by direct experience with the violence, the batterer, and the criminal justice system. This also makes their views especially complex. Like the academics, abused women's voices are not unified, but understanding the intricacy of their views is essential in making the criminal justice system work for all battered women whether or not they choose to use it.

The main purpose of this research was to better understand abused women's views about the criminal justice system, and how those views are integrated into a cohesive perspective for individual women. A secondary purpose was to examine how victims' perspectives may be influenced by the stage they are in within the abusive relationship.

Before delving into the main elements of this introduction, a discussion of the use of the language in this field, and in particular, my own use of the terms "victims," "survivors," and "battered" is necessary. The criminal justice system labels women who

have been abused as “the victim” or more commonly, “the alleged victim”. Most mainstream social science research that examines the criminal justice system’s response to domestic violence has also used the term “victim.” In contrast, many feminist authors in the 1980s began using the term “survivor” instead of “victim”. They argued that this change to the use of the term “survivor” would counter the passiveness and powerlessness implied by the term “victim” and instead emphasize agency and ability (Kelly, 1988). In other words, when it was originally conceived the term “survivor” was used to replace the term “victim”.

The term “survivor” became widespread in the feminist therapy community as a way to help women replace the victimization paradigm with something that could acknowledge their ability to cope (Anderson and Gold, 1994). The term “survivor” has also become widespread in what Kelly, Burton, and Regan (1996) call commercialized feminism in which the notion of a journey from “victim” to “survivor” is used as a metaphor in self-help books and therapeutic work. Although this metaphor can be helpful to some women, Kelly et al. (1996) emphasize that this either/or approach that moves from victim to survivor misrepresents many women’s realities. It also “prevents an alternative conceptualization where the two concepts refer to different aspects of experience: being victimized is what was done –a statement of historical fact; survival is what individuals who are victimized achieve in relation to, and often in spite of, that historical reality” (Kelly et al., 1996, p.92). The use of the term “survivor” is problematic in that it is not suitable for women who actively resist, and cope with abuse, but are killed by their partners or take their own lives. The term “survivor” is also a problem for women who are moving past the abuse and attempting to take on new

identities that no longer incorporate abuse or survival from abuse (Wuest & Merritt-Gray 2001). Spry (1995) has critiqued the use of both terms because they similarly reduce the woman's whole experience to someone else's action; "a woman's body is viewed as surviving a powerful force or being victim of a powerful force, rather than existing as a powerful force in its own right." (p. 28).

Kirkwood (1993), who prefers the term "survivor," has pointed out that both terms are personally useful to battered women in helping them understand what has happen to them. The term "victim" helps women in two ways: it allows them to name what was done to them by the abuser and how they once acted (Kirkwood, 1993). Conversely, "survivor" allows them to describe the positive actions they have taken to free themselves from the abuse (Kirkwood, 1993). Both terms can also be important in helping researchers identify and describe the experiences of their participants (Mann, 2000) and the stages that women go through in abusive relationships (Ferraro & Johnson, 1983; Merritt-Gray & Wuest, 1995).

In this paper, I recognize that a particular woman may choose to identify as a victim, a survivor, neither, or both. I also realize that an identification as a victim or a survivor does not necessarily correspond with ending the abuse. It is a fluid identity in that a woman may feel like a victim some of the time and a survivor at other times. For this reason I perceive these experiences as intertwined, and as such I use the terms somewhat interchangeably. When I refer to abused women in general I mean all abused women, and so I believe either and both terms apply. However, when referring to stages of abuse, I tend to use "victim" in the earlier stages and "survivor" in the later stages. This initially occurred somewhat unconsciously, but I have chosen to keep my original

terms because the literature on the stages of abuse emphasizes the types of coping mechanisms that have come to be identified with either a victim or a survivor response. When referring to past research, I have used the terminology of the original authors, and in the materials that participants were given, I have used neither term in order to avoid labeling women.

With regard to the term “battered,” Johnson and Ferraro (2000) note that the term “is generally understood by professionals and by the public as primarily a problem of heterosexual male control of women partners” (p.946). Osthoff (2002) defines battering as the systematic use of violence and other coercive behaviours to exert power, induce fear, and control another person’s behaviour. It is within this context of male control over women that I also use the term “battered”. Johnson and colleagues distinguish patriarchal terrorism (called intimate terrorism in subsequent publications) from other types of violence such as common couple violence (Johnson, 1995; Johnson & Ferraro, 2000). The pattern of violence seen in patriarchal terrorism is most closely associated with battery for a number of reasons. It is almost entirely a male pattern of violence against women; it uses not only violence, but also other tactics such as emotional abuse in order to control behaviour; it is likely to escalate over time; and it is likely to involve serious injury (Johnson, 1995; Johnson & Ferraro, 2000). When I use the term battered, I am referring to women who have experienced patriarchal terrorism at the hands of a male intimate partner. I believe this use of the term is appropriate because I am examining women’s perceptions of the criminal justice system from the standpoint of victims. In addition, the literature reviewed for this study was also more likely to have captured patriarchal violence rather than other kinds of violence because the participants were

largely drawn from women's shelters and the CJS. Other types of couple violence are usually found in large randomized nationwide surveys that call participants at home (Johnson, 1995; Johnson & Ferraro, 2000).

This introduction begins with a brief historical look at the criminal justice system's response to domestic violence against women, which has changed dramatically in the last 30 years. Next, there is a review of the perspectives expressed by academics about the role the criminal justice system should play in domestic violence cases. This is followed by the more recent, but growing, literature on the perspectives of the victims themselves. Victims' complex and varied perspectives are described, and the approaches to exploring survivors' views are highlighted. Next, survivors' similar experiences through different stages of the abusive relationship are described, and how victims may use the criminal justice system differently depending on the stage they are in is explained. Finally, the rationale for this study is outlined.

A Historical Look at the Criminal Justice Response to Domestic Violence

The Canadian, English, and American systems of law have taken similar approaches to wife abuse. English common law of the 18th century allowed husbands to physically punish their wives, but put restraints on the amount of punishment. For instance, the law permitted punches and kicks to the back, so long as they did not leave marks (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1996; Dobash & Dobash, 1979). The distinction between appropriate beatings and illegal beatings was of course difficult to judge and the law was rarely enforced. When the violence exceeded socially acceptable norms, it was generally friends and family who sought revenge rather than law officials who sought justice. Early American laws were similar in that they expressed some disapproval for severe acts

of violence by husbands against wives, but they allowed for some physical punishment (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1996). The Massachusetts Body of Laws and Liberties enacted by the Puritans in 1641 expressly made domestic violence illegal, but the laws quickly evolved to allow for some physical discipline. The result was that only 12 cases of domestic violence were ever heard between 1633 and 1802 and virtually no initiatives by the criminal justices system were made to control domestic violence (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1996). In 1871 a court decision in Alabama took away husbands' rights to beat their wives, but the laws soon evolved again to allow for some physical punishment.

A few changes to legislation were made in the 19th century that might have improved the plight of some abused women. English divorce laws changed in 1857 making it easier for couples to divorce in England, but Canada did not follow suit. This was especially true in Quebec where most residents were Catholic and where laws based on French legislation had never recognized divorce (Backhouse, 1991). A campaign against wife beating in England produced legislation in 1878 called the Matrimonial Causes Act (Smart & Brophy, 1985). This legislation removed the notion that a wife was the property of her husband, but did little in a practical sense for women that were being battered. Women had to first gain a conviction of assault in the criminal courts, before they could apply to a civil court for permission to live separately from their husbands. In Canada, legislation granting property rights to married women, allowing some to escape abusive marriages, was passed in New Brunswick in 1851, twenty years before similar legislation was passed in England.

Backhouse (1991) describes the case of Esther Hawley Ham, which illustrates how difficult it was for women in abusive marriages to seek a separation from their

husbands. Esther lived in Upper Canada in the early 19th century and was the victim of emotional and physical abuse at the hands of her husband. With the help and support of her parents she separated from her husband. When she first went to live with her parents, she brought her only child, but her husband soon secured custody of the child and thus, separation from her husband also meant separation from her son. Twelve years after the separation, she attempted to gain alimony. At the time, divorce was not legal, but a wife could live apart from her husband and a male relative could apply for alimony for the wife's upkeep; however, the court must be satisfied that she was justified in living apart from her husband. Although many testified that they had seen Esther's husband, George Ham, beat his wife, including a neutral witness who had seen him chastise Esther with a whip, the judge determined that this was not just cause for separation because "fear and terror of life" (Backhouse, 1991, p.174) were not proven. The judge in the case, Chief Justice William Campbell, emphasized to the jury that moderate chastisement was the right of the husband and that the parents should have sent their daughter home when she first came to them for help. The jury of 12 men found that she did not deserve alimony. This case set the stage for 100 years of Canadian judicial precedent denying women basic protection against violent husbands (Backhouse, 1991). A similar verdict was handed down in Quebec in 1856 by Judge Charles-Dewey Day of the Superior court in Montreal. In this case the wife was so severely beaten that the husband was arrested and prosecuted, but the judge determined that although morally she may have reason to leave, she did not legally have reason to leave, and thus she was entitled to nothing (Backhouse, 1991).

One hundred years later, little had changed with regards to criminalizing wife abuse. Technically beating one's wife was a crime, but there were few consequences for

men who committed this crime. Pressure from the women's movement of the early 1970s resulted in an awareness of the absence and ineffectiveness of many laws, and to changes to some laws and procedures concerning domestic violence. For instance, in America, marital rape was not considered a crime until 1981, and was thereafter still largely ignored by the police (Zorza, 1992). Likewise, in Canada, spousal immunity for sexual assault was not removed until 1983 (Dawson, 1994). English activists from the battered women's movement met with government officials in 1975 and domestic violence was acknowledged as a serious problem. This meeting served to reaffirm that assaulted women were due the full protection of the law, but no changes were made to police practices. Soon after this, changes in legislation occurred in the form of the Domestic Violence and Matrimonial Proceedings Act (DVA) as well as the Domestic Proceedings and Magistrates' Court Act (DPMCA), which were introduced in 1976 (McCann, 1985).

In Canada, the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women brought the issue to the attention of the public. On May 12, 1982 an MP raised a question for the minister responsible for the Status of Women citing from the Advisory Council's report that one out of every ten women is assaulted by her husband (Dawson, 1994). Many members of the House erupted into laughter and ridicule because of the apparent absurdity of the claim (Dawson, 1994; Faubert & Hinch, 1996). When the government was assured that the Advisory Council's report was not a joke, the report resulted in an intensive investigation of the criminal justice system's response to the problem (Faubert et al., 1996). In that same year, the House adopted a "resolution calling for police to lay

charges in all instances where there was reasonable and probable ground that an offence had occurred” (Faubert & Hinch, 1996, p.132).

In the United States, activists met in the White House in 1977 to discuss the problem of domestic violence (Dobash & Dobash, 1992). Non-arrest policies were criticized for denying women equal protection under the law. Another important impetus for changes was pressure from individual women, who sued their cities for damages because the police did not provide adequate protection. Two landmark cases were filed in 1976: *Bruno v. Codd* was filed against the New York City Police and the case of *Scott v. Hart* was filed against the Oakland, California Police (Dobash & Dobash, 1992; Sparks, 1997; Zorza, 1992). In both cases, the police departments agreed to change their policies and arrest suspects of domestic disputes using the same criteria as that used for stranger assault (Dobash & Dobash, 1992). Perhaps the most famous case occurred 1984 when Tracy Thurman, who was brutally attacked and stabbed by her husband after multiple attempts to secure protection from the police, successfully sued the City of Torrington, Connecticut because of their non-arrest policy in domestic violence cases and was awarded 2.3 million dollars (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1996; Frisch, 1992; Sparks, 1997; Zorza, 1992). Other police departments soon adopted similar policies in order to avoid being sued and being liable for attorney fees and damages.

As recently as the early 1980s, research demonstrated that domestic violence was not being treated as a serious crime by the criminal justice system in the United States (Hemmons, 1981; Oppenlander, 1982) or in Canada (Jaffe & Burris, 1981). Since that time, many policy and procedural changes have followed, beginning with mandatory arrest or mandatory charging. Mandatory arrest directs police to arrest perpetrators of

intimate partner violence when there is reason to believe that an assault has occurred, regardless of whether or not the victim wants the batterer arrested. Mandatory charging is similar, but directs police to lay charges. Extensive research has been conducted with respect to the deterrent effects of mandatory arrest in the United States (Berk, Campbell, Klap, & Western, 1992; Garner, Gagan, & Maxwell, 1995; Gelles, 1993b; Pate & Hamilton, 1992; Schmidt & Sherman, 1993; Sherman & Berk, 1984) and of mandatory charging in Canada (Burriss & Jaffe, 1983; Jaffe, Wolfe, Telford, & Austin, 1986; London Family Court Clinic Inc., 1991). The impact that this research has had on policy changes, however, is unclear. Some credited the policy changes in the United States to the results of the Sherman and Berk (1984) study, which demonstrated that arrest was better at reducing future violence than simple mediation or asking the offender to leave for eight hours (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1996; Gelles, 1993a). However, it is clear from the dates that the momentum for change had begun long before this first study. For instance, reform to arrest laws in the United States began in 1977 in Pennsylvania by encouraging a proactive police response that included pro-arrest policies in cases of domestic violence (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1993). It is also clear from the discussion above that there was political pressure for a change in police policy with respect to the arrest of batterers.

The criminal justice response to wife abuse in Canada and the United States has changed dramatically in the last 15 years. In conjunction with mandatory arrest and mandatory charging policies, different jurisdictions have introduced other policies to keep domestic violence cases from being dismissed before prosecution and to ensure that enough evidence is available to achieve a guilty plea or a conviction. Examples include no-drop prosecution, subpoena of the victim, videotaped statements, photographing

injuries, and domestic violence courts with specially trained personnel (Women Abuse Council of Toronto, 2001). Research has not been extensive with respect to the deterrent effect of these policies. One exception was a study that examined the rates of future violence for women who were permitted to drop prosecution compared to those who were not. The researchers reported that permitting women to drop charges reduced their risk of future violence, which led them to conclude that no-drop policies increased the risk of violence (Ford & Regoli, 1993). However, as will be discussed shortly, there is a serious problem in drawing this conclusion from the data.

There is evidence that the criminal justice system is working to bring more cases to justice. In London, Ontario the number of charges drastically increased from 12 in 1979 to 320 in 1990 despite a small decrease in wife assault occurrences (London Family Court Clinic Inc., 1991). There was also a decrease in the percentages of cases that were dismissed from 38.4% in 1979 to 10.9% in 1990 and dramatic increases in the percentage of cases that received a fine, jail time, or probation (London Family Court Clinic Inc., 1991). The Women Abuse Council of Toronto (2001) reported that a variety of evidence is now used in domestic violence court cases in Toronto including officer testimony, medical reports, 911 calls, photographs, videotapes, and audiotapes. This indicates that wife abuse is being taken much more seriously now than it has been in the past.

In summary, the criminal justice response to domestic violence has gone from condoning wife abuse, to criminalizing it without enforcement, to developing increasingly restrictive policies that direct police and prosecutor actions and force more cases into the criminal justice system and more victims into the courtroom. Whether or

not these policies are always helpful to victims has led to considerable debate among the academic community. These views are considered in the next section.

*Academic Perspectives on the Role that the Criminal Justice System Should Play in
Domestic Violence Cases*

As discussed, in the previous section on the history of the criminal justice response to domestic violence, wife beating was largely condoned by the law in the 19th century and largely ignored by the law in the 20th century. Given this history, it is perhaps not surprising that some feminist authors have questioned whether laws, legal reform, and the judicial system as a whole can be used to help women in general (Atkins & Hogett, 1984; Dobash & Dobash, 1992; Ellis, 1980; MacKinnon, 1983; Smart, 1977; Smart, 1989) and victims of domestic violence in particular (Atkins & Hogett, 1984; Dobash & Dobash, 1992; Lakeman, 2000; McCann, 1985). Ellis (1980) noted that women are unequal before the law because they were invisible when laws were created. During the emergence of bureaucratic justice in the 19th century, women were increasingly excluded and played little or no role in setting up the current system of justice, thus men's values and world views dominated in the new system (Dobash & Dobash, 1992; Ellis, 1980; Smart, 1989). A number of authors have noted that the law reinforces patriarchy (Lakeman 2000; MacKinnon, 1983; Smart; 1989). This has led some to suggest that using the law may be futile because it "simply traps feminists in its discourse" and ultimately gives more power to the legal system (Dobash & Dobash, 1992, p. 148).

Some authors have acknowledged a hesitation toward using the law and do not see the law or formal legal equality as a complete solution to domestic violence, but do

see some benefits and propose ways of proceeding with caution (Braithwaite & Daly, 1998; Chunn, 1999; Dobash & Dobash, 1992; Koss, 2000; Marshall, 1997; Sparks, 1997). Snider (1994) contends that feminist efforts around law are focusing on punishment and victimization at the expense of empowerment and transformation. She argues that the law should be used in only a limited manner to gain concrete rights (e.g., day care and minimum wage) as opposed to abstract ones (e.g., equality). Dobash and Dobash (1992) have been critical of state intervention in women's lives, but have not rejected the notion of any state involvement. They have suggested an "enabling state" (p.109), which can help prevent tyranny by limiting the power of patriarchal institutions and by making the state more accountable. This state incorporates family affairs into state politics, which allows for a consideration of violence against women without which the problem is ignored. Dobash and Dobash (1992) have written that the state is part of the problem of violence against women, but for that reason the state needs to be part of the solution. In this view of the state, laws against domestic violence are unlikely to eliminate the problem, but may limit the abuse of power by husbands and law officials, and may protect individual women from some of this abuse. Thus, state involvement, including the law, may play a small role in a more complete solution that ends domestic violence.

Sparks (1997) examined the more specific intervention of police in domestic violence, and asked whether or not the police could bring about fundamental change in the social conditions that perpetuate violence against women. She also asked what consequences might result from giving the state primary responsibility for reducing this kind of violence. Sparks suggested that different strategies might be needed. Police

and/or state involvement might be key in only the first strategy, which is to protect women in immediate danger. Authors who propose that the law be used in a limited manner see formal equality for women as a necessary beginning to end domestic violence and perceive the potential benefits of law as worth battered women's involvement in it (Braithwaite & Daly, 1998; Chunn, 1999; Dobash & Dobash, 1992; Koss, 2000; Marshall, 1997; Sparks, 1997). Law can make powerful patriarchal institutions, such as the family, more accountable, and it can also bring attention to domestic violence in ways that less formal means cannot.

More specific discussion about the role the criminal justice system should play with respect to domestic violence has taken place on the merits of policies such as mandatory arrest and mandatory charging, which take decision making control away from victims. The spark for much of the discussion was a series of studies that examined the deterrent effect of mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence. The first research study was Sherman and Berk's 1984 American study, which found that arrest reduced future violence. Six studies were then conducted to replicate certain aspects of the Sherman and Berk (1984) study, while also expanding the number of variables and the populations that were examined. These six studies resulted in contradictory findings, and thus different authors came to different conclusions about whether or not mandatory arrest was effective at reducing future violence. (See Berk, Campbell, Klap & Western, 1992; Garner, Gangan, & Mazzwll, 1995; Gelles, 1993b; Schmidt & Sherman, 1993 for a critical look at the mandatory arrest studies). There were a number of methodological flaws in these studies (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1996; Faubert & Hinch, 1996; Gelles, 1993a), which are beyond the scope of this introduction. It is sufficient to say that the results of

these studies did not give a clear indication of whether or not mandatory arrest reduces future violence. Nevertheless, as we have seen, mandatory arrest and mandatory charging policies as well as a number of mandatory prosecution policies have become the standard in many jurisdictions in Canada and the United States.

A review of the academic opinions about the merits of mandatory intervention policies provides a good overview of what authors believe is best for victims. The reader will note that the voices of the victims themselves are noticeably absent, as the ‘experts’ provide their opinions. As Loseke and Cahill (1984) note, there are certainly problems with relying solely on expert opinions, but this research has provided a beginning in a dialogue about the role of the CJS in cases of domestic violence. For the sake of simplicity, I have organized the discussion about these policies in terms of arguments for mandatory intervention policies and against such policies in favor instead of more victim, police, and prosecutor discretion. Three of the most widely discussed effects of these policies are considered. That is, whether or not they (a) increase or decrease violence, (b) empower or disempower victims, and (c) demonstrate the seriousness of the crime to the batterer and to society.

Increase/decrease Violence

The impact of mandatory intervention policies on violence has largely focused on the positive effects of deterring future violence (future violence is usually operationally defined in the literature as occurring within six months) and the negative effects of inciting retaliatory violence (violence specifically perpetrated as payback for arrest and/or prosecution). The opinions about the deterrent effect of mandatory arrest rest upon the analyses of the Sherman and Berk (1984) study and the research that followed. Some

have argued that mandatory arrest increases violence for at least some battered women because four of the studies provided no support for decreased violence after arrest and some showed increased violence for some women (Pate & Hamilton, 1992; Sherman, 1992; Sherman, Smith, Schmidt, & Rogan, 1992). This conclusion was largely based on reports of increased violence after arrest when the batterer was unemployed (Pate & Hamilton, 1992; Sherman et al., 1992) and unmarried (Sherman et al., 1992).

Consequently some have speculated that the deterrent effects of arrest work only through mediating factors such as the degrading aspect of punishment, which are lessened if the offender has already gained exposure to the judicial system (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1996). Others have argued that mandatory arrest should be the preferred policy because it deters domestic violence better than anything else that has been tried (Berk, 1993; Stark, 1993).

Few studies have used violent recidivism as a measure of the effectiveness of other mandatory intervention policies, such as no-drop prosecution. An exception compared a no-drop policy to a drop permitted policy using victim reported violence (Ford & Regoli, 1993). These authors found that permitting victims to drop charges significantly reduced their risk of further violence, although the effect was largely due to the option of permitting women to drop, rather than the actual dropping of charges. That is, women who were permitted to drop, but chose not to drop, were less likely to experience violence; however women who actually dropped did not benefit. The authors suggested that women might drop charges in order to have a means with which to bargain for their security. However, there was a serious problem in the data because none of the cases initiated by on scene arrest were allowed to drop. This makes the results of this study difficult to interpret because the circumstances of women who initiate charges may

be very different from those who do not. Arguments that mandatory intervention policies other than mandatory arrest reduce violence have focused on retaliatory violence and have been based on rational arguments rather than empirical evidence. The argument is that removing the responsibility for prosecution from the victim and placing it in the hands of the criminal justice system might lead to less retaliatory violence because the state and not the victim files charges against the batterer and has control over whether or not the prosecution proceeds (Hart, 1993; Davis & Smith, 1995; Lerman, 1981). Whether or not batterers actually believe that the victim did not lay the charges and cannot have them dropped is, however, not known.

Of concern is that the reduction of violence on the day or night the offender is arrested has largely been excluded from the academic discussions about the effects of mandatory arrest and charging. This oversight is perhaps made because it is obvious that the immediate violence does stop if the batterer is taken away, albeit for only a short time. However, this short reprieve from the violence and the fear of violence can be an essential time for victims, providing them with time to think about what they will do next and perhaps plan for their security. As discussed in a latter section, the advantage of a temporary respite from violence is important to victims (Barata, 1999; Hoyle & Sanders, 2000), and should not be underestimated.

Empowerment/Disempowerment

The concept of empowerment is complex, which is apparent in the discussions about whether or not policies that remove decision-making control from survivors are empowering or disempowering. At times arguments for and against empowerment appear to be speaking of different concepts. Authors contending that mandatory arrest is

disempowering have noted that victim preference is ignored (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1993; Gelles, 1993a). That is, mandatory arrest and mandatory prosecution policies take away a victim's decision-making power. There are many reasons why a victim may not want the batterer arrested (e.g., fear of retaliation, trauma to the children, stigma, etc.) or prosecuted (e.g., lack of childcare or time to go to court, anxiety about testifying, economic costs, etc.), and having others ignore those reasons may be disempowering. Particularly worrisome is that the policies may disempower victims by defining them as criminals. For instance, there is concern that mandatory policies are increasing dual arrests in which both the victim and the batterer are arrested (Saunders, 1995; Sparks, 1997). Likewise, mandatory prosecution policies force some victims to take actions that result in criminal charges when they do not want to testify, as was the case of an Ontario woman who served one week in jail (reduced from a three month sentence) for refusing to testify against her fiancé (Platiel, 1984).

In contrast, Stark (1993) has argued that mandatory arrest empowers victims by reducing the expression of police bias against arrest. In other words, mandatory arrest forces the police to take the victim's complaint seriously. Similarly, mandatory prosecution policies force prosecutors to proceed with prosecution, when in the past prosecutors often discouraged victims from continuing (Cannings, 1984; Ford & Regoli, 1993). Certainly, combating bias against victims of domestic violence continues to be an important issue. Cretney and Davis (1997) and Erez and King (2000) demonstrated that the trivialization and stereotyping of domestic violence cases persists despite mandatory intervention laws.

A victim may also be empowered by having powerful criminal justice officials working on her side against the batterer, although this conceptualization of empowerment may be naïve (Hoyle & Sanders 2000). A powerful 'us' against 'him' argument for empowerment quickly breaks down if the victim does not want to be against the batterer. Another way that victims may be empowered is by being given the time and ability to make non-coerced informed decisions. Thus, mandatory arrest may be empowering because it gives the victim space in which to decide how to proceed, but mandatory prosecution policies may not be empowering in the same way (Hoyle & Sanders 2000).

A more modest argument in support of mandatory intervention policies is that they are not disempowering because they do not take away decision-making power. It is important to note that this argument does not imply that such policies are empowering, or that they are not disempowering for other reasons. Simply put, it may be that these policies do not take away decision-making power because victims never possessed this power to begin with. Without mandatory arrest, batterers are not arrested regardless of victim preference. With mandatory arrest, batterers are arrested regardless of victim preference. Similarly, before mandatory prosecution laws, victims who wanted to prosecute encountered barriers (Cannings, 1984; Sanders, 1988), and with mandatory prosecution laws victims who do not wish to prosecute encounter barriers. Whether or not a mandatory intervention policy is disempowering is thus largely based on the victim's preference and situation.

Adding to the complexity of empowerment versus disempowerment is that some women might not want the batterer arrested or prosecuted because they are coerced by the batterer or constrained by circumstances beyond their control (Hoyle & Sanders,

2000). For these women mandatory intervention policies may give them the encouragement they need to continue, especially if victims are supported through the process and their concerns about retaliation, finances, and the court process are dealt with effectively. However, some survivors may decide after weighing the costs and benefits of criminal justice actions that they prefer not to use the system, and for these women mandatory intervention policies may be disempowering. This idea is related to Peled, Eisidovits, Enosh, and Winstock's (2000) discussion of empowerment for battered women who choose to stay with their partners. These authors conceptually defined empowerment as "a process of enabling people to master their environments and achieve self-determination" (Peled et al., 2000, p.10). Using this definition they argued that some women who 'decide' to stay with their partners are not empowered because they stay for fear of retaliation or for other reasons beyond their control. However, some women may be empowered by their decision to remain in the relationship and end the abuse. The key is that these women know that they are able and willing to leave, but choose not to for the time being. Transferring this idea back to victims' use of the criminal justice system, some women may choose after weighing their options not to use the system, but know that they are able and willing to use it at a later date should they change their minds.

How empowerment is defined greatly affects the arguments for and against mandatory intervention policies. Are survivors empowered by decision-making power, by vicarious police and prosecutor power, by reduced police and prosecutor bias against them, or by something else? These are difficult questions to answer, given that survivors' definitions of empowerment have not been studied. To date, our notions of empowerment and disempowerment through using the criminal justice system are largely

based on academic reasoning. It is also important to determine the significance of empowerment for victims who use the criminal justice system. We can assume that survivors do not want to be disempowered by the system, but we have no reason to believe that they use or even expect the system to be a source of empowerment. Although empowerment would be a nice side effect, it may be unlikely and perhaps unnecessary for victims seeking more concrete results from the criminal justice system. Empowerment may be very important for the survivor's recovery, but it may have to be encouraged elsewhere.

Demonstrate the Seriousness of the Crime

An argument that has been advanced repeatedly by those who feel arrest is beneficial is that criminalizing domestic violence sends a strong message that this kind of behaviour is unacceptable and will not be tolerated (Buzawa, Austin, & Buzawa, 1995; Edwards, 1989; Pagelow, 1992; Stark, 1993). "In the long term criminalization will serve to convey a powerful message, creating a public attitude of intolerance of and repugnance towards violence against women" (Edwards, 1989, p.187). In the same way, Davis and Smith (1995) argued that prosecution should be pursued aggressively because the courts have an obligation to prosecute those who violate the law and that dropping charges sends the message that it is acceptable to break laws against domestic violence. Victims' perspectives need to be added to this argument. Do survivors perceive their partners as having learned that their violence is unacceptable?

Hoyle and Sanders (2000) noted that the reasons for implementing mandatory intervention policies rely on four assumptions: 1) taking choice away reduces retaliatory violence; 2) arrest and prosecution communicate to victims and offenders that domestic

violence is socially unacceptable; 3) the criminal justice system is responsible and capable of reducing the violence; 4) reasons for non-cooperation are invalid and contrary to the interests of the women who express them. The authors then pointed out that if assumptions 1-3 are incorrect, there is no wonder that some women fight participation in the criminal justice system, and that their decision to do so is entirely justified. What needs to be emphasized here is that the academic perspective has relied on many assumptions without taking the perspectives of victims into account. Survivors' views and beliefs about the criminal justice system are as important, if not more so, than academic assumptions.

Adding Survivors' Voices to Academic Perspectives

With a few exceptions, research on domestic violence and the criminal justice system did not examine victims' opinions about or experiences with the criminal justice system until the late 1990s. The exceptions include two early Canadian studies that examined the impact of police laying charges in incidents of wife abuse. In their design these studies included victims' impressions of mandatory charging and their satisfaction with police following the implementation of the policy (Jaffe et al., 1986; London Family Court Clinic Inc., 1991). A third study looked at, among other things, victims' satisfaction with taking out a restraining order (Horton, Simonidis, & Simonidis, 1987). And a fourth early study examined women's use of the criminal justice system as a power resource through in-depth interviews with 25 women (Ford, 1991). With so few studies examining the perspectives of victims, the assumptions made by academics dominated the discussions concerning the use of the criminal justice system in cases of domestic violence. More recently there has been a much needed surge of research in both the

United States and in Canada exploring victims' views about, and experiences with, using various aspects of the criminal justice system (Barata, 1999; Bennett, Goodman, & Dutton, 1999; Byrne, Kilpatrick, Howley, & Beatty, 1999; Coulter & Chez, 1997; Cretney & Davis, 1997; Erez & Belknap, 1998; Fischer & Rose, 1995; Fleury, 2000; Gielen et al., 2000; Gondolf, 1998; Hoyle & Sanders, 2000; Hutchison & Hirschel, 1998; Landau, 1998; Landau, 2000; Lewis, Dobash, Dobash, & Cavanagh, 2000; Malecha et al., 2000; Smith, 2000; Smith, 2001; Stephens & Sinden, 2000; Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996; Wiist & McFarlane, 1998; Wolf, Holt, Kernie, & Rivara, 2000).

These studies have used a variety of methods and examined different questions, but they are united in their perceived focus on learning more about survivors' perspectives. Some researchers have used a quantitative approach, whereas others have opted for qualitative in-depth interviews. Some have sought to answer questions about specific areas within the criminal justice system, while others have opted to learn about victims' general experiences with the system. It is important to note that because most of these studies have taken place within the last five years, we can assume that they have been conducted within the context of at least some mandatory intervention policies, although the authors rarely mention the specific policies in place.

Satisfaction with the Criminal Justice System

Many studies have included victim satisfaction, but the studies reviewed in this section made victim satisfaction a primary focus. Byrne et al. (1999) compared partner assault victims to nonpartner assault victims on their satisfaction and experiences with the criminal justice system. The participants had all had some involvement with the criminal justice system because they were recruited from a survey of crime victims. This study

involved 284 female participants who filled out a victim satisfaction scale and answered questions during a structured interview. The authors report that victims of intimate partner assault were significantly less satisfied with the police, prosecutors, victim assistance staff, judges, and the criminal justice system overall than were victims of nonpartner assault. The differences in satisfaction may be explained by their experiences with various members of the system. For instance, victims of partner violence were less likely to report that police officers demonstrated an interest in their feelings or that they tried to gather all necessary evidence, that prosecutors had taken their opinions into account, and that the prosecutors' office had encouraged them to attend the grand jury hearings. In addition, victims were more likely to indicate that the perpetrators of the violence were more likely to have been allowed to plead guilty to a lesser offence.

Rather than do a comparison of different victims, Fleury (2000) measured satisfaction with various components of the criminal justice system and then examined the relationship between satisfaction and various demographic and experiential markers. Participants had had extensive involvement with all components of the criminal justice system. Cluster analysis was used on four questions that measured satisfaction with the police response, the prosecuting attorney, the court process, and the court outcome. On average, participants were between neutral and somewhat satisfied with the police response and felt neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the other three aspects of the system. More interesting, however, were the results of the four clusters. High levels of satisfaction across all four components characterized the first cluster, containing 39% of the participants. The second cluster, aptly named "let down," was characterized by high levels of satisfaction with the police, neutral satisfaction with the prosecutor, and low

levels of satisfaction with the court process and court outcome. The third cluster was characterized by neutral satisfaction with the police, dissatisfaction with the prosecutor and the process, but satisfaction with the outcome. Low levels of satisfaction across all four components of the system characterized the fourth cluster. The results of the cluster analysis demonstrate that survivors' opinions about various aspects of the criminal justice system are quite varied despite the similar mean satisfaction ratings. The author also found a number of relationships between cluster membership and various survivor experiences. For instance, those in the most satisfied cluster were more likely to have assailants who had plead or were found guilty. Those in the "let down" cluster had experienced strikingly high levels of violence against them, and those in the dissatisfied cluster were most likely to be women who had attempted to have the charges dropped.

Horton et al. (1987) chose to examine a different aspect of the criminal justice system and looked at victims' uses and satisfaction with a temporary restraining order. What was measured in this study was quite different than the other two studies because all of the women in this study chose to engage in the criminal justice system by seeking a restraining order, which is likely reflected in the relatively high levels of satisfaction. Horton et al. found that 86% were satisfied with the results of their temporary restraining order, and 94% said that their decision to obtain a restraining order was a good one. The authors further reported that 78% of the women in the study showed no ambivalence about using the restraining order, that they were extremely committed to ending the relationship, and that this commitment did not waiver in the six month follow-up period. The authors noted comments from the participants such as, "It's a real dramatic move in

the relationship,” “You’ve got to be ready to call the police if you take out a restraining order,” and “You can’t just use it when you feel like it.”

The results of these studies suggest that satisfaction is not uniform. It varies between participants and between different aspects of the system. There is also evidence that satisfaction is not as high as it perhaps should be, given the dramatic changes to the criminal justice response since the mid 1980s. Victims of partner assault are not as satisfied as other victims and the relatively neutral levels of satisfaction found in Fleury’s (2000) very recent study are disappointing. The high levels of satisfaction in Horton et al.’s research (1987) are an interesting contrast. A possible explanation may be the deliberate choice that victims made in Horton et al. (1987) to go to the police to take out a temporary restraining order. Their commitment to use of the system could have led to high satisfaction not unlike the high rates of satisfaction seen in many service settings (Shaw, 1984). There could also be something particular about restraining orders, such as the ability to use or not use them, that survivors find satisfying.

Decision to Use or Continue to Use the Criminal Justice System

In contrast to the quantitative studies that have specifically looked at satisfaction, a number of studies exploring why survivors use or do not use the system have been qualitative. Bennett et al. (1999) asked 49 victims three questions about why they continued with pressing charges, what parts of the system made it easier or harder to follow-through with pressing charges, and what types of services would have been helpful. Victims were interviewed just after their first scheduled trial date (approximately 3 months after intake). Four themes arose under the overriding theme “obstacles presented by the system.” The first theme, “a confusing process”

encompassed the lack of understanding that many victims had about the system. Most were told what to expect and about the rules on the day of intake when they were least likely to absorb information. This lack of understanding had a profound impact on their interactions with the criminal justice system. For instance, many women did not know what to do when their partners violated court orders and felt disillusioned when things did not go as expected. The second theme, “frustration” resulted largely from the slow process, but was compounded by the limited information provided to the victim about the case’s progress. The third theme was “fear” because victims did not feel protected by their involvement in the criminal justice system, and contact with the court also meant contact with their assailant. The final theme was “conflict over incarceration” due to the guilt involved in believing that one would be sending one’s partner to jail. This was an especially strong theme for African American women with black partners. It is important to note that 90% of the women in this study were African American. This percentage is substantially higher than what is reported in most studies, which usually include a white majority or omit information regarding the participants’ race or ethnicity.

An appropriate contrast to Bennett et al.’s (1999) study is Lewis et al.’s (2000) qualitative exploration of why women use the law. Victims were interviewed immediately following the imposition of a court sanction. Three themes emerged around this issue: protection, prevention, and rehabilitation. Women sought immediate protection from present danger, and believed that the police could provide short-term protection. Based on their notions of deterrence, victims also sought prevention through a long-term reduction of violence by using the police and the courts. For instance, they believed that using the law would demonstrate that he could not get away with abusing

her and it would also teach her kids that abuse is wrong. Rehabilitation was also important to many women who thought the legal system was a way to get their partner help. Hoyle and Sanders (2000) note that the majority of the women in their study wanted a respite from the violence, albeit temporary, by calling the police. Like the women in the Lewis et al. (2000) study, they sought protection from immediate violence. Some women spoke of needing this time to contemplate a more permanent separation from the abuser.

Ford (1991) provided a different reason for why women use the system in his research on victims' reasons for seeking and later dropping charges. Ford interviewed 25 women who sought charges and followed up with 12 of the 15 women who later dropped the charges. Although a number of themes arose for why women used the system (e.g., having been advised by the police to prosecute, being afraid of the abuser, having previously warned him that she would, being tired of the abuse, etc.) and why they dropped charges (e.g., he had stayed away, he had agreed to get help, he had agreed to divorce, the defense attorney had convinced her, she did not want any more hassles, she did not want him to go to jail, he threatened her, etc.), Ford concluded that some women used the criminal justice system as a power resource. That is, a woman might engage the system to force her partner to do something (e.g., leave her alone, go to counseling, agree to a divorce, etc.) and then disengage from the system when she achieved that end. Some victims in Hoyle and Sanders' study (2000) also identified having achieved what they wanted as reasons for not prosecuting, suggesting a strategic use of the system. Although feelings of power and control through the use of the criminal justice system are not

dominant reasons for engaging the system, they are also mentioned briefly by Fischer and Rose (1995).

Fischer and Rose (1995) used both quantitative and qualitative methods in their exploration of why victims seek court orders of protection and what they get out of them. They had 287 battered women fill out a short questionnaire about why they were obtaining a court order of protection (i.e., a restraining order), and then interviewed a subsample of these women ($n = 83$). The most common reasons for obtaining the court orders were being tired of the abuse (92%), and deciding to make a change in their lives (87%). Most indicated that either or both the emotional and physical abuse was becoming more severe (60%) and more frequent (59%). The authors interpret these results as indicating that many women had reached a point where they had had “enough” and were now willing to take drastic measures. Interestingly, while most felt their decisions to obtain the orders were good ones (91%) and expressed feeling more control in their lives (98%), most also believed that the batterers would violate the orders (85%), but expressed confidence in the police’s ability to respond rapidly to violations (95%). The participants in this study were recruited because they had sought out a court order of protection, which is similar to Horton et al.’s (1987) participants who sought temporary restraining orders, and it is interesting to note that in both studies the participants were very positive about the criminal justice system.

The themes that emerged from Fischer and Rose’s interviews demonstrated women’s reservations to use the system while also needing to make life changes. They discussed the emotional toll associated with calling the police to enforce the order, but also feelings of power and control over the relationship. Fear was a dominant theme.

Some talked about their fear of ending the relationship because obtaining the court order would do this. Others spoke of fear of retaliation, fear of appearing in court, and fear of reliving previous negative experiences with police or court officials. Another dominant theme was the final motivating factor leading them to obtain the court order, such as becoming angry that their right to live free of abuse was something that they had to fight for, or realizing that the law is the only communication their partner will hear.

A Canadian study of residents in the Yukon interviewed 57 victims, 70% of whom were First Nations, and found that victims did not report the violence to the police for a number of reasons: fear of the offender; ambivalence about the impact reporting would have on the relationship; concern that the criminal justice system would not serve the victim's interests or the interests of her family; and logistic reasons such as not having a telephone (Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996). Participants in this study had all reported at least one assault to the police, thus bringing them into contact with the criminal justice system. Reasons for reporting this particular assault included the serious and violent nature of the assault, a change in the victim's attitude about violence, and a concern about the impact that the violence had on their children (Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996). The authors concluded that women "typically do not report violence until a point is reached where it is perceived to be intolerable" (Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996, p.4). A second Canadian study conducted in diverse communities in Ontario (Landau, 2000) found that victims called the police because they were afraid for their lives, wanted the police to stop the assault, were concerned about harm to the children, and believed that this time the abuse was worse.

Studies examining the help-seeking strategies of abused women put the use of the criminal justice system into a larger perspective (Gondolf, 1998; Hutchinson & Hirschel, 1998). Hutchinson and Hirschel (1998) interviewed 419 abused women about the various kinds of help-seeking that they used. The authors found that calling the police was used by 93% of the women at least once, and was used more often than any other kind of help-seeking strategy. However, the victim participants in this study were recruited from a larger study on the effects of mandatory arrest, and were thus more likely than most battered women to have used the criminal justice system in the past. Moreover, the authors did not ask about seeking help from friends or family. Nevertheless, one can interpret these findings to indicate that for women who have had police involvement in their cases, the criminal justice system is used more often than other kinds of help such as shelters, ministers, counselors, victim assistance, and lawyers, although not necessarily more often than seeking help from family or friends. Gondolf (1998) examined help-seeking in battered women whose partners were court ordered to counseling and educational sessions. He found that the majority of women (58%) had used the criminal justice system to cope with past violence. However, substantially fewer women in this study than in Hutchinson and Hirschel's (1998) had called the police (39% compared to 93%). Also of interest is that women were much more likely to seek criminal justice assistance if they had been severely abused in the past by the same partner (Gondolf, 1998).

Unlike the previous two studies, Wiist and McFarlene (1998) examined help seeking in women outside of a criminal justice context. They recruited abused Hispanic prenatal patients during routine prenatal care and found that calling the police was the

most common community service used by the survivors although the percentage of women calling the police (23%) was substantially lower in this study than in the other two studies. Similar to the participants in Gondolf's study, the women who used the police in this study had experienced more severe violence and threats (Wiist & McFarlene, 1998).

The research on why abused women use or do not use the system provides excellent insight into women's perceptions of the criminal justice system. We learn that there are systemic barriers within the system itself that have evoked confusion and frustration in victims (Bennett et al., 1999) as well as the fear of attending court (Fischer et al., 1995). Women also spoke of the emotional turmoil felt because of ambivalence about ending their relationship (Fischer et al., 1995; Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996) or because of guilt about sending their partners to jail, which may be especially true for women whose partners are minorities (Bennett et al., 1999; Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996). The fear of the batterer himself cannot be understated. Many victims in different studies have described fear of and threats from the batterer as barriers to using the system (Bennett, 1999; Erez & Belknap, 1998; Fischer & Rose, 1995; Ford, 1991; Hoyle & Sanders, 2000; Tim Roberts Focus Consultants). It must be emphasized that this fear is real and justified. Women are at increased risk for severe injury and death when they leave an abusive partner (Kirkwood, 1993; Walker, 2000), and using the criminal justice system is not a guarantee of protection, and may put some women at greater risk.

Fear and the need for protection were also identified as reasons to engage the system (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000; Landau, 2000; Lewis, 2000). Victims spoke of seeking

the prevention of future violence (Landau, 2000; Lewis et al., 2000) and rehabilitation for their partners (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000; Lewis, 2000). Other studies talked about changes in the victims' attitudes towards the abuse (Fischer & Rose, 1995; Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996), and concern for their children (Landau, 2000; Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996). A change in the violence itself may be a particularly common reason for using the system. A number of studies identified an escalation in the abuse (Fischer & Rose, 1995; Landau, 2000; Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996) before women sought help from the criminal justice system. Other studies noted that the severity of violence was greater for victims who had used the criminal justice system than for those who had not (Gondolf, 1998; Wiist & McFarlane, 1998). This is consistent with notions that women engage the system when they have been pushed too far and have had "enough" (Fischer et al., 1995) or believed that the abuse had become intolerable (Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996). Fear of what will happen if they do not use the criminal justice system may supersede the fear of using the system, which may also coincide with a change in attitude about their relationship. It is interesting to note that the need to punish is not a dominant theme in the literature. When it is mentioned, authors report that only a few women spoke of a desire for retribution (Hoyle & Saunders, 2000; Lewis, 2000).

What is clear is that a number of women do use the system, despite barriers and difficulties. Women may also use the system more than once and thus it is essential that their interactions with police, prosecutors, judges and other court officials be positive. If they have discouraging experiences, they may not seek help through the criminal justice system again. As one woman put it "it's not worth it –it left a bad taste in my mouth the

first time” (Landau, 2000, p.152). Their perceptions of police, prosecutors, and the court process are important and may determine whether or not they call on the criminal justice system again –maybe at a point when it is needed to save their lives. In the next few sections I review victims’ views about different areas of the criminal justice system.

Views about Police

The views that women have about the police are likely to affect whether or not they will use the criminal justice system. A number of authors have sought victims’ views on the police within the context of larger studies. In general recent studies using close-ended questions have found that victims rate the police positively (Lewis, 2000; London Family Court Clinic Inc., 1991; Wiist & McFarlane, 1998), especially in comparison to other aspects of the system (Fleury, 2000; Jaffe et al., 1986), and in comparison to older studies (Jaffe et al., 1986). However, a recent in-depth qualitative study gives a much more negative impression of the police (Stephens & Sinden, 2000). The differences are likely due to the way the data were collected, and what the participants were asked to think about in answering the questions. That is, some victims were asked to reflect on the most recent incident leading to an arrest, while others commented on a more general experience shaped from multiple interactions with the police. I will first examine the responses to close-ended questions.

In the quantitative component of Lewis et al.’s (2000) study, participants rated the police officers involved in the incident leading to their court case. Eighty-one percent rated the police as ‘helpful’ or ‘very helpful’ on a five-point scale as opposed to 16% who rated the police as ‘not helpful’ or ‘not at all helpful’. As the authors point out, the high level of satisfaction is likely a reflection of the fact that the abuser was charged and

prosecuted in all of the cases. A Canadian study used a variety of recruitment techniques resulting in a mix of police involvement although the police had laid charges in the majority of cases (78%) (London Family Court Clinic, Inc., 1991). Most participants were satisfied with the advice the police had given (65.2%), and 87% indicated that they would call the police again. Fleury (2000) recruited women whose cases had gone to court and found that on average women rated their satisfaction with the police more positively than other aspects of the system, and many said that the police listened to them (94%) and believed them (82%). A quarter of women (27%), however, said that the police acted bored, and 2% indicated that they themselves were arrested. Jaffe et al. (1986) compared satisfaction over time and found that only 5.5% of victims reported being dissatisfied with the police in 1983 compared to 47% in 1979, which the authors attribute to the implementation of mandatory charging. The only study that recruited women solely outside the criminal justice system, found that, of the women who used the police (23%), about half (51%) reported that the police had been 'very effective' in helping to reduce the violence, and a further 21% indicated that the police had been somewhat effective (Wiist & McFarlane, 1998). At the other end of the spectrum, 11% said the police were not effective, and 17% said the police had made the violence worse (Wiist & McFarlane, 1998). Of course rating effectiveness is very different and perhaps more valid than rating helpfulness or satisfaction, but the ratings were nevertheless quite positive.

Results from two studies that ask more in-depth questions about victims' experiences provide a different picture. Erez and Belknap (1998) surveyed 50 women whose cases had gone to prosecution about their experiences with the criminal justice

system. Open-ended questions asked participants to recall positive and negative interactions with police. Experiences varied dramatically with some participants (43%) indicating that they encountered encouraging behaviour and comments from the police, such as arresting the batterer immediately and being told to insist on prosecution. A slightly higher percentage (49%) of victims reported discouraging comments and attitudes by the police, such as “acting as if nothing happened” and “acting as if it was my fault” (Erez & Belknap, 1998, p.256). Interestingly, participants were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with police response, as indicated by their mean response ($M = 3.14$) on a scale of 1 to 5. This relatively low rating may be a result of having thought about both the positive and the negative interactions they had had with the police when they answered the qualitative questions before they did the quantitative rating.

Stephens and Sinden (2000) conducted in-depth interviews with 25 victims from a semi-rural county in western New York about their perception of police demeanor towards them. The women had been referred from a victim witness program. Four categories of police demeanor arose: minimizing the situation, disbelieving the victim, we don't care, and macho cop. As is evident from the category names, police demeanors were perceived to be very negative. Minimizing the situation included acting like the abuse was a normal part of life, and laughing about the victim's predicament, which resulted in victim bitterness towards the officers. Disbelieving the victim sometimes included threats to arrest both partners. The 'we don't care' category included attitudes of indifference through a style of fact gathering that demonstrated little emotional responsiveness and left victims feeling like the police could not care less what had happened or what might happen in the future. The 'macho cop' demeanor was presented

through arrogant, rude, and contemptuous treatment, which was especially demoralizing to victims. Stephens and Sinden (2000) noted that five of their participants extended their negative perceptions of some police officers to law enforcement as a whole, which could have far reaching implications for whether or not victims cooperate with other aspects of the system or call the police in the future. The negative attitudes described in this study came largely from victims with multiple experiences with the police. Of the 7 participants who had only one encounter with the police, 3 described police demeanor in positive terms; only 2 of the 18 participants who had multiple encounters with police described their encounters positively. The positive things officers did were remarkably ordinary such as listening to victims, offering them a tissue, and asking about their children, but these acts took on new meaning because they showed that the police were taking victims seriously and that they deserved to be treated well (Stephens & Sinden, 2000). Some participants were pleasantly surprised by positive police actions, which puts ratings of police satisfaction into some perspective.

It may be that victims do not expect a lot from the police beyond stopping the immediate violence and removing the abuser from the home, as indicated by what victims hoped the police would do (Landau, 2000) and by the positive police actions mentioned by victims (Erez & Belknap, 1998). High victim satisfaction ratings may be a reflection of more proactive arrest policies, which do stop the immediate violence and remove the abuser from the home, albeit temporarily. Victims may also be reacting to the positive experience of having a police officer do something as opposed to doing nothing. A qualitative study, however, that probed for in-depth experiences with a number of different police officers, revealed more negative evaluations (Stephens & Sinden, 2000).

This disheartening finding suggests that there are still many police officers with negative and even hostile attitudes towards battered women. As women encounter more police officers, their chance of having a particularly negative experience increases.

Views about Prosecution and the Court Process

Few studies have included victims' evaluations of prosecuting attorneys or the court process and outcome more generally, but the studies available generally show negative victim views of the court process and outcome. Participants in Cretney and Davis' British study (1997) expressed dissatisfaction with a reduction of their partners' charges (often from 'actual bodily harm' to 'common assault'). They also criticized sentences that did not reflect the seriousness of the assault. A woman commented, "they might as well not go to court really. I don't think there's any value in that – and fining them...£2.50 a week and that's no hardship." (Cretney & Davis, 1997, p.153). The authors acknowledged that some women have unrealistic expectations about what the final sentence will be because they are not given enough information or are given misleading information by police and attorneys who attempt to bolster victims' commitment to prosecution. This view is illustrated by one victim's words, "I was lead to believe that he was looking at 7 or 8 years, not four months" (Cretney & Davis, 1997, p.154).

Canadian studies have also reported dissatisfaction with court outcomes and sentencing (Landau, 1998; Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996). However, the London Family Court Clinic Inc. (1991) found that victim satisfaction with the court process was high. They reported that 65% of the victims who had contact with the Crown attorney felt a sense of complete support, and over half (53.1%) of the victims indicated that they

had spent enough time with the Crown attorney, which although not particularly high was substantially better than another Canadian study (18.6%) in a primarily aboriginal community (Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996). The findings in London, Ontario may be due in part to the unique political situation in that city. City officials, including the police chief, have historically been more responsive to the needs of battered women. Indeed, the city was the first to establish mandatory charging, and did so a number of years before it was mandated for the rest of Canada (Faubert & Hinch, 1996).

Fleury (2000) found that a majority of victims indicated that prosecuting attorneys listened to them (79%) and believed what they had to say (79%). However, ratings of satisfaction were less encouraging. The way the prosecutor handled the case, the court process, and the court outcome were all rated as neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Similarly, Erez and Belknap (1998) found interactions with prosecutors were split down the middle, with 51% experiencing encouraging comments, such as 'no one has the right to hit you,' and 49% being discouraged by such things as obnoxious or overly busy prosecutors. Worrisome, although not mentioned by the original authors, is that some encouraging comments may have more to do with ensuring cooperation and may mislead victims into expecting unrealistic outcomes. For instance, some of the encouraging comments were that the batterer would go to jail and would not contact her again, or that the prosecutor could "get him" with the victim's help. Court experience varied, and about one fifth of the respondents believed that the batterer's abusive behaviour was minimized in court, and 33% stated that judges made objectionable comments (Erez & Belknap, 1998). This study included a five-point rating scale of satisfaction with various components of the system and found that prosecutors (3.31) and judges (3.14) fell

between neutral and satisfied, while the court process (2.77) and outcome (2.22) fell between neutral and dissatisfied. Overall, victims were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. The authors concluded that “criminal processing authorities (e.g., police, prosecutors, and judges) who offer appropriate responses are rare, and receiving meaningful assistance is generally a random event” (Erez & Belknap, 1998, p.252).

Views About Mandatory Interventions

It is important to remember that most of the victims’ views, reviewed in the last few sections, were within the context of new proactive policies that encourage actors within the criminal justice system to arrest, charge, and forcefully prosecute. This has led some researchers to ask victims what they think of mandatory intervention policies.

Three studies have asked victims for their evaluations of mandatory arrest (Barata, 1999; Smith, 2000; Smith, 2001), and all have found relatively positive evaluations. Smith (2000) surveyed 241 women who were in shelters for battered women across eight American states. She found that 75.7% of participants supported the adoption of mandatory arrest, and only 5% did not support the policy. However, fewer felt they would benefit from the policy themselves (63.7%) than would other women (78.1%), and 13% said they would be less likely to report future violence in a community with mandatory arrest. In a second study, Smith (2001) surveyed 93 victims who were staying in shelters in a midwestern US state and found that 75% gave absolute support to the adoption of the policy, 65% believed the policy would benefit them, 85% believed the policy would benefit other victims, and 60% thought the policy would lead to increased future reporting (compared to 10% who thought there would be less future reporting). Interestingly, the authors found that black women were more likely to request arrest and

want arrest, but were less likely to support mandatory arrest. It appears that for black women, relinquishing power to the police was perceived more negatively. Marital status also had an impact on policy support. Divorced and single women were more likely to endorse the policy than married or separated women (Smith, 2001), suggesting that women who are less committed to the relationship may be more likely to want an aggressive police response.

In my own study of 39 abused women staying in a shelter in a Southwestern Ontario city I found that 74% liked the policy and 23% did not (Barata, 1999). Consistent with Smith's studies, the participants in my study supported mandatory arrest more strongly for other women than for themselves. Many advantages were listed in response to open-ended questions, but the most common were stopping the violence that day or night, a reduction in violence overall, and having time to make other living arrangements. The most common disadvantages were an increase in retaliatory violence, negative emotional experiences, and the belief that nothing would be done beyond arrest. In response to forced-choice items, participants were most likely to endorse perceptions that the policy would force the police to take abuse seriously and would take the burden or responsibility off the victim. They were least likely to believe that victims had influence over whether or not the police arrested before the policy and that victims would feel disempowered.

The same three studies reviewed above asked victims about their views of no-drop prosecution (Barata, 1999; Smith, 2000; Smith, 2001), and again the results were quite positive. Smith (2000) found lower support for no-drop than for mandatory arrest, but again a difference between perceived benefits for self and others was seen. A small

percentage (15%) indicated that they would not report violence if no-drop policies were in place. In Smith's (2001) second study the findings were similar, and consistent with the findings on mandatory arrest, more white women (75%) than black women (46.7%) supported the policy. However, the differences in support for mandatory arrest by marital status were smaller for the no-drop policy.

I found substantially higher support for no-drop policies (Barata, 1999) than was found in either of Smith's (2000, 2001) studies. Eighty-two percent of the women staying in the Ontario shelter said they would like the policy and only 8% said they would not like it. A possible reason for participants' high support is that the definition of no-drop not only emphasized that the victim could not drop charges, but also emphasized that the Crown attorney had to follow strict guidelines that greatly limited when s/he could drop charges. This is consistent with the Canadian policy. Like most published studies, Smith (2000, 2001) did not indicate how the policies were defined. In my study, perceived advantages of no-drop were that the victim could not drop out of fear, manipulation, or other negative feelings, that she would be relieved of responsibility, that it would make her feel safer, that the prosecution should continue because abuse is a crime, and because it sends a strong message to the batterer and to society that assault is wrong (Barata, 1999). The most common perceived disadvantage by far was that the batterer's anger or violence would increase. As with mandatory arrest the most common perception of the policy endorsed in the forced-choice responses was that the Crown attorney would take the abuse seriously, and the least commonly endorsed item was that it would disempower the victim.

Mandatory charging is a Canadian policy that has been equated to the American policy of mandatory arrest, but is quite different because it also ensures that the batterer is prosecuted. The victim cannot withdraw the charge because she did not make it, and the Crown attorney is directed to withdraw charges in exceptional cases only and instructed that victim non-cooperation is not a reason for dropping the charge. Two Canadian studies have specifically looked at mandatory charging and found positive evaluations from the majority of victims (Landau, 2000; Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996). A third Canadian study interpreted an increase in satisfaction with the police after the implementation of the policy as a positive evaluation of the policy (Jaffe et al., 1996). Tim Roberts Focus Consultant (1996) found that most women wanted their partners charged, but that a sizable minority (30%) did not. Notably, negative feelings about charging were higher among First Nations victims (Tim Roberts Focus Consultant, 1996). The authors concluded that there was support for mandatory charging, but that participants preferred flexibility after the charge. That is, mandatory charging should not automatically imply mandatory prosecution.

Landau (2000) surveyed victims whose partners were charged under the policy, and found that 60% of her participants wanted the batterer charged, while 40% did not, and consequently 32% asked to have the charges dropped (unsuccessfully). In support of the policy, women mentioned not being able to make the decision to charge on their own, and wanting that responsibility taken away from them. One woman said, “with some help from the system, I discovered I could be stronger” (Landau, 2000, p.151). In opposition to the policy, women spoke about increased feelings of powerlessness and believing that the situation was blown out of proportion. Some said that they did not call

the police to have him charged, but rather to end the immediate violence. Particularly disturbing was that some victims felt revictimized by the Crown attorney who was angered by victim noncooperation. One woman said, “the Crown was mad at me, actually made me cry. It was like I was being victimized again with nobody on my side because I did not want my husband to go to jail” (Landau, 2000, p.150). Some charges were dropped later in the process, which was devastating for victims who had earlier begged to no avail to have the charges dropped, and had since been coerced into cooperating. These women felt particularly abandoned.

Mandatory reporting, although not specifically a criminal justice policy, is relevant here because reporting of domestic abuse cases by doctors and nurses to law officials brings victims into contact with the criminal justice system without their consent. This may be even more contentious than other policies because the victims have not called the police themselves nor have the police been called by others to stop an acute battering incident (which may have been life threatening). Women who may purposely avoid criminal justice intervention are unlikely to see a connection between seeking healthcare and engaging the system, thus women who have taken precautions to avoid the system, may inadvertently find themselves entwined in it.

Mandatory reporting has been examined by a number of authors (Coulter & Chez, 1997; Gielen, et al., 2000; Malecha, et al., 2000; Smith, 2000; Smith, 2001). Malecha, et al. (2000) found the highest rates of support for mandatory reporting in their survey of abused women; these results are perhaps not surprising, given that all of their participants were already engaged in the criminal justice system. Eighty-one percent believed that doctors or nurses should report abuse to the police, and 92% believed that this would

have made it easier for them to get help. However, 65% said they would have been unlikely to tell the nurse or doctor about the abuse. Gielen et al., (2000) examined the view of abused and nonabused women accessing healthcare, and found much lower support for mandatory reporting than Malecha et al. (2000). Fifty-five percent of abused women and 42% of non-abused women supported routine screening of abuse and the same percentages of women believed that reporting abuse to the police should be the woman's decision. A majority of abused women (68%) said they believed abused women would be less likely to report the abuse to their healthcare provider under mandatory reporting laws than in a similar situation without mandatory reporting laws.

Smith (2000) found that a majority of victims (74%) supported the adoption of mandatory reporting, about half (58%) thought the law would benefit them, and about two thirds (65%) thought it would benefit other victims. Only 44% thought the law would make it more likely that victims would seek medical attention and 22% thought fewer women would seek medical attention. Similar results were reported in Smith (2001). Coulter and Chez (1997) surveyed women who had participated in support groups for battered women. Eighty percent said that healthcare professionals should have to report cases of abuse to the police. Consistent with other findings women were more supportive of the policy for other women than for themselves.

In general there is support for mandatory intervention laws. Mandatory arrest and mandatory charging appear to have greater support in most studies than no-drop prosecution and mandatory reporting. It is important to note, however, that all of the studies were quantitative. The addition of qualitative studies that explored police satisfaction and why women engage the system provided new insights into the criminal

justice system that were not as positive as the simple ratings of 'helpfulness' and 'satisfaction' would indicate. Qualitative studies might also shed new light on women's evaluations of mandatory intervention policies, and these kinds of studies are needed before definitive conclusions can be made about these policies. I think most would agree that ignoring the views of between 20% to 40% of women who do not support mandatory intervention policies is not good enough.

Another important issue that must be considered is that the studies that asked about mandatory arrest and no-drop prosecution recruited participants from shelters, and all but two of the mandatory reporting studies recruited from shelters (and one of the exceptions recruited from the criminal justice system). The results of the studies on mandatory interventions, therefore, provide us with the opinions of only some battered women. It is tempting to generalize the findings to all battered women, but there are a number of reasons why battered women who do not use a shelter might also have more negative opinions about mandatory intervention laws. They may be wary of outside intervention, less knowledgeable about government and community systems, more inclined to deal with abuse through family supports, and so forth. The one study that recruited participants in a hospital reported substantially less support by battered women for mandatory reporting of abuse to the police (Gilelen et al., 2000) than the other studies on mandatory intervention policies.

The notion that mandatory policies may be disempowering to victims because they take away decision making power has not been given much consideration in the studies that have explored victims' perceptions of these laws. Understanding the role that power plays in women's use of the criminal justice system is important if not to help

women be empowered through the use of the law, but to ensure, at the very least, that women are not disempowered. This is the topic of the last section dealing with survivors' perceptions of the criminal justice system.

Views about Power and Empowerment

With the exception of Ford (1991), researchers have not focused on how survivors can use the criminal justice system as a source of power. Recall that Ford found that some women used the criminal justice system as a way to force their partners to do something desirable such as leave them alone or agree to a divorce, and then later dropped the charges when their partners did what they asked, thus keeping their end of the bargain. Some support for this idea is found in the work of other researchers who have noted that some victims dropped protection orders (Fischer & Rose, 1995) or discontinued prosecution (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000) when their partners gave them what they needed. Fischer and Rose (1995) found that their participants spoke about the psychological benefits of obtaining an order of protection. For some women obtaining the order of protection symbolized their own internal strength, indicated that they would not take the abuse anymore, and provided a means by which to find their voices again. Some spoke of having a little bit of power over their life again, and not feeling like a victim anymore. Just having the ability to call the police gave some women a sense of ultimate control (Fischer & Rose, 1995). Lewis et al. (2000) described survivors' use of interdicts (the British version of orders of protection) as sources of power. Because women can control when the interdict is implemented by reporting violations to the police, they can use it as a power resource. One woman commented that she felt great

about the interdict because “it gave [her] the power to say ‘yes, you can come in’ or ‘no, I don’t want to see you.’ Or, ‘if you don’t go, I can use it” (Lewis et al., 2000, p. 200).

In contrast to findings suggesting that some victims use the criminal justice system as a power resource, Lewis et al. (2000) spoke of a number of ways in which the criminal justice system renders survivors powerless, largely because it sees women solely as victims and ignores their agency. These authors pointed out that women make choices about the extent of intervention that they want from the criminal justice system, but that their choices are ignored because of mandatory arrest and prosecution policies. In response to the question, “How much do you think that going to court affected you?” a participant responded, “Not at all because I had nothing to do with it, except the fact that I was blamed for it all” (Lewis et al., 2000, p.194). This woman’s response indicates that she was feeling blamed for something she had no power over. Powerlessness was also expressed in women’s lack of access to information about their case. Lewis et al. (2000) described how the researchers, who had access to files, knew more about some women’s cases than they did. For example, the researchers informed one woman that her partner had been admonished, which means that the courts found him guilty and gave him a record despite not being fined. The victim thought he had been found not guilty. Some women felt a loss of power because of the way in which their partners manipulated the system. For instance, they would plead not guilty until the last minute, thus forcing victims to take time off work to go to court where their testimony was not needed and they were sent home. Lewis et al. (2000) described cases in which victims felt silenced because they had deliberately invoked the law as a strategy to “go public” with the abuse, but did not feel they had a role in the batterer’s conviction because they were not allowed

to testify against him. Others felt silenced by their lack of input in the process as a whole. One woman commented, “They said the whole thing was out of my hands. It was like I got the feeling that *they* wanted to prosecute him and *they* wanted to deal with it but I was never given the chance to clarify anything” (Lewis et al., 2000, p.195).

In my own study about victims’ perceptions of mandatory arrest and no-drop prosecution, I asked victims whether they felt the policies were empowering. Their responses led me to conclude that most victims did not perceive mandatory arrest and no-drop prosecution as disempowering, although there was also little evidence that they viewed the policies as empowering (Barata, 1999). Rather, victims appeared to be reacting to the perception that with or without the policies, they had little say in whether or not abusers would be arrested and prosecuted. An important piece that has yet to be examined is whether or not survivors actually feel empowered or disempowered as they go through the various phases of the criminal justice system process. For instance, do victims feel empowered after calling the police, speaking with the crown attorney, or testifying in court?

Strengths and Limitations of Studies that have Added Survivors’ Voices

Much has been learned in a short time about some battered women’s views of the criminal justice system. The quantitative studies have given us an indication about the average experiences and opinions of the women who use the system, and how those opinions vary across the system. For instance, the quantitative studies on satisfaction have indicated that women may be more satisfied with police responses than with other aspects of the system. The qualitative studies have provided us with rich data about

women's experiences maneuvering through the system and their reasons for engaging and/or disengaging from the system.

The majority of studies have recruited women who were already using the criminal justice system. This is a reasonable first step given that these studies were largely exploratory in understanding women's experiences and views about the criminal justice system. Asking women who have actually used the system is an appropriate place to begin. However, we must be careful not to extrapolate those findings to other battered women. Women who never engage the system may do so for reasons that are different from the women who eventually do engage the system. One might imagine that this would be a small problem because the implementation of mandatory intervention laws is bringing more and more women into the system. However, as with most research studies sampling bias likely confounds the data. Women with negative views about the criminal justice system may be reluctant to cooperate with researchers who they associate with the system, thus inflating positive attitudes. As noted earlier in this chapter, the almost exclusive recruitment of women residing in shelters for studies asking about mandatory intervention policies is also problematic.

When women are recruited for participation in research studies is also important in understanding battered women's views. That is, the point at which their opinions are sought likely influences their answers. Fleury (2000) sought women's opinions after they had been through the court process. She found higher levels of satisfaction with the police than with the prosecutor, the court process, or the court outcome. It is possible that other aspects of the system influenced women's views about the police. For instance, in retrospect the police officer who encouraged her to file charges may seem

like a victim advocate compared to the judge who threw out the case. This is somewhat supported by the cluster analysis conducted by Fleury (2000) that categorized some women's views as "let down" by the system. The fact that the women in Fluery's study had gone through the whole system also introduces a narrowing of the sample. I wonder if the satisfaction rates for police officers would be different if the recruitment of participants occurred when women first came into contact with the police.

There is also emerging evidence that women of different races and ethnicities might have different views from those of the white majority. For instance, First Nation Canadian women have expressed concern about the criminal justice system's ability to meet the interests of themselves and their families (Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996), which may be similar to concerns expressed by African American women who are conflicted over the possible incarceration of their Black partners (Bennett et al., 1999). The limited representation of minorities in most studies obscures their opinions.

Despite these limitations, the studies reviewed above indicate that some women do seek out the criminal justice system as a potential resource for help, although it is likely that different women use the system differently. It is also possible that the same woman might use the system differently depending on where she is in her relationship. For instance, does she still love her partner, is she thinking about leaving him, or has she already left? This is an important area to explore because the criminal justice system must ensure that a survivor's faith in the system is not turned off by a bad experience. A victim who at one time wants nothing more from the system than the cessation of immediate violence might, at a later date, need the criminal justice system to help her terminate the relationship. The next section deals with the stages of abuse that women go

through, and how their experiences, thoughts, and feelings in different stages may predict their use of the criminal justice system.

Survivor's Varying Perspectives on the Criminal Justice System as a Function of the Stage of Abuse

There is limited understanding of theoretically different stages of abuse that women go through during the lifetime of the abusive relationship. Yet it is clear from data gathered from in-depth interviews that the abuse, the relationship itself, and the woman's view of the relationship change over time. Her first experience of violence is likely to be very different from her tenth experience. Early on she may forgive and hope for improvements, but later she may gather her strength and plan her escape.

Theoretical Models

A review of the theoretical models that have advanced our understanding of the process of change in abusive relationships provides a framework in which to understand the stages of abuse. These theoretical models help us see how survivors move from one stage into another and suggest periods of time when intervention, including criminal justice intervention, may be most successful.

The cycle of abuse described by Walker (1979; 1984; 2000) is a tension reducing theory that identifies three distinct periods (i.e., tension-building, acute abuse, and loving contrition) that surround any one incident of abuse. There is a gradual increase of tension in the tension-building period caused by such things as name-calling, expressions of hostility and dissatisfaction, and minor acts of physical abuse. During this period the woman may try to please and calm her partner in order to avoid his explosive violence. Her attempts at controlling his behaviour sometimes work for a limited time, which

reinforces her belief that she can control his violence. In reality, however, she cannot, and the tension inevitably builds to an unbearable level that triggers the acute battering incident when a barrage of verbal and physical aggression is unleashed. The aggression in this period is both quantitatively and qualitatively different from the aggression expressed during the tension-building phase in that it is more extreme and perceived as uncontrollable by both partners. The acute battering incident usually lasts between 2 and 24 hours, although some women have reported a much longer time period. It ends with a sharp reduction in tension, which begins the loving-contrition phase. This phase is marked by a lack of tension or violence and the batterer may apologize, assist the victim, give her gifts, and make promises to never hit her again.

The cycle of abuse repeats itself, but it also changes over time in predictable ways. In general the tension and abuse escalate and the calm respite of apologies and promises dwindle (Walker, 1984; 2000). Walker (1984; 2000) interviewed battered and formerly battered women about their first, second, last (or most recent), and worst battering incidents. She found that the occurrence of tension-building increased from being present in 56% of the first battering incidents to being present in 70% of the last battering incidents. Conversely, the occurrence of loving-contrition decreased from 69% after the first incident to 42% after the last incident. As these percentages indicate, not every battered woman experiences the abuse this way, (see Schuller & Rzepa, 2002 for a review) and the occurrence of each phase can change over time within a relationship. Walker (1984; 2000) also noted that there were cycle differences between women who were still in the relationship and women who had left the relationship. Specifically, women who were still in the relationship reported less tension building at the last (or

most recent) incident, although the decline in loving-contrition was evidenced in both groups.

Dutton (1992-1993) has emphasized that not all battered women experience this cycle of abuse. Like other authors, including Walker herself, Dutton points out that violence sometimes appears out of nowhere and that some women never experience the contrition phase. However, she takes the critique a step further by noting that abuse is not always experienced as a discrete event. The dynamics of power and control in the relationship can put the battered woman in a constant “state of siege” (p.1208). Nevertheless, Dutton (1992-1993) maintains that the “character” of the relationship can still change over time. It is this change over time that I want to emphasize.

Walker’s (1979; 1984; 2000) application of learned helplessness theory is even more contentious than her cycle of abuse theory. However, like the cycle of abuse theory, I believe that aspects of learned helplessness in conjunction with a survivor perspective can be useful in understanding the changes that occur over time in abusive relationships. Learned helplessness was first described by Seligman (1975) who observed that laboratory animals that were repeatedly and unavoidably shocked eventually gave up and stopped trying to escape; moreover, they did not escape when given the opportunity. He went on to link learned helplessness to depression in humans. Walker (2000) defined learned helplessness as “having lost the ability to predict that what you do will make a particular outcome occur” (p.116). She used learned helplessness to explain how battered women who developed and used important life-saving strategies nevertheless found it so difficult to escape battering relationships. She suggested that because battered women are repeatedly exposed to violence that is completely out of their

control they develop learned helplessness and the accompanying depression associated with it. Walker (2000) emphasized that because learned helplessness is learned, it can also be unlearned, and she noted that battered women who develop learned helplessness must overcome it to escape an abusive relationship.

Using this logic, Walker (1984; 2000) tested the application of learned helplessness to battered women by comparing women who had left an abusive relationship to women who were still in the relationship on their reactions to earlier abuse compared to the most recent abuse. As expected, the results indicated that women who had left the relationship showed a decrease in fear, anxiety, and depression as well as an increase in anger, disgust, and hostility; whereas, women who were still in the relationship did not show this pattern. The results were interpreted as showing a resigned acceptance after the last incident of abuse for both groups of women, but for women who were out of the relationship this acceptance decreased. Also in support of learned helplessness theory, Walker (2000) reported that women described themselves as more passive than active after an abusive incident than before the incident.

Other learned helplessness hypotheses were not supported by Walker's (1984; 2000) results. For instance, battered women scored higher than average on internal locus of control, and battered women who were still in the relationship did not report powerful others to have more control over them than women who had left the relationship. Battered women also scored higher than average on self-esteem. And although battered women did score higher than the high risk score for depression, women who had left the relationship were more likely to be depressed than those still in it. I interpret these results to mean that there was a learned helplessness reaction to the assault, but that this did not

necessary affect the battered women's overall functioning, or at least not to the extent expected from learned helplessness theory. Women may feel helpless (or perhaps hopeless) to change the abusive relationship after repeated beatings, and this is likely to affect their affect and cognitions. Women increasingly learn that they cannot control the batterer's actions, and therefore cannot fix the relationship. They are, however, not helpless in the colloquial sense, and the realization that they cannot control the batterer's actions can prompt new strategies geared instead to leaving the relationship. This does not exclude the possibility that some women, who for various reasons believe that they cannot seek external assistance, show learned helplessness in the classic sense. As others have pointed out, women who do not talk about the abuse to outsiders are invisible to research (Gondolf & Fisher, 1988; Kirdwood, 1993; Lempert, 1995).

Walker's (1979; 1984) learned helplessness theory has been criticized by members of the feminist assaulted women's community for its emphasis on battered women's psychological functioning, its lack of attention to the social constraints that keep women in abusive relationships, and its portrayal of battered women as helpless victims (Bowker, 1993; Gondolf & Fisher, 1988). Gondolf and Fisher (1988) suggested instead that battered women be viewed as survivors as an alternative to viewing them as 'victims' of learned helplessness. They described battered women as active survivors rather than passive victims, and they found that help seeking increased as women faced increased violence. To test their hypothesis, they used data from a Texas shelter's intake and exit interviews over a period of one and a half years, which resulted in well over 6000 participants. They found that the number of different help seeking strategies that women took "immediately after abusive incidents" (Gondolf & Fisher, 1988, p.110) was

positively related to the severity of wife abuse and influenced by the batterer's antisocial behaviour (i.e., arrests, general violence, and substance abuse). They concluded that women were more likely to seek help when they perceived themselves to be in danger and when it was clear that the batterer's behaviour was not going to change. They rejected the notion that battered women learned to be helpless, and they suggested instead that the agencies that battered women turn to showed signs of learned helplessness due to their inability to adequately help the women who turned to them for support. A problem in Gondolf and Fisher's (1988) study, which they acknowledged, is that all of the women in the study had come to a shelter. Women with learned helplessness would not be expected to go to a shelter, so it can be argued that if the women in this study had ever had feelings of learned helplessness, these feelings would have to have been unlearned before their participation in the study.

Perceiving battered women as either victims of learned helplessness or as active survivors appear to be perspectives that are diametrically opposed. Gondolf and Fischer (1988) used both tables and model diagramming to demonstrate the vast differences between these two perspectives. I suggest, however, that these two viewpoints can be reconciled, and that together they provide a more complete understanding of how battered women go from using strategies to control the batterer's anger (e.g., placating, pleasing, controlling his environment, etc.) to strategies that physically remove her from the violence (e.g., going to a friend's house, having him arrested, going to a shelter, etc.).

Walker (2000) and Gondolf and Fischer (1988) actually agreed on a number of important issues. First, Walker (2000), like Gondolf and Fisher (1988), recognized that women do develop essential coping skills that can protect them from more serious injury

or even death, but she argued that those coping skills can “become stereotyped and repetitive, foregoing the possibility of more effective responses” (p.10). She insisted that battered women need to develop a different set of skills to terminate the relationship and it is with the development of these skills, which they could acquire with the help of intervention (i.e., friends, shelter workers etc.), that they would be able to unlearn the learned helplessness. Second, Walker (1984; 2000) found as Gondolf and Fisher (1988) did that as the abuse escalates battered women were more likely to seek outside help. Third, Gondolf and Fisher (1988) recognized that women did experience a number of affective ‘symptoms’ that were consistent with learned helplessness such as physical unresponsiveness, guilt, self-blame, and depression. They attributed these symptoms to ‘traumatic shock’ and suggested that they reflect an initial effort on the part of the battered woman to save the relationship. Fourth, Gondolf and Fisher further proposed that the depression seen in shelter women could be explained by separation anxiety, which Walker (2000) also explored as a possibility when her results found more depression in women who had left the batterer compared to women who were still with him. These similarities lead me to conclude that the helplessness that results from repeated abuse may be less a feeling of helplessness towards stopping the abuse, and more a feeling of helplessness to change the course of the relationship. Battered women try a number of strategies to control the abuse and to maintain the possibility that the abuse will stop and the relationship will continue. Initially these attempts work to some degree, but as the abuse escalates nothing seems to work. They realize that they cannot control the batterer and there is no longer any point in trying to control him. They also realize that their hope for a change in the relationship is not realistic and it is here that

some women will experience symptoms of learned helplessness. At this point there is a cognitive hurdle that needs to be crossed. That is, there is a realization that needs to be made that changes her thinking about the relationship. The realization will vary depending on the woman (e.g., he will never change, I have to leave, I have to get outside help, next time he might kill me, etc.), but having made this realization, battered women will look more like the survivors described by Gondolf and Fisher (1988).

Studies that have used grounded theory have also provided important information that expands understandings of the process of change in abusive relationships. Merrit-Gray and Wuest (1995) used grounded theory to build a substantive theory about how women leave abusive relationships. Central to their theory is that women who leave begin a process of reclaiming the self after having given up part of themselves in counteracting the abuse. These authors described how women relinquished parts of themselves and developed strategies for minimizing the abuse such as ignoring, agreeing, and avoiding before they began the process of leaving by fortifying their defenses. Merrit-Gray and Wuest (1995) noted that the strategies used early on to cope with the abuse are quite different from the strategies that are used to escape. Lempert (1996) utilized grounded theory methodology in her exploration of the strategies that women use to survive an abusive relationship. She provided rich descriptions of how women first used strategies to keep the violence invisible both to themselves and others, but as their expectations for a loving relationship eroded, they used other strategies such as minimizing and rationalizing the violence. These strategies, although they did little to change the violence, did change how the women perceived themselves, and new strategies had to then be implemented to help them regain their sense of self.

A common theme in both the grounded theory studies and the studies that used more traditional theory building is that women use different strategies at different times in the relationship to attain different ends. Early on they use unobtrusive strategies in the hope that the relationship can be saved, but as they come to believe that the relationship cannot be saved, at least not by the battered woman, they move on to other strategies.

A comment on the terminology used to describe the experiences of abuse and the women themselves is appropriate here before moving on to my interpretation of the stages of abuse. Walker (1979; 1984; 2000) has been critiqued for her learned helplessness theory because of the implication that battered women are helpless. Walker (2000) argued that some critics were not able to get past the term “helpless” to more fully critique the theory itself. However, the terminology is important, and if misinterpreted by other academics, can surely be misinterpreted by service providers and battered women themselves. As discussed earlier in this introduction, a similar critique has been applied to the term “victim,” which some believe serves only to disempower women and prefer instead to use the term “survivor.” The language used to describe abuse is never neutral, and the reader may notice my own bias as I describe victims in early stages of abuse and survivors in later stages in my next section on the stages of abuse.

Four Stages of Abuse

In this section I use the theoretical models described above as well as studies that have described women’s experiences of abusive relationships to define four stages of abuse. The stages I define are heavily influenced by six studies that are unified in their examination of abusive relationships over time (Campbell, Miller, Cardwell, & Belknap, 1994; Campbell, Rose, Kub, & Nedd, 1998; Landenburger, 1989; Lempert, 1995;

Lempert, 1996; Merritt-Gray & Wuest, 1995; Mills, 1985; Wuest & Merritt-Gray, 1999; Wuest & Merritt-Gray, 2001). With the exception of one study, these examinations of the abusive relationships over time have used qualitative methodology.

Merritt-Gray and Wuest (1995) recruited, through professionals and lay helpers, women who defined themselves as survivors and interviewed 13 women in rural Eastern Canada. They used grounded theory to develop a better understanding of the process of leaving, and they expanded on their findings in two subsequent articles (Wuest & Merritt-Gray, 1999; Wuest & Merritt-Gray, 2001). Landenburger (1989) included both qualitative and quantitative components in her analysis; however, the data used to describe the four phase process of leaving focused on the analysis of semi-structured interviews with 30 women who had left their abusive partners. These women were recruited through newspaper advertisements, community support groups, and a shelter for battered women. Mills (1985) developed a five stage process of leaving through interviews with 10 shelter women who had recently left their abusive partners. Lempert (1995; 1996) conducted in-depth interviews with 32 women who had left or were still in abusive relationships in order to better understand the strategies they use to cope with the violence and to develop agency. All of the women in Lempert's (1996) study were recruited through a support group that worked in conjunction with a shelter. Campbell et al. (1998) conducted a qualitative, longitudinal study by recruiting women through newspapers who indicated that they had problems in their relationship. Their study examined women's various coping strategies at three different time intervals by using the data from 32 of the 96 women interviewed who were randomly selected for the analysis. The one quantitative study examined differences between battered and non-battered

women with problems in their relationships at time one and 2 ½ years later (Campbell et al., 1994). I should note that this study also contained an open-ended component, but data were analysed quantitatively.

All of the studies provide support for the notion that abusive relationships change over time (Campbell, Miller, Cardwell, & Belknap, 1994; Campbell, Rose, Kub, & Nedd, 1998; Lempert, 1996; Landenburger, 1989; Merritt-Gray & Wuest, 1995; Mills, 1985). Campbell et al. (1994) did this quantitatively. They recruited 97 battered and 96 non battered women who were having serious problems in an intimate relationship by placing a newspaper advertisement and by contacting a shelter. They classified women into categories at time one (no violence, battered, mutual violence), and noted the shifts in categories at time two. They found that of the 51 women who were being battered at time one and returned for follow-up (53% return rate), 24 moved into the no violence category, four moved into mutual violence, 10 had no partner, and 13 continued to be battered at time two. Of the 48 women who had no violence in their relationship at time one and returned for follow-up (50% return rate), 30 continued to have no violence, 9 were being battered, 2 were experiencing mutual violence, and 7 had no partner at time two. The authors highlight that most of the women who were being battered at time one were not still being battered at time two, suggesting that most women left the relationship or found other ways of ending the violence. Despite the possibility that battered women may have self-selected out of the study for time 2, the results indicated that abusive relationships are more fluid than they are often portrayed.

In the next section, I will describe four stages that many women experience in abusive relationships: 1) Prelude to physical abuse, 2) Denying the abuse and hoping for

better times, 3) Labeling the abuse and actively coping with escalating violence, and 4) Arriving at nonviolence and healing. After each description, I will show how women might use the criminal justice system when they are experiencing a particular stage. It is important to note, as others have (Landenburger, 1989; Mills, 1985), that the stages are not mutually exclusive and that women can move both forward and back through the various stages or skip stages entirely. The stages are theoretical points in time that are associated with particular experiences. Dividing battered women's experiences over time into stages serves to emphasize the commonality of their experiences and helps us understand the reasons for their changing emotions, cognitions, and behaviours, but it is important to remember that the divisions are fuzzy and experiences in one stage continue into others.

Prelude to physical abuse. I have named this stage 'prelude to physical abuse' because it includes the descriptions of the abusive relationship before the physical violence begins. This early stage of abuse is the most difficult to study, because women have not yet experienced physical abuse and are unlikely to define their relationship as abusive. However, in any physically abusive relationship there is always a first time and the violence is not likely to materialize from out of nowhere. Two longitudinal studies cleverly included women in this phase by recruiting through newspapers women who were having serious problems in a long-term intimate relationship (Campbell et al., 1994; Campbell et al., 1998). Other studies that have commented on this phase have relied on women's memory about the relationship before the violence began (Landenburger, 1989; Lempert, 1996; Mills, 1985).

Women have described being at a particularly vulnerable point in their lives and desperately needing the intimacy that the man seemed so willing to give when they first became involved with the batterer (Mills, 1985). One of Mills' (1985) participants said, "I felt so unwanted, I guess, unnecessary. And, here was somebody that loved me and made me feel special" (p. 105). Women have described ignoring problems and warnings early on because of their desire for a loving relationship (Landenburger, 1989; Mills, 1985).

Lempert (1996) described the 'invisible violence' that occurred in this stage such as the verbal abuse that caused women to challenge their definitions of self. One of Lempert's (1996) participants described this process, "After [he] called me a cunt, it really bothered me and (sighs) my perception was so screwed up, I didn't know what was right and wrong anymore in the relationship. Whether it was OK for him to do that or not." (p. 274). In this stage, the name-calling and other verbal abuse escalate, but women do not mention it to others in an attempt to maintain the image of a happy couple. Batterers deny the severity of the verbal abuse and women struggle in verbal exchanges with their partners to understand these definitional inconsistencies (Lempert, 1995; 1996). That is, the verbal assaults feel like abuse, but they are difficult to define as such by the women. Merritt-Gray and Wuest (1995) described a process they call 'relinquishing parts of self' that is similar to Lempert's (1996) conceptualization of how women's sense of self is challenged. The eroding of the self begins in this stage but continues and worsens in the next stage.

Victims in this first stage are worn down by the emotional abuse, but feel dependent on their partners to provide a happy future and ignore warning signs and early

problems. It is difficult to see how women in this initial stage might use the criminal justice system. Name-calling and communication problems are not crimes, although women may also experience threats of physical violence and harassment, which are crimes. However, it is unlikely that women in this stage would call on the criminal justice system, given that they are unlikely to define what is happening to them as abuse. Their perceptions of the criminal justice system are, therefore, likely based on things outside the relationship, and they might see the system's ability to help abused women in the same way as other non-abused women. Hoyle & Sanders (2000) suggested that the more controlling the partner's behaviour has been, the less likely the woman will be to seek help from the criminal justice system. Thus, if a pattern of extremely controlling behaviour is set in this stage, the woman's thinking about the criminal justice system may be influenced.

A police reaction at this early stage may set the tone for the woman's future use of the system or even cause her to rethink her relationship. Neighbours may call the police if noise levels become high, and the police's reaction may begin to form the woman's perception of the system. For instance, if the police officer takes the woman aside, probes for abuse, and provides her with a number to call, she may begin to wonder if her relationship is abusive, perhaps skipping the next stage completely. The first time she is hit she may define it as abuse immediately and perhaps call the number the police gave her. In contrast, if the police threatens to arrest both of them if he has to come back, the likelihood of her calling the police herself probably goes down.

Denying the abuse and hoping for better times. In this stage women begin to experience physical violence, but maintain hope that the relationship will improve. Their

optimism is likely affected by the loving-contrition period described in Walker's (1979; 1984; 2000) cycle of abuse. The batterer's apologies are accepted and both partners believe his promises to be nonviolent. Battered women may actively work on the relationship during this phase by giving their partners what they want, and feel confident their problems will be resolved (Landenburger, 1989) and that the abuse will stop, but that the relationship will continue (Merritt-Gray & Wuest, 1995). Here women resemble Landenburger's 'enduring' phase by putting up with the abuse and consciously blocking out negative aspects of the relationship. For instance, they may ignore signs that the tension-building period has returned (Walker, 2000). They tolerate the abuse because they are still very committed to maintaining the relationship (Landenburger, 1989). They cover up the abuse so others will not find out (Landenburger, 1989), which also helps them save face (Lempert, 1996). Hiding the abuse becomes an interactive process between the batterer and the victim as both works to deny what is happening (Lempert, 1996). By hiding the abuse, women keep from labeling themselves as victims (Lemper, 1996; Mills, 1985).

This period is also similar to Mills' (1985) stage of managing the violence, which is described as having two goals: protecting one's self from harm and developing a justification for maintaining the relationship. In protecting one's self, victims attempt to control the number of times they are abused as well as the severity of the abuse. Women actively work to decrease the violence by avoiding fights and placating their partners (Campbel et al., 1998; Merritt-Gray & Wuest, 1995; Mills, 1985). For instance, victims may limit their friendships or change their behaviour in other ways to satisfy their partners. In developing justifications for maintaining the relationship, survivors attempt

to minimize the significance of the violence by rationalizing it (Lempert, 1996), focusing on other aspects of their lives (Mills, 1985), and labeling their partners as “sick” or stressed rather than abusive (Mills, 1985).

This period is emotionally draining as victims may experience contradictory beliefs like thinking that they are the only ones who can stop the abuse, yet being powerless to do so (Lemper, 1996). A number of authors have described a loss of identity or self (Landenburger, 1989; Merritt-Gray & Wuest, 1995; Mills, 1985; Sleutel. 1998), which may have begun before the physical abuse, but increases in intensity with the violence. This loss of self occurs because women may do things, in order to survive the abuse, that go against their self-images, and women may wonder if the image the batterer creates of the victim is accurate (e.g., slut, stupid, bitch, etc.) (Merritt-Gray & Wuest, 1995). One woman says, “I molded myself into the situation instead of keeping my own self. I had let him put me down so far that I was part of what he was” (Merritt-Gray & Wuest, 1995, p.402). Mills (1985) described the loss of self as taking two forms. The first was a loss of identities as the woman’s world becomes narrower and revolves around being a wife and/or mother, which was further eroded by feeling she was a bad wife and/or mother. The second was a loss of the observing self, which Mills (1985) described as very passive and barely reacting to the world around her. This passiveness may arise from confusion about why her strategies for managing the violence are not working and why the man who says he “needs” his partner also threatens to hurt or kill her. Also emotionally draining is that some women in this stage feel very responsible for the problems in the relationship (Landenburger, 1989).

The coping strategies in this phase help minimize the violence without necessitating that women leave the relationship or seek outside help. It is important to note that these strategies often become less effective over time. Thus, what at first seems manageable, as victims are sometimes able to have an effect on the violence, soon becomes unmanageable. It becomes more difficult to justify or rationalize the abuse as women experience more cycles of abuse. They begin to doubt the batterer's promises and are confronted with having to name the violence as violence. It is at this point that women may experience learned helplessness as they increasingly realize they are helpless to change the batterer's behaviour or the course of the relationship without allowing the outside world to intervene in their private life. Ironically, the realization that comes with believing that they can do nothing more to save the relationship and end the abuse may spark some women into taking actions in the next stage that are more consistent with the behaviours that Gondof and Fisher (1988) observed in their survivors.

Merritt-Gray and Wuest (1995) describe how some agencies such as law enforcement, churches, and healthcare services intensify the loss of self for the victim. The criminal justice system may also contribute to a loss of self for victims especially in this particularly emotionally confusing stage. As criminal justice policies become increasingly stringent, more women in this stage will come face to face with the criminal justice system. Some women in this early stage will call the police themselves to stop a particularly violent episode (Mills, 1985), but that does not mean they want extensive police involvement. Lewis (2000) found that women who call the police early in an abusive relationship often want only immediate protection, although their future use of the system may include wanting full prosecution. Current policies, however, bring the

full force of the system into place once the police are called and the survivor's hesitation would likely label her uncooperative. Of particular concern is that a bad experience with the criminal justice system during this phase may make it less likely that the victim will turn to the system for help in the future. This is particularly relevant for women who are beginning to feel helpless about stopping the violence on their own and then have a bad experience with their first attempt at bringing in outside intervention. In a worst-case scenario she may isolate herself even further to avoid outside 'meddling,' which may make it more difficult to move into a phase where she can label her experience as abuse and seek help.

Hoyle and Sanders (2000) interviewed women who had in the past reported domestic disputes, but who had not recently reported any violence to understand if their lack of reporting was due to a cessation of the violence. They found that 6 of the 21 women interviewed were still experiencing physical violence, but no longer reported it to the police because the system had not helped them in the past. Five of the six women had not considered ending the relationship, which may indicate that they were in an early stage of abuse when the police became involved. Women in this early stage may be the most vocal critics of mandatory arrest and prosecution policies and the most likely to try to drop charges as soon as they are made. They may also be more likely to be coerced into dropping charges by partners who still have strong emotional holds on them.

Labeling the abuse and actively coping with escalating violence. In this stage survivors are more likely to label what is happening to them as abuse and use active coping strategies to deal with the abuse. In other words, they look more like the survivors described by Gondolf and Fisher (1988) than victims of learned helplessness.

Although there is no clear-cut transition from the previous stage to this one, a number of authors have described a shift in thinking that changes the way the survivor views the relationship (Campbell et al., 1998; Landenburger, 1989; Mills, 1985). Campbell et al. (1998) described “turning points” that changed the victim’s thinking and could occur a number of different times in the process of achieving non-violence. Actual turning points varied for victims, but one of the most common was a dramatic escalation in the violence. For example one woman said, “I really saw the light when he drew a gun on me” (Campbell et al., 1998, p. 752). A number of other situations were described as turning points: becoming violent themselves, his infidelity, realizing the need for financial independence, seeing the effects of the violence on their children, and so forth. Mills (1985) described a similar process as “insights” that changed the definition of the situation and threatened the stability of the relationship. For example, a victim might note that what the batterer says and does are contradictory, or she might recognize that she is not to blame for his behaviours. Ferraro and Johnson (1983) described six catalysts for change, including ‘despair’ which was characterized by a loss of hope that the relationship would improve. Importantly, for some women insight came from conversations with others who questioned her thinking about the relationship (Ferraro & Johnson, 1983; Landenburger, 1989). In this stage, the survivor, who at this point has likely gone through the cycle of abuse a number of times, is beginning to see patterns and defines the batterer as violent. Landenburger’s (1989) described this shift in thinking as “labeling” in which the survivor labels the relationship as abusive and identifies with other abused women. Defining the situation as abusive can lead to active coping

strategies that include seeking help from others. Ironically, for some women, labeling one's self as a victim can lead to acting like a survivor.

The survivor may continue to use passive coping strategies described in stage two such as placating the batterer to avoid violence, but now uses active coping strategies more often. A number of authors have described this active coping (Campbell, Rose, Kub, & Nedd, 1998; Gondolf & Fisher, 1988; Lempert, 1996; Landenburger, 1989; Merritt-Gray & Wuest, 1995; Sleutel, 1998), which includes asking for advice or help, calling the police, pressing charges, fighting back, taking financial action (e.g., gaining financial independence etc.), leaving, using self talk (e.g., reminding oneself how bad the relationship is etc.), seeking a divorce, and hiding after having left. Some authors have described self-preservation strategies that help the woman cope with the emotional impact of the abuse and that are most likely to occur in this stage after the woman has labeled the situation as abusive. For example, victims may fantasize about murdering their partners (Landenburger, 1998; Lempert, 1996), which may empower them to seek help or leave the relationship. Other survivors described fantasies of suicide (Lempert, 1996), which also served the purpose of providing the survivor with a sense of control over her life.

Campbell et al. (1998) described the fluidity of an abusive relationship. They explained that women go from being "in" to "in/out" to "out" of an abusive relationship. Most of their participants were "in" the relationship during the first interview, but most moved to an "in/out" or "out" phase by the second interview, and almost all were "out" of the abusive relationship by the third interview. The "in/out" phase that they described is particularly relevant to the labeling and active coping stage described in this section.

As the survivor begins to label her relationship as abusive, she is more likely to see a need to leave her partner. In the “in/out” phase, the relationship is in flux because survivors see a need to leave and make attempts to leave, but may continue to be ambivalent about ending the relationship forever. Alternatively, some women in the “in/out” phase are emotionally out of the relationship and want it to end, but are waiting for the right time to leave.

The process of leaving has been described by many authors as a slow process that may involve leaving and returning a number of times before the relationship and or the abuse ends for good (see Sleutel, 1998 for a review). Merrit-Gray and Wuest (1995) have noted that leaving is rarely a single action such as a change of address, although it is often described that way. They have described leaving as a gradual process whereby women who initially could not even consider leaving begin to leave in a number of different ways such as emotionally withdrawing from their partner, avoiding intimacy, separating her things from his, and staying away as much as possible. Helpers are often challenged by survivors’ behaviour during this time because they find it difficult to understand why women do not take their good advice (i.e., just leave him). Helpers sometimes make things worse by mirroring the batterer’s actions through blame and victimization.

Changes in the way survivors view the relationship, and consequently their use of active coping, may be short lived. That is, a “turning point” or “insight” may have a temporary effect on a woman’s thinking, but these changes in perspective are critical points of entry for service providers who often come into contact with a victim for the first time. This has led Sleutel (1988) to label this time as the “open window phase.”

This is also a critical point of entry for the criminal justice system. Women may call the police themselves, or may consider criminal justice intervention for the first time after speaking with shelter workers, healthcare providers, friends, or others. A number of authors have described an escalation in violence or the experience of more severe violence in comparison to other women as a reason for engaging the criminal justice system (Fischer & Rose, 1995; Gondolf, 1998; Smith, 2001; Wiist & McFarlane, 1998; Wolf et al., 2000). It is also likely that women engage the system later in the abusive relationship because women often experienced years of physical abuse before they turn to the police (Gondolf, 1998; Hutchison & Hirschel, 1998). Engaging the system after escalating violence or after years of physical abuse supports the idea that women have turning points as the relationship progresses that bring them into contact with the system.

Whether or not women continue to want the criminal justice system involved in their lives changes for a number of reasons (also discussed earlier). One reason, of particular relevance to this stage, is a continued attachment to the partner. Women in this stage may continue to be involved with the abuser on varying levels and consequently their desire for prosecution may change. The process of leaving and returning to the batterer likely affects the woman's use of the criminal justice system. Women in this stage may be particularly prone to early enthusiasm with the system that wanes as the lengthy process continues.

Arriving at nonviolence and healing. I have deliberately chosen to name this stage 'arriving at nonviolence and healing' rather than wording that connotes leaving. Women often leave without ending the violence, in fact it may be when they are in the most danger (Kirkwood, 1993; Walker, 2000; Wuest & Merritt-Gray, 1999), and some

women arrive at nonviolence without ending the relationship (Campbell, 1994). Despite the obstacles, research suggests that many battered women do achieve nonviolence. Campbell et al. (1994) found that two-thirds of the women in their study who were battered at time one were no longer being battered 2 ½ years later. The literature about this stage is less extensive than the previous two stages; nevertheless, some authors have specifically explored a final stage that moves past the violence (Landenburger, 1989; Mills, 1985; Wuest & Merritt-Gray, 1999; Wuest & Merritt-Gray, 2001).

This stage may begin with what Wuest and Merritt-Gray (1999) referred to as 'not going back,' which encompasses some of the very practical initial aspects of achieving nonviolence. The woman focuses her energy on sustaining the separation by doing a number of things: she learns to harness the system by using it to her benefit (e.g., income assistance, the criminal justice system, legal aid, community services, etc.); she learns to set limits with friends, family, and her ex-partner; she creates a plan for her future (e.g., getting a job, going to school, etc.); and she learns to live with the fear of potential retaliation, so that it does not control her life (Wuest & Merritt-Gray, 1999).

Landenburger (1989) also focused on the beginning of this stage in what she refers to as 'recovery'. She explained that there is a period of readjustment after the woman leaves her partner but before gaining a balance in her life. The woman must struggle to survive on a very practical level by obtaining shelter and the necessary financial resources needed to make a life for herself. During this difficult process she often reminds herself why she left and struggles to believe that she can make it on her own. There is a process of grieving the good aspects of the lost relationship.

Later in this stage when the practicalities of separation are settled, women search for meaning by asking why they stayed and whether they will find themselves in another abusive relationship (Landenburger, 1989; Wuest & Merritt-Gray, 2001). Taking on a new identity is an important aspect of this stage (Mills, 1985; Wuest & Merritt-Gray, 2001), although how the identity incorporates notions of having been a victim or a survivor is unclear. Mills (1985) described how women use their experience as a way to change their sense of self. Seven of the 10 women in Mills' (1985) study took on the identity of a formerly battered wife and used this identity as a way to view themselves in a variety of interactions and to combat their previous loss of identity; whereas, the three who did not take on this identity offered no strategies for reconstructing the self. Mills (1985) cautions the reader that the experiences of these women are not necessarily generalizable, and one should not conclude that taking on the identity of a formerly battered wife is essential in healing. The women in her study all described a loss of self and all came from shelters where a battered wife identity may be fostered. Of the seven who took on the identity of a formerly battered wife, two distinct definitions emerged: four women were survivors and three were victims. The survivors focused on the positive ways in which they were changing, and although they pointed out the mistakes they had made, they explained them in a positive light. The victims focused instead on the flaws that they must overcome. For instance, a survivor described her belief that her husband could change as "overly optimistic" (Mills, 1985, p118); whereas, a victim attributed the same belief to her stupidity. Mills (1985) cautiously suggests that taking on a victim identity may put a woman at greater risk for future abuse. In contrast to the participants in Mills (1985) study, Wuest and Merritt-Gray (2001) found that women

shed the identity of an abused woman or a survivor in favour instead of a new identity that focused on their current experiences. The authors suggested that the continued application of the term 'survivor' might disempower women in this stage because they wanted to move past the abuse and enjoy the rest of their future.

Wuest and Merritt-Gray (1999) described a number of ways in which women used the criminal justice system when they decided not to go back. Although their participants described the system as frustrating and not a guarantee of their safety, they also described gaining self-confidence by learning to use the system effectively. For instance, they used police escorts and peace bonds to help protect their safety, they threatened to lay (new) charges, they asserted their legal rights, and they presented strong cases in court. It is important to note that batterers also became proficient at using the criminal justice system. Batterers purposefully delayed court dates in order to enter counseling or short-term drug or alcohol treatment programs to improve their image (Wuest & Merritt-Gray, 1999), and they also manipulated the system to continue to control their partner by forcing her into court and then pleading guilty (Walker, 2000). These were attempts by the batterer to discourage the woman's use of the system, and sometimes they succeeded. Women were also discouraged by the criminal justice system when its players (i.e., police, attorney, and judges) made judgments about the legitimacy of the survivor's claims, and when past experience indicated that they could not trust the system (Wuest & Merritt-Gray, 1999). Other women may avoid using the criminal justice system because they fear it will put them in more danger and conclude that it is better to let the batterer 'get away with it' and move on with their own lives.

Many, perhaps most, women achieve a stage of nonviolence by leaving the batterer. Leaving the batterer is associated with engaging and with continuing to use the criminal justice system (Fischer & Rose, 1995; Horton et al., 1987; Hoyle & Sanders, 2000; Smith, 2001; Wolf et al., 2000). For instance, Hoyle and Sanders (2000) found that nonviolence was more common for women who reported successful prosecution and divorced their husbands leading the authors to conclude that criminal justice action helps end the violence when the victim is committed to leaving the partner. Women who are committed to leaving their partner may be particularly active in using the criminal justice system. Studies that have compared women who have and have not obtained court orders have found that women who seek these orders are less likely to be living with or involved with the abuser (Wolf et al., 2000) and more likely to have decided to leave their partner (Fischer & Rose, 1995; Horton et al., 1987). Fischer and Rose (1995) speculated that women who have made the decision to leave may use the criminal justice system as a way to enforce that decision. Missing from this analysis are women who have achieved nonviolence without using the criminal justice system. It is conceivable that for some women a decision to leave the batterer is enough to end the violence. Also missing are women who have achieved nonviolence without leaving the batterer. There is some indication that non-violence can be achieved while maintaining the relationship for a minority of women (Campbell et al., 1998) although what role the criminal justice system played in these few cases is not known. It is possible that the enforcement of court ordered treatment may help change a violent relationship into a nonviolent one in some cases.

Possible Variations of Views on the Criminal Justice System by Stages

Overall it appears that just as women's experiences and views of the relationship change over time, their views of the criminal justice system and their desire for the system's involvement also change over time. Lewis (2000) noted that an individual woman may only want protection early on in the relationship, but may want to charge and prosecute her partner months or years later. Gondolf (1998) found that the majority (58%) of women in his study (victims of court-ordered batterers) had used the criminal justice system more than once. These two findings suggest that some women may engage the system several times and for different reasons.

Mandatory arrest and prosecution policies are likely to bring women into the system at earlier stages in the abuse which, if the experience is good, may help the woman define her situation as abusive and confront the problem earlier, or if the experience is bad, may lead her to further isolate herself and avoid future interaction with the criminal justice system. Women who are 'denying the abuse and hoping for better times' (stage two) may be particularly resistant to proactive policies and discouraged by a system that does not appear to hear their views. Women who are 'labeling the abuse and actively coping with escalating violence' (stage three) may benefit from proactive policies because they are ready to label what has happened to them as violence and have often experienced severe acts of violence that require police protection. Proactive policies may give the women the encouragement they need to follow through with prosecution and perhaps with leaving their partner. The relatively high approval rates for these policies likely come from women who are 'labeling the abuse and actively coping with escalating violence' (stage three). These women are more likely to use active

coping strategies such as seeking help from shelters, which is where high approval rates have been documented. These may be the women who are most likely to say they do not want control over the decision about whether or not their partner will be arrested/prosecuted. However, because women experiencing this stage continue to be involved with their partners on varying levels, their support for proactive policies may change if they experience frustration in attempts to disengage the system. Women who are 'arriving at nonviolence and healing' (stage four) are likely to benefit from proactive policies if they in fact do want their partners prosecuted, and may be more likely to rate these policies positively. These women may find the system supports their decision to leave their partners and appreciates their 'cooperativeness'. However, some women experiencing this stage may not see prosecution and conviction as a goal, and simply want to forget and move on. For these women the continued stress of prosecution may create more problems than it solves.

The Justification for this Study

Research that includes victims' perceptions and views about the different aspects of the criminal justice system has given survivors a voice in the discussion about whether or not the criminal justice system can be helpful to battered women. Missing, however, is how their views work together to create a cohesive perspective about how the criminal justice system can work for them. For instance, are victims who use the system as a power resource the same women who dislike no-drop policies? How does satisfaction with the police interact with perspectives about mandatory arrest? It is difficult to organize victims' views and make policy recommendations when we do not know how those views work together. From Fleury's (2000) cluster analysis, we learn that even

simple ratings of satisfaction work together differently for different groups of women. It is not simply the fact that some women are satisfied with all aspects of the system and some women are not. The complexity of women's views is evident even though this study measured only their 'satisfaction' with different areas of the criminal justice system. When other perceptions of the system (beyond mere satisfaction) are explored the true complexity of women's views becomes even more apparent.

In my own quantitative study of victims' evaluations of mandatory intervention policies, there were hints from anecdotal accounts that different views were combined into perspectives differently for different women. For instance, during the debriefing session one woman expressed hating the policies because she believed that her ex-partner would kill her if the police became involved. In her view, she would be blamed regardless of whether or not she initiated prosecution. Another woman strongly supported the policies despite believing that they would anger her partner and cause more violence against her. In explanation she wrote, "I think my partner would be more violent ...being arrested will make him worse, but I was glad to see him arrested as quick as possible."

The quantitative research on victims' perspectives has been useful in describing average responses and the views of the majority, but the quieter voices are obscured. The qualitative research is rich with information about both majority and minority views, but is overwhelming in scope and difficult to organize with respect to how individual views come together to create cohesive perspectives about the CJS. What is needed is a way to organize women's views without losing the perspectives of the views in the minority. Understanding abused women's views about the criminal justice system is the main

purpose of this study. Using Q-methodology, described in detail in the Methods section of this paper, participants were asked to represent their perspectives on issues that are known to be important to at least some women. Participants did this by sorting statements about the criminal justice system depending on how strongly they agreed or disagreed with each statement. Each participant's subjective view of the criminal justice system was reflected in how she sorted the statements (i.e., her Q-sort), and then comparisons were made between participants using the statistics of factor analysis. Q-methodology allowed me to understand how participants think about the criminal justice system without losing the views of the minority.

A secondary purpose of this study was to examine how victims' perspectives may be influenced by the stage they are in within the abusive relationship. The studies to date that have included victims' perspectives on and experiences with the criminal justice system are limited in their applicability to all battered women. Specifically, women who have never been physically abused (stage one) or who are 'denying the abuse and hoping for better times' (stage two) are unlikely to be adequately represented in these studies. These women have not yet defined their experiences as abusive and are unlikely to purposefully engage the system or seek help from a shelter. If these women do participate in some research studies, their views are likely to be obscured by the more dominant voices of women who are 'labeling the abuse and actively coping with escalating violence' and who are 'arriving at nonviolence and healing' (stages three and four). Q-methodology uses selective recruitment to ensure that many views are heard. This study used a number of different recruitment strategies to increase the likelihood that women experiencing stages one and two would also participate. Women

experiencing stages one and two were actively recruited through posters and flyers calling for participation from women with serious problems in intimate relationships. Women experiencing any stage who had never used victim services were also recruited through posters and flyers. Participants were also recruited through a shelter, a community centre, hospitals, and a council on wife abuse.

The literature on the stages of an abusive relationship suggests that as women move through the relationship, they have different experiences and different thought processes. Just as their thinking about the relationship changes, their thinking about how the criminal justice system can help them may also change. Detailed hypotheses about what views would be expressed in what stages were not possible given that the organization of participants' views would be known only after the Q-sorts had been analyzed. However, a few general hypotheses based on the literature were explored:

It was expected that women who were 'denying the abuse and hoping for better times' (stage two) would have negative views about the criminal justice system and dislike mandatory intervention policies compared to women experiencing other stages.

Women who were 'labeling the abuse and actively coping with escalating violence' (stage three) were expected to have conflicting views about the criminal justice system and to perceive mandatory intervention policies as generally positive compared to women experiencing other stages.

Women who were 'arriving at non violence and healing' (stage four) were hypothesized to hold relatively positive views of the criminal justice system and to perceive mandatory intervention policies as helpful compared to women experiencing other stages.

Method

Q Methodology

Q methodology is not a new method, but it is not widely used in psychology and thus warrants a short introduction. William Stephenson invented Q methodology in 1935 as a way to investigate human subjectivity (Brown, 1980; Brown, 1996). As a student of Charles Spearman, William Stephenson was knowledgeable in Pearson's correlation and factor analysis, which has come to be called 'R technique'. The R represents a generalization of Pearson's r , which is conventionally used to study the relationship between different traits, abilities, test results and so forth (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Stephenson's (1935; 1953) interest, however, lay in the possibility of inverting factor analysis through the use of 'Q technique'. This inversion leads to the correlation of persons, rather than traits, and thus the letter Q is used to distinguish the technique from R. The statistics used in R and Q techniques are identical, but the methods are fundamentally different. Whereas factor analysis (i.e., R technique) selects n individuals to be measured by m variables, its inversion (i.e., Q technique) selects n different variables to be measured by m individuals (Brown, 1980). The individuals, rather than the tests, are intercorrelated and factored in the usual way. The result is a set of factors of people with similar perspectives.

However, Q methodology is not merely the transposition of the R matrix because Q only works under the special condition of a common unit of measurement (Brown, 1980). This 'limitation' is what makes the method uniquely suited to the study of operant subjectivity (Brown, 1980). The common unit of measurement used is the participant's subjectivity. In practice this is her belief of what means more to her, item A or item B.

Participants are asked to order statements or other stimuli (e.g., pictures, words, art, etc.) along a continuum that goes from one extreme to another. In this study, participants ordered statements about the criminal justice system from how strongly they disagreed to how strongly they agreed with each statement. The participants judged each statement in relation to every other statement according to their own subjectivity. The result was an ordering of statements (each Q sort) that reflected each participant's beliefs about the concourse (the opinions of interest), which in this case were views about the criminal justice system. Thus Q is a fundamentally different methodology from R because both the goals and methods of Q are necessarily different from those of R. The goal in Q methodology is the measure of subjectivity and its method involves Q sorting.

Brown (1980) describes the Q sort as a reflection of the person's thinking, evaluating, and interpreting. The Q sort becomes a concrete representation of the person's subjective beliefs. The power of Q methodology is its unique ability to allow for easy comparisons between participants. In essence it allows for a mathematical comparison of participants' subjective beliefs. Participants with similar Q sorts will stand out in each factor, and the way they have sorted the Q statements will give that factor meaning. Thus, Q methodology uses an operant approach. Unlike R methodology wherein concepts are defined before the analysis, in Q methodology concepts are defined by the resulting factors (Brown, 1980). This allows for the possibility of uncovering unexpected sets of beliefs.

One of the strengths of Q methodology is that it allows the researcher to hear quiet voices that are often missing from methodology that places an emphasis on averages and makes a point of excluding outliers. In Q methodology, participant

selection is done carefully and deliberately to ensure that a variety of diverse perspectives are represented. Participants with diverse beliefs that are theoretically relevant to the study's goals should be selected (Brown, 1980). A P-set structure helps guide recruitment by defining situations in which views are likely to vary (Brown, 1980). The main effects in a P-set identify areas that are expected to influence participants' perspectives, but only the most important main effects are normally included. The main effects in this study were: experiences with the criminal justice system, stage of abuse, and utilization of victim services. These main effects were chosen, not only because the literature suggests that they would affect perspectives, but also because they identify women who have been noticeably absent in other studies (i.e., women who have not used the criminal justice system or victim services, and women who are experiencing early stages of abuse). For practical purposes the main effects need to be limited or the number of necessary participants would quickly become unmanageable. Most Q studies do not use more than 50 participants (Brown, 1993). Each main effect contains levels that identify potential participants' different experiences. The goal is to recruit participants who have had the various experiences identified by the P-set, although it is rarely necessary to ensure a complete balance of the P-set (Brown, 1980).

Q methodology is particularly well suited for this study because the main purpose was to understand the complexity of battered women's views about the criminal justice system. It was expected that some women would feel very positively and some would feel very negatively about some aspects of the system, but beyond this polarization of positive and negative feelings it was unclear from the current literature how their views

would work together to form cohesive perspectives. The factors that resulted from this Q methodology study help clarify these perspectives.

Participants

Fifty-eight women participated in this study. Two additional women were excluded after having participated. One had never been in an abusive relationship as determined by her relationship events questionnaire. The second could not sort the cards along the template despite my attempts at explaining the task. With assistance she was able to sort the cards into three piles, but she was very distracted and could not determine how much she agreed or disagreed with each card.

Women who had experienced emotional and/or physical abuse by a current or past male partner were eligible to participate. The P-set structure for this research study is shown in Table 1, and it identifies variation by experience with the CJS, stage of abuse, and utilization of victim services. Note that the actual number of women with each of the experiences in the P-set appears in brackets. For example, 12 women were experiencing the prelude to abuse stage (stage one), and therefore had not experienced physical violence. Further details are given in the results' section. At first, participation was widely sought, but as recruitment continued, participants who had experienced physical abuse and participants with more experience with the CJS were sought and selected because more women with these experiences were needed. The 58 participants were recruited through a number of avenues.

First, 14 participants were recruited through Hiatus House in Windsor, which has a close working relationship with criminal justice personnel. Women who were staying at the shelter on the five or six occasions that I went to the shelter were invited to

Table 1

P-Set Structure

Main effects ^a	Levels	N
A) Experience with CJS	a. none (24) b. police only (13) c. experience with prosecution, but not court experience (8) d. experience with court process (13)	4
B) Stage of abuse	a. prelude to abuse (12) b. denying the abuse (1) c. labeling the abuse (26) d. arriving at non violence (18) ^c	4
C) Utilization of victim services	a. none (18) b. shelter (29) ^d c. other (30)	3

^aABC = (4)(4)(3) = 48 combinations

^bThe number in brackets refers to the number of women with that experience.

^cThe total number of women for stages of abuse adds up to 57 because one woman's stage could not be identified due to a lack of data.

^dNote that 19 women had experience with a shelter and another type of victim service

participate. I would go into the common area and ask women to participate. In addition staff would tell women in other areas that I was there and that if they wanted to participate they could go into the common area and talk to me.

Second, 3 women whose current or ex-partner was in the 'fresh start' treatment program in Windsor were recruited. Most of the men in this program are mandated to attend treatment through a court order although some volunteer to attend the program. Service providers notified the women and told them about the study. If they were interested in participating the women called me and set up an appointment.

Third, 8 participants were recruited through three hospitals in the Toronto area. These women saw recruitment posters or were given a flyer by the wife abuse coordinator in one of the hospitals. If they were interested, they called and set up an appointment. The hospital that has an abuse coordinator also provides services to women who seek medical attention consistent with abuse. The other two hospitals do not provide this service. I found that the women recruited through this method were hospital staff, patients, or visitors. One version of the poster/flyer asked for participation from women who were having serious problems in a long-term relationship. The goal of this method was to recruit women who had not been physically abused (stage one) or who were 'denying the abuse and hoping for better times' (stage two). The second version asked for participation from women who were currently in or had left an abusive relationship. The main goal of this method was to recruit women experiencing various stages of abuse who had not sought victim services.

Fourth, 11 participants were recruited through posters and flyers (same two versions as above) located in public places on the University of Windsor campus. In

addition, counselors who work in student counseling services gave out flyers to women who had experienced abuse. Women who were interested called and set up an appointment.

Fifth, 2 women were recruited through posters (same two versions as above) in public areas around Toronto (e.g., grocery stores, libraries, community centers, churches, university campuses, etc.). Again, women called to set up an appointment. Posters were also put up in public places around Windsor, but no one responded.

Sixth, 4 participants were recruited through the House of Sophrosyne's aftercare program. The House of Sophrosyne is a substance abuse treatment centre for women. I attended two sessions of the aftercare program, told women about the study, and made appointments with interested women.

Seventh, 7 participants were recruited through a West Indian community centre located in a low income area of a Toronto suburb. The volunteer coordinator put up posters, told women about the study, and told them on what days I would be coming to the centre. When I arrived I talked to women who were interested and set up appointments.

Eighth, 9 participants were recruited through the Toronto Woman Abuse council's accountability committee. All of the women on this committee have experienced abuse. I went to two meetings, told women about the study and set up appointments.

Materials

The Q Sort

The concourse is where the opinions of interest to the researcher have been expressed. In other words, it is the population from which the Q statements are taken. The opinions in this study's concourse answer the question: "What are battered women's perspectives of the criminal justice system?" A concourse can be obtained in a number of ways including individual or group interviews, literature review, media output, and the cultural experience of the researcher (Rogers, 1995). What is important is that the concourse is grounded in concrete existence (Brown, 1980). The concourse for this study was the academic literature, reviewed in the introduction, which has specifically included victims' perspectives on various aspects of the criminal justice system. This is an appropriate concourse for this study for three reasons. First, the goal of this study is to understand the complexity of victims' views because so many views have already been expressed in the literature. Second, a sufficient number of perspectives are highlighted by victims' direct quotes because many authors included open-ended responses or conducted qualitative studies. Third, the addition of new interviews would most likely produce repetition of literature findings.

I established a concrete concourse by rereading the literature and the open-ended responses to an earlier study that I conducted (Barata, 1999) with the specific purpose of extracting victims' perspectives. I chose representative examples for each idea that I came across in each study, rather than including everything that was said in the concourse. For instance, if an author used a number of examples to illustrate a theme, I

chose only one example to include in the concourse. This resulted in 153 statements about the criminal justice system (Appendix A).

It is unmanageable and unnecessary to use an entire concourse in a Q study just as it is unmanageable and unnecessary to include an entire population of people in an R study. The next step is to represent the concourse in miniature. A random sample of statements is usually inadequate because for theoretical reasons certain areas within the original discourse need to be covered. The solution is to model the Q sort theoretically by using the principles of variance design. This structured sampling helps ensure that perspectives about different topic areas within the concourse are represented in the Q sort (Brown, 1980). Structured sampling in this study takes different areas, reasons for using the system, and general comments about the criminal justice system into account. Positive and negative perspectives about criminal justice involvement were also used to create a balanced block design (see Table 2). Note that the number of Q sort statements chosen in each topic area varies because the number and quality of the original concourse statements varied; however, the total number of positive and negative Q sort items is identical. The number of Q statements used from each topic area is listed, followed in parenthesis by the number of statements in the original concourse.

Q statements were created directly from concourse statements. Following Kitzinger's (1987) example, simple unambiguous statements that were general enough to cover a number of experiences and beliefs were developed. Statements were written so that they would be able to be evaluated by women experiencing various stages of abuse and with various levels of criminal justice system experience. Whenever possible, Q statements for this study were developed from direct quotes from victims about the

Table 2

Balanced Block Design: Number of Q sort items followed in parenthesis by the number of items in the concrete concourse

Areas of the system	Perspectives on criminal justice system involvement	
	Positive	Negative
a. Police	5 (8)	5 (12)
b. Arrest and mandatory arrest	5 (18)	5 (10)
c. Attorneys	4 (5)	4 (4)
d. Prosecution and no-drop	8 (14)	5 (10)
e. Judges, court experiences, and verdicts	2 (7)	5 (11)
f. Why use the criminal justice system	9 (18)	7 (20)
g. General comments on the criminal justice system	3 (7)	5 (9)
Total	36 (77)	36 (76)

criminal justice system; however, some perspectives have only been examined through quantitative studies. The final 72 Q statements are in Appendix B.

The Q statements were ordered on a Likert-type template that ranged from -5 (strongly disagree) to +5 (strongly agree) (Appendix C), and participants recorded their answers on a record sheet (Appendix D). The cards were ordered to approximate a normal curve (see Appendix C) (i.e., 4 at -5 & +5; 5 at -4 & +4; 6 at -3 & +3; 7 at -2 & +2; 8 at -1 & +1; 12 at 0). This particular distribution was chosen to maximize the number of cards in the neutral position. This was necessary because a number of statements, dealing with how a woman would use the criminal justice system, would not apply to women who do not identify what has happened to them as abuse. A quasi-normal distribution is best because it aids in yielding equivalent patterns between participants (Rogers, 1995), it leads participants to make distinctions they would otherwise not make, and it facilitates the data analysis (Brown, 1980). However, when participants found this difficult, they were told to do a free sort. A number of women did put more cards in the strongly agree section because they said they found it difficult to pick only four cards for this slot.

Identification of Stages

The stage of abuse that the woman was experiencing when she participated in the study was identified by collecting information from her about the abusive relationship (Appendix E). The idea for this questionnaire came from Williams's (1998) stage assessment tool; however, the questions and theory behind the identification of stages in this study is completely different. While Williams uses Prochaska and Di Clemente's (1982) stages of change theory to identify the stages women go through before leaving an

abusive partner, I have used the qualitative literature on the stages of abuse to define four stages. The questions in my identification of stages questionnaire thus reflect identifying features of each of these four stages.

Stage one was defined as having experienced emotional abuse, but not physical abuse, regardless of whether or not the woman defined the relationship as abusive. Stage two was defined as having experienced physical abuse (and possibly emotional abuse), but believing that the relationship would improve and being unlikely to define the relationship as abusive. Stage three was defined as having experienced physical abuse (and possibly emotional abuse), but believing that the relationship would not improve and being likely to define the relationship as abusive. Stage four consisted of two versions. Stage fourA was defined as having experienced physical abuse (and possibly emotional abuse), which has stopped for at least one year, and which the woman felt would not occur again. Stage fourB was defined as having experienced only emotional abuse, which had stopped for at least one year, and which the woman felt would not occur again.

These definitions served only as a guide in identifying the stage a woman was in. Further information was also collected and if it conflicted with the above definitions the woman may have been placed in a different stage. For example, information was also collected about the kinds of things she did to minimize the abuse, and about how the abuse ended (if it did). A second rater and I read definitions of the four stages of abuse (Appendix F) and independently decided in which stage the participant best fit. We agreed on 47 of the 58 ratings (81%) and the proportion of agreement after chance had been excluded was 72%, $\kappa = .721$, $p < .001$. We met to discuss discrepancies and agreed on the final ratings.

Background Questionnaire

Background information was collected through the use of a short questionnaire (Appendix G). Participants were asked standard demographic questions as well as questions concerning their use of the criminal justice system and of various victim services. All of the questions were written specifically for this study, with the exception of the ethnicity question, which was adapted from Statistics Canada (1996). This questionnaire concluded by asking participants if they would be interested in participating in a follow-up interview to discuss their Q sort. If a participant was interested, she filled in her name and a safe telephone number where she could be reached or where she could collect her messages. She was also given the option of providing an e-mail address. Most of participants (52 of 58) provided their names and contact information.

Interview

Short follow-up interviews with six selected participants were used to allow participants to expand on their reasoning for ranking the statements as they did, to help clarify unexpected results, and to help define the factors that emerged (Brown, 1980). Women who loaded purely on a given factor were eligible for an interview. One woman from each of the first four factors, and two women from the last factor were interviewed. The interviews (Appendix H) asked women about their views on criminal justice involvement in domestic violence cases, and about why they sorted the Q sort statements in the way that they did. Five of the interviews were audio taped and transcribed. One participant was unwilling to have her interview audio taped, so careful notes and verbatim quotes were written down as accurately as possible.

Procedure

Two participants did not want to meet and were mailed the study package (i.e., general instructions, two copies of the consent form, Q sort instructions, the Q sort cards, the Likert-type template, the record sheet, the glossary of terms, the instructions for the Relationship Events Questionnaire, the questionnaire itself, the instructions for the Background Questionnaire, the questionnaire itself, and a debriefing form), completed it on their own and mailed it back to me. I met with the other 56 participants and gave them the study package, asked them to read and sign the consent form, explained the study, and was available to answer any of their questions as they sorted the cards and filled out the questionnaires. Rogers (1995) indicates that most adults can complete Q sorts as a self-completion exercise, and most of the participants did complete the study without asking questions. The Q sort cards in each package were shuffled before they were given to participants to ensure that they were randomized.

Participants began by reading (or listening while I explained) the general instructions (Appendix I) that told them in what order they would proceed. First, participants read and signed the informed consent form (Appendix J). Second, they read the Q sort instructions (or listened while I explained)(Appendix K). These instructions directed them to read through all of the Q sort cards to get a sense of the domain of statements. While they were reading through the cards they placed them in three piles: disagree, neutral, or agree. Next, they read through the cards again and used the Likert-type template to sort the statements according to how strongly they disagreed or agreed while trying to maintain the suggested distribution of cards. They were told that they could move the cards around as often as they liked until they had obtained the normal

distribution and were satisfied that their perspectives were represented. They were also told that they could do a free sort if some of the cards did not fit in the suggested distribution. They then marked each card number on the record sheet. They were also provided with a glossary of criminal justice terms to help them with definitions that may have been unfamiliar (Appendix L). Third, participants read the instructions (Appendix M) for the 'Relationship Events' questionnaire and filled in their answers. Fourth, they read the instructions for the 'Background Questionnaire' (Appendix N) and filled in their answers. Participants then placed everything back in the original envelope, sealed it and returned it to me in person or by mail (a self-addressed and stamped envelope was provided). Participants were given \$10.00 as remuneration for their participation. This was either given to them directly or mailed to them by having them self-address a blank envelope at the end of the study. They were also given a debriefing form (Appendix O), a pamphlet on wife abuse and hidden information (in a lipstick container or a mini pad) on wife abuse with victim service numbers.

Six participants whose views were most like the perspectives that emerged in the analysis were contacted and a meeting for an interview was arranged. These were the participants who loaded significantly and exclusively on one of the factors that emerged. Interviews followed an interview guide (Appendix H). Participants who agreed to be interviewed first read and signed a consent form (Appendix P). At the end of the interview they were given an additional \$10.00.

Results

Participant Demographics and Experiences

Detailed descriptions of the participant demographics are in Table 3. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 60 and had a mean age of 34.96 ($SD = 10.57$). The majority had at least some post-secondary education, but the level of education varied. Approximately half of the participants were of European (White) ancestry, and the other half was quite diverse with seven different ethnicities represented. Most participants identified with a religion, and the most common was a Christian religion. Almost all of the women identified as heterosexual, although two identified as bisexual and two chose to leave this item blank.

Approximately half of the participants were currently in a relationship (55.2%). Of those women, most were casually or exclusively dating, married, or living together. The length of time in the current relationship varied from 0.08 to 29 years ($M = 4.88$; $SD = 7.75$). Most of the participants had children (62.1%; $n = 36$). On average women had 3 children ($M = 2.67$; $SD = 1.66$), but the range was substantial (1 to 9). Many women had children living with them (44.8%; $n = 26$). The number of children living with them ranged from 1 to 7 ($M = 2.19$; $SD = 1.35$; $n = 26$). All of the participants lived in Southern Ontario, Canada. Approximately half of the participants were from Windsor or a city near Windsor, and the other half were from Toronto or a city near Toronto.

Check for Participant Diversity: P-Set Structure

Participants' Experiences with the Criminal Justice System. Criminal justice system experiences varied substantially. Just over half of the participants had personally called the police because of abuse (56.9%; $n = 33$). Approximately a third had

Table 3: Participant Demographics

Variable	N	%
Age		
18-19	3	5.2
20s	16	27.6
30s	17	29.3
40s	16	27.6
50s	4	6.9
60s	1	1.7
Not answered	1	1.7
Education		
Some elementary	1	1.7
Some high-school	8	13.8
Graduated high-school	8	13.8
Some college	13	22.4
College diploma	14	24.1
University degree	9	15.5
Post graduate degree	4	6.9
Not answered	1	1.7
Ethnicity		
European (White)	30	51.7
Caribbean	7	12.1
South Asian	4	6.9
East or South East Asian	4	6.9
African	2	3.4
First Nations	2	3.4
Arab	2	3.4
Latin, Central, and South American	1	1.7
First Nations & White	2	3.4
Not answered	4	6.9
Currently in a relationship		
Casually dating	9	28.1
Exclusively dating	6	18.8
Married	6	18.8
Living together	6	18.8
Engaged	1	3.1
Separated	1	3.1
Divorced	1	3.1
Long distance	1	3.1
Safe dating	1	3.1
City of residence		
Windsor	28	48.3
City near Windsor	2	3.4
Toronto	18	31.0
City near Toronto	10	17.2

experience with others calling the police on their behalf (31.0%; n = 18), and the police came to half of the participants' homes (50.0%; n = 29). About 1/3 had experience with their partner being arrested (31.0%; n = 18); however, a similar percentage indicated that on at least one occasion their partner was not arrested when the police arrived (29.3%; n = 17). A substantial minority had experience with their partner being charged (31.0%; n = 18), and/or prosecuted (29.3%; n = 17). A little over a quarter of the participants were required to attend court (27.6%; n = 16), and a little under a quarter testified in court (20.7%; n = 12). A few indicated that they wanted their partner prosecuted, but he was not prosecuted (12.1%; n = 7). Overall, the P-set structure for criminal justice experiences had four levels, the result of which were that 24 (41.4%) of the participants had no personal experience with the criminal justice system, 13 (22.4%) only had experience with the police, 8 (13.8%) had experience with the prosecution (but not with the court process), and 13 (22.4%) had court experience. This indicates that there was considerable diversity in the participants' experiences with the CJS.

Stages of Abuse. The stages of abuse were identified by examining the responses to the Relationship Events Questionnaire (Appendix E) and following the definitions of the different stages (Appendix F). The P-set structure for stages of abuse had four levels. Twelve women (20.7%) were defined as stage one, 1 (1.7%) was defined as stage two, 26 (44.8%) were defined as stage three, and 18 (31.0%) were defined as stage four (16 were stage fourA, and two were stage fourB). One person's stage could not be identified because insufficient information was available. With the exception of stage two, there was good representation of women who were currently experiencing different stages of abuse.

Participants' Use of Victim Services. The most common victim service used by participants was staying at a shelter (43.1%; n = 25). A number of participants used shelter services while living somewhere else (34.5%; n = 20), called a woman's help hotline (29.3%; n = 29.3), used victim services at a hospital (20.7%; n = 12) and/or used victim services in the court system (13.8%; n = 8). Ten (17.2%) mentioned other services such as specific agencies in the Toronto area, the Internet, private counseling, and Children's Aid. Overall, the P-set structure for victim's services had three levels, the results of which were that 18 (31.0%) participants had not used any victim services, 29 (50%) had used shelter services (as residence or for other services) and 11 (19.0%) had never used shelter services, but had used at least one other service. Note that 19 (32.8%) had used shelter services and used at least one additional service. There was good representation of women who had and who had not used a shelter or any victim services.

Q Analysis

In Q methodology the statistics of factor analysis are used to identify the Q sorts that are most similar. The resulting factors provide information about groups of similar Q sorts, or in other words groups of women with similar perspectives. The factor loadings reflect the correlation between each woman's Q sort and each factor. For example, a high positive loading indicates that the Q sort is very similar to the factor. In the initial stages of Q analysis the factors are little more than groups of numbers and it is not until the later stages of analysis, when the factors are interpreted that they are more adequately described as perspectives. For this reason, I use the word "factor" in the early stages of analysis and "perspective" in summaries and in the discussion.

PQMethod version 2.11 (Schmolek, 2000), which is an MS-DOS statistical program designed for Q studies, was used for the statistical analysis. This program was chosen over other more widely used statistical programs (i.e., SPSS or SAS) because it allows data to be entered as a distribution of scores for each participant and contains checks for accurate data entry. In addition the standard output is tailored to Q studies in order to facilitate the factor interpretations.

As per the standard recommended procedures (Brown, 1980), principal component analysis was performed on the correlation matrix of participants (i.e., the correlations between participants' Q sorts) and the factors were rotated orthogonally using Varimax rotation. Brown (1980) describes a number of statistical ways one can determine the appropriate number of factors that should be interpreted, but stresses that choosing a final solution is subjective. That is, both statistical and theoretical significance needs to be taken into account. McKeown and Thomas (1988) also make this point and emphasize that the solution chosen should highlight the theoretical underpinnings of the particular study. The first, and most commonly used method in R studies is to examine the eigenvalues and cut off factors at an eigenvalue of one. The eigenvalue is the sum of squared loadings for a factor and thus in a Q study is highly influenced by the number of people who participate, and is generally not considered the best method for determining the number of factors to interpret (Brown, 1980). In this study a cut off of one eigenvalue would have resulted in the interpretation of 12 factors, which by Q standards is far too many.

Another statistical criterion that Brown (1980) suggests is that factors with at least two significant loadings should be rotated and examined for pure loadings. A person has

a pure loading if their sort loads significantly ($p < .01$) on only one factor. In this case a loading greater than .304 was significant ($SE_r \times 2.58$)¹. PQMethod allows for the rotation of a maximum of eight factors. This is not a limitation because more than seven factors would be highly unusual in a Q analysis (Brown, 1980). All eight rotated factors had at least two significant loadings, so an eight factor solution was considered first by examining the number of pure loadings in the rotated factor solution. At least two or three pure loadings are usually² needed for an adequate interpretation of a factor because the interpretation is based solely on the Q sorts of participants with pure loadings (Brown, 1980). In an eight-factor solution 62% of the variance was explained, and three factors had only one pure loading (other loadings: 8, 3, 2, 2, and 2). In a seven-factor solution 58% of the variance was explained, and two factors had only one pure loading (other loadings: 8, 3, 4, 2, and 2). And in a six-factor solution, 56% of the variance was explained, and one factor had zero and another had only one pure loading (other loadings: 9, 3, 2, and 3). Thus these three solutions were all discarded. A five-factor solution resulted in factors with 7, 5, 3, 4, and 3 pure loadings and was determined to be the best solution and the one that was used in all subsequent steps. This solution accounted for 52% of the variance. Table 4 contains the factor loadings for each participant.

Interpretation of Factors

Participants that loaded significantly on each factor were used to help determine the perspective represented by that factor. The scores of participants who loaded significantly on each of the extracted factors were merged (Brown, 1980). However, before scores could be merged, the differences in loading strengths were taken into

¹Standard error of a zero-order loading = $SE_r = 1/\sqrt{N} = 1/\sqrt{72} = 0.11785$ (Brown, 1980, p.222)

²An exception would be if a participant of particular theoretical interest to the study was the only person to load significantly on that factor (e.g., the CEO of a company) (Brown, 1980).

Table 4: Factor Loadings

Participant	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
38Sara	0.8230*	-0.1808	0.1066	-0.0958	0.1940
36	0.7850*	0.2189	-0.0340	-0.0804	0.2176
33	0.6861*	0.2646	0.0467	-0.0034	0.0783
1	0.6167*	0.1004	0.1771	-0.2247	-0.0572
53	0.4824*	0.2494	0.0059	0.1716	-0.1563
10	0.3458*	0.1450	-0.2047	0.1113	0.0635
19	0.3352*	-0.1844	-0.1478	-0.0358	0.0003
39Grace	0.1588	0.7235*	0.2089	-0.2306	0.2830
58	0.0382	0.6670*	0.2185	0.2241	-0.1188
56	0.0008	0.6662*	0.3002	0.2753	0.0935
5	-0.0337	0.6244*	-0.1151	-0.1110	0.0886
3	-0.0377	0.5347*	0.0460	0.2913	0.2365
34	0.1019	-0.0787	0.7494*	0.2572	0.0248
35Savita	-0.1641	0.1746	0.6447*	-0.0014	-0.2391
16	-0.1933	0.1796	0.6327*	0.0813	0.2294
29Ying May	0.0578	0.0589	0.1439	0.5959*	0.0837
45	-0.1824	0.1349	0.0553	0.4346*	-0.0853
46	-0.0792	0.1078	0.0739	0.3944*	0.1046
27	-0.0094	-0.1035	0.2233	0.3808*	-0.2813
51Reena	0.1403	0.1068	0.2704	-0.0356	0.6416*
37Jen	-0.1726	0.2664	-0.0015	-0.0997	0.5321*
42	0.2494	0.2809	-0.1106	0.0308	0.4859*
2	0.5056*	0.2275	0.2949	-0.3102*	-0.1532
4	0.6769*	0.1833	0.2237	0.2121	0.4033*
6	0.0695	0.4713*	0.3263*	-0.0043	0.0553
7	0.1758	0.0656	0.2682	0.0883	0.2815
8	0.6528*	0.2720	0.0157	-0.1674	0.4352*
9	0.5657*	0.1208	-0.0667	-0.1452	0.3269*
11	0.3210*	0.5185*	0.1376	-0.3130*	0.2007
12	0.7313*	0.1428	0.0353	-0.3196*	-0.0683
13	0.5186*	0.1072	0.0107	0.3101*	-0.1017
14	0.7769*	-0.1117	-0.0109	-0.1249	0.3128*
15	0.2210	0.5561*	0.1040	0.2641	0.3211*
17	0.4796*	0.3877*	-0.1184	-0.2267	0.4135*
18	0.3845*	0.4713*	0.3273*	-0.2969	-0.1014
20	0.0012	0.4182*	0.0638	0.3897*	0.3428*
21	0.3721*	0.1039	0.3999*	-0.2834	0.4001*
22	0.0246	0.6985*	0.0645	0.3763*	-0.1116
23	0.4323*	0.5084*	-0.0606	0.1913	0.3220*
24	0.3224*	0.5944*	-0.2110	0.1787	0.1629
25	0.2551	0.2363	0.1317	0.2513	-0.2159
26	0.6794*	0.3807*	-0.1114	0.0118	0.1358
28	0.5639*	0.2870	-0.0075	0.1397	0.4184*
30	0.5892*	0.4224*	0.1226	-0.0759	0.2146
31	0.4012*	0.0671	0.5818*	-0.0234	0.0934
32	0.3102*	-0.0923	-0.0079	0.2602	0.4833*
40	-0.1129	-0.2146	0.5673*	0.4198*	-0.0008
41	0.4321*	0.6043*	0.1252	0.1662	0.1003
43	0.2404	0.5209*	-0.0484	0.2209	0.4445*
44	0.5075*	0.3775*	0.0861	-0.3845*	0.3099*
47	0.3474*	0.6994*	-0.0437	-0.0143	0.2124
48	0.3205*	0.7551*	0.0401	-0.1322	0.0649
49	0.4443*	0.3258*	-0.0546	0.1000	0.3501*
50	-0.0662	0.4385*	-0.2512	0.5789*	0.0060
52	0.3956*	0.4962*	-0.1588	0.0647	0.0123
54	0.3009	0.6970*	-0.1311	0.1329	0.3813*
55	0.5161*	0.4160*	0.0781	-0.0228	0.0046
57	0.2442	0.5337*	-0.0775	-0.0500	0.4610*

* p < .01

Note: Names are pseudonyms for the women interviewed.

consideration, so that a relatively weak loading was not given the same meaning as a stronger loading (Brown, 1980). Following the standard method described by Brown (1980, p.240) scores were weighted for each factor loading, and multiplied by each participant's raw score for each item. The new scores (raw data x weighted score) were added up for each Q sort statement, resulting in new total score for each statement that encompassed all the women's significant Q sort scores for that factor. The total scores for each statement were then converted into Z-scores, and for easy interpretation these Z-scores were transformed into numbers that represent the original distribution (e.g. -5 to +5). For instance in this study the 4 smallest Z-scores were transformed into -5s, the 4 largest Z-scores were transformed into +5s etc. These calculations produced a prototype Q sort for each factor, which represent the women who loaded significantly on each factor. PQMethod provided the Z-scores and transformed them into the units of the original distribution for each factor.

The perspectives represented by each prototype Q sort were identified by examining each factor in four ways (Brown, 1980). First and most importantly, the placement of each Q statement was examined for each factor and compared with its placement on other factors. The statements that were most strongly agreed with and most strongly disagreed with were particularly important in helping to determine the meaning of each factor. However any position was considered if a pattern that differentiated it from other factors emerged. My knowledge of the literature was particularly important in this first step, as I was able to recognize patterns more easily in each of the prototypes. As I noticed interesting patterns, I developed hunches about the factors that I would test by looking for other statements that would help confirm these hunches or lead me to new

ideas. This step was necessarily subjective and the primary manner in which the factors were interpreted so most of my time was spent on this step. PQMethod provided a list of the statements in order of agreement for each factor to make this initial analysis easier. (See Appendix Q for the prototype Q sorts.)

The second step was statistical and was given less importance than the first step because it provided less information. Its primary purpose was to help me recognize patterns or give more attention to statements that did not necessarily stand out in their placement, but did differentiate between factors. The statements that significantly differentiate factors were determined by calculating the standard error ($SE_f = SD \sqrt{1-r_{xx}}$) of each factor followed by the standard error differences for each pair of factors³ ($SED_{x-y} = \sqrt{SE_x^2 + SE_y^2}$). Note that PQMethod uses the normalized factor scores to calculate the standard error, for which the $SD = 1.00$. Statements that were significantly unique to only one factor were considered particularly important in giving that factor meaning. PQMethod provided the standard errors for each factor, the standard error deviations for each pair of factors (Appendix R), and a list of statistically unique statements (at the $p < .05$ and $p < .01$ level) for each factor (Appendix S).

Third, the demographics and experiences (e.g., age, ethnicity, use of victim services etc.) of participants who load significantly on each factor were examined to determine whether or not they could help in the interpretation of the factors. For instance, I looked for patterns in each factor that would indicate an absence or predominance of women of a particular demographic group. Only the patterns that stood

³ A reliability coefficient is needed to calculate the SE. This is estimated using the following equation (Brown, 1980, P. 244):

$r_{xx} = p(.8) / 1 + (p-1).8$. p = the number of persons defining that factor.

out as important in understanding the emerging perspective were included in the analysis, and for this reason, they appear at the end of each factor description.

Fourth, interviews with women who loaded purely on one factor were used to help confirm, correct or expand upon initial interpretations of the factors. Women with the highest loading on each factor were called for an interview. The woman with the highest loading on factor three was not available, so the woman with the second highest loading on factor three was interviewed. The two women with the highest loadings were interviewed for factor five because it was the factor I was most unclear about after the initial interpretations.

My interpretation of each of the five factors is in the sections that follow. Each of the four steps was used in the interpretations, although the emphasis was on statement placement (first step) and the interview transcripts (fourth step) because these provided the richest data. However, statements that significantly differentiated the factors (step two) and the demographics and experiences (step three) are noted and described when they helped illuminate the interpretation. I gave a descriptive name and a short identifying name (follows in brackets) to each of the perspectives that emerged from the analysis of the five factors: Factor one: Trust in the criminal justice system ('trust'); Factor two: Disappointment in the criminal justice system ('disappointment'); Factor three: Victims should have input into the criminal justice system and be sure they want to use it ('wants input'); Factor four: The criminal justice system cannot protect women and can make matters worse ('cannot protect'); Factor five: The criminal justice system should be used for her safety, for his rehabilitation, and for justice despite its problems ('safety, rehabilitation, and justice').

Factor One: Trust in the Criminal Justice System

As shown in Table 4, seven women loaded purely on factor one. An additional 25 women loaded significantly on this factor, but also loaded significantly on one or more other factors. The estimated reliability for this factor was 0.966, and the normalized standard error was 0.186. Seventeen percent of the variance was explained by this factor.

Sara's Q-sort was most strongly correlated with factor one and she was interviewed about her views on the CJS and her sorting of the statements. Sara is a 46-year-old white woman with a college diploma and two young children. She has used victim services provided by the court system, and she has called an assaulted women's hotline on two occasions. She has been involved with the CJS for one incident of abuse. For that incident she called the police, they came to her home, her husband was arrested, charged, and prosecuted. She was subpoenaed and testified in court. Her husband was found guilty and was given probation. She left her husband three years ago, but continues to be harassed and emotionally abused due to his continued contact with their children.

Positive attitude toward people in the CJS. The women who loaded significantly on factor one consistently rated the police's attitude and behaviour towards victims of domestic violence more positively than other women. Although the actual position placement on the template was not always extreme (i.e., very large), the pattern is clearly more positive than the position placement of the statements in the other factors. In addition almost all the statements listed below significantly differentiate factor one from other factors. (The placement scores for each of the prototype Q sorts are listed to the

right under the factor number, and the current factor is bolded. Statements that significantly differentiate the current factor are marked with stars; * < .05; ** <.01).

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(1) I am very satisfied with police response to domestic violence.	1**	-4	-2	-4	-3
(23) I don't think police officers believe women who are abused by their partners unless they're really hurt.	-3**	5	3	5	2
(8) When the police arrive at a domestic dispute they act as if nothing important has happened. They don't even make an effort to collect all the evidence.	-4**	3	3	3	0
(51) The police are still sexist. They aren't fair to women and instead protect her partner because he is a man.	-4**	2	0	-1	-1
(26) If a woman is forced to testify against her partner when she doesn't want to, she has no choice but to lie in court.	-4**	-1	1	3	0
(38) Police officers are cold. In most cases of domestic violence they don't sympathize or even listen to the woman.	-3*	1	1	-1	0

Sara's interactions with the police were very positive. For instance, she credits them with helping her deal with her problem, "from the first policeman who answered my 911 call. He's the one who helped me make a decision to pursue the problem." And in explaining why she would use the CJS again if she needed to she said,

And when I last, when I was finished with it the first time they assured me that I could call any time. And the policemen that were involved you know all gave me their cards and said phone if you have any problems. I haven't need to but uhh (pause). They were all good at counseling for the future and giving you tools to work with, you know should you come across any other difficulties, how to prepare yourself in the event, like having a cell phone. ... And then the police put you, put me in touch with, I forget the name of the groups now, a woman's support group who called the same day that I went through umm the police station. And gave me lots more information.

Statements referring to the players in the court system (Crown attorneys and judges) were also rated positively. Again, some of the statement placement numbers are not particularly large, but the pattern is clearly positive, and most of the statements significantly differentiated factor one from other factors.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(17) Crown attorneys support women who have been abused by their partners.	5**	-2	0	-2	-4
(3) Crown attorneys listen to women who have been abused by their partners and believe what they have to say. For example, they write down what women say in a careful and accurate manner.	4**	-1	0	-1	-3
(20) I am very satisfied with the court process and with the way judges deal with domestic violence.	3**	-4	-3	-4	-5
(10) Crown attorneys often reduce charges against	-2**	3	0	1	0

men who abuse their partners. It gets to a point where the charges do not reflect the seriousness of the assault.

(25) Crown attorneys are too busy to do a good job with domestic violence cases. They don't have time to prepare, so they just go from one case to the next without seeming to care about any of the cases. -3* 1 -1 1 -1

(33) I am very satisfied with the way Crown attorneys deal with cases of domestic violence. 2 -4 -1 0 -5

Sara had a mixed reaction to her experience with the Crown attorney, but conceded that he did "an ok job." In response to a question asking what parts of the CJS do not work well, she said,

It was a bit disconcerting that umm they had spent hours with me, the policemen had spent a long time with me and then the court appointed lawyer who was defending me or prosecuting my husband, I forget. He had never met me before. ...And he never met me before, even when I was sitting in the anteroom of the courtroom for an hour or two before and he never met me. So I was kind of upset that this man has taken over my case and is pleading my case in front of a judge but he's never met me. It was almost like I had steeled myself to get in the courtroom and I wanted to tell my own story to the judge. I didn't want this strange lawyer to tell it. ...But he did an ok job (slight laugh).

Sara took many opportunities to make positive comments about the different people she encountered throughout her experiences with the CJS. This was especially true with regard to the police and to the women who work in victim services. She attributed negative experiences (e.g., being frightened in court) to the situation and the positive ones to the people who helped her through it. She also seems to have generalized the positive encounters to everyone. For instance, in response to the first question about why women should use the CJS she said, "Because I never ran into anyone who struck me in a negative way at all. Everyone was extremely helpful, professional, umm sensitive to my situation." However, later in the interview it is clear that she did not think the Crown attorney was particularly sensitive.

The CJS can be trusted to work in the victim's best interest. These statements demonstrated a trust in a system that works for the benefit of victims and with which victims should cooperate.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(14) When a man hits his partner, the law isn't on the woman's side unless she is very sure she wants him charged and convicted.	-1**	4	4	1	3
(26) If a woman is forced to testify against her partner when she doesn't want to, she has no choice but to lie in court.	-4**	-1	1	3	0
(42) Women who are abused by their partners are portrayed badly in court. They are seen as jealous, vengeful, unreliable, violent, alcoholic, crazy or	-2*	3	0	0	4

worse.

Sara felt that the system was on her side, especially because the people she encountered were supportive. When asked why she would use the CJS again she said, "Because I know they have, that the system is out there to help and support me. Ya." Sara also felt that the system listened to her when they sentenced her husband. She says, "he had probation for a year, he did not have a jail sentence. I had said all along I did not want him in jail because I didn't want him losing his ability to earn income, his future ability to whatever else the ramification are"

Trust in the CJS is perhaps best illustrated by the women's support of mandatory arrest and to a lesser degree, no-drop prosecution. The pattern of these statements shows that the women who loaded on this factor were more supportive of these policies than other women. The two statements that significantly differentiate this factor refer to instances where the policies may backfire and be more harmful to women. The women's disagreement with these statements may imply a trust that the policies would not work against them.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(2) I support mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence.	5	1	1	1	3
(32) I would be (or would have been) helped by mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence.	4	2	0	1	1
(52) Mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence can make things worse for the woman. If she defends herself by hitting him back she might also be arrested.	-1*	3	1	4	-5

(60) Women who are abused by their partners aren't in the right state of mind to decide whether or not their partner should be arrested and charged. They are afraid of him, so the law needs to make that decision for them.	3	-3	-4	2	4
(4) I support no-drop prosecution in cases of domestic violence.	2	0	-5	-3	2
(18) I would be (or would have been) helped by no-drop prosecution in cases of domestic violence.	1	0	-3	-4	3
(49) A no-drop prosecution policy is helpful because a woman can't change her mind about having her partner prosecuted for hitting her.	3	0	-5	-3	1
(11) A woman who has been abused by her partner should have the option of dropping the charges against him. Why should she get in trouble for not showing up for court?	-4*	0	4	0	-2

In explaining why she supported mandatory arrest, Sara said,

I never ever would have [charged him], ya, I wouldn't have, the police, after they heard the story said, well he will be charged by the police because I wouldn't have charged him... And the policeman just said, well what you've told me, he will, we will charge him. [I: I see. And that was, that was good for you, you didn't want to be in control of that...] I would have never done that... and in fact his father called me for months and months harassing me on the phone after. And

I kept trying to make it clear, still me, trying to make it clear to my father in-law that I hadn't charged him... 'Cause I wouldn't have woken up for another five years maybe saying I hope he'll be happier... that system worked in that the policeman just said, he will be charged by us, not by you. You, you're the victim, you're not the, the proactive person who has to come out [and] charge him. You know. Because you're in a situation, psychologically for years where you, you are put down. And you don't feel like you have any power any more.

Sara seemed relieved to have the charging decision out of her hands because it reduced her blame and got her out of a situation that she did not feel she had control over. She seemed to believe that the police were taking action in her best interest.

Using the CJS demonstrates the seriousness of abuse. An idea that was strongly associated with factor one was that using the CJS demonstrates the seriousness of abuse. Women should therefore use the system to take a stand against abuse. In addition, the CJS itself was seen as taking abuse seriously. Most of the statements below did not significantly differentiate factor one from other factors because notions of seriousness also stood out in other factors, especially in factor two ('disappointment' perspective, discussed in a later section). However, it is important to note that the women who loaded on factor one reacted strongly to these statements. What is unique is that these women strongly endorsed the notion that abuse is a serious crime and believed that the CJS treats it that way, which differentiated them from women who held the 'disappointment' perspective, which emerged from factor two.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(35) When an abusive partner is prosecuted the	3	0	0	-5	1

criminal justice system is on the woman's side.

Prosecution means that the violence is being treated seriously.

(50) If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case to show him that he can't get away with abusing me. This would show him that society takes domestic violence seriously. 4 4 3 0 0

(7) Beating your partner is certainly not a family matter. It's a criminal offence. I think if more people were arrested, prosecuted, and convicted of assaulting their partners, this kind of abuse would be taken more seriously. 5 4 1 0 3

(39) There is no point in arresting men who abuse their partners because they are just released again with a slap on the wrist. -5* 0 -2 3 -3

(36) If my partner hit me, I would want him prosecuted because that is the safest thing for my children. I wouldn't want them to grow up thinking it's ok to hit a woman. 4 2 4 -3 4

What seemed to be particularly important for Sara was that using the CJS would demonstrate to her daughters that this kind of abuse was not acceptable. She says, what I have is two daughters and I would hate for them to think that it's the right thing to be with a man or be in any kind of relationship with a man who [is]

overbearing, overpowering, abusive, umm... It's not ok (small laugh)....And I don't want my kids to think that ever. So I needed to become active and I wanted my girls to see that I could take the bull by the horn so to speak. And fix a problem and you... I needed help, I couldn't do it in my four walls, my house. I was extremely dependent on this man emotionally psychologically, beaten down too, so I didn't have any power. And I wouldn't want my girls to be like that at all.

As is also demonstrated by the quote above, Sara talked about needing outside help to bring the secret out of the family and into the public domain. She believed that she could not deal with the abuse within the confines of the four walls of her house. When she used the criminal justice system, it confirmed to her that this was a serious problem, it was a crime, and she did not have to deal with it alone. She felt that when the police arrived they took it seriously. She said,

Ya, I really needed that outside help. That first policeman who came to the door and said, look, I wouldn't want to if I was a woman, he said, I wouldn't want to go to sleep every night with a baseball bat under my bed and a bicycle helmet on my head to keep myself safe. Why? You know why do you do this?"

She also saw her case as being taken seriously because he was found guilty. She talked about her court experience as less than positive, but that it had a positive outcome.

Women should use the CJS. Given that the women who loaded on factor one felt positively toward the people who work in the CJS and appeared to trust that the system worked in their best interest, it is perhaps not surprising that they endorsed using the system both for themselves and for other women. Most of the statements below did not

significantly differentiate factor one from other factors. This is because others also endorsed using the CJS. However, as will be demonstrated, the apparent reasons for the endorsement are different in this factor.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(13) If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him prosecuted because involving the criminal justice system is too much of a hassle. It wouldn't be worth the stress. It just wouldn't be good for me.	-5*	-2	-3	4	-2
(6) If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case. It would help stop my partner from hurting me and make me feel safer.	4	2	2	-2	0
(50) If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case to show him that he can't get away with abusing me. This would show him that society takes domestic violence seriously.	4	4	3	0	0
(28) Women who are abused by their partners might as well <u>not</u> go to court. I think it's a waste of time.	-5	-4	-3	-2	0

Sara noted difficulties with the system such as the time delay in hearing her case, which was one year, but in general she saw those kinds of difficulties as small compared to the benefit of getting out of the violent relationship. For instance, in explaining why she disagreed with statement #28 she said, "It is a waste of time, it's a waste of, I mean hours and hours and hours of your life are wasted, but you've got to get out of that

relationship.” Sara indicated that women should use the CJS and when asked why said, “well because I had a positive response, a positive experience.” And when asked on what she was basing her judgment of the CJS, she says,

Well I don’t have any other information to base my judgment on. Like I don’t really watch TV, that kind of stuff. I don’t have other women that I know who have been through this these problems. So. That is my only way to base the judgment of the system is my own experience.

Her positive experience with the CJS has shaped her views of it. It is somewhat remarkable that on the first and only time that she called the police the CJS seemingly went into action with textbook efficiency. The police were supportive, she was put in touch with victim services, the prosecution went smoothly and he was convicted. Even his sentence reflected her wishes. Perhaps most importantly she wanted the CJS to take action and it did.

Demographics and experiences of factor one. The demographics and experiences of the 21 women whose loadings were the highest on factor one (7 pure loading and 14 others) were examined in comparison to women whose loadings were highest on other factors. The women who loaded on this factor were more likely to have been recruited from the shelter in Windsor (8 of the 12 women from the shelter loaded on this factor and 8 of the 21 women who loaded on this factor were recruited from the shelter). However, they were no more likely to have used a shelter or other victim services than women who loaded on other factors. This may be explained in an understanding of the shelter itself. The shelter in Windsor has an unusually good relationship with the police service and the staff encourages and provides support for criminal justice intervention when women

decide to take that route. A second demographic that appears to be related to this factor is limited direct experience with the CJS (12 of the 23 women with no direct experience loaded on this factor and 12 of the 21 women on this factor had no direct experience). Ironically, it appears that the women who have the least experience with the CJS are the most positive. There may be an element of naïve optimism in the responses of some of the women who loaded on this factor.

Summary of factor one. The ‘trust’ perspective that emerged from this factor was associated with a positive attitude toward the criminal justice system as a whole and especially toward the people who work within the system. There appeared to be a trust that the system would work in the victim’s best interest, and would demonstrate the seriousness of abuse to society and to the batterer. The women who held the ‘trust’ perspective would use the criminal justice system and believed other women should also use it.

Factor Two: Disappointment in the CJS

Five women loaded purely, and an additional 22 women loaded significantly on factor two. The estimated reliability was 0.952 and the normalized standard error was 0.218. Sixteen percent of the variance was explained by this factor.

Grace was interviewed because her Q-sort was most strongly correlated with this factor. She is a 42-year-old Chinese immigrant woman with a university degree. She has never used victim services and has had limited experience with the CJS (i.e., she spoke with the police on one occasion and her partner was not charged.) She is no longer in the relationship, but continues to be emotionally abused.

The CJS has the potential to demonstrate the seriousness of abuse with strong actions. The women who loaded on factor two saw the CJS as having the potential to demonstrate the seriousness of abuse. That is, a strong CJS response could demonstrate to the batterer and to society that wife abuse is a serious crime that will not be tolerated. The statements below did not significantly differentiate this factor because a similar sentiment is expressed in factor one, which was associated with the ‘trust’ perspective. However, the high numbers clearly indicate that demonstrating the seriousness of abuse was an important aspect of factor two.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(50) If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case to show him that he can't get away with abusing me. This would show him that society takes domestic violence seriously.	4	4	3	0	0
(7) Beating your partner is certainly not a family matter. It's a criminal offence. I think if more people were arrested, prosecuted, and convicted of assaulting their partners, this kind of abuse would be taken more seriously.	5	4	1	0	3
(64) If the police know that a man has abused his partner, they should calm him down, warn him, and provide advice and contact numbers for both him and his partner. They <u>should not</u> arrest him.	-4	-5	-2	-1	-2

Grace brought up the notion of using the CJS to demonstrate seriousness in her interview. She emphasized that involving the CJS would show the batterer that his actions are wrong, that the victim is willing to take a stand against the abuse, and that she has an option for recourse. Grace made this point multiple times throughout the interview,

Where there is a lot of domestic violence a warning should be one night in jail, so he knows what it feels like. He can start thinking about what he has done and think what if he does something more serious. It will get him thinking of the ramifications on his doings....

I disagree with that (that going to court is a waste of time). It's not a waste of time, it's a good use of time because this may never happen again. He would know it's serious. If you take action, he would get the message....

He calmed down. He was surprised that I called [the police]. You have to take action to show the man that what you say is what you'll do, rather than just say something and not take action....

My main point is, I'm taking serious action, I mean it.

The CJS does not treat wife abuse as seriously as it should. In contrast to factor one ('trust' perspective), the women who loaded on factor two did not believe that the CJS takes abuse as seriously as it should.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(68) The criminal justice system makes such a big deal about violence against women and then they don't do very much. That upsets me.	-2	5	-1	0	4

(12) Even when an abusive partner is convicted, the	-1	5**	0	0	-1
--	----	------------	---	---	----

sentence does not reflect the seriousness of the assault. Abusive partners rarely receive jail time.

(10) Crown attorneys often reduce charges against	-2	3	0	1	0
--	----	----------	---	---	---

men who abuse their partners. It gets to a point where the charges do not reflect the seriousness of the assault.

(22) Knowing I can call the police if my partner hits	2	-2**	2	2	2
--	---	-------------	---	---	---

me gives me a sense of control over the situation.

Grace talked about the disappointing action that the police took when they came to her house,

In my case the police came and could have done more, but they didn't. They should take domestic violence more seriously. More serious is a way to be very firm, that action is going to be taken. Action should be taken immediately to show the person it's not a joking matter, it's a serious offence.

When asked whether or not she wanted the police to arrest her partner she said, "Yes, they don't arrest usually, so they think they can get away with it." She came back to this idea of leniency leading to more abuse when she said, "If prosecuted, if charges laid and they are very lenient, then they'll do it again." Grace believed that a strong CJS response was positive and would demonstrate to abusive men that the violence was serious, but she did not believe that the CJS responded in a serious manner. In her view, "It should be serious to teach him a lesson. There should be more serious charges so he's aware it's not right to abuse women. He will be punished in a serious manner."

A negative view of the CJS and the people who work in the system. Factor two was associated with a general negativity towards the whole system, which encompassed different people within the system, as well as the system itself. Although women who loaded on other factors perceived specific areas quite negatively, factor two is unique in the range rather than the strength of the negative responses. The statements below were selected to demonstrate this range.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(23) I don't think police officers believe women who are abused by their partners unless they're really hurt.	-3	5	3	5	2
(1) I am very satisfied with police response to domestic violence.	1	-4	-2	-4	-3
(33) I am very satisfied with the way Crown attorneys deal with cases of domestic violence.	2	-4	-1	0	-5
(20) I am very satisfied with the court process and with the way judges deal with domestic violence.	3	-4	-3	-4	-5
(44) The criminal justice system doesn't work well enough for women who are abused by their partners. The system is very difficult to understand and the whole process is too slow.	0	4**	-2	0	1
(57) The criminal justice system makes the woman feel like a victim again. If the system could just give women a little more power, women would have the confidence to get out of violent relationships.	1	4	1	3	-2

(14) When a man hits his partner, the law isn't on the -1 4 4 1 3
 woman's side unless she is very sure she wants him
 charged and convicted.

Grace's personal experience with the CJS was limited to interactions with the police, which she described in a lukewarm manner. When asked what she thought of the police who came to her house she said, "They were helpful in a sense. They went by the book. They were not sympathetic to me. They were quite neutral, this is just a domestic abuse." When asked about her agreement with statement #57 she said, "If we go and prosecute, when I did call the police, they were neutral, not sympathetic. I felt they are always on the men's side, we call the police, but the prosecution, the system is always on their side." From this response it seems that Grace has generalized her experience with the police to the system as a whole. If the police are unsympathetic, there is little reason to expect others within the system to be on her side. She agreed that her view was one of disappointment with the CJS when asked about the title for this factor, "Yes. That seems to fit (told her title of her factor). A lot of women would like to use it, but lack of resources and lack of knowledge. There is a stereotype of you women deserve it. The system has a stereotype of women that you deserve it."

Grace was also frustrated with the complexity of the CJS. "The whole process is long and that is why I'm disappointed. If it was shorter or simpler, more women would use the system." On a number of different occasions, she brought up the lack of resources to help women understand their options. In one such incident she said, "I don't think, again, there is enough knowledge or resources for us to understand. I don't

understand the criminal justice system, so it puts me at a disadvantage.” Her confusion about the system was apparent in this quote,

“All I can do is call the police –that’s all I know to do. I don’t know what are the legal actions take. I don’t have money to hire a lawyer etc. I don’t know if I can go to legal aid, small claims courts. I’m worried about that, I think about courts and lawyers and that. Women are hesitant to prosecute because of the cost.”

Perhaps most troubling was her expressed fear of getting in trouble if she was to use the CJS, which may be related to her immigrant status. “If we speak out we’re afraid we’ll get in trouble. When we speak out it’s hard to get help. There are not enough resources for women to get help to prosecute.”

Most Women should use the CJS, but with some trepidation. Despite the negative feelings towards the CJS, the women who loaded on factor two generally believed that women should use the CJS. The sentiment seemed to be that women should use the CJS to demonstrate the seriousness of abuse despite some of the problems. However their endorsement of using the CJS was not overwhelming and did not extend to everyone. The hassle of using the CJS was still a consideration that might keep them from using the system and the support was not strong for women who were unsure about leaving their partners.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(66) If my partner hit me, I would not call the police because I wouldn’t want him arrested.	-1	-5	-3	-2	-4
(67) After you leave and get away from an abusive partner, there doesn’t seem to be any point in having	-3	-5	-5	2	-5

him prosecuted.

(28) Women who are abused by their partners might -5 **-4** -3 -2 0

as well not go to court. I think it's a waste of time.

(13) If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him -5 **-2** -3 4 -2

prosecuted because involving the criminal justice system is too much of a hassle. It wouldn't be worth the stress. It just wouldn't be good for me.

(27) If a woman doesn't want to end the relationship -3 **-2** 3 2 -4

with a partner who has hit her, there is no point in prosecuting him.

It should be noted that any apprehension toward using the system was not because of continued attachment to their partners, or feelings of unfairness towards their partners. The women who loaded on this factor were least likely to feel attached to their partners, or worry about the consequences for him.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(29) If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him prosecuted. I wouldn't want him to lose his job or go to jail because what he would need is help, not punishment.	-3	-5	2	4	0
(43) I am (or was) very emotionally attached to my partner and would have (or would have had) a hard time even calling the police on him. Involving the criminal justice system would end the relationship	0	-3**	3	4	0

and this is not what I want (or wanted).

(56) If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want the 0 -3* 1 0 -1
 criminal justice system involved in my case because
 the system is racist. It is very unfair to Black,
 Aboriginal, and other minority men.

Grace believed that she would use the CJS if she needed to and that other women should do the same. When asked whether or not she would use it she said, "Yes... It is hard on the woman to prosecute, but it will stop him from doing it again." And when specifically asked about the discrepancy between her criticism of the system and her endorsement of using it she said,

I would use it anyway because I want him punished. I want him to know that I have taken a serious action. I'm not just saying it, I'm doing it...The whole process is long and that is why I'm disappointed. If it was shorter or simpler, more women would use the system.

As discussed above, Grace thought it was very important to show her partner that she was willing to call the police. It would show him that she could stand up for herself and that in itself might help end the abuse.

Demographics and experiences of factor two. The demographics and experiences of the 20 women whose loadings were the highest on factor two were examined. One thing that stood out was that five of the nine women who were recruited from the Women's Abuse council loaded on this factor (the others were dispersed throughout the other factors). The women's abuse council advocates for other abused women and is very familiar with how the criminal justice system works in cases of abuse. The

sentiment expressed by this factor may in some cases be an activist one, although this did not come out strongly in Grace's interview. The problems with the CJS are clearly being expressed because the system needs outside pressure before it will change. However, women should continue to use the CJS because this kind of violence is clearly criminal and that message needs to be clear.

Summary of factor two. The 'disappointment' perspective that emerged from factor two is one of disappointment with the CJS and the people that work within the system. The CJS was perceived as having the potential to be a strong force that could demonstrate the seriousness of domestic violence, but that it fell short of that potential. Despite their disappointment, the women who held this perspective would use the CJS.

Factor three: Victims Should Have Input into the CJS, And be Sure They Want to Use it

Three women loaded purely, and an additional 5 women loaded significantly on factor three. The estimated reliability for this factor was .923, and the normalized standard error was .277. Six percent of the variance was explained by this factor.

Savita had the second highest loading on factor three and was interviewed about her views on the CJS and about her sort. She is a 23-year-old South Asian immigrant woman with a university degree who is pursuing a post-graduate degree. She is currently engaged and in an emotionally abusive relationship, although she does not define it as abusive. She has not used any victim services or the CJS.

Forcing the CJS on victims will not help, but individualized responses might. The women who loaded significantly on this factor strongly believed women were capable of making up their own minds about arrest and prosecution decisions. Interestingly, when sorting direct statements about mandatory arrest, a more neutral response was

demonstrated. Perhaps women felt that the policy itself was okay because it forced the police to act, but that women should be able to stop the pursuit of charges after the arrest.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(59) An abused woman is too frightened to ask for arrest, so it is better that that decision is out of her hands.	1	-2	-5**	3	2
(60) Women who are abused by their partners aren't in the right state of mind to decide whether or not their partner should be arrested and charged. They are afraid of him, so the law needs to make that decision for them.	3	-3	-4	2	4
(4) I support no-drop prosecution in cases of domestic violence.	2	0	-5	-3	2
(11) A woman who has been abused by her partner should have the option of dropping the charges against him. Why should she get in trouble for not showing up for court?	-4	0	4**	0	-2
(49) A no-drop prosecution policy is helpful because a woman can't change her mind about having her partner prosecuted for hitting her.	3	0	-5**	-3	1
(54) A no-drop prosecution policy makes the woman who has been abused feel powerless. This is because she has no control over whether or not her	-2	-1	3	0	-3

partner is prosecuted.

(2) I support mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence. 5 1 1 1 3

(32) I would be (or would have been) helped by mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence. 4 2 0 1 1

Savita believed very strongly that women should be able to control their use of the CJS. She said, “She can [use the CJS] but her decision is there. The option is there. There should be the option for her to take the justice system or not to take the justice system. But if she doesn’t want to reconcile and just wants like, then there should be the freedom of her decision.” In explaining her disagreement with statement #49 she said,

Ya. Well first of all it is that she is the person who is suffering the most, so she is the person who is complaining and it is her partner, it is her life, so the decision cannot be taken without her consent. So if she decides that it is, like her partner should go to jail and whatever then it is okay for the abusing her. But if she later on decides that it was not enough for her partner, like it was not enough abuse for what her partner is going through, then it is like, and then again the police takes her partner off and then again she has to run for the hassle of court to get her partner out of that then that becomes even more hassle for her.

Savita also believed that women were neither too frightened nor too distraught to make decisions. In explaining why she disagreed with item #60 she said,

“No. Why should, what, it is not that when she is abused she will lose her mental stability or whatever. She hasn’t, she has, of course because she has her mental stability that is why she is identifying that she is being abused. It is not that she

will, she will be mad by getting abused or whatever or be indecisive. If she is indecisive, she is indecisive by her nature, not because of getting abused.”

The women who loaded on this factor had a high regard for a specially trained workforce that would understand domestic violence. Perhaps there was a feeling that this kind of training would help provide individualized responses that could cater to women’s different needs. In other words it may have been perceived as an alternative to the one-size-fits-all approach of mandatory policies.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(37) There should be special domestic violence officers and special courts for domestic violence. ⁴	5	5	5*	5	3
(31) Special domestic violence officers help women stay involved with the criminal justice system so that their partner can be taken to court.	3	0	4	-1	1

I had not considered the idea that specialized personnel might be an alternative to specific policies until I interviewed Savita. In explaining why she strongly supported item # 37, Savita said,

Like there are a lots of psychologies, emotions relationships which are involved in it. Like there can’t be specific laws like this behaviour results in this, this behaviour results in this...[I ask her to clarify] Ya there can’t be a specific law, which is valid for everybody because this case, every other case is a little different from the other ones. So like there should be some people who could understand the situation exactly and decide on the issue. Like just not only the police and law

⁴ Although #37 looks like it should not be significant it is. Recall that the significance level is calculated from the standardized Z-score, not from the statement placement number.

and just going to court and just going to a jail or whatever....So there should be some people who would understand both of them.

Women should be sure before they engage the CJS. The women who loaded on factor three believed that the CJS could only benefit women who were certain that they wanted to use it. This was seen as most likely for women who were ready to leave their partners.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(30) If a woman wants the violence to end, but does <u>not</u> want the relationship to end, the criminal justice system can't help her.	0	0	5*	1	-3
(14) When a man hits his partner, the law isn't on the woman's side unless she is very sure she wants him charged and convicted.	-1	4	4	1	3
(27) If a woman doesn't want to end the relationship with a partner who has hit her, there is no point in prosecuting him.	-3	-2	3	2	-4
(67) After you leave and get away from an abusive partner, there doesn't seem to be any point in having him prosecuted.	-3	-5	-5	2	-5

Savita brought up the notion that women should only use the CJS if they are sure they want to leave their partner on a number of different occasions. In response to whether or not women should use the CJS she said,

Well it depends on the decision of the woman... It depends on the extent of the, the extent of the, the way she is being abused. If it is up to the extent that she decides to leave and have a life of her own and if it is beyond a certain extent, beyond the mental abuse, it is physical then I would suggest her [that she use the CJS]. But if it a mental abuse and if she wants to reconcile and think about the decision then I think, well I would advise her to talk to her partner, that it is not repeated, and think about it and then go for the criminal justice system.

Savita believed that if a woman used the CJS her relationship with her partner would end. She said, "So it depends on the woman, like if she is like she should be mentally prepared not to go and then return back when she goes for the criminal justice system because its not in her hands anymore. It is in the hands of somebody else."

Emotional issues affecting views on CJS. Emotional issues such as love, guilt, and fear may have affected these women's views on the CJS. Along with the women in factor four, which is associated with the 'cannot protect' perspective (discussed in a later section), the women who loaded on factor three were most likely to agree that being emotionally attached, feeling guilty, and worrying about what others would think would influence women not to use the CJS. However, they were the least likely to agree that fear would keep them from using the CJS.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(43) I am (or was) very emotionally attached to my partner and would have (or would have had) a hard time even calling the police on him. Involving the criminal justice system would end the relationship	0	-3	3	4	0

and this is not what I want (or wanted).

(29) If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him prosecuted. I wouldn't want him to lose his job or go to jail because what he would need is help, not punishment.	-3	-5	2	4	0
(24) If my partner were arrested or taken to court for hitting me, I would feel guilty and worry about what people would think of me.	-1	-2	4*	5*	0
(62) If my partner hit me, I would want him prosecuted so that I could tell my story and let people know what he did.	0	-1	-4	-5	-4
(65) My partner would (or would have) come after me if I put him in jail for hitting me. I'd be scared to find out what he would do once he was free.	1	0	-4*	2	-1
(41) If my partner were charged for assaulting me, he would kill me before the court date if I didn't get the charges dropped.	0	0	-4	-3	-2

Savita talked about love as an explanation for not using the CJS. She said, "I think all women are not the same. Maybe somebody loves her husband so much that [she] is ready to accept some more insults and then forgive him if he comes back and says he won't repeat." She discussed guilt and blame in relation to her ethnic background. To explain her agreement with statement #24, she said,

I'm from an ethnic background and from my like Asian background, and from my background it's accepted that you're getting married and you'll have a nice family, family life and if it goes up to a certain extent that I have to complain to people and my partner is taken away completely by police or law, it is up to such an extent, then I would maybe sometimes find myself also in not a very nice or happy position. [I: Do you think other people would blame you?] Well maybe the relatives of my husband's family might blame me. Well another thing I felt, I might feel guilty is somehow the relationship didn't work out and, the relationship which I would start is with a lot of hope to make it work out, so once it ends I would feel guilty for myself and maybe for himself. 'Cause there was not proper understanding somehow.

Not against using CJS. Despite a strong dislike for policies that did not take women's decisions into account, the women who loaded on this factor were not against using the CJS per se and they generally believed the CJS did an adequate job.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(19) Being prosecuted teaches the violent partner that you can't be abusive and get away with it. He'll learn not to do it again.	0	-1	5	-5	2
(50) If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case to show him that he can't get away with abusing me. This would show him that society takes domestic violence seriously.	4	4	3	0	0

(66) If my partner hit me, I would not call the police	-1	-5	-3	-2	-4
--	----	----	----	----	----

because I wouldn't want him arrested.

(28) Women who are abused by their partners might	-5	-4	-3	-2	0
---	----	----	----	----	---

as well not go to court. I think it's a waste of time.

(44) The criminal justice system doesn't work well	0	4	-2	0	1
--	---	---	----	---	---

enough for women who are abused by their partners.

The system is very difficult to understand and the

whole process is too slow.

Savita explained the discrepancy between disliking the mandatory intervention policies and believing that women should use the system in this way,

So I wanted to keep, probably, I wanted to keep the option for the woman open because she should react towards any abuse or any insult towards him. However, if she decides not to react she should not be put in a position that she has to react. In general it is good for the women to, like it is for the women's sake that they should react. That is a general statement. But however, for her personal case, if somehow the situation is that she decides not to react, then the law should not be such that it forces her to react.

Although Savita did not think women should be forced to use the CJS she believed using the system was generally in women's best interest. This was especially true if women were prepared to leave their partners. Savita also seemed to support CJS intervention for serious cases of physical abuse and as a way of preventing imminent and more serious abuse. She said,

Well, I think that when a woman is physically abused, the first step should be the police should come and take the man away. And then decide about the court and then decide how much the man is responsible and how much the woman is.

Because under any circumstances, whether you are drunk whether you are provoking, ...[you] should not delay the issue and give time to the man...

Demographics and experiences of factor three. There were five women whose loadings were the highest on this factor, and none of them were White. One was African Canadian, one was First Nations and three were South Asian Canadian. Only one statement referred to discrimination, and although the endorsement of discrimination was not large, it did stand out as being the only positive number.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(56) If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want the criminal justice system involved in my case because the system is racist. It is very unfair to Black, Aboriginal, and other minority men.	0	-3	1	0	-1

Summary of factor three. This 'wants input' perspective represented a strong dislike of policies that do not take the victim's opinions and wishes into account. The women who held this perspective did not want the CJS to make decisions for them. They also endorsed the view that the CJS could only help women who were ready to leave their partners, which may explain why emotional issues (i.e., attachment to the partner, feelings of guilt, worrying about what other would think) were relevant in this perspective. However, this perspective was not associated with a strong negative reaction to arrest or prosecution in general. Most of the women who held the 'wants input'

perspective were South Asian, and all of them were women of colour, which may be important in understanding this perspective.

Factor four: The CJS Cannot Protect Women and Can Make Matters Worse

Four women loaded purely and nine additional women loaded significantly (four of which loaded negatively) on factor four. The estimated reliability for this factor was 0.941, and the normalized standard error was 0.243. Six percent of the variance was accounted for by this factor.

Ying May's Q sort was most strongly correlated with this factor, and she was interviewed. She is a 30-year-old Chinese immigrant woman with a post-graduate degree. She has never used victim services, and has had limited interaction with the CJS. The police have come to her home twice, but have never arrested her partner. She is currently in an emotionally abusive relationship, and was previously married to a physically abusive man.

The CJS is not a deterrent and cannot protect women. The women who loaded on this factor did not believe that the CJS was a deterrent. Using the CJS would not make them feel safer and might make them more frightened.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(19) Being prosecuted teaches the violent partner that you can't be abusive and get away with it. He'll learn not to do it again.	0	-1	5	-5**	2
(16) If a man is arrested for abusing his partner he will not hit her again because he will not want to be arrested again.	-5	-3	0	-5**	3

(45) The police help decrease long-term violence in cases of domestic abuse.	0	-4	-2	-3	1
(6) If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case. It would help stop my partner from hurting me and make me feel safer.	4	2	2	-2	0
(36) If my partner hit me, I would want him prosecuted because that is the safest thing for my children. I wouldn't want them to grow up thinking it's okay to hit a woman.	4	2	4	-3	4

Ying May did not believe the CJS would be a deterrent for violent men. She had this response to statement #16,

Oh ya. (lots of laughing)...There are so many examples, I really don't think so. [I ask about what examples]...Umm, not in my own life, but in my friends and from my relatives, even from T.V. from movies. Ya I would think, its like the nature, they are naturally, they like to do that and they'll just do that. But maybe if they come back from the court and they really want to maintain the relationship with that woman, maybe they will be better. But it's really hard to say they will never do that again. I strongly disagree with this.

Ying May had quite a negative experience with the police because her abuse was not taken seriously and this has coloured her impression of the whole system's ability to protect her. When asked what parts of the CJS she thought worked well for victims she said,

Umm, I think maybe I don't have too much experience in those parts. But it seems it works very well, umm, well, but when it applies to me (small laugh) [I: Ya, it didn't work very well for you, from the sounds of it.] Ya, ya, I'm not too happy, I don't think I was protected very very, very good, but umm. But I really, I think because, I really I don't have time to think about it very well. But umm, every time when I recall is I just think, well, (small laugh) well since I'm not protected very well... Ya. But I'm not umm, an expert in this field so I don't know. I really don't know what wrong here, but I don't feel well... Ya, ya. It should be good, but umm it doesn't, it doesn't really make me very very happy with it [the CJS]. But I don't know what's wrong with it (small laugh).

The CJS cannot be trusted to work in the victim's best interest. The women who loaded on this factor did not think the CJS always acted in the victim's best interest. The system was likely to take the man's side, and sometimes the victim would be worse off after engaging the CJS because she would be at greater risk for violence or might get in trouble with the law herself.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(35) When an abusive partner is prosecuted the criminal justice system is on the woman's side. Prosecution means that the violence is being treated seriously.	3	0	0	-5**	1
(9) Arresting a man who has abused his partner will make him angrier and he will take his anger out on the woman.	0	2	-3	5	-1

(52) Mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence -1 3 1 4 -5

can make things worse for the woman. If she defends herself by hitting him back she might also be arrested.

(57) The criminal justice system makes the woman 1 4 1 3 -2

feel like a victim again. If the system could just give women a little more power, women would have the confidence to get out of violent relationships.

When the police came to Ying May's home her partner had already left. Her impression was that the police blamed her and threatened to charge her. In explaining what happened she said,

They just came and they asked me the whole thing, the whole situation. And then they make, make kind of record, and then they left. [So they didn't charge him?] No. Ya, I think, they said the problem was caused by both of us, so the fault is not only from him. I did something wrong too....Ya, I was at fault, half of the fault it belonged to me. [I see. Because he hit you because you blocked his way, that's how they thought?] Ya, ya. They said so they won't charge him and they won't charge me too. Because it's not very serious case, so. Maybe they just considered it that it's just a fighting between families, husband and wife it's just, ya. [These are the policemen that told you this?] Ya, the policemen told me this.

Later in the interview she came back to this experience and explained that she would be unlikely to call the police again because she would worry that it might affect her immigration status. She said,

Ya, just I think it's because of that unhappy experience again. So I think I'll never, I will suppress [calling the police] because they told me I was some kind of fault too. So next time when I try to look for help from them I will think again did I do something wrong or I will think that, think about that again because you know I am a new immigrant, and I very trigger my status here, I would be so I don't want to be involved in any trouble, so well next time if I try to call the police I would think about it again, if I did something wrong, or and also I think it will effect the system protect me because I have to, well... [You don't think the system could protect you. It would affect your thinking about that.]

P: Ya. [So if umm, this ever happen to you again, you would think, did I do anything to provoke this?] Ya. (slight laugh) [And if there is even the slightest little possibility that maybe you did...] Ya, I wouldn't call. Ya, because I'm just calling for protection, for help, I don't want to call somebody in and then they said well that's your fault. I really don't want to do that even if I was hurt.

The experience she had with the police on one occasion has greatly influenced her willingness to use the system again.

CJS does not provide justice coupled with negative attitude toward police. The women who loaded on this factor did not think the CJS provided justice. That is, they did not think that the end result of using the system would be satisfactory. This was coupled by a negative attitude toward the police in particular, but not toward other members of the system.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(48) Continuing with prosecution in cases of	2	2	-4	-4	5

domestic violence stops the man from getting away

with the abuse. He committed a crime and he

deserves to be punished.

(39) There is no point in arresting men who abuse -5 0 -2 **3*** -3

their partners because they are just released again

with a slap on the wrist.

(72) If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal 0 1 -1 **-3** 2

justice system involved in my case because that is

what he deserves. This would punish and

straightened him out.

(23) I don't think police officers believe women who -3 5 3 **5** 2

are abused by their partners unless they're really

hurt.

(1) I am very satisfied with police response to 1 -4 -2 **-4** -3

domestic violence.

(63) When responding to domestic disputes police -2 3 -1 **3** -3

officers often act cocky and macho.

(8) When the police arrive at a domestic dispute they -4 3 3 **3** 0

act as if nothing important has happened. They

don't even make an effort to collect all the evidence.

Ying May's negative experience with the police seems to have coloured her view of the whole system. She said,

Umm, well I think I was hurt, so I called the police, but when they arrived they told me that because I blocked his way, so it was not just his fault, it was my fault too. So that it's it's acceptable that he hit me because I blocked his way... Ya, I was sur.. surprised, I think it's not fair to me, but umm, that is the system.

Later she says,

I think when I sorted the cards maybe I just recalled about the unhappy experience with the policeman. So I put it for negative things. [If the police are bad, maybe they're all bad, kind of?] Even if I go to court maybe they will tell me the same thing. That I blocked his way and, so. It is not the court system, maybe it is the whole, well whole justice system. Ya, they don't think about your feelings. Ya but of course they won't think about your feelings, they just, they just want the truth, what happen. They don't care what you are thinking, what your situation is, what your feelings at that time. They won't think about it. But umm, well I was confused. I don't know, if I was a judge how will I think about well this woman, she was hurt but she did something wrong. I don't know if I was the judge what I will, what justice will do.

Emotional issues affecting views on CJS. Emotional issues were an important consideration for the women who loaded on factor four. Feelings of attachment, guilt, and worry about what others would think were most strongly noted on this factor and likely influenced their views on the use of the CJS. Unlike the women who held the 'wants input' perspective (factor three), those who loaded on factor four also had a strong fear of the abuser.

F1 F2 F3 **F4** F5

(43) I am (or was) very emotionally attached to my partner and would have (or would have had) a hard time even calling the police on him. Involving the criminal justice system would end the relationship and this is not what I want (or wanted).	0	-3	3	4	0
(29) If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him prosecuted. I wouldn't want him to lose his job or go to jail because what he would need is help, not punishment.	-3	-5	2	4	0
(24) If my partner were arrested or taken to court for hitting me, I would feel guilty and worry about what people would think of me.	-1	-2	4*	5*	0
(62) If my partner hit me, I would want him prosecuted so that I could tell my story and let people know what he did.	0	-1	-4	-5	-4

Attachment to one's partner comes up a number of times in the interview both in discussions of Ying May's own relationship and in discussions of hypothetical relationships. Regardless of how attached a woman is to her partner, Ying May thinks the woman should call the police if the abuse is serious, but she admits that knowing when to define the abuse as serious is difficult. When discussing whether or not women should use the CJS she said,

And she thinks well he'll never do that again so she just keeps it. And if you really want to keep the relationship then maybe she will just keep it. But if she

thinks well she can't stand it any more and she is looking for some other way to solve the problem maybe, maybe she is better [using the CJS]... Ya but umm, but if the hurt is very serious, if it very badly of course she couldn't just umm, even if she likes to still have that man, but if that man hurt her very seriously or very badly.

In explaining her agreement with item #43 she said,

Ya, if I do love him, definitely I won't do that [call the police]. But right now, it really depends on the situation. When you are in the situation, you be very mad, and by that time what you are thinking would be very different with what you are thinking when you are become calm down. Like when I sit here and I don't love him anymore, so what you are saying has nothing to do with me, so I will be thinking all of these very considerate or very comfort. Right so, he's just a man and we've been husband and wife for years and I won't hurt him.

She seems to be saying that her emotional state would really affect her decision to call the police. If she loved the man she would not want to call the police, but if she got angry enough she might call them. Guilt and worry about what people would think was also very salient for Ying May. She said,

Ya, even my family, they would think well this woman she is so, well, how can I describe it, well, she is so, this woman can call the police, she could do that to her husband. ...If anything happens later she will call the police again...My family is okay, but my friends, I think to my friends maybe they will think, this woman, she is too, well... Too wicked...ya she even called the police to her husband. Well, who will marry her again?"

She related guilt and shame to her Chinese heritage when she was asked about her agreement with statement #62. She said, “Ya (laughs). This is a cultural influence ‘cause I he was caught and charged because of me and I sent him to the jail. I think I would be very very guilty. Like I would be very shy to tell anybody else. Well I’m so strong, I’m so powerful, well I wouldn’t do that.” For her it seems that talking about it in court would be perceived as arrogant.

Although not particularly high, statement #65 was highest for factor four. Fear of the batterer may also have affected the women’s responses to items that alluded to fear such as being too frightened to ask for arrest.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(65) My partner would (or would have) come after me if I put him in jail for hitting me. I’d be scared to find out what he would do once he was free.	1	0	-4*	2	-1
(59) An abused woman is too frightened to ask for arrest, so it is better that that decision is out of her hands.	1	-2	-5	3	2
(60) Women who are abused by their partners aren’t in the right state of mind to decide whether or not their partner should be arrested and charged. They are afraid of him, so the law needs to make that decision for them.	3	-3	-4	2	4
(9) Arresting a man who has abused his partner will make him angrier and he will take his anger out on	0	2	-3	5	-1

the woman.

Fear was not a dominant theme in Ying May's interview, but it did surface in her explanations of some of the statements. When she was read #65 she said, "Oh ya. [So you think your own partner, the one who hit you would have been revengeful.] Ya, at that time we were all very mad. So maybe he can do anything he want." And when she was explaining her disagreement with statement # 9 she said,

Ya. It's not. I don't think it really happen to me. But umm, I think I have this feeling because I watch too many movies, (laughing) too much T.V. I just don't think, well a man who is released from prison, they will be more angry, because well that woman just ruined my life. I will, maybe I will do anything I can to fight her back.

Would not use the CJS, especially for prosecution. The women on this factor were least likely to agree that they would use the CJS, and if forced to, would not likely cooperate.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(13) If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him prosecuted because involving the criminal justice system is too much of a hassle. It wouldn't be worth the stress. It just wouldn't be good for me.	-5	-2	-3	4**	-2
(67) After you leave and get away from an abusive partner, there doesn't seem to be any point in having him prosecuted.	-3	-5	-5	2**	-5
(34) A woman who has been abused by her partner	1	2	2	-2**	1

should not drop the charges or fail to show up to

testify. If she does the violence will continue.

(26) If a woman is forced to testify against her -4 -1 1 3 0

partner when she doesn't want to, she has no choice

but to lie in court.

When Ying May was first asked about whether or not women should use the CJS, she indicated that they should, but when asked why she quickly adds that this would only be best in very serious cases when a third party is needed. And when asked about cases that are not very serious she says,

Ya if it is not so serious, but it is very hard to say how is serious and how is not serious. So, but if the problem really can be solved by themselves it is better just to keep it in the family. Not to, Ya. Because I know sometimes if they look for help from other parts maybe it will just make the case even more worse.

A similar scenario occurs when she was asked about whether or not she would use the CJS if she needed to. She indicates that she would, and has in the past. However, later in the interview after she describes her "unhappy experience with the policeman" it becomes clear that she probably would not call them again.

Demographics and experiences of factor four. The demographics and experiences of the five women who loaded most significantly on this factor were examined. All of the women who loaded on this factor had experience with the CJS. Two only had police experience, one had prosecution experience, and two had court experience. All of the women had experienced physical abuse (stage two to fourA) and all, but one, were still being abused. So some of their views may be a result of still being

currently physically abused. Only one of the five women who loaded on this factor was White.

Summary of factor four. Women who held the ‘cannot protect’ perspective believed that the CJS could not ensure the safety of victims of domestic violence and was not a deterrent to abusers. They were also the most fearful, emotionally attached, and likely to experience guilt if their partners were charged. They had a negative attitude toward the system as whole, but especially toward the police, and they believed that the CJS could turn against victims and make matters worse for them. The women who held this perspective were least likely to indicate that they would use the CJS or that other women should use it. Some of the women’s demographics and experiences may be important in understanding this perspective. In particular, the fact that they had all experienced physical abuse and were all currently being abused could explain the high level of fear. The high percentage of minority women who held this perspective and the ‘wants input’ perspective (factor three), and the fact that both of the women interviewed connected their ethnicity to emotions of guilt and worry about what people might think could be important in understanding these perspectives.

Factor Five: The CJS Should be Used for Her Safety, for His Rehabilitation, and for Justice Despite its Problems

Three women loaded purely, and an additional 16 women loaded significantly on factor five. The estimated reliability for this factor was 0.923, and the normalized standard error was 0.277. Seven percent of the variance was explained by factor five.

Two interviews were conducted. Reena’s Q sort was most strongly correlated with factor five. She is a 54-year-old South Asian Canadian woman. She has a college

diploma and two young adult children. She has called an assaulted woman's hotline once and has also used victim services provided by the courts on one occasion. She has substantial experience with the CJS. She has called the police six times, and someone else has called on her behalf once. The police have come to her house four times and her partner has been arrested twice. He was prosecuted and found guilty once. Although Reena did not testify in court, she has watched a number of other women testify through her work with Court Watch. She has been married for 26 years and lives with the man who has assaulted her. He has not been physically abusive in two years, but continues to be verbally abusive.

Jen's Q sort had the second highest correlation with factor five. She is a 38-year-old Caribbean Canadian woman. She has a high-school education and one small child. She has stayed in a shelter for women 15 times and once used shelter services while living somewhere else. She has called the police twice and on one occasion someone else called on her behalf. The police have come to her home twice and her partner was arrested twice. On one occasion she wanted the police to arrest and they did not. He was charged and prosecuted on one occasion, and she was subpoenaed and testified in court. The abuse stopped 12 years ago when she left him. She is currently in a non-abusive relationship that is three years old.

Using the CJS can stop the abuse. The women who loaded on this factor were most likely to believe that using the CJS could stop the abuse both temporarily and permanently. They consistently supported notions of deterrence, although some of the unit numbers were not very large. Statement #19 in particular may have been affected by

a general negativity towards Crown attorneys and the court process, which is discussed in a later section.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(36) If my partner hit me, I would want him prosecuted because that is the safest thing for my children. I wouldn't want them to grow up thinking it's okay to hit a woman.	4	2	4	-3	4
(46) Arresting a man who has hit his partner stops the violence underway and the woman is safe while he is gone. This is important because it gives her time to make plans such as finding a place to live.	2	1	-1	2	4
(19) Being prosecuted teaches the violent partner that you can't be abusive and get away with it. He'll learn not to do it again.	0	-1	5	-5	2
(16) If a man is arrested for abusing his partner he will not hit her again because he will not want to be arrested again.	-5	-3	0	-5	3
(45) The police help decrease long-term violence in cases of domestic abuse.	0	-4	-2	-3	1

Both Reena and Jen believed that using the CJS could be a deterrent to future abuse, although there was no guarantee that it would always stop a man from being abusive. Jen explained that women should use the CJS to help stop the abuse. She said,

...victims should get some could get some relief if their assaulter got punished.

[Okay, So you mean relief in the sense that the abuse might stop?] Ya, definitely the abuse would stop. If you went to that extreme. You have more chances of it stopping.

Jen also felt that the CJS could protect women, but that the woman herself had to have personal strength and resolve to get the case prosecuted. Her reaction to this factor's title was,

It [the CJS] can protect, women, it can protect victims, if you keep your strength, and you know, don't allow say a Crown to push, you know umm persuade you not to follow through with it if you keep umm, your head straight and just umm keep pursuing and umm go all the way, you can get some, you could possibly could get somewhere... Ya. It does keep them safe for at least that time being, you can say.

Reena had more personal experience with deterrence. The first time she used the CJS, her husband was not charged. And she acknowledged that this was okay with her because "at first all [she] wanted to do was to frighten him." However as the abuse escalated, her husband became accustomed to speaking to the police. She described it this way,

I think, the police took so long to charge him, you know three four visits later, ah, to a certain extent it made him feel, ah, sort of these are empty threats they're never going to charge me. You know, like you can keep calling them, you know, like so you're wasting public money. Rather than ah something is going to come

out of this one of these days. So that was good that like they did eventually charge him.

Later in the interview she directly attributed an escalation of violence to the police's lack of action the night before. She said, "so the next time in fact maybe they [the police] told him, we don't see any marks so we're not going to charge you. And I felt that he had got so complacent that they're not going to charge me that he actually scratched my face."

Reena's husband eventually spent 17 days in jail, which she believes to be the reason why he has not been physically abusive in the last two years.

My husband got the fear of the law because of those 17 days. He was locked up with heavy duty criminals who didn't like the way he looked and was threatening to smash his face in. So that was, I think the major deterrent. You know being taken away in handcuffs and going to sleeping in jail in the division for the night, I don't think bothered him so much because the next day he was very defiant in the court, you know. Because he thought, you know, I'm getting out today. But those fellows threatening to smash his brains in, you know really frightened him...

Reena's husband continues to be verbally abusive, but she believes he does not hit her because he is afraid that she will call the police again. She said, "Because as I say, it triggers in his head that like if he touches me, if he lets his anger get away from him and he touches him, I have, I have this option [calling the police]."

Reena has also done Court Watch, so she has seen a number of trials, and although she feels the CJS was a deterrent in her case, she believes that that is often not

the case because men have “learned how to beat the system” by admitting guilt immediately and getting off with a light sentence.

The CJS should be used for justice (punishment) and rehabilitation. The women who loaded on this factor supported the idea that abusive men should be punished although there is some evidence that they did not believe that CJS always did this strongly enough (e.g., statement #68). The notion of using the CJS so that men will not get away with abuse may have been particularly important.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(48) Continuing with prosecution in cases of domestic violence stops the man from getting away with the abuse. He committed a crime and he deserves to be punished.	2	2	-4	-4	5**
(68) The criminal justice system makes such a big deal about violence against women and then they don't do very much. That upsets me.	-2	5	-1	0	4
(72) If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case because that is what he deserves. This would punish and straightened him out.	0	1	-1	-3	2
(7) Beating your partner is certainly not a family matter. It's a criminal offence. I think if more people were arrested, prosecuted, and convicted of assaulting their partners, this kind of abuse would be	5	4	1	0	3

taken more seriously.

Jen supported the idea that abusive men should be punished, although she was less likely to believe that they actually would be punished. In response to why she would use the CJS Jen said,

Because umm, I've experienced, kind of the abuse, and I think that umm, more I realize that the, they shouldn't, people, people shouldn't, that's not respectful behaviour and people shouldn't get away with that. They should be punished. [I: So you feel that if you did use the CJS, that there would be justice, that there would be punishment for him?] I would hope that, I would think that umm, justice umm works for umm the person wounded.

Reena saw the punishing aspect of the criminal justice system was important for deterrence in her own situation. She also thought it was very important that this kind of violence be treated as a crime, which accordingly involves punishment. In explaining why she agreed with item #48 she said,

And that domestic violence is a crime. Because not only does it involve the two or four people it goes on to involve generations. Because I think that he is the way he is because he was an abused child. He comes from a home of domestic violence, which nobody paid any attention to. [So by using the criminal justice system you show that it's serious] Umm hmm. [Is that the idea?] Ya. And not only serious. I want it to be made a crime. You know like drunken driving is a crime.

This factor was the one that was most associated with wanting treatment for abusive men, and for their own partners in particular.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(71) I want (or wanted) the criminal justice system involved in my case because they could get my partner into treatment.	0	1	0	-1	5**
(5) Most men who are charged with abusing their partners are sentenced to receive treatment. I think this is the best kind of sentence.	1	-3	5	-1	5

Jen was supportive of treatment because it might help some couples reconcile. In response to her agreement with statement #5, she said,

Ya, I really am supportive of that, of treatment because it could resolve the issue, ya know, maybe it could help them if they go through treatment and they, you know some men are really serious but they don't want completely out of the set, you know away from their wives and their children, you know once they've gotten some treatment and they're able to talk it out and they come to their sentence, and ah, and there is a lot of reconciliation, which I'm supportive of. [I: So it could keep the couple together in a more healthy relationship?] Ya, ya. And sometimes it is a first time and they deserve a second chance as well. Ya, just because it ya, could happen once or even a few, it doesn't mean that it will always continue. Ya know it's just like a, it's like, kind of like a substance abuse kind of.

Reena had personal experience with treatment because her husband was sentenced to anger management. She had this to say about his treatment,

It helped in a way that my husband is very interested in learning about different things. And ah, so he's become an expert on anger management to a certain

extent, but he doesn't think that he is somebody that needs it...But when they had a session where accept responsibility for your actions, he refused, completely... I felt that instead of like stopping there and saying, no until you do this we cannot proceed, they moved on. Like it was impossible to budge him so alright you're one of the many, so let's just move on. You know, so he's still in that same mindset...Ah, he has not touched me since then. I don't know whether he can control his anger. He still sort of yells and screams and you feel like his veins are going to pop out of his head. But he is terrified of touching me because, ah, he knows I can call back even though his probation is over, umm, this still hangs over his head.

Although he has not hit her since he was sentenced, she does not attribute this to his treatment. Nevertheless, she remained supportive of treatment, perhaps "longer treatment." She did think there were some positive aspects to anger management. "For instance, he has learned is that if he feels he is getting out of control, he better get out of the situation. And he walks away, which is a good thing."

Both women were supportive of treatment for abusive men, but they saw it fitting into the CJS system in slightly different ways. For Jen, justice would be served if essentially good men who "went a little wrong" were given the opportunity for treatment so that they could possibly reconcile with their wives. And bad men, "the monsters" got jail. Reena saw it differently. Because abuse is a crime everyone should be punished, but if it were to stop there, "What happens to the next woman? Because there will be another woman." That is, she saw punishment as particular to one relationship in which

the person may learn that if he hits her again, she will call the police. Treatment, however, might help the abusive man actually learn not to be abusive.

Court experience and Crown attorneys are viewed negatively. This factor was associated with a very negative attitude toward the experiences that women have in court and toward Crown attorneys. Unlike other factors, the system as whole and police officers in particular were not rated negatively. In this factor the real problems seemed to start after prosecution.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(55) Women who are abused by their partners should not be required to testify because they have been through enough. Testifying causes more stress and fear.	-1	-1	0	0	5**
(28) Women who are abused by their partners might as well <u>not</u> go to court. I think it's a waste of time.	-5	-4	-3	-2	0*
(42) Women who are abused by their partners are portrayed badly in court. They are seen as jealous, vengeful, unreliable, violent, alcoholic, crazy or worse.	-2	3	0	0	4
(20) I am very satisfied with the court process and with the way judges deal with domestic violence.	3	-4	-3	-4	-5
(17) Crown attorneys support women who have been abused by their partners.	5	-2	0	-2	-4
(47) Crown attorneys help women who have been	0	0	0	1	-2*

abused by their partners to stay involved with the case. For example, they tell her that a conviction is possible if she testifies.

(3) Crown attorneys listen to women who have been 4 -1 0 -1 -3*
 abused by their partners and believe what they have to say. For example, they write down what women say in a careful and accurate manner.

Jen began her interview with a relatively positive attitude toward the court process. When asked about what parts of the court system work well she said,

“I think the whole court experiences.... Ya, I think it’s important to call the police when you know you feel you violated, when something is not right. And I think prosecutors can be very supportive and judges as well, they, they’re really understanding, they, that’s my impression, I think.”

However, later in the interview she was quite critical of Crown Attorneys.

The Crowns are just out to umm, you know, make the woman look bad, like what are you doing wasting people’s time or whatever and umm, you know, make her feel not good at all... or go back and tell the women, you sure you want to do it, and try to talk her out of it and all that, well it’s hard enough what you have to go through and then she’ll back down, that’s what the whole thing, I do think.

Her criticism of the system became quite passionate at times.

What’s wrong with the justice, our justice system is that we have like these judges and these Crown attorneys interfering with all that, like Crowns pushing the women to get away, not to pursue it, which you know they really need to do

'cause those guys are really monsters and they need to go to jail. And you have these judges, that 'I don't care, it's tax payers money', you know, 'let's stop now wasting the taxpayers money, and this is all too expensive for taxpayers'...

Reena had mostly formed her negative impression of the court system through her work with Court Watch. In particular she thought many men got off easy because they had simply learned how the system worked. She also got a bad impression of some judges and some prosecutors by watching them work.

I didn't think that the courts were on the side of the woman. Sometimes I found judges dozing. You know. And it seemed to be mixed, if there were male prosecutor they kept their mouth shut and let the defense go to town on the women. And if they were female prosecutors, they jumped up and there seemed to be this ah aggravation going on between the defense and the prosecutor, like you know.

Reena also had her own negative experiences with the court system. Although her husband spent 17 days in jail, it was not part of his sentence. The judge would not grant him bail and put him in jail because "for whatever reason the judge did not like his attitude." Reena did not feel this was fair and it was not what she expected. She said,

And uh, so they practically put him away and threw away the key. Umm of course this is not quite what I expected or wanted because we also work together. We have a business together, and ah, I didn't know what to do...eventually, uh, the lawyer called me and said that he had ah, asked him to represent him, and I would have to pay for it. Now of course because we have joint accounts, we have

everything together, you know, and ah, so there was no choice in the matter...So I felt that he was not given a fair chance either, you know.

Women should use the CJS despite its problems. Despite the expressed problems with Crown attorneys and court experiences, the women who loaded on this factor still believed that women should pursue justice by using the CJS.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(67) After you leave and get away from an abusive partner, there doesn't seem to be any point in having him prosecuted.	-3	-5	-5	2	-5
(27) If a woman doesn't want to end the relationship with a partner who has hit her, there is no point in prosecuting him.	-3	-2	3	2	-4
(48) Continuing with prosecution in cases of domestic violence stops the man from getting away with the abuse. He committed a crime and he deserves to be punished.	2	2	-4	-4	5
(66) If my partner hit me, I would not call the police because I wouldn't want him arrested.	-1	-5	-3	-2	-4
(13) If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him prosecuted because involving the criminal justice system is too much of a hassle. It wouldn't be worth the stress. It just wouldn't be good for me.	-5	-2	-3	4	-2

Although both Reena and Jen clearly felt that women should use the CJS if they are abused, they also noted a number of problems with the CJS and were cautious about endorsing it whole heartedly. In response to the first question about whether or not women should use the CJS both Jen and Reena noted that there are good and bad aspects to the CJS. In explaining why women should use the CJS Jen said “Because, umm, it would probably do them more good than it would do harm, they should, umm, the umm, like victims should get some could get some relief if their assaulted got punished.” She went on to explain that harm might come because “these is always that possibility too that you could emotionally be kind of scarred if you if you didn’t see justice.” Reena’s response to the same question was,

Because there is some protection. Umm knowing that the, it is, that the police and umm, the justice system is hopefully on their side. It doesn’t always work out the first time because umm, the police came to my place at least three times before they laid charges. So it can be discouraging umm, when they come and talk to you and umm ask to see bruises and if you haven’t got any bruises then they haven’t got any proof and then they walk away. So it umm, sometimes there can be, there are precautions to calling them.

Demographics and experiences of factor five. The demographics and experiences of the five women who loaded most significantly on factor five were examined. Two things stood out. Three of the five women were Caribbean, and four of the five women had left their physically abusive partner over two years ago. The exception was Reena who remained with her husband, but had not been physically abused in two years.

Summary of factor five. Women who held the ‘safety, rehabilitation, and justice’ perspective believed that the CJS could protect victims of abuse and change the abuser’s behaviour through deterrence and treatment. Ambivalence was present in this perspective because while prosecution of the batterer was seen as important, the court experience and Crown attorney was viewed quite negatively. All of the women who held this perspective had been free from physical abuse for over two years.

Comparing Stages of Abuse to Factors

The coefficient of contingency, which is based on the chi-square statistic, but is less sensitive to small cell frequencies, is more useful when comparing varying sample sizes. Therefore, it was chosen to determine whether or not there was a significant relationship between the factor that a woman loaded on and her stage of abuse. The four original stages were: Prelude to physical abuse (stage one), Denying the abuse and hoping for better times (stage two), Labeling the abuse and actively coping with escalating violence (stage three), and Arriving at nonviolence and healing (stage four). In addition the last stage was divided into women who had and had not experienced physical violence, resulting in five groups of women. However, only three groups were considered in the analysis. The original five groups of women were collapsed into three by merging one person categorized as stage two with stage three participants and by merging two people categorized as stage fourB (no physical violence) with the stage fourA participants. This was done to help minimize empty cells in the analysis and because the interpretation of a stage with only one or two people would be difficult. To increase the number of participants, all of the women who loaded significantly ($p < .01$) on one or more factors were included in the analysis. When a woman loaded

significantly on two or more factors, she was included in the factor on which she loaded the highest. The five factors that emerged from the Q analysis were compared to three stages of abuse (stages one, three, and four). The results of the analysis were not significant, contingency coefficient ($N = 55$) = .363, $p = 0.398$. Table 5 presents the counts in each cell.

The small number of participants in factors four and five might not have been sufficient to produce a significant result in the above analysis, but the pattern was of interest; therefore, two additional analysis were conducted to compare each of those factors with the stages of abuse. Whether or not a participant loaded significantly on factor four ('cannot protect' perspective) was compared to the three stages of abuse. The analysis was not significant, contingency coefficient ($N = 55$) = .098, $p = .765$. The same analysis was done for factor five ('safety, rehabilitation, and justice' perspective), which was significant, contingency coefficient ($N = 55$) = .307, $p = .057$. Factor five ('safety, rehabilitation, and justice' perspective) had more women in stage four ('arriving at nonviolence and healing') than would be expected by chance alone. Table 6 presents the counts for each of these analyses.

Although not an original hypothesis the emphasis on experience with the CJS that was noted in the interviews was interesting. Therefore a post hoc analysis of experience with different areas of the CJS was conducted. The five factors were compared to the four different types of experience with the CJS (none, police only, prosecution, and court). Women were placed at the highest level of their CJS involvement. The results of the analysis were not significant, contingency coefficient $X^2(12) = .376$, $p = .683$. Table 7 presents the counts for this analysis.

Table 5

Overall Chi-square Analysis of the Number of Women in Each Factor by Stage of Abuse

	Stage 1 (<i>n</i> = 12)	Stage 3 (<i>n</i> = 25)	Stage 4 (<i>n</i> = 18)
Factor 1 (<i>n</i> = 21)	7 (4.6) ^a	8 (9.5)	6 (6.9)
Factor 2 (<i>n</i> = 19)	3 (4.1)	10 (8.6)	6 (6.2)
Factor 3 (<i>n</i> = 5)	1 (1.1)	3 (2.3)	1 (1.6)
Factor 4 (<i>n</i> = 5)	1 (1.1)	3 (2.3)	1 (1.6)
Factor 5 (<i>n</i> = 5)	0 (1.1)	1 (2.3)	4 (1.6)

Note. $X^2(8) = .363, p = .398$

^a Numbers in brackets refer to the expected counts.

Table 6

Individual Chi-square Analysis for Factor Four and Five Separately -Number of Women in Each Factor by Stages of Abuse

	Stage 1	Stage 3	Stage 4	$X^2(2)$	p
Factor 4 ($n = 5$)	1 (1.1) ^a	3 (2.3)	1 (1.6)	.098	.765
Factor 5 ($n = 5$)	0 (1.1)	1 (2.3)	4 (1.6)	.307	.057

^a Numbers in brackets refer to the expected counts.

Table 7

Overall Chi-square Analysis of the Number of Women in Each Factor by Experience with the Criminal Justice System

	None (<i>n</i> = 23)	Police (<i>n</i> = 12)	Prosecution (<i>n</i> = 8)	Court (<i>n</i> = 13)
Factor 1 (<i>n</i> = 21)	12 (8.6) ^a	4 (4.5)	1 (3.0)	4 (4.9)
Factor 2 (<i>n</i> = 20)	7 (8.2)	5 (4.3)	4 (2.9)	4 (4.6)
Factor 3 (<i>n</i> = 5)	2 (2.1)	1 (1.1)	1 (.7)	1 (1.2)
Factor 4 (<i>n</i> = 5)	0 (2.1)	2 (1.1)	1 (.7)	2 (1.2)
Factor 5 (<i>n</i> = 5)	2 (2.1)	0 (1.1)	1 (.7)	2 (1.2)

Note. $X^2(12) = .376, p = .683$

^a Numbers in brackets refer to the expected counts.

Discussion

Many past researchers have conceptualised abused women's perspectives about the CJS in a dichotomised fashion (e.g., Barata, 1999; Jaffe, et al., Smith, 2000). On one side, women are seen as favouring the use of the CJS (e.g., satisfied, cooperative, continuing with prosecution, etc.), and, on the other side, women are seen as opposing it (e.g., dissatisfied, uncooperative, seeking to drop charges, etc.). If this were an accurate description of women's views, there would have been only one perspective (a single factor solution) in the current study, with which some women would have agreed and some would have disagreed. Instead, five qualitatively different perspectives have emerged; 'trust' (factor one), 'disappointment' (factor two), 'wants input' (factor three), 'cannot protect' (factor four), and 'safety, rehabilitation, and justice' (factor five).

The main goal of this study was to examine women's perspectives about the CJS as a whole. This was accomplished in the analysis of the five perspectives and each perspective was described at length in the results section. One perspective ('trust'; factor one) was clearly positive and one ('cannot protect'; factor four) was clearly negative, but even these two perspectives cannot be described as opposites. The other three perspectives were less dominated by women's overall sense of positive or negative regard for the system, but rather contained collections of ideas that have not been well documented in previous studies. These ideas were important in describing and understanding one or more of the perspectives that emerged in this study. Sometimes the findings of past research were challenged and more often things that have only been hinted at in the past were more fully developed. Issues were raised that ranged from challenging the importance of satisfaction measures, which have been widely used in past

research (e.g., Byrne et al. 1999; Fleury, 2000; Horton, Simonidis, and Simonidis, 1987), to examining how views of different CJS personnel interact with an overall perspective of the system itself, to describing interesting combinations of ideas such as wanting the CJS to both punish and rehabilitate. These and other issues are considered first because they set the groundwork for a discussion of the wider implications of this study and of the implications of the five perspectives that emerged.

Issues that Stood Out in the Women's Perspectives

Satisfaction with the Criminal Justice System

Past quantitative research has relied heavily on the use of satisfaction ratings to measure victims' perceptions of different areas of the criminal justice system. Findings have generally ranged from neutral to positive levels of satisfaction depending on what areas of the system were being measured (the police have generally received higher ratings than Crown attorneys, judges or the court process) (Fleury, 2000; Jaffe, et al., 1986; Lewis, 2000; London Family Court Clinic Inc., 1991; Wiist & McFarlane, 1998). There were three statements in this study that specifically asked about satisfaction. An examination of their placement suggests lower satisfaction in this study than in previous studies.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(1) I am very satisfied with police response to domestic violence.	1**	-4	-2	-4	-3
(33) I am very satisfied with the way Crown attorneys deal with cases of domestic violence.	2	-4	-1	0	-5
(20) I am very satisfied with the court process and	3**	-4	-3	-4	-5

with the way judges deal with domestic violence.

One explanation is that the recruitment strategy in this study brought in women who were much less satisfied with the CJS. However, this is strongly contradicted by the 'trust' perspective (factor one). The women who held this perspective were clearly more pleased with the whole CJS and with the people in the system than were other women. Nevertheless, the placement of their satisfaction statements was not very positive. Another explanation is that the method used in this study is different from standard ratings of satisfaction because participants had to compare statements to each other and only statements that stood out as salient were placed in positions of strong agreement or strong disagreement. Perhaps the satisfaction statements simply did not capture the women's beliefs as well as other statements. This brings into question the meaning of high satisfaction ratings in past studies. Ratings of satisfaction in various settings have been critiqued in the past because high rates of satisfaction are common in many service settings when standard Likert scales are used (Shaw, 1984). Thus, past research that has shown positive ratings of the CJS is not surprising. "Satisfaction" can certainly mean different things to different people, and as an overall evaluation it may not be very meaningful. Satisfaction ratings may have more to do with how the CJS performs in relation to the woman's expectation. For instance, if the woman expects the police to simply reprimand her partner, but they also provide her with a victim service number, the satisfaction rating may be exaggerated.

The satisfaction statements in this study do seem to have captured extreme dissatisfaction in the 'disappointment' (factor two), 'cannot protect' (factor four) and 'safety, rehabilitation and justice' (factor five) perspectives even though extreme

dissatisfaction is rarely observed in other studies (Fleury (2000) is an exception). This study may have been better able to capture dissatisfaction for two reasons. First, past studies that have used quantitative methods necessarily obscure opinions that are in the minority so a minority view of dissatisfaction would not have been noted. Second, the women in this study read many statements about the CJS and considered them in relation to each other. For instance, after considering a number of statements about Crown attorneys and prosecutors, the women who held the ‘safety, rehabilitation, and justice’ perspective (factor five) may have realized that their satisfaction was low and thus placed statements #33 and #20 in a strongly disagree position. There is some support for this notion in past research. For example, Erez and Belknap (1998) found unusually low ratings of satisfaction (although not extreme dissatisfaction). They had participants answer open-ended questions about both their positive and negative interactions with CJS personnel before they completed the satisfaction ratings. This suggests that satisfaction ratings should only be used after women have had the opportunity to reflect on the CJS in a meaningful way. It also suggests that Q-sorting may be a particularly effective way for participants to evaluate the CJS because it allows for such reflection.

As noted above, the satisfaction ratings in Fleury’s (2000) study also reflect extreme dissatisfaction for some women, and her overall results are closest to the findings in the current study. Fleury used cluster analysis to examine satisfaction across four areas of the CJS (i.e., police, prosecutor, court process and court outcome) with survivors who all had substantial experience with different areas of the CJS. One of her clusters is similar to the ‘trust’ perspective (factor one) in the current study because it was positive across all four aspects of the system. There is also some similarity between her low

satisfaction across the board cluster, which captured extreme dissatisfaction, and the 'disappointment' (factor two) and 'cannot protect' (factor four) perspectives in the current study. And there is a resemblance between her cluster two (increasingly dissatisfied as the process continues) and the 'safety, rehabilitation, and justice' perspective (factor five) in that both groups of women were most unhappy with the court process and sentencing. So although there is some consistency between Fleruy's study and the current findings, the cluster analysis of satisfaction ratings does not provide the richness needed to paint detailed perspectives of the CJS. Satisfaction was only one of many areas that were important in distinguishing and understanding the perspectives that emerged in this study.

Views about the People in the Criminal Justice System

Women's views about different CJS personnel were important in distinguishing between different perspectives. The 'trust' perspective (factor one) was the only one that was really dominated by an emphasis on all the people within the CJS. The women who held this view felt quite positively about CJS personnel in general. For the 'disappointment' perspective (factor two) it was the range of negative perceptions about different people throughout the system that stood out. The women who held the 'cannot protect' perspective (factor four) felt quite negative about the police, but relatively neutral about other personnel. In contrast, the 'safety, rehabilitation, and justice' perspective (factor five) was dominated by a negative attitude toward prosecutors and judges.

Criticism of the court process has been an overriding theme in past research. Bennett et al. (1999) found that confusion about how the system worked and frustration

over its slowness were dominant concerns for victims. Victims have also expressed dissatisfaction with reduced charges (Cretney & Davis, 1997) and court outcomes (Landau, 1998; Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996). Most quantitative studies find that Crown attorneys received lower ratings of satisfaction and helpfulness than police officers (Erez & Belknap, 1998; Fleury, 2000; London Family Court, 1991). This view is best represented by the 'safety, rehabilitation and justice' perspective (factor five). Although the women who held this perspective did not have an overall negative attitude toward using the CJS, they were very negative about the court process, Crown attorneys and judges. This may be because these women valued punishment and rehabilitation and may not have believed that prosecution actually brought about either of these things. A negative attitude toward the court process may have dominated in only one perspective because relatively few women in this study compared to past research studies had experience with the court process. About a third of women had partners who were prosecuted and only about a quarter were required to attend court. Including women without extensive experience with the CJS strengthens this study because most women will not have a case that goes to prosecution, but that does not mean that they do not have an opinion about the CJS. If we want to know what battered women think of the CJS, these women must also be included. Interestingly, the women with the least experience were most likely to hold the 'trust' (factor one) perspective. Therefore, the negative attitudes about the process, which are expressed in the 'safety, rehabilitation, and justice' perspective' (factor five) are not likely to influence women's decisions to engage the system for the first time.

In contrast to the relative ease with which many women placed their cards in positions that expressed dissatisfaction with different CJS personnel, there was a real hesitation in the interviews towards saying anything negative about them. For instance, Ying May ('cannot protect'; factor four) clearly had a terrible experience with the police, but was very hesitant to complain about it early on in the interview. In response to the first few questions she indicates that most women should use the CJS and that she herself would use it, but later in the interview it became clear that she would not likely ever call the police again. Grace ('disappointment'; factor two) wanted the police to arrest her partner, and even though they did not, she says, "they were helpful in a sense." Sara ('trust'; factor one) took many opportunities to praise the people that she encountered throughout the system, but was reluctant to criticize the Crown attorney even though she was not satisfied with the amount of time he spent with her. Jen ('safety, rehabilitation, and justice'; factor five) at first makes generally positive comments about how Crown attorneys can be supportive to women, but later makes very specific and negative comments about how Crown attorneys push women to drop charges⁵.

Hesitation toward criticizing the CJS is understandable because it may appear ungrateful. The system is there to catch and punish the guilty and thus protect the

⁵ It is worth noting that Jen was the only participant who struck me as being less than entirely candid in her interview. When asked if her case was prosecuted she says, "Umm, ya I had one case that went court. No, not really, not really, no." In her discussions about Crown attorneys and judges she became quite passionate and it sounded like she might have had some personal experience, but she did not frame it that way. I asked her a few times throughout the interview if she was basing her judgments on personal experiences, but she consistently said no. However, she had indicated in her questionnaire that she had testified against her partner on one occasion. I wondered if she had had an experience that she did not want to tell me about, perhaps an incident where she had also been violent or felt at fault. There is not much in the transcript to base this conclusion on, but I do believe that there was a missing piece to her story.

innocent. The people who work in the system are the proverbial “good guys” so if a victim is not appreciative she may feel that it says something negative about her. This context needs to be seriously considered when evaluations of the CJS are developed. Interviews may be especially affected because of the lack of anonymity. A recent study has examined the helpfulness of the police by victims of domestic violence (Apsler, Cummins & Carl, 2003), and found that helpfulness ratings were extremely high with 75% of the participants giving the highest rating. However, the participants in this study were interviewed by one of three police officers (two male and one female), and it is difficult to believe that many participants would have been comfortable criticizing the interviewer’s fellow officers. The participants in my study appeared hesitant in the interviews (although not in the card sorting exercise) to criticize the CJS even though they knew this was my dissertation and I had no connection whatsoever to the criminal justice system. Therefore, it seems that hesitation to criticize members of the CJS cannot be taken lightly and interviews should be balanced with methods that allow for anonymity.

Evaluations that occur within the context of mandatory policies may be especially influenced by a lack of anonymity. The policies force the people in the CJS to arrest and prosecute, which is what society perceives to be their jobs. It may be, therefore, easier to criticize police who do not arrest or prosecutors who do not prosecute than those who do arrest and prosecute. Apsler et al.’s (2003) study took place within the context of a recently instituted mandatory arrest policy. As expected, participants who wanted arrest and got arrest, rated the police as much more helpful than women who wanted arrest and did not get it. However, there was no difference for women who did not want arrest.

That is, for these women having their partners actually arrested did not affect their helpfulness ratings. To me this indicates that the women who did not want arrest, may not have felt at liberty to complain when their partners were in fact arrested. This touches on views about mandatory intervention policies, which are discussed next.

Views about Mandatory Intervention

Past research on victims' views of mandatory intervention policies such as mandatory arrest and no-drop prosecution has resulted in positive evaluations (Barata, 1999; Smith, 2000, 2001). This is most closely associated with the 'trust' perspective (factor one). The women who held this perspective were most supportive of mandatory arrest, although their support for no-drop prosecution was not overwhelming. These women were also more like the women in previous studies in that they were more likely to be recruited from a shelter. This finding supports concerns made by the authors of these studies that positive evaluations from certain select samples might not generalize to all abused women. The 'trust' perspective may only represent women who have faith in the system and have positive attitudes toward the people who work in the system.

The 'wants input' perspective (factor three) was also very relevant to mandatory intervention policies in that there was a strong dislike for no-drop prosecution, although a relatively neutral response to mandatory arrest. This perspective has not been found in past research because the survey methods have led to an emphasis on the majority view, which is a positive evaluation of the policies (Barata, 1999; Smith, 2000, 2001). The women with the 'wants input' perspective (factor three) believed that abused women were capable of deciding that they wanted their partners arrested and that they should be able to decide if they wanted the charges dropped. These women were not necessarily

against using the CJS, but they wanted choice. In my past research, I found that feeling committed to one's partner predicted a woman's dislike of mandatory arrest (Barata, 1999). This may explain why the women with the 'wants input' perspective emphasized that women should be sure that they want to leave their partner before they engage the system. These women seemed to be expressing a desire for a more personalized response, perhaps one that would take women's feelings of love, attachment, and guilt into consideration.

The women who had the most overall negative attitude toward the CJS ('cannot protect'; factor four) were not necessarily against mandatory intervention policies (although they did not support them either). Perhaps this ambivalence was the result of realizing that the policies would force the police and prosecutors to act when they might otherwise be reluctant. That is, part of the reason that these women were quite negative about the police was because they saw them as not responding, but these policies would force them to respond. The 'wants input' and 'cannot protect' perspectives highlight the fact that a negative view of the CJS does not necessarily go together with a negative view of mandatory intervention policies.

Academics have debated whether or not these policies are empowering (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1993; Gelles, 1993a; Hoyle & Sanders, 2000; Stark (1993). However, victims' views on whether or not the CJS does or should empower abused women have not been well researched. Consequently, there were few statements in this study that directly related to empowerment. The four statements below are peripherally related.

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(22) Knowing I can call the police if my partner hits	2	-2**	2	2	2

me gives me a sense of control over the situation.

(54) A no-drop prosecution policy makes the woman -2 -1 3 0 -3

who has been abused feel powerless. This is because she has no control over whether or not her partner is prosecuted.

(61) I want (or wanted) my partner prosecuted in -1 -2 2 1 -1

order to get him to do something (for example, to give me a divorce, give me custody of the children, get himself into counseling, stop abusing me, etc.). If he did this, I would want to drop the charges.

(57) The criminal justice system makes the woman 1 4 1 3 -2

feel like a victim again. If the system could just give women a little more power, women would have the confidence to get out of violent relationships.

There was no clear pattern in the above statements and most of the statements did not stand out in any of the perspectives. It may be that empowerment, or gaining power as it has been phrased in past research, is not an important goal for women who use the CJS. It may not be realistic or appropriate to expect the CJS to empower women who have been abused. This work might better be put in the hands of victim services. However, it is absolutely essential that activists continue to work toward ensuring that the system does not disempower women who engage in it.

A recent study published since this dissertation was conceived, sheds some light on the issue of empowerment. Miller (2003) analysed the victim interviews from one of

the arrest experiment replication studies with respect to power. In the past these interviews had only been analysed as a measure of whether or not abuse reoccurred. Miller (2003) examined victims' perceptions of personal power (one item about her independence) and legal power (six semantic-differential items such as helpless/powerful and weak/strong following police intervention). She found that whether or not the man was arrested was not related to the victim's personal power, but it was negatively related to her legal power. This is probably because many women did not want their partners arrested. As expected, legal power was higher for those women who wanted arrest and he was arrested. Legal power was also positively associated with her satisfaction with the police and with her perceptions of safety. Miller (2003) reasoned that an effective response to domestic violence is one that reflects the victim's preferences and autonomy. This is in line with the 'wants input' perspective (factor three), which emphasized a desire for a more personalized CJS response.

It is important to remember that Miller's (2003) study was not originally designed to explore power issues, but rather took advantage of data that had been collected as part of the arrest experiment. At this point researchers are not clear on what empowerment is when it is discussed in relation to the CJS. We clearly need an in-depth qualitative study to better understand whether or not empowerment and disempowerment are meaningful issues for abused women who use the CJS.

One of the key arguments around empowerment is that mandatory policies force the CJS to act, which in turn empowers victims (Stark, 1993). The argument is that by forcing the CJS to act, police and prosecutor bias against treating the violence seriously will be reduced. This is not a trivial concern given the lack of police and prosecutor

action in the 1970s and early 1980s despite laws that clearly made battery a crime (Hemmons, 1981; Oppenlander, 1982). However the flaw in the logic is that forcing the CJS to arrest and prosecute does not necessarily mean that the CJS will start perceiving domestic violence as a serious crime and it certainly does not mean that the CJS will be on the victim's side. The importance of demonstrating the seriousness of abuse is a separate issue and stood out in different perspectives.

Demonstrating the Seriousness of Abuse

Demonstrating the seriousness of abuse to the batterer, society, or others by using the CJS was a key aspect of both perspectives 'trust' (factor one) and 'disappointment' (factor two). This idea has been noted by activists in the early shelter movement (Dobash & Dobash, 1992) and has more recently been used by academics as a justification for mandatory intervention policies (Buzawa, Austin, and Buzawa, 1995; Edwards, 1989; Pagelow, 1992; Stark, 1993). This issue was also mentioned by a minority of women as an explanation for supporting mandatory arrest (21%) and no-drop prosecution (9%) in my previous study (Barata, 1999) and for supporting prosecution (25%) in a study of African American women done by another researcher (Weisz, 2002). Therefore, demonstrating the seriousness of abuse is a salient issue for some women. Academics and activists have taken this notion of seriousness one step further and argued that taking strong criminal action against abuse can create a culture of intolerance towards violence against women, which will ultimately deter men from abusing women. Pence (1999) compares the women who use the criminal justice system in cases of domestic violence to the first African-American children who attended all-White schools when they were

being desegregated. These children, like women who use the CJS, did not benefit personally, but “the victory was for those who followed” (p.33).

However, the notion of taking violence seriously may not have this emphasis when victims express it. In Sara’s interview (‘trust’; factor one) she emphasized that it was important to show her daughters that this kind of abuse was wrong and that using the CJS would demonstrate this to them. For Grace (‘disappointment’; factor two) the most important thing was that using the CJS would show her partner that she personally could take a stand against the abuse. For these women the seriousness of abuse had a much more personal meaning and did not extend into an abstract benefit for future women, apart from their own daughters. The idea of forcing some women to use the CJS for the greater good of other women may be unfair if they do not see this as a priority. This is especially true if some women will choose to engage the CJS (for whatever reason) even without policies that force them, and there are women who choose to engage the system. In fact they may be in the majority. A recent study that interviewed attorneys and judges found that only one in five women refused to testify or testified for the defense (Hartman & Belknap, 2003). If many women are willing to use the CJS, especially when they have the support of police, prosecutors and judges, it does not seem necessary or beneficial to drag a few others through the system when they are adamant that they will not testify against their partners or will lie in court. Perhaps the police, prosecutors and judges could still be forced to act (mandatory charging), but women could have the option of declining their actions (drop the charge). The analogy of Black children attending all-White schools is then replaced by the analogy of the suffrage movement where a few women fought for the right to vote, and all women won the option to vote.

As female voting became more acceptable (a change in culture), more women voted. Perhaps a culture of change (which I believe has begun) within the CJS will encourage more women to use the system, and not because future women will benefit, but because the victory will be theirs.

Punishment and Rehabilitation

Using the CJS for safety, for justice (punishment), and for the rehabilitation of batterers emerged in this study in the ‘safety, justice, and rehabilitation’ perspective (factor five), but has not been well documented in past research. It is worth noting that the CJS was not seen to increase women’s safety in any other perspective including the most positive perspective (‘trust’; factor one). Lewis et al. (2000) found three themes for why women used the criminal justice system: protection, prevention, and rehabilitation; however; these themes were presented as separate reasons given by different women rather than as a unified perspective. The fact that safety, rehabilitation, and punishment came together in one perspective is interesting and at first may seem counterintuitive. Why would women who want rehabilitation also want punishment? The answer may be in these women’s belief that using the CJS can actually stop and prevent future violence. The mechanism by which this occurs is possibly in both the preventative aspect of deterrence due to punishment and in the educational aspect of treatment. Interestingly, in these women’s views, support for treatment did not necessarily imply that the couple would or should remain together, which is sometimes an assumption of court ordered treatment. Reena advocated treatment because she felt it was the best way to prevent future violence against other women. She saw the deterrent effects of punishment as

being more relevant for the current relationship because the man was aware that this particular woman was willing and able to engage the CJS.

Punishment was certainly related to prevention in this perspective, but it was also considered important in and of itself. Reena was adamant that punishment was important because abuse is a crime, and like any crime there should be a real consequence. Jen noted that punishment was important because some men were “monsters” and as such deserved punishment. The idea of wanting abusive men punished is often linked in our minds to notions of revenge, which does seem to be what Jen was expressing. Revenge has not been adequately examined in past research. At most, authors note it in passing as being mentioned by very few women but have not elaborated on how revenge is expressed (Hoyle & Saunders, 2000; Lewis, 2000). However, wanting punishment and wanting revenge are not the same. For Reena, punishment was more closely linked to notions of justice rather than revenge. This may be similar to the sentiment many people feel when a mass murder or child molester is caught. Generally the public expresses outrage and wants the person punished, but these feelings are not adequately described as revenge, which is generally the result of a personal grievance.

Who Will Use the CJS? The Influences of Past Experiences

In four out of the five perspectives victims were generally in favour of using the CJS (perspectives ‘trust’, ‘disappointment’, ‘wants input’, and ‘safety, justice, and rehabilitation’; factors one to three and five). Yet, in a number of perspectives there were also reasons that could explain why women might not use the CJS (perspectives ‘disappointment’, ‘wants input’, ‘cannot protect’, and ‘safety, justice, and rehabilitation’; factors two to five). For example, women with the ‘disappointment’ perspective (factor

two) emphasized the system's inadequacies (Bennett et al., 1999). Women who held the 'wants input' and 'cannot protect' (factors three and four) perspectives emphasized emotional issues such as love and guilt (Bennett et al., 1999; Fischer et al., 1995; Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996). Women with the 'cannot protect' (factor four) perspective also emphasized a lack of protection from future violence (Bennett et al., 1999; Erez & Belknap, 1998, Fischer & Rose, 1995; Ford, 1991; Hoyle & Sanders, 2000; Tim Roberts Focus Consultants), and the women who held the 'safety, justice and rehabilitation' (factor five) perspective emphasized the frustrations and hassles associated with prosecution (Bennett et al., 1999; Fischer et al., 1995). These four perspectives all contain elements associated with the stereotype of the uncooperative victim (Cannings, 1984; Mcleod, 1983; Wasoff, 1982), but none of them capture this stereotype in its entirety. Yet as noted above, in all but one of these perspectives there are also elements that would support using the CJS. For most women, it would appear that they could go either way; they may engage the CJS and remain committed to taking the case to prosecution or they may never engage or try to disengage before prosecution. This does not mean that there are only two kinds of views about the system, but rather that different views can lead to the same behaviours depending on the circumstances. Perhaps we need to start viewing all women as having the potential to be both cooperative and uncooperative rather than trying to differentiate between the two. If CJS personnel were trained to think about the situation in this way they might be less likely to stigmatize some women as uncooperative and by doing so, produce the uncooperative behaviour.

A determining factor in whether or not women will use the CJS might be how past experiences have shaped women's perspective of the CJS as a whole. This has not

been adequately examined in past research, but it seemed to be important in the interviews conducted in this study. Sara ('trust'; factor one) engaged the system on only one occasion, but had a very positive experience. She says that, if she needed, she would call the police again and attributes her attitude to her past interactions with the system. Many women who held the 'trust' perspective (factor one) had very limited experience with the CJS, and their positive evaluation is consistent with past research. Stephens and Sinden (2000) found that multiple interactions with the police led to more negative perceptions, and that negative perceptions of the police are extended to the whole system. Ying May ('cannot protect'; factor four) had a very negative interaction with the police and directly attributed her unwillingness to use the system again to that interaction. Like many women in Stephen and Sinden's study Ying May also extended her negative view of the police to the system as a whole. Reena ('safely, justice and rehabilitation'; factor five), through her own experiences and her work with Court Watch⁶, had a lot of experience with court cases and her perceptions of attorneys, judges, and the process as a whole were quite negative. Clearly the way women are treated by the people in the system on past occasions can be an important factor in the development of their perspectives, and in their decision on whether or not to engage the CJS.

Survivors' Varying Perspectives on the Criminal Justice System as a Function of the Stage of Abuse

A secondary goal of this study was to examine the relationship between a woman's perspective on the CJS and her current stage of abuse. Four stages were considered: 'prelude to physical violence' (stage one), 'denying the abuse and hoping for

⁶ Court Watch is a program that uses volunteers to watch and take notes during court cases involving domestic violence as a way to increase the court system's accountability towards victims.

better times' (stage two), 'labeling the abuse and actively coping with escalating violence' (stage three), and 'arriving at nonviolence and healing' (stage four). Three very general hypotheses were made. The first was that women who were 'denying the abuse and hoping for better times' (stage two) would have negative views about the CJS as a whole and dislike mandatory intervention policies in comparison to other women. Unfortunately there was only one woman who fit the stage two criteria, so this analysis was not possible. However, it is interesting to note that this one woman was most strongly associated with the 'wants input' perspective (factor three). That is, she was quite negative about the mandatory intervention policies. I examined the other two women who also held the 'wants input' perspective. One was Savita who was interviewed. She indicated that she had not been physically abused and was therefore categorized as 'prelude to physical abuse' (stage one); however later in her questionnaire she wrote that she has tried to defend herself by hitting him back, so she may have been physically hit at some point. She did not label the relationship as abusive, although she did respond "yes" to all the previous questions (i.e., felt what he had said or done was unacceptable, felt scared or threatened by what he said or did; felt confused about herself because of what he said or did, and felt that he wanted to control her actions). Her response to one of the final items on the questionnaire made it clear that she was not thinking about leaving. She wrote, "Men don't change, but I love him so I want to continue with the situation." She seems to be most closely associated with Landenburger's (1989) 'enduring' phase where abuse is tolerated in order to maintain the relationship. She also may be generalizing his behaviour to all men, which may be keeping her from labeling it as abusive. So although Savita was technically in the first

stage, her cognitions may have been more like women who were 'denying the abuse and hoping for better times' (stage two). The third woman who held the 'wants input' perspective (factor three) was clearly 'labeling the abuse and actively coping with escalating violence' (stage three). She had taken substantial step towards stopping the abuse and leaving the relationship, and although she was still very upset –she filled the back of the questionnaire with her story –there was no indication that she wanted to return to the relationship. Overall, there may have been a relationship between 'denying the abuse and hoping for better times' (stage two) and negative views of no-drop prosecution which was most closely associated with the 'wants input' perspective (factor three), but the limited number of women categorized as stage two, make this interpretation difficult.

There was no significant relationship between a woman's stage of abuse and the most negative perspective ('cannot protect'; factor four), but there was an interesting trend. Four of the five women who held the 'cannot protect' perspective were still in an abusive relationship. This may be important because the negative attitude toward the CJS that was associated with this perspective may have been partially related to current and ongoing abuse or current and ongoing contact with the system. The woman who held this perspective indicated that feelings of love, guilt, and fear influenced their views on the CJS. This is consistent with Hoyle and Sanders (2000) finding that women who were not thinking about leaving the abusive relationship were less likely to reengage the CJS despite continued violence compared to women who had already left or were considering leaving. Higher commitment towards a partner has also been associated with a negative attitude towards mandatory arrest and no-drop prosecution (Barata, 1999).

The second general hypothesis, which was not supported, had two parts. The first was that women who were 'labeling the abuse and actively coping with escalating violence' (stage three) would have conflicting views about the CJS. A perspective that was defined by conflicting views did not emerge, although three perspectives had mixed feelings about using the CJS ('disappointment', 'wants input', and 'safety, justice, and rehabilitation'; factors two, three, and five). The women who were 'labeling the abuse and actively coping with escalating violence' (stage three) were spread throughout the five perspectives, so in that sense their views were conflicting with each other, although it is probably more accurate to describe their views as varied. The second part of this hypothesis was that women who were 'labeling the abuse and actively coping with escalating violence' (stage three) would perceive mandatory intervention policies in a generally positive manner. The 'trust' perspective (factor one) was most closely associated with positive attitudes about mandatory intervention policies, but there was no evidence that the women who held this perspective were more likely to be categorized as in stage three, so there was no support for this part of the hypothesis.

The third general hypothesis was that the women who were 'arriving at nonviolence and healing' (stage four) would hold positive views about the CJS and would perceive mandatory intervention policies as helpful. Women categorized as stage four were significantly more likely to hold the 'safety, justice, and rehabilitation' perspective' (factor five). In fact only one woman who held this perspective was not categorized as in stage four (Reena), and although she was still being emotionally abused she had not been physically abused in two years. However, this perspective was not associated with more positive views about the CJS in general or mandatory intervention

policies. In fact, there was surprisingly little relationship between stage of abuse and overall positive or negative perspectives of the CJS or mandatory intervention policies.

In each of my original hypotheses, I predicted that positive views of the CJS and positive views of mandatory intervention policies would come together in one or more perspectives and that negative views of the CJS and mandatory intervention policies would appear together in different perspectives. This was not generally the case.

Although the 'trust' perspective (factor one) did have positive elements of both, there was no one perspective that had negative elements of both intervention policies and the CJS in general.

There was a relationship between 'arriving at nonviolence and healing' (stage four) and the 'safety, justice, and rehabilitation' perspective (factor five). This perspective was associated with the belief that the CJS can stop the abuse and should be used for the victim's safety and to punish the batterer and get him into treatment. It may be that after the abuse has ended women are more reflective about why the abuse ended and may be more likely to credit the CJS. It may also be that women who use the CJS successfully are more likely to see an end to the abuse and or the relationship. A number of studies show an association between leaving the batterer and staying engaged with the CJS (Fisher & Rose, 1995; Horton et al., Hoyle & Sanders, 2000; Smith, 2001; Wolf et al., 2000). In Reena's interview she did credit the CJS with the fact that her husband had not physically assaulted her since his last interaction with the system, which resulted in jail time.

Research on the stages of abuse has been advancing rapidly and authors are now trying to develop reliable methods of identifying a woman's stage of abuse so that

tailored counseling that meets her where she is and works with her current beliefs and desires can be implemented (Dienemann, Campbell, Landenburger & Curry, 2002; Frasier, Slatt, Kowlowitz, & Glowa, 2001). Frasier et al.'s research applies the Prochaska and DiClemente's (1982) transtheoretical model of change to domestic violence, which I rejected as a possible theoretical model for the stages in the current study because it seemed to imply that stopping the abuse was completely within the woman's control. Dienemann et al.'s (2002) work on this issue began with much of the same grounded theory literature that I used to develop the stages in this study; however, the actual method for identifying each state (their terminology) was substantially different. Trained counselors conducted their usual intake interviews and then filled out a form by circling the identifying features of each state. There were no particular questions for particular states. The counselor used the overall interview to evaluate the woman's thinking about her relationship and herself. The goal of these two studies was to tailor counseling to meet the woman's needs, and each article provides practical ways to work with women in each stage/state. As the research on stages of abuse develops, it might also be applied to the CJS. That is, the system might better tailor its actions to serve individual women. Research for best CJS practices for each stage would have to be developed, but perceptions of the CJS would likely be important for at least some stages. For example, if women who are denying the abuse and hoping for better times are in fact more likely to have the 'wants input' perspective (factor three), it might be more beneficial to allow them that input even if it means dropping the charge, and emphasizing to them that this does not mean they cannot engage the CJS for a future assault.

The Relationship Events Questionnaire developed for this study might be useful to CJS personnel because, unlike counselors, they would not have the time to fully explore and understand the woman's relationship and her thinking about it, which is essential in Dienemann et al.'s (2002) process for distinguishing between states. However, a general understanding of where a woman is in her thinking about her relationship could be gained by having her answer the questionnaire items. Her responses may help victim advocates within the CJS better support her through the process. I do not believe that categorizing woman according to stages and then automatically deciding to drop or proceed with charges would be useful. Rather CJS personnel could be educated about the stages of abuse that women go through, and use that information to tailor their advice to meet the woman at a place where she is willing to listen (much like the work that is being done with counselors).

Limitations and Strengths

As with all research, there are some limitations in this study. The ability to estimate the frequency of each perspective in the general population was not a goal of this study, and the nonrandom recruitment strategy does not allow for these kinds of generalizations. For instance, the 'trust' perspective (factor one) was the most common in this study, but this does not imply that most women in the general population hold this perspective. These women, many of whom were from the shelter, may simply have been easier to recruit.

The difficulty of truly recruiting a representative sample is highlighted by the disappointing representation of women who were 'denying the abuse and hoping for better times' (stage two) despite efforts to specifically recruit these women. It may be

that this stage, as it was defined, is so fleeting that it is difficult to capture. However, this stage is well documented in past research, so this is unlikely (Campbel et al., 1998; Landenburger, 1989; Lempert, 1996; Merritt-Gray & Wuest, 1995; Mills, 1995; Sleutel, 1998). The fluidity of women's cognitions in this stage coupled by the nature of the questionnaire design may have made it more difficult to identify these women. This stage is more about feelings and cognitions than about behaviours, which make it more difficult to capture in a written questionnaire. The literature about stages of abuse emphasizes the confusing nature of this stage (Lemper, 1996; Merritt-Gray & Wuest, 1995; Mills, 1985; Sleutel, 1998), which leads to a number of reasons why women experiencing stage two might not have volunteered or might not have been identified. First, women may try to deny the abuse by not thinking about it (Lemper, 1996; Mills, 1985), but participation in the study required quite a bit of thinking about the topic and may actually have changed their thinking about their own situation, even temporarily. After sorting 72 statements about abusive relationships, answering yes to a number of questions about abuse, and acknowledging that they have been physically hurt, it might have been difficult not to label their experience as abuse, which was a key identifying element for this stage. Second, women often hide the abuse in this stage (Landenburger, 1989; Lempert, 1996), so they may not have acknowledged a physical assault on the questionnaire. Third, women who are actively trying to avoid thinking about the abuse would be unlikely to volunteer for a study about difficult relationships.

The recruitment strategy I used led me to ask about the kinds of experiences women had with the CJS, but I did not specifically recruit women whose experiences were either recent or long past, nor did I ask when they last interacted with the CJS (i.e.,

when was the last time they spoke to a police officer, when they were scheduled to testify, when they last testified etc.) Nevertheless, women with a range of past and current interactions with the CJS are likely to have participated in this study because women with varied experiences with the CJS and women who were in different stages of abuse were recruited. However asking for this information in the final questionnaire might have been helpful in understanding the perspectives that emerged. For instance, might the 'cannot protect' perspective (factor four) be related to current and ongoing contact with the CJS?

Using the existing literature to develop the Q statements had both benefits and limitations. The obvious benefit was that the results of this study are more easily interpreted in the light of past findings. However, by using the existing literature the statements were limited to what survivors had said in past qualitative research and what academics had theorized. For instance, I did not find direct quotes about feelings of empowerment or disempowerment, so only a few statements touched on this issue. In addition, past research has not adequately represented some women, especially ethnic minority women, and women who have not used victim services or the CJS. Therefore, the statements chosen might not have captured some of the thoughts, feelings, and concerns of these women. This may have created a situation in which some women could have been more limited in their ability to express their perspective with the statements provided. The fact that three perspectives ('wants input', 'cannot protect', and 'safety, rehabilitation, and justice; factors three to five) were almost entirely comprised of ethnic minority women does give credence to the fact that these women's perspectives may be substantially different from White women's perspectives. However, these

minority women were still able to represent their perspectives with the Q statements, which implies that the method was not overly restrictive or alienating for these women.

Despite these limitations, the current study adds to our understanding about how women who have been abused think about the CJS. Women who have been underrepresented in past research were represented here. The use of this particular recruitment strategy helped insure that women with many different experiences were included. Of particular importance was the fact that women who had not been physically assaulted, who had minimal or no interaction with the CJS, and who had not used victim services participated in this study. There was also a good representation of women of different ethnicities. The nature of the methodology helped bring to light views that have not been heard in past quantitative research and helped us understand how themes that have emerged in past qualitative research are linked for some groups of women. Albeit it in a limited way, this study also examined how perspectives are related, or perhaps not related, to stages of abuse, which had not been examined in the past. The main contribution of this study is that the complexity of women's perspectives about the CJS is illustrated. The perspectives that emerged are new in their complexity and in their substance. New combinations of issues were identified as important for some women and old assumptions such as the relationship between supporting mandatory intervention policies and wanting CJS intervention are challenged. The implications of these perspectives are discussed in the next section.

Implications of the Perspectives that Emerged

Overall, the emergence of multiple perspectives as opposed to one polarized perspective has theoretical, methodological, and applied implications for research and

practice. From a theoretical perspective, the results highlight the fact that subjective views are rarely black and white. Beginning with a dualist model of abused women's perspectives in an effort to predict other beliefs or behaviours may be futile. For instance, in past work (Barata, 1999), I tried to uncover variables that would predict battered women's views about mandatory intervention policies. I began with the assumption that they either liked them or did not, but found surprisingly few predictive variables. It now seems obvious that whether or not women liked mandatory intervention policies is not complex enough to accurately predict other beliefs.

In this study, I began with the assumption that positive evaluations of the CJS would come together in perspectives that supported mandatory intervention policies. This was garnered from the literature review in which the two ideas 'logically' go together. For instance, some authors have noted that the policies are disempowering because for many reasons women may not want their partners arrested and prosecuted (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1993; Gelles 1993a). The problem is that the simplicity of the logic ignores many other issues that can also affect a woman's views of the policies. In other words, she may want her partner arrested, but may still not like the policies. The results of this study showed that supporting mandatory intervention policies and wanting CJS intervention do not automatically go together. There is some relationship for some women (e.g., 'trust' perspective; factor one), but researchers cannot assume a linear relationship for all women.

Adding to the complexity of women's views is that they are not static over time. Although the stages analysis did not capture changes in perspectives as well as hypothesized, the interviews suggest that perspectives may be quite malleable to change

over time. Actual experience with the CJS over time, rather than the stage of abuse the woman is experiencing, may be more relevant in understanding changing perspectives over time. A single negative experience with the CJS may be sufficient to drastically alter a woman's view, perhaps especially for women with little personal experience with the CJS. The influence of negative experiences stood out as a powerful influence on perspectives for some of the women who were interviewed. The very positive 'trust' perspective (factor one) could easily be changed by a negative interaction. For instance, I wonder what Ying May's perspective was before her negative experience with the police. And I wonder how a more positive experience would have changed her perspective. The potential of experiences with the CJS to alter women's perspectives over time highlights the importance of training CJS personnel about the issues involved in domestic violence. Some attention has been given to providing training to all police officers and developing specialized domestic violence units where domestic violence officers work (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000), but other CJS personnel also need to be trained so that at least disastrous interactions (e.g., victim blaming) can be avoided.

A methodological implication of the multiple perspectives that emerged is that research in this area, perhaps especially program and policy evaluative research, must include a broader range of abused women (e.g., women with and without CJS and victim service experience, women of different ethnicities, etc.). The importance of the amount and type of experience women have had with the CJS has been hinted at in past research (Stephens & Sinden, 2000) and was found to be important in shaping women's perspectives in the current study. Women with the 'trust' perspectives (factor one) were more likely to have had little experience with the CJS. In contrast all of the women with

the most negative perspective (cannot protect, factor four) had had experience with the CJS. If we want to understand how all women might benefit or be hurt by using the CJS, we must include women who have decided not to use it.

Experience with victim services is also likely to be important in shaping women's views. The women who were recruited from the shelter in this study were more likely to have the 'trust' perspective (factor one). While this local shelter may be unusual in its extremely positive relationship with the police, this is likely to be important in understanding the positive evaluations of mandatory intervention policies, which have been found in past research that has only recruited from shelters (Barata, 1999; Smith, 2000, 2001).

Evidence is also mounting that ethnically diverse women have different perspectives about the CJS than White women (Smith, 2001; Weisz, 2002). In this study the 'trust' and 'disappointment' perspectives (factors one and two) were held by a majority of White women, and the other three perspectives were overwhelmingly held by non-White women. It is unlikely that ethnically diverse women have been consciously excluded from past research; it is more likely these women have not been included because recruitment has largely been from the CJS itself and from victim services, and these women might be less likely to use these systems. In the current study, diverse ethnicity was not part of the recruitment strategy but by recruiting outside the usual systems, ethnic diversity was achieved. However, in the future it will be important to do more in-depth research with women of particular ethnic backgrounds. With the exception of African American women in the United States (Weisz, 2002) and First Nations women in Canada (Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996) most studies that have

examined women's perspectives of the CJS have not recruited a majority of women of a particular ethnicity. Three of the five women with the 'wants input' perspective (factor three) were South Asian, and three of the five women with the 'safety, rehabilitation and justice' perspective were Caribbean indicating that there may be important commonalities among some women with similar ethnic backgrounds.

Another methodological implication of the current study is that the method used to examine women's views about the CJS must allow for multiple perspectives, which are not necessarily linked in a linear fashion. Multiple perspectives are also more likely to emerge when women have an opportunity to reflect on the CJS before they provide their answers. Q methodology does this quite well because women go through the statements at least twice and are able to move the statements around multiple times as they consider them in relation to each other. Standard survey questions are unlikely to accomplish either of these goals. Various qualitative methods are likely to be better suited at understanding women's perspectives on the CJS, but as already discussed the inability to provide anonymity in some qualitative methods cannot be taken lightly because women may be unwilling to criticize the CJS in one-on-one interviews.

The emergence of multiple perspectives also suggests some practical implications for the CJS and for policy development. CJS personnel need to be trained to avoid thinking about abused women in a dualistic manner, which tends to stereotype them as cooperative or uncooperative. Noncooperation is a frequently voiced claim of law officials (Cannings, 1984; Wasoff, 1982), and more recent research reveals that CJS personnel continue to hold negative stereotypes about battered women. Many police officers believe that battered women are very likely to want charges dropped or are

otherwise uncooperative with prosecutors (Ferraro, 1998), despite the fact that most women testify against the batterer (Hartman & Belknap, 2003). Attorneys who prosecute and defend batterers also continue to hold stereotypical images of victims. For instance they believe that women are usually uncooperative because they are concerned for the batterer's well being or because they want to maintain the relationship (Erez & King, 2000), whereas victims are more likely to name fear as the reason for wanting to drop charges (Erez & Belknap, 1998). Helping CJS personnel understand the complexity and fluidity of women's perspectives may help combat the tendency to stereotype. One way to do this would be to educate them about the different perspectives that emerged in this study.

The development of mandatory intervention policies has in some ways been built upon the stereotypes expressed above. No-drop prosecution does not allow the victim to drop a charge against the batterer, presumably because noncooperation is a problem. Of course the policies also address prosecutor bias against pursuing the charge (Cannings, 1984; Sanders, 1988). That some women were historically unhappy with the unresponsiveness of the CJS is undeniable. Cases of blatant disregard for victim safety and for victim pleas to arrest and prosecute came to the attention of victim advocates and eventually the media in the form of lawsuits (Dobash & Dobash, 1992; Sparks, 1997; Zorza, 1992). There were likely to be many more women that were unhappy with the status quo, but whose cases were not sensational enough to grab attention. With the implementation of mandatory policies, we are now seeing a very different scenario. In some cases the new zeal to arrest and prosecute is hurting some abused women through dual arrest (Dasgupta, 2002; Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002) and the filing of other charges

such as failure to appear (Snider, 1994). Again, the less sensational cases where women are unhappy with the new status quo are less likely to come to our attention.

Snider (1994) sees the new policies as (at best) a symbolic victory that may have come at the cost of lower class women and women of colour. In her words, “Mobilizing class bias (and probably racism as well) in the name of justice, and feminism, is not a clever strategy” (Snider, 1994, p.87). Those who are already vulnerable because of class, ethnicity, race or gender will be more negatively affected by policies that focus on punishment (Snider, 1994). Some evidence for this does exist. Mandatory arrest has increased rates of arrest in domestic violence cases, but it has disproportionately increased the number of women arrested (Dasgupta, 2002; Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002). Similarly, what little research exists, suggests that minority women are less satisfied with mandatory intervention policies (Smith, 2001), and that they may be discriminated against when mandatory intervention policies are used (e.g., through dual arrest) because ethnic and cultural difference are ignored in a one size fits all approach (Dasgupta, 2002).

So what policies, if any, should be mandated? The solution is clearly not to go back to a time when the CJS largely ignored domestic violence. The police remain the main resource for victims during an acute battering episode. Mandatory or pro-arrest policies are still needed to ensure that bias against arrest does not once again become commonplace. Unfortunately, these policies have also had the unintended consequence of increases in dual arrests. The rates of dual arrest vary substantially from state to state, but have been reported to be as high as 23% in Connecticut and as low as 4.9% in Rhode Island (Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002). McMahon and Pence (2003) discuss Duluth, Minnesota’s strategy for reducing the number of battered women arrested by careful

attention to cases of self-defense and by determining and arresting only the primary aggressor. They indicate that a majority of these cases can be eliminated through “a well-trained police department, using a predominant aggressor policy, and monitoring compliance among arresting officers” (p. 65). Many states are moving towards this model and 24 states already have a primary or predominant aggressor assessment law (Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002).

However, even when the batterer (and not the victim) is correctly arrested, it is also important that the victim’s views, needs, and wants play a greater role at various points throughout prosecution. The victim should be able to drop the case if the alternative is likely to make things worse for her (e.g., charged for failing to appear, lying in court, etc.). Perhaps a system could be put in place in which arrest and prosecution are the preferred courses of action, and the victim would have to meet with a victim advocate in order to have the charge dropped. A victim advocate would be better suited to understand the situation and advise the victim than a prosecutor whose advice would be influenced by wanting to win the case (Erez & King, 2000). Unlike the defense attorney who advises the client, but ultimately cannot act without the client’s consent, the prosecutor is not the victim’s attorney and, as such, is not obligated to take the victim’s opinions into consideration. The system is set up as if victims do not have a stake or interest in the outcome of the case (Busby, 1999); however, in domestic violence cases this is clearly not accurate and the system needs to incorporate her opinions. This is already occurring to some degree with regards to sentencing. Sara (‘trust’ perspective; factor one) indicated that her opinion about the sentence that her ex-husband should

receive was taken into consideration and he did not receive jail time because that is not what she wanted.

McMahon and Pence (2003) note that attorney discretion to prosecute or defer a case is sometimes necessary in order to obtain justice. For instance, they describe the work of women's advocates in Duluth who are encouraging prosecutor discretion in cases where women, who are clearly not battering their partners, are charged with assault. Prosecutor discretion may also be appropriate in some cases where the female victim does not want to prosecute. Snider (1994) believes that ameliorative reforms within the CJS are more likely by emphasizing differentiation rather than universalism. This may be especially important in a country such as Canada where the people affected by mandatory intervention policies are so ethnically diverse. The best course of action in one case is not likely to be the same in another. Each woman's unique circumstances and perspectives should be incorporated into each decision that is made once a charge is laid. Policies that alienate some women are not good enough. Her perspective needs to be understood before decisions can be made (e.g., continuing with prosecution, allowing him to plead guilty to a lesser charge, putting him on probation, sentencing, etc.). This study provides a description of some of the perspectives that abused women have expressed and may be useful in advising other women who hold similar perspectives. A brief assessment of more specific implications for each perspective follows.

The 'Trust in the CJS' Perspective

The 'trust' perspective (factor one) was clearly more positive than other perspectives, and was dominated by a sense of trust in the system, including its policies and its people. Because of this trust, these women probably have the most potential to

feel empowered by using the CJS. What little has been written about empowerment through the use of the CJS tends to focus on gaining power by having powerful others (i.e., police, prosecutors, judges) on your side, and/or by being treated seriously by the CJS (Stark, 1993). In my own study, in which most women supported mandatory arrest and no-drop prosecution, participants rated being taken seriously by the police and Crown attorneys as the best outcome of these policies (Barata, 1999). The women who held the 'trust' perspective did perceive the CJS to be on their side and did believe that woman abuse was actually taken seriously by the CJS. It is possible that if anyone can feel empowered through the use of the CJS, it will be women who hold this perspective, but it seems unlikely that women with other perspectives could benefit in this manner. Women who are socially marginalized may be particularly unlikely to trust the CJS or feel empowered by it. The fact that the 'trust' perspective was held by a majority of White women may indicate that this perspective is less likely to be held by marginalized women. As McMahon and Pence (2003) have emphasized, middle-class White women do not face the same risks when they call the police. Women who lack legal and financial resources are more vulnerable to the intrusion of state agencies in their lives (McMahon & Pence, 2003).

The 'Disappointment in the CJS' Perspective

The combination of believing that the CJS can demonstrate the seriousness of abuse and at the same time, believing that the CJS does not treat abuse seriously, might represent a victim/activist perspective. This idea has been addressed in academic thinking about the problem, but had not yet been captured in the literature on victims' perspectives. This perspective identifies an important resource for abused woman, but

says the status quo is not good enough. A number of women from the Woman Abuse Accountability Committee held this perspective. This committee is made up of women who have experienced or are currently experiencing abuse, and their work helps keep the Woman Abuse Council of Toronto focused on issues that are important to victims.

The notion of victim as activist is not well understood. We usually think of activists as separate from victims or as survivors who become activists, but activists can and often do develop a passion for the work because of past or current abuse (Warrior, 1978). Activist victims have played an important role in grass-roots domestic abuse committees and shelter development (Mann, 2000). There is some evidence that some activist victims took part in this study. The women who held the 'disappointment' perspective were no more likely to be 'arriving at nonviolence and healing' (stage four) than other women, indicating that many of these women were still actively experiencing abuse. Of the five women who held this perspective and were part of the Woman Abuse Council, three were 'labeling the abuse and actively coping with escalation violence' (stage three) and two were 'arriving at nonviolence and healing' (stage four), indicating that there were at least three women who were both activists and currently experiencing abuse. These women may be particularly vocal and assertive when they engage the CJS. Their demands and non-victim-like attitude might alienate CJS personnel, but the effect can be also be positive. For instance, Reena ('safety, rehabilitation, and justice' perspective; factor five) was a victim advocate and a victim. She volunteered for at least two organizations that helped abused women while at the same time dealing with her own abuse. At one point she told the police officer who arrived at her house that she was a

member of the Woman Abuse Council and she wanted to know exactly when they did charge, and her impression was that “they seemed to back right up then.”

The ‘Victims Should Have Input Into the CJS and be Sure They Want to Use it’

Perspective

The ‘wants input’ perspective is new in that it emphasizes a lack of support for mandatory intervention policies. The literature to date on mandatory policies, which has been entirely quantitative, suggests widespread support for the policies and had not yet given voice to these women (Barata, 1999; Smith 2000, 2001). Of particular interest is that the women who held this perspective were not against using the CJS per se, as one might expect. Their dislike for these policies seemed instead to be combined with a desire for more personal choice and more individualized treatment. A similar desire for more personal choice was noted in studies that have examined the benefits of obtaining restraining orders (Fischer & Rose, 1995) and British interdicts (Lewis et al., 2000).

The women who held the ‘wants input’ perspective believed that women should engage the system only when they are ready to leave their partners, and emotional issues such as love and guilt affected their thinking about the CJS. The emotional turmoil that some women feel when they use the CJS has been well documented in past research (Bennett et al., 1999; Fischer et al., 1995; Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996). If forced to use the system before they were ready, the women who held this perspective would be likely to react quite negatively. This is unfortunate because their relatively positive evaluations of the CJS indicated that in the future they might be very receptive to CJS interventions. However, if they have a negative experience on one occasion their perspective of the CJS might change to one that is more negative and they may avoid the

system in the future. This information needs to be shared with CJS personnel and others who work with abused women. Women who do not want to use the CJS and want to stay with their partners may still be willing to use other services and we need to find ways of providing them the services they are willing to use. The CJS also needs to find ways of maintaining open communication with these women, so that if they change their minds the option of using the CJS is still there for them.

The fact that the women who held this perspective were all of colour is also important. Mandatory intervention policies may be perceived more negatively by women who are not White. This is an important consideration given that ethnic minority women have not been well represented in previous evaluations of these interventions. Although relatively few Black women participated in Smith's (2001) study, the author did a comparison by ethnicity. She found that Black women were much less likely than White women to support mandatory arrest and no-drop prosecution, and yet they were more likely to have wanted their partner arrested. This suggests, that like the women who held the 'wants input' perspective, they were not against CJS intervention per se, but wanted to maintain some control over the process. A recent study of African American women's views found that the majority (65%) favoured the prosecutor pressing charges against their partner (Weisz, 2002). Unfortunately, Weisz (2002) did not examine the participants' perspectives on whether or not the victim should be allowed to later drop the charges.

'The CJS Cannot Protect Women and Can Make Matters Worse' Perspective

The women who held the 'cannot protect' perspective emphasized the system's lack of ability to protect and its potential to harm. Women who hold this perspective are

not likely to come into contact with the CJS by choice. If they find themselves entwined in the system because of mandatory intervention policies, they may resist by complaining, trying to have the charges dropped, not showing up, lying in court, or otherwise sabotaging the prosecutor's case. This kind of behaviour would undoubtedly lead CJS personnel to have a negative impression and might lead them to react negatively towards these women thus reinforcing the woman's perception that the system is not there to help victims. Yet it seems very important that these women are not pushed away because they were also the most fearful and might be in the most danger. All of the women who held this perspective had experienced physical abuse and were currently in an abusive relationship.

Recent research suggests that women who refuse to testify (and the case would otherwise be dropped) may be the most likely to benefit from having their partners sentenced to probation. Ames and Dunham (2002) described probation as asymptotic justice for intimate partner violence. That is, probation might help achieve justice, but only eventually. They used case study examples to show how probation could reduce violence or at a later date result in significant punishment. For example, a man sentenced to probation for abuse may end up in jail in the future for violating a probation order. They found that probation was particularly effective for women who refused to testify or otherwise tried to compromise the prosecution's case. Ames and Dunham (2002) reported that less evidence is required for a sentence of probation and defendants are more likely to accept plea bargains. Probation is also more likely to result in continued prosecution, the defendant remains more accountable for his future actions, and if he

violates his probation (many actions besides recurrent abuse are violations) a more severe sentence is imminent.

'The CJS Should be Used for her Safety, for his Rehabilitation, and for Justice Despite its Problems' Perspective

The 'safety, rehabilitation, and justice' perspective (factor five) combined beliefs of safety, rehabilitation, and justice or punishment. Notions of the victim wanting rehabilitation and/or punishment have been peripheral in past research. This may be because rehabilitation implies a desire to maintain the relationship and punishment implies a desire for revenge, neither of which are acceptable options for a "good" victim. However, the emphasis in this perspective is that the CJS is able to reduce violence, which may be likely through both rehabilitation and punishment. Despite the theme of rehabilitation, this perspective did not focus on maintaining the relationship or on feelings of love and attachment. So it would be inaccurate to assume that a woman who wants her partner in treatment is committed to continuing the relationship.

This 'safety, justice, and rehabilitation' perspective may also be one of reflection. The women who held this perspective were more likely to be 'arriving at nonviolence and healing' (stage four), and thus could look back on the abuse with a little bit of distance. Some may have directly attributed the end of the abuse to the CJS, which may have influenced their belief that the CJS could help stop abuse. This was certainly the case for Reena. It seems somewhat promising that women who have moved past the abuse would be more likely to perceive the CJS as able to stop abuse. Their focus on punishment and rehabilitation may indicate that this was the process by which they believed the abuse could be stopped. However, these women's negative evaluation of the process of

prosecution was disconcerting although perhaps not surprising. When looking back on the whole experience it seems likely that prosecution would stand out as particularly difficult. Past research shows that women are often dissatisfied with court outcomes (Cretney & Davis, 1997; Landau, 1998; Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996) and that they rate more dissatisfaction with prosecutors and judges than with the police (Erez & Belknap, 1998; Fleury, 2000; London Family Court, 1991).

Conclusion

Continuing to view abused women who come into contact with the criminal justice system in a polarized fashion that labels them as either cooperative or non-cooperative is clearly inaccurate and is likely a harmful approach that further stigmatizes women and disconnects them from the CJS and the people in the system. The focus for many activists and researchers in the past 20 years has been on how to force the CJS to enforce justice and ensure that all cases of wife abuse are treated seriously. This has largely lead to the implementation of policies that aim to ensure a uniform response to wife abuse. It is likely that this was the more direct route to force the CJS to act and to begin to bring about systematic cultural change of a system that had for too long treated wife abuse as a personal problem that had nothing to do with fighting crime. However, a forceful criminal justice response does not necessarily have to be uniform and it certainly does not have to forget that each case brings a unique set of circumstances. The challenge for the future is to ascertain how to maintain a forceful criminal justice response, maintain a continuation of a culture of change and yet meet the individual needs of many different women. The perspectives of the women in the current study provide a number of suggestions. Certainly we can do better.

References

- Ames, L. J., & Dunham, K. T. (2002). Probation as a criminal justice response to intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women, 8*(1), 6-34.
- Anderson, L., & Gold, K. (1994). "I know what it means but it's not how I feel": The construction of survivor identity in feminist counseling practice. *Women and Therapy, 15*(2), 5-17.
- Apsler, R., Cummins, M. R., & Carl, S. (2003). Perceptions of the police by female victims of domestic partner violence. *Violence Against Women, 9*(11), 1318-1335.
- Atkins, S., & Hogett, B. (1984). *Women and the Law*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Backhouse, C. (1991). *Petticoats and prejudice: Women and law in nineteenth-century Canada*. Toronto, ON: Women's Press.
- Barata, P.C. (1999). *Battered Women's Evaluations of Two Criminal Justice Policies designed to Arrest and Prosecute more Batters*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Windsor, Ontario, Canada.
- Bennett, L., Goodman, L., & Dutton, M.A. (1999). Systemic obstacles to the criminal prosecution of a battering partner. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14*, 761-772.
- Berk, R.A. (1993). What the scientific evidence shows. On average, we can do no better than arrest. In R. J. Gelles & D. R. Loseke (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence*. (pp. 323-336). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Berk, R.A., Campbell, A., Klap, R., & Western, B. (1992). The deterrent effect of arrest in incidence of domestic violence: A Bayesian analysis of four field experiments. *American Sociological Review, 57*, 698-708.

- Bowker, L. (1993). A battered woman's problems are social, not psychological. In R. J. Gelles & D. L. Loseke (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence*. (pp. 154-165). Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications Inc.
- Braithwaite, J., & Daly, K. (1998). Masculinities, violence and communitarian control. In S. L. Miller (Ed.), *Crime control and women: Feminist implications of criminal justice policy*. (pp. 151-180). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Brown, S.R. (1980). *Political subjectivity applications of Q methodology in political science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Brown, S.R. (1993). A primer on Q methodology. *Operant Subjectivity*, 16, 91-138.
- Brown, S.R. (1996). Q methodology and qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 6(4), 561-567.
- Burris, C.A., & Jaffe, P. (1983). Wife abuse as a crime: The impact of police laying charges. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 25, 309-318.
- Busby, K. (1999). "Not a victim until a conviction is entered": Sexual violence prosecutions and legal "truth". E. Comack (Ed.), Locating the Law: race/class/gender connections (pp. 260-288). Halifax, N.S.: Fernwood Publishing.
- Buzawa, E.S., Austin, T.L., & Buzawa, C.G. (1995). Responding to crimes of violence against women: Gender differences versus organizational imperatives. *Crime and Delinquency*, 41, 443-466.
- Buzawa, E.S., & Buzawa, C.G. (1993). The impact of arrest on domestic violence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 36, 558-574.
- Buzawa, E.S., & Buzawa, C.G. (1996). *Domestic Violence: The Criminal justice*

Response 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks, California : Sage Publications .

- Byrne, C., Kilpatrick, Dean G., Howley, S.S., & Beatty, D. (1999). Female victims of partner versus nonpartner violence: Experiences with the criminal justice system. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26, 275-293.
- Campbell, J., Rose, L., Kub, J., & Nedd, D. (1998). Voices of strength and resistance: A contextual and longitudinal analysis of women's responses to battering. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 13(6), 743-762.
- Campbell, J.C., Miller, P., Cardwell, M.M., & Belknap, R.A. (1994). Relationship status of battered women over time. *Journal of family violence*, 9(2), 99-111.
- Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. (2000). Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Cannings, D.M. (1984). Myths and stereotypes: Obstacles to effective police intervention in domestic disputes involving a battered woman. *The Police Journal*, 57, 43-56.
- Chunn, D.E. (1999). Feminism, law, and "the family": Assessing the reform legacy. In E. Comack (Ed.), *Locating the Law: race/class/gender connections*. (pp. 236-259). Halifax, N.S.: Fernwood Publishing.
- Coulter, M.L., & Chez, R.A. (1997). Domestic violence victims support mandatory reporting: For others. *Journal of Family Violence*, 12, 349-356.
- Cretney, A., & Davis, G. (1997). Prosecuting domestic assault: Victims failing courts or courts failing victims? *The Howard Journal*, 36(2), 146-157.
- Dasgupta, S. D. (2002). A framework for understanding women's use of nonlethal violence in intimate heterosexual relationships. *Violence Against Women*, 8(11), 1364-1389.

- Davis, R.C., & Smith, B. (1995). Domestic violence reforms: Empty promises or fulfilled expectations? *Crime and Delinquency*, 41, 541-552.
- Dawson, B.T. (1994). *Relating to law: A chronology of women and law in Canada*. (second ed.). North York, ON: Captus Press.
- Dienemann, J., Campbell, J., Landenburger, K., & Curry, M. A. (2002). The domestic violence survivor assessment: a tool for counseling women in intimate partner violence relationships. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 46, 221-228.
- Dobash, R.E., & Dobash, R.P. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against patriarchy*. New York: The free press.
- Dobash, R.E., & Dobash, R.P. (1992). *Women, violence, and social change*. London: Routledge.
- Dutton, M. A. (1992-1993). Understanding women's responses to domestic violence: A redefinition of battered woman syndrome. *Hofstra Law Review*, 21, 1191-1242.
- Edwards, S.S.M. (1989). *Policing 'domestic' violence. Women, the law and the state*. London: Sage.
- Ellis, R. (1980). The legal wrongs of battered women . In Z. Bankowski & G. Mungham (Eds.), *Essay in Law and Society*. (pp. 143-156). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Erez, E., & Belknap, J. (1998). In their own words: Battered women's assessment of the criminal processing system's responses. *Violence and Victims*, 13, 251-268.
- Erez, E., & King, T.A. (2000). Patriarchal terrorism or common couple violence: Attorneys' views of prosecuting and defending woman battering. *International Review of Victimology*, 7, 207-226.

- Faubert, J., & Hinch, R. (1996). The dialectics of mandatory arrest policies . In T. O'Reilly-Fleming (Ed.), *Post-critical criminology*. (pp. 230-251). Scarborough, On: Prentice Hall Canada Inc.
- Ferraro, K. J. (1998). Policing woman Battering. K. Day, & L. Maher (Eds.), *Criminology at the crossroads: Feminist readings in crime and justice* (pp. 209-224). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ferraro, K.J., & Johnson, J.M. (1983). How women experience battering: The process of victimization. *Social Problems*, 30(3), 325-339.
- Fischer, K., & Rose, M. (1995). When "enough is enough": Battered women's decision making around court orders of protection. *Crime and Delinquency*, 41(4), 414-429.
- Fleury, R.E. (2000). *Survivors' satisfaction with the criminal legal system response to intimate partner violence*. Michigan State University.
- Ford, D.A., & Regoli, M.J. (1993). The criminal prosecution of wife assaulters: Process, problems, and effects. In N. Z. Hilton (Ed.), *Legal responses to wife assault*. (pp. 127-164). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ford, D.A. (1991). Prosecution as a victim power resource: A note on empowering women in violent conjugal relationships. *Law and Society Review*, 25, 313-334.
- Frasier, P. Y., Slatt, L., Kowlowitz, V., & Glowa, P. T. (2001). Using the stages of change model to counsel victims of intimate partner violence. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 43, 211-217.
- Frisch, L.A. (1992). Research that succeeds, policies that fail. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 83, 209-216.

- Garner, J., Gagan, F., & Maxwell, C. (1995). Published findings from the spouse assault replication program: A critical review. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 11*, 3-28.
- Gelles, J. (1993). Constraints against family violence. *American Behavioral Scientist, 36*, 575-586.
- Gelles, R.J. (1993). Through a sociological lens Social structure and family violence. In R. J. Gelles & D. R. Loseke (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence*. (pp. 31-46). Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.
- Gielen, A.C., O'Campo, P.J., Campbell, J.C., Schollenberger, J., Woods, A.B., Jones, A.S., Dienemann, J.A., Kub, J., & Wynne, C. (2000). Women's opinions about domestic violence screening and mandatory reporting. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine, 19*, 279-285.
- Gondolf, E.W. (1998). The victims of court-ordered batterers: Their victimization, helpseeking, and perceptions. *Violence Against Women, 4*(6), 659-676.
- Gondolf, E. W., & Fisher, E. R. (1988). *Battered women as survivors: An alternative to treating learned helplessness*. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.
- Hart, B. (1993). Battered women and the criminal justice system. *American Behavioral Scientist, 36*(5), 624-638.
- Hartman, J. L., & Belknap, J. (2003). Beyond the gatekeepers: Court professionals' self-reported attitudes about and experiences with misdemeanor domestic violence cases. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 30*(3), 349-373.
- Hemmons, J.D. (1981). The need for domestic violence laws with adequate legal and social support servies. *Journal of divorce, 4*, 49-61.

- Hirschel, D., & Buzawa, E. (2002). Understanding the context of dual arrest with directions for future research. *Violence Against Women, 8*(12), 1449-1473.
- Horton, A.L., Simonidis, K.M., & Simonidis, L.L. (1987). Legal remedies for spousal abuse: Victim characteristics, expectations, and satisfaction. *Journal of Family Violence, 2*, 265-279.
- Hoyle, C., & Sanders, A. (2000). Police response to domestic violence: From victim choice to victim empowerment? *British Journal of Criminology, 40*, 14-36.
- Hutchison, I.W., & Hirschel, J.D. (1998). Abused women: Help-seeking strategies and police utilization. *Violence Against Women, 4*, 436-456.
- Jaffe, P., & Burris, C.A., (1981). *The response of the criminal justice system to wife abuse*. Research Contact No. 79-445, Solicitor General of Canada, Ottawa.
- Jaffe, P., Wolfe, D.A., Telford, A., & Austin, G. (1986). The impact of police charges in incidents of wife abuse. *Journal of Family Violence, 1*, 37-49.
- Johnson, M. P. (1995). Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: Two forms of violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57*, 283-294.
- Johnson, M. P., & Ferraro, K. J. (2000). Research on domestic violence in the 1990's: Making distinctions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62*(4), 948-963.
- Johnson, H., & Sacco, V. F. (1995). Researching violence against women : Statistics Canada's national survey. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 37*(3), 281-304.
- Kelly, L. (1988). *Surviving sexual violence*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kelly, L., Burton, S., & Regan, L. (1996). Beyond victim or survivor: sexual

violence, identity and feminist theory and practice. L. Adkins, & V. Merchant (Eds.), *Sexualizing the social: Power and the organization of sexuality*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Kirkwood, C. (1993). *Leaving abusive partners: From the scars of survival to the wisdom for change*. London: Sage Publications.

Kitzinger, C. (1987). *The social construction of lesbianism*. London: Sage Publications.

Koss, M.P. (2000). Blame, shame, and community: Justice responses to violence against women. *American Psychologist*, 55, 1332-1343.

Lakeman, L. (2000). Why "Law and order" cannot end violence against women; and why the development of women's (social, economic and political and civil) rights might. *Canadian woman studies*, 20, 24-33.

Landau, T. (1998, March). *Synthesis of department of justice Canada research findings on assault*. Retrieved November, 2001 from <http://canada.justice.gc.ca/en/ps/rs/rep/wd98-5a-e.pdf>

Landau, T.C. (2000). Women's experiences with mandatory charging for wife assault in Ontario Canada: A case against the prosecution. *International Review of Victimology*, 7, 141-157.

Landenburger, K. (1989). A process of entrapment in and recovery from an abusive relationship. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 10, 209-227.

Lempert, L.B. (1995). The line in the sand: Definitional dialogues in abusive relationships. *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, 18, 171-195.

Lempert, L.B. (1996). Women's strategies for survival: Developing agency in

- abusive relationships. *Journal of Family violence*, 11(3), 269-289.
- Lerman, L.G. (1981). Criminal prosecution of wife beaters. *Response to Violence in the Family*, 4, 1-8.
- Lewis, R., Dobash, R.P., Dobash, R.E., & Cavanagh, K. (2000). Protection, prevention, rehabilitation or justice? Women's use of the law to challenge domestic violence. *International Review of Victimology*, 7, 179-205h.
- London Family Court Clinic Inc. (1991). *Wife assault as a crime: the perspectives of victims and police officers on a charging policy in London, Ontario from 1980-1990*. (Department of Justice Canada, Research and Statistics Division Rep. No. WD 1991-13a). Retrieved November, 2001 from <http://canada.justice.gc.ca/en/ps/rs/rep/wd91-13a-e.pdf>
- Loseke, D. R., & Cahill, S. E. (1984). The social construction of deviance: Experts on battered women. *Social Problems*, 31(3), 296-310.
- MacKinnon, C.A. (1983). Feminism, Marxism, Method, and the State: Toward Feminist Jurisprudence. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 8, 635-658.
- Malecha, A.T., Lemmey, D., McFarlae, J., Willson, P., Fredland, N., Gist, J., & Schultz, P. (2000). Mandatory reporting of intimate partner violence: Safety or retaliatory abuse for women. *Journal of Women's Health and Gender-Based Medicine*, 9, 75-78.
- Mann, R. M. (2000). *Who owns domestic abuse? The local politics of a social problem*. Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press.
- Marshall, S. (1997). Feminists and the state: A theoretical exploration. In C. R. Daniels (Ed.), *Feminists negotiate the state: The politics of domestic violence*.

(pp. 95-107). Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, Inc.

- McCann, K. (1985). Battered women and the law: the limits of the legislation. In J. Brophy & C. Smart (Eds.), *Women in law: Explorations in law family and sexuality*. (pp. 71-96). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- McKeown, B., & Thomas, D. (1988). *Q Methodology* (Quantitative applications in the social sciences No. 07-066). Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.
- McLeod, M. (1983). Victim noncooperation in the prosecution of domestic assault. *Criminology*, 21, 395-416.
- McMahon, M., & Pence, E. (2003). Making social change Reflections on individual and institutional advocacy with women arrested for domestic violence. *Violence Against Women*, 9(1), 47-74.
- Merritt-Gray, M., & Wuest, J. (1995). Counteracting abuse and breaking free: The process of leaving revealed through women's voices. *Health Care for Women International*, 16, 399-412.
- Miller, J. (2003). An arresting experiment: Domestic violence victim experiences and perceptions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18(7), 695-716.
- Mills, T. (1985). The assault on the self: Stages in coping with battering husbands. *Qualitative Sociology*, 8(2), 103-123.
- Oppenlander, N. (1982). Coping or copping out. Police service delivery in domestic disputes. *Criminology*, 20, 449-465.
- Osthoff, S. (2002). But, Gertrude, I beg to differ, a hit is not a hit is not a hit. *Violence Against Women*, 12(8), 1521-1544.
- Pagelow, M.D. (1992). Adult victims of domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal*

Violence, 7, 87-120.

Pate, A.M., & Hamilton, E.E. (1992). Formal and informal deterrents to domestic violence: The Dade county spouse assault experiment. *American Sociological Review*, 57, 691-697.

Peled, E., Eisikovits, Z., Enosh, G., & Winstok, Z. (2000). Choice and empowerment for battered women who stay: Toward a constructivist model. *Social Work Journal of the National Association of Social Workers*, 45(1), 9-25.

Pence, E. L. (1999). Some thoughts on philosophy. E. L. Pence, & M. F. Shepard (Eds.), *Coordinating community responses to domestic violence: Lessons from Duluth and beyond*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Platiel, R. (1984, March 20). Jailed one week for not testifying, woman recalled. *The Globe and Mail*.

Prochaska, J. O., & Di Clemente, C. C. (1982). Transtheoretical therapy: Toward a more integrative model of change. *Psychotherapy Theory Research and Practice*, 19(3), 276-288.

Rogers, R.S. (1995). Q methodology. In J. A. Smith, R. Harre, & L. V. Langenhove (Eds.), *Rethinking methods in psychology*. London: Sage Publications.

Sanders, A. (1988). Personal violence and public order: The prosecution of 'domestic' violence in England and Wales. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 16, 359-382.

Saunders, D.G. (1995). The tendency to arrest victims of domestic violence. A preliminary analysis of officer characteristics. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 10, 147-158.

- Schmidt, J.D., & Sherman, L.W. (1993). Does arrest deter domestic violence? *American Behavioral Scientist*, 36, 601-609.
- Schmolck, P. (2000). *PQMethod Manual*. Retrieved May 9, 2002, from <http://www.rz.unibw-muenchen.de/~p41bsmk/qmethod/pqmanual.htm>
- Schuller, R., & Rzepa, S. (2002). The scientific status of research on domestic violence against women. D. L. Faigman, D. H. Kaye, M. J. Saks, & J. Sanders (Eds.), *Modern scientific evidence The law and science of expert testimony* (pp. 37-72). St. Paul., Minn.: West Publishing Co.
- Seligman, M.E.P. (1975). *Helplessness: On depression, development, and death*. San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman.
- Shaw, I. (1984). Consumer evaluations of the personal social services. *British Journal of Social Work*, 14, 277-284.
- Sherman, L.W. (1992). *Policing domestic violence: Experiments and dilemmas*. New York: The Free Press.
- Sherman, L.W., Smith, D.A., Schmidt, J.D., & Rogan, D.P. (1992). Crime, punishment, and stake in conformity: Legal and informal control of domestic violence. *American Sociological Review*, 57, 680-690.
- Sherman, L.W., & Berk, R.A. (1984). The specific deterrent effects of arrest for domestic assault. *American Sociological Review*, 49, 261-272.
- Sleutel, M.R. (1998). Women's experiences of abuse: A review of qualitative research. *Issues in mental health nursing*, 19, 525-539.
- Smart, C. (1977). *Women, Crime, and Criminology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- Smart, C. (1989). *Feminism and the power of law*. London: Routledge .
- Smart, C., & Brophy, J. (1985). Locating law: a discussion of the place of law in feminist politics . In J. Brophy & C. Smart (Eds.), *Women in law: Explorations in law, family, and sexuality*. (pp. 1-20). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Smith, A. (2000). It's my decision, isn't it? A research note on battered women's perceptions of mandatory intervention laws. *Violence against women*, 6, 1384-1402.
- Smith, A. (2001). Domestic violence laws: The voices of battered women. *Violence and Victims*, 16 , 91-111.
- Snider, L. (1994). Feminism, punishment, and the potential of empowerment. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, 9, 75-104.
- Sparks, A. (1997). Feminists negotiate the executive branch: The policing of male violence. In C. R. Daniels (Ed.), *Feminists negotiate the state: The politics of domestic violence*. (pp. 36-52). Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, Inc.
- Spry, T. (1995). In the absence of word and body: hegemonic implications of "victim" and "survivor" in women's narratives of sexual violence. *Women and Language*, 18(2), 27-32.
- Stark, E. (1993). Mandatory arrest of batterers. A reply to its critics. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 36, 587-600.
- Stephens, B.J., & Sinden, P.G. (2000). Victims' voices: Domestic assault victims' perceptions of police demeanor. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 15, 534-547.
- Stephenson, W. (1935). Technique of factor analysis. *Nature*, 136(August 24), 297.

- Stephenson, W. (1953). *The study of behavior: Q-technique and its methodology*. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
- Straus, M.A., & Gelles, R.J. (1986). Societal change and change in family violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 465-479.
- Tim Roberts Focus Consultants. (1996). *Spousal assault and mandatory charging in the Yukon: Experiences, perspectives and alternatives* (Department of Justice Canada, Research and Statistics Division Rep. No. WD 1996-3e). Retrieved November, 2001 from <http://www.canada.justice.gc.ca/en/ps/rs/rep/wd96-3a-e.html>
- Walker, L.E. (1979). *The battered woman*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Walker, L.E. (1984). *The battered woman syndrome*. New York: Springer publishing company.
- Walker, L.E.A. (2000). *The battered woman syndrome 2nd edition*. (2 ed.). New York: Springer Publishing Company, Inc.
- Warrior, B. (1978). *Working on wife abuse*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Wasoff, F. (1982). Legal protection from wife beating: The processing of domestic assaults by Scottish prosecutors and criminal courts. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 10, 187-204.
- Weisz, A. N. (2002). Prosecution of batterers: Views of African American battered women. *Violence and Victims*, 17(1), 19-34.
- Wiist, W.H., & McFarlane, J. (1998). Utilization of police by abused pregnant Hispanic women. *Violence Against Women*, 4, 677-693.
- Williams, J. (2000). *Factors related to women's stages of terminating violent intimate*

relationships. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Indiana.

Wolf, M.E., Holt, V.L., Kernie, M.A., & Rivara, F.P. (2000). Who gets protection orders for intimate partner violence? *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 19*, 286-291.

Women abuse council of Toronto. (2001). *Women's court watch project III: Report on first year data collection old city hall court (2000-2001)*. Toronto, On: Women abuse council of Toronto.

Wuest, J., & Merritt-Gray, M. (1999). Not going back: Sustaining the separation in the process of leaving abusive relationships. *Violence Against Women, 5*(2), 110-133.

Wuest, J., & Merritt-Gray, M. (2001). Beyond survival: Reclaiming self after leaving an abusive male partner. *Canadian Journal of Nursing Research, 32*(4), 79-94.

Yllo, K.A. (1993). Through a feminist lens gender, power, and violence. In R. J. Gelles & D. R. Loseke (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence*. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications .

Zorza, J. (1992). The criminal law of misdemeanor domestic violence, 1970-1990. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 83*, 46-72.

Appendix A: Concourse

Level a ⁷ : Police	
Positive Perspectives	Negative Perspectives
(1) The police are very helpful to victims of domestic violence when they are called to a domestic dispute. (Lewis, Dobash, Dobash, & Cavanagh, 2000) (Quant.) ⁸	(9) The police act bored (Fleury, 2000) (Quant.) or “act as if nothing [important has] happened” ⁹ when dealing with cases of wife abuse. (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)
(2) I am very satisfied with the way the police respond to domestic violence. (Fleury, 2000) (Quant.)(Jaffe, Wolfe, Teleford, & Austin, 1986) (Quant.)	(10) When attending a domestic dispute, police officers “act like it [is] just a domestic, no big deal, just part of life.” (Stephens & Sinden, 2000) (Qual.)
(3) Police officers empathize with the victim in domestic disputes. (Stephens & Sinden, 2000) (Qual.)	(11) The police “act as if it’s [the victim’s] fault” when they attend domestic disputes. (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)
(4) Police officers “listen to [victims] and are sympathetic. [They can make the victim] feel good about [herself]” (Stephens & Sinden, 2000) (Qual.)	(12) Police officers are not likely to believe the victim when they arrive at a domestic dispute. (Stephens & Sinden, 2000) (Qual.)
(5) Police officers “encourage [victims] to think about [their] options such as arrest and an order of prosecution. (Stephens & Sinden, 2000) (Qual.)	(13) Police officers are “cold” and “just [don’t] care [about victims of domestic violence]. (Stephens & Sinden, 2000) (Qual.) (Byrne, Kilpatrick, Howley, & Beatty, 1999) (Quant.)
(6) Domestic violence officers, who are specifically trained to deal with domestic disputes, provide the support the victim needs to stay involved with the criminal justice system. (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000) (Qual.)	(14) Police officers act “cocky, really kind of macho” and make the victim feel like she wouldn’t “dare say anything else.” (Stephens & Sinden, 2000) (Qual.)
(7) The police are very effective in helping to reduce the violence. (Wiist & McFarlane, 1998) (Quant.)	(15) Police officers are all the same when it comes to domestic violence. They stick together in a “brotherhood” that protects the batterer. (Stephens & Sinden, 2000) (Qual.)
(8) Police provide short-term protection from the immediate threat of violence. (Lewis et al., 2000) (Qual.)	(16) “The police are chauvinist. They aren’t fair to women still.” (Stephens & Sinden, 2000) (Qual.)
	(17) “If [the police] don’t see blood, they don’t believe [the victim]. (Barata, 1999)

⁷ Each level represents an area of discourse identified by the balanced block design (see table 2).

⁸ The item in brackets after each reference refers to the way the information obtained from that reference was collected (i.e., quantitative data, qualitative data, open-ended data).

⁹ Direct quotes indicate that the language comes directly from a survivor of domestic violence.

	(Open-ended)
	(18) Police officers should be more understanding in cases of domestic violence. (London Family Court Clinic Inc., 1991) (Quant.)
	(19) The police should provide victims with more information about the court process and about victim services when they attend a domestic dispute. (London Family Court Clinic Inc., 1991) (Quant.)
	(20) Police officers do not make enough of an effort to gather all the necessary evidence in domestic violence cases. (Byrne et al., 1999) (Quant.)

Level b: Arrest and Mandatory Arrest	
Positive Perspectives	Negative Perspectives
(1) I support mandatory arrest where police officers that are called to a domestic dispute are required by law to arrest the batterer if there is reason to believe that an offense has occurred regardless of whether or not the victim wants him arrested. (Smith, 2000) (Quant.)	(19) Arrest “would make the abuser more angry” and he “would take his anger out on [the victim].” (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)
(2) Arrest “scares [the batterer] to stop the violence.” (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	(20) Arrest would “make the man more angry causing him to become more abusive and she would be even more afraid.” (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)
(3) “If [the batterer is arrested], it may be a deterrent just knowing he’s going to be arrested every time.” (Barata, 1999) (Open ended)	(21) I would “feel guilty for having [my partner] arrested, especially if children were present.” (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)
(4) I would benefit from mandatory arrest where police officers that are called to a domestic dispute are required by law to arrest the batterer if there is reason to believe that an offense has occurred regardless of whether or not the victim wants him arrested. (Smith, 2000) (Quant.)	(22) If my partner were arrested, I would “fear what others would think of [me] because [I] called the police.” (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)
(5) Arrest “helps stop the immediate situation” and “the woman is safe for the time being.” (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	(23) There is no point in arresting batterers because they are just released again with a slap on the wrist. (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)
(6) Arrest of the batterer “provides safety for the victim” (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	(24) Mandatory arrest can “make the situation worse” because the victim herself might be arrested if she defended herself by

	hitting the batterer. (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)
(7) "If [arrest] happens repeatedly, it may be a deterrent just knowing he's going to be arrested every time." (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	(25) I don't want to involve the police. "I want peace in my life. I just want to get away." (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)
(8) Arrest "gives [the victim] time to make other temporary living arrangements. (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	(26) The police should calm the batterer down or warn him, but not arrest him. (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000) (Qual.)
(9) Arrest "helps stop the immediate situation" and "the woman is safe for the time being." (Barata, 1999) (Open ended)	(27) The police should provide advice and get the batterer some help, but not arrest him. (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000) (Qual.)
(10) Arresting the batterer is important because it provides a temporary respite for the victim that she can use to plan for her future. (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000) (Qual.) (Lewis et al., 2000) (Qual.)	(28) Calling the police doesn't increase or decrease violence. The batterer will continue to be violent whether the victim calls the police or not. (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000) (Qual.)
(11) "Abuse is a crime the same as a B&E so they should automatically be arrested." (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	
(12) "Arrest gives a direct message to the offender that abuse and violence will not be tolerated." (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	
(13) Arrest "provides an incidence report, thus precipitating possible action or enforcement in the future." In other words, it "starts a paper trail." (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	
(14) Mandatory arrest "makes it easier for a woman who might be afraid to state any abuse." (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	
(15) Mandatory arrest is "beneficial because the batterer would know that it wasn't [the victim's] fault that he was arrested." (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	
(16) Mandatory arrest is "beneficial because if [the victim] is too afraid to press charges it would be done for [her]." (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	
(17) Mandatory arrest is beneficial because the victim cannot stop the police from arresting her partner. (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	
(18) The batterer should be arrested as payback for what he has done to his partner. (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000) (Qual.)	

Level c: Attorneys	
Positive Perspectives	Negative Perspectives
(1) Crown/prosecuting attorneys listen to victims of domestic violence and believe what they have to say. (Fleury, 2000) (Quant.)	(6) The Crown/prosecuting attorney often reduces charges against batterers to the point where they do not reflect the seriousness of the assault. (Cretney & Davis, 1997) (Quant.) (Byrne et al., 1999) Quant.)
(2) Crown/prosecuting attorneys are supportive of victims of domestic violence. (Erez & Belknap, 1998)(Open-ended) (London Family Court Clinic Inc., 1991) (Quant.) (Fleury, 2000) (Quant.)	(7) Crown/prosecuting attorneys are too busy to do a good job with domestic violence cases. They just go from one case to the next without seeming to care about any of the cases. They often don't even look at the case materials until the court date. (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)
(3) I am very satisfied with the way the Crown/prosecuting attorneys handle cases of domestic violence. (Fleury, 2000) (Quant.) (London Family Court Clinic Inc., 1991) (Quant.)	(8) Crown/prosecuting attorneys are very mean to women who want to drop charges against their partners. It can make the victim feel revictimized. (Landau, 2000) (Open-ended)
(4) Crown/prosecuting attorneys can encourage the victims to stay involved with the case by, for example, telling her they can "get him, with her help" (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)	(9) Crown/prosecuting attorneys don't really take the victim's opinion into consideration when they make decisions about the case. (Byrne et al., 1999) (Quant.)
(5) Crown/prosecuting attorneys "take statements in a careful and accurate manner making sure not to exclude anything." (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)	

Level d: Prosecution and Mandatory Prosecution	
Positive Perspectives	Negative Perspectives
(1) [The victim] dropping charges will not improve the situation; it will just enable it to continue." (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)	(15) [Dropping charges is the victim's] choice –why should [she] get arrested for not showing up or dropping charges." (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)
(2) Proceeding with prosecution "stops the abuser from getting away with the abuse." (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	(16) If I couldn't get the charges against my partner dropped, I would lie in court so that he would not be found guilty. (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)
(3) "One advantage [of a no-drop prosecution policy] would be that it would teach the violent [partner] that you can't hit your [partner] and get away with it."	(17) If a woman is forced to testify against her partner when she doesn't want to she has no choice but to lie in court. (Landau, 1998) (Open-ended)

(Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	
(4) If the batterer is prosecuted, it would “feel [like] someone is on [the victim’s] side and like [the violence] would be taken seriously.” (Barata, 1999)(Open-ended)	(18) If my partner was charged for assault, “he could kill me before court if I [didn’t] get the charges dropped.” (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)
(5) A no-drop policy is “an advantage because at first you could be upset at your partner and then you may [tell yourself] to just drop the charges because your getting along, but this way you couldn’t [drop the charges].” (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	(19) A no-drop policy “would [make me] feel I have no power.” (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)
(6) “The woman after being abused is not capable of making a decision of whether or not he should be arrested or charged, [so the criminal justice system needs to decide to arrest and charge him].” (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	(20) I wouldn’t support a no-drop policy because “I like to feel like I have control over what is happening. I don’t like others deciding what to do for me.” (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)
(7) “I want to be safe and the only way is to keep the charges on him and keep him in jail.” (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	(21) Mandatory charging “removes the flexibility to look at the context. The woman has no say in why she called [the police] and what she wants done. It increases feelings of powerlessness.” (Landau, 2000) (Open-ended)
(8) “I’m not sure I would lay charges ... but charges need to be laid. Let him face it. He deserves to be charged even if I’m afraid to.” (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	(22) I want him arrested “to show him that he can’t treat me like this. However, I don’t really want to get him in trouble, [and I don’t want things] to go to far. [I don’t want him prosecuted].” (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000) (Qual.)
(9) Strong prosecution policies “give [the victim] support because the courts would be on [her] side.” (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	(23) Fear of violent retaliation is the main reason that I wouldn’t support prosecution by recanting or refusing to show up for court. (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000) (Qual.)
(10) “Its about fear. I would feel more control knowing once [the charges] are laid, that’s it. I can’t take it back.” (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	(24) If you don’t “want to end the relationship, I [see] no point in prosecuting [the batterer]. (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000) (Qual.)
(11) I support no-drop prosecution where neither the victim nor the Crown/prosecuting attorney can drop the charge once its been laid against their batterer. (Smith, 2000) (Quant.)	
(12) I would benefit from no-drop prosecution where neither the victim nor the Crown/prosecuting attorney can drop the charge once its been laid against their	

batterer. (Smith, 2000) (Quant.)	
(13) “[Abused] women aren’t in the right state of mind to make [the decision to charge their partner]. They have other things on their mind. The law [should do] the thinking for you. (Landau, 2000) (Open-ended)	
(14) “He’ll be charged and he’ll learn not to do it again.” (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	

Level e: Judges/Courtroom experiences/Verdict	
Positive Perspectives	Negative Perspectives
(1) I hope that most batterers are sentenced to receive treatment to help them control their violence. (Cretney & Davis, 1997) (Quant.)	(8) Even when a batterer is convicted, the sentence does not reflect the seriousness of the assault. (Cretney & Davis, 1997) (Quant.) (Byrne et al., 1999)(Quant.)
(2) Most batterers are sentenced to substantial jail time when they are convicted of assaulting their partners. (Cretney & Davis, 1997) (Quant.)	(9) “[Victims of domestic violence] might as well not go to court really. I don’t think there’s any value in that.” (Cretney & Davis, 1997) (Quant.)
(3) I am very satisfied with the court process in cases of domestic violence. (Fleury, 2000) (Quant.)	(10) Victims of domestic violence are portrayed badly in court as jealous, vengeful, unreliable, violent, alcoholic, crazy or worse. (Cretney & Davis, 1997) (Quant.)
(4) I am very satisfied with the outcome of domestic violence court cases. (Fleury, 2000) (Quant.)	(11) The courtroom is not the place to address domestic violence problems. (Cretney & Davis, 1997) (Quant.)
(5) I am very satisfied with the way the judges respond to domestic violence cases. (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Quant.)	(12) “If he get a fine, he will just see it as a joke unless jail time was involved.” (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)
(6) [Victims of domestic violence] should be required to testify “because I think the abuser should have to sit there and hear what [she] has to say.” (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)	(13) [Victims of domestic violence] should not be required to testify “because [they] have been through enough.”(Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)
(7) [Victims of domestic violence] should be required to testify “because no one will know unless [she] tells[s] what happened.” (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)	(14) [Victims of domestic violence] should not be required to testify because there is “too much turmoil and pain of having to face the abuser” in court. (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)
	(15) “My partner would come after me if I put him in jail. I’d be scared to find out what he would do once he was free.”

	(Barata, 1999)(Open-ended)
	(16) I'm "not sure how going to court would help me –what I really want is him out of my life." (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000) (Qual.)
	(17) Testifying against the batterer in court is one of the most frightening things a victim could be asked to do. (Bennett, Goodman, & Dutton, 1999)(Qual.)
	(18) Going to court is a "pure and utter waste of time. [The abuser forces you to go by not pleading guilty]. And the judge just goes, 'you're a bad boy, here's a fine.'" (Bennett et al., 1999) (Qual.)

Level f: Why use the Criminal Justice System	
Positive Perspectives (why use)	Negative Perspectives (why don't use)
(1) I would prosecute my partner because of "the fear of him continuing to try and hurt me and [because of] his threats to kill me." (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)	(19) I would not prosecute my partner because "it's scary and it takes a lot of guts to come forward about domestic violence. You've already been threatened, beaten and traumatized by the abuser, after you come forward, you fear for your life!" (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)
(2) I would prosecute my partner "because I would rather be dead than live [with abuse] any longer. (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)	(20) I would drop charges if my partner gave me what I wanted (e.g. a divorce, custody of the children, got counseling, left me alone, stop harassing me, stopped abusing me etc.) (Ford, 1991) (Qual.)
(3) I would prosecute my partner for the sake of my children. (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)	(21) I wouldn't want to prosecute because I wouldn't want more hassles in my life. (Ford, 1991) (Qual.)
(4) "I don't want my children to grow up thinking you [can] hit a woman. [I would take my partner] to court so [the children would] know it is wrong [to abuse your partner]." (Lewis et al., 2000) (Qual.)	(22) I wouldn't want to prosecute because I wouldn't want my partner to go to jail. (Ford, 1991) (Qual.)
(5) I would prosecute my partner because you get to a point where you say "enough is enough" and you know you just can't take the abuse any longer. (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)	(23) I wouldn't want to prosecute because I wouldn't want my partner to loose his job. (Ford, 1991)(Qual.)
(6) I would put my partner "in jail to straighten him out." (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)	(24) I wouldn't want to see my partner go to jail because I feel sorry for him. I want him to get the help he needs. (Lewis et al., 2000) (Qual.)

<p>(7) I would prosecute my partner to get him to do what I want (e.g. give me a divorce, give me custody of the children, get counseling, leave me alone, stop harassing me, stopped abusing me etc.). (Ford, 1991) (Qual.)</p>	<p>(25) Continuing with prosecution means there is “no chance of ever finding peace between [yourself] and your partner.” (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)</p>
<p>(8) I would have my partner “charged so he’d realize that he couldn’t get away with it.” (Lewis et al., 2000) (Qual.)</p>	<p>(26) I would feel guilty if my partner was prosecuted for abusing me. (Lewis et al., 2000) (Qual.) (Bennett et al., 1999) (Qual.)</p>
<p>(9) “I would like to [go to court] to give my point of view and let people know what he’s done.” (Lewis et al., 2000) (Qual.)</p>	<p>(27) “I [would have] a hard time even calling the police on [my partner] because I [am] so emotionally attached.”(Fischer & Rose, 1995) (Qual.)</p>
<p>(10) By using the criminal justice system “I want [my partner] to find out that it’s not just me. Society takes [abuse] seriously. And you don’t have to put up with it. (Fischer & Rose, 1995) (Qual.)</p>	<p>(28) Involving the criminal justice system “is not worth it because he’d kill me if I got him into trouble” (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000) (Qual.)</p>
<p>(11) “I knew that in order to keep my own sanity and feel better and feel safe, that I needed to do something legally. ...At least if it didn’t stop ... there would be enough people around me that if something seriously, seriously happened to me because of him, that he was not going to get away with anything.” (Fischer & Rose, 1995) (Qual.)</p>	<p>(29) The time period between the batterer’s arrest and the resolution of the case is extremely frightening for victims because they are “worried about what [the batterer will] do.” Using the criminal justice system does not make the victim feel protected, in fact it can make her feel like she is more likely to get hurt. (Bennett et al., 1999) (Qual.) (Fischer & Rose, 1995) (Qual.)</p>
<p>(12) I got the criminal justice system involved to “show him just how serious I was about this: I’m not all talk and no show.” (Fischer & Rose, 1995) (Qual.)</p>	<p>(30) “Locking [a batterer] up is not a solution to the problem. [What] he needs is help.” (Bennett et al., 1999) (Qual.)</p>
<p>(13) Most victims of domestic violence will use the criminal justice system when the physical abuse becomes unbearable. (Wiist & McFarlane, 1998) (Quant.)</p>	<p>(31) The criminal justice system is racist, and particularly unfair to Black and Aboriginal men. (Bennett et al., 1999) (Qual.) (Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996) (Quant.)</p>
<p>(14) Victims of domestic violence will use the criminal justice system when they finally decide that they are going to make a change in their lives. (Fischer & Rose, 1995) (Qual.)</p>	<p>(32) It is extremely hard for a victim to take that next step and seek out the criminal justice system for help because she knows it will almost certainly mean the end of the relationship. (Fischer & Rose, 1995) (Qual.)</p>
<p>(15) Victims of domestic violence will use the criminal justice system when they get angry enough. (Fischer & Rose, 1995)</p>	<p>(33) “I would be afraid to call the police with both of us knowing her could be arrested.” (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)</p>

(Qual.)	
(16) Victims of domestic violence will use the criminal justice system when they realize their lives are in danger. (Landau, 2000) (Quant.)	(34) "I don't feel [arresting my partner would be] good for me. I wouldn't call the police." (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)
(17) I would use the criminal justice system to seek retribution for what has been done to me. (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000) (Qual.)	(35) I would not call the police after my partner hit me because I wouldn't want him arrested. (Smith, 2000) (Quant.)
(18) I would prosecute my partner to get him the treatment that he needs. (Lewis et al., 2000) (Qual.)	(36) "If he's arrested it will make my financial situation worse." (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)
	(37) "It would hurt the kids because their father had to go to court. The kids would see what was going on." (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)
	(38) After "I left him [and] got away from the violence, there didn't seem to be any point in getting him prosecuted." (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000) (Qual.)

Level g: General comments on the Criminal Justice System	
Positive Perspectives	Negative Perspectives
(1) "Beating [your spouse] is certainly not a family matter and beating and abuse is a criminal offence." (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	(8) "The law isn't on my side" (Stephens & Sinden, 2000) (Qual.)
(2) A Temporary Protection Order/Restraining is "great because it gives me the power to say 'yes, you can com in' or 'no, I don't want to see you.' Or, 'If you don't go I can use it.'" (Lewis et al., 2000) (Qual.)	(9) "A Temporary Protection Order (restraining order) is not worth the paper it is [written] on." (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)
(3) "You've got to be ready to call the police if you take out a retraining order. You can't just use it if you feel like it." (Horton, Simonidis, & Simonidis, 1987) (Open ended)	(10) If a victim wants to end the violence, but not the relationship, the criminal justice system does not provide many options for her. (Landau, 1998) (Quant.)
(4) "I personally think that if more men were prosecuted and convicted [for assaulting their partners] people would take this more seriously." (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	(11) "The [criminal justice] system doesn't work well enough" for victims of domestic violence." (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)
(5) Knowing I can call the police gives me	(12) The criminal justice system

a sense of control. (Fischer & Rose, 1995) (Quant.)	revictimizes women. "If the system could just give women a little more power, women would have the confidence to get out." (Landau, 2000) (Open-ended)
(6) There should be "special police officers" and special courts for domestic violence. (Lewis et al., 2000) (Qual.)	(13) The criminal justice system isn't on your side unless your determined to have your partner charged and convicted. (Landau, 2000) (Open-ended)
(7) A victim can exert some power and control over her partner by using the criminal justice system. (Fischer & Rose, 1995) (Qual.)	(14) The criminal justice system "makes such a big deal about violence against women and then they don't do very much. That upsets me." (Landau, 2000) (Open-ended)
	(15) Using the criminal justice system is extremely confusing. "The whole process should be simple." (Bennett et al., 1999) (Qual.)
	(16) It is frustrating to use the criminal justice system because the process is so slow. It can feel like the victim "is doing time instead of the defendant." (Bennett et al., 1999) (Qual.) (London Family Court Clinic Inc., 1991) (Quant.)

Appendix B: Q Sort Statements

Level a ¹⁰ : Police	
Positive Perspectives	Negative Perspectives
I am very satisfied with the way the police respond to domestic violence (2) ¹¹ . (Fleury, 2000) (Quant.) ¹² (Jaffe, Wolfe, Teleford, & Austin, 1986) (Quant.)	When the police arrive at a domestic dispute they act as if nothing important has happened. They don't even make an effort to collect all the evidence. (9, 10) (Byrne, Kilpatrick, Howley, & Beatty, 1999) (Quant.) (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended) (Stephens & Sinden, 2000) (Qual.)
Police officers tell women who have been abused by their partners to think about having their partner arrested and prosecuted ¹³ . (5) (Stephens & Sinden, 2000) (Qual.)	I don't think police officers believe women who are abused by their partners unless they are really hurt. (11, 12, 17) (Stephens & Sinden, 2000) (Qual.) (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)
Special domestic violence officers help women stay involved with the criminal justice system so that their partner can be taken to court. (6) (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000) (Qual.)	Police officers are cold. In most cases of domestic violence they don't sympathize or even listen to the woman. (3, 4, 13, 18) (Stephens & Sinden, 2000) (Qual.) (Byrne, et al., 1999) (Quant.) (London Family Court Clinic Inc., 1991) (Quant.)
The police help decrease long-term violence in cases of domestic abuse. (7) (Wiist & McFarlane, 1998) (Quant.)	The police are still sexist. They aren't fair to women and instead protect her partner because he is a man. (15,16) (Stephens & Sinden, 2000) (Qual.)
In cases of domestic violence the police provide short-term protection from the immediate threat of abuse. (8) (Lewis, Dobash, Dobash, & Cavanagh, 2000) (Qual.)	When responding to domestic disputes police officers often act cocky and macho. (14) (Stephens & Sinden, 2000) (Qual.)

Level b. Arrest and Mandatory arrest	
Positive Perspectives	Negative Perspectives
I support mandatory arrest in cases of	Arresting a man who has abused his partner

¹⁰ Each level represents an area of discourse identified by the balanced block design (see table 2).

¹¹ Numbers in bold refer to the concourse statements in Appendix A that were used to develop the Q sort statement.

¹² The item in brackets after each reference refers to the way the information obtained from that reference was collected (i.e., quantitative data, qualitative data, open-ended data).

¹³ Phrases in bold indicate that the definition for the phrase is found in the glossary.

domestic violence. (1) (Smith, 2000) (Quant.)	will make him angrier and he will take his anger out on the woman. (19, 20) (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended) (Smith, 2000) (Quant.)
If a man is arrested for abusing his partner he will not hit her again because he will not want to be arrested again. (2, 3, 7, 28) (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended) (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000) (Qual.)	If my partner were arrested or taken to court for hitting me, I would feel guilty and worry about what people would think of me. (21, 22, 26¹⁴) (Barata, 1999)(Open-ended) (Lewis et al., 2000)(Qual.) (Bennett, Goodman, & Dutton, 1999) (Qual.)
I would be (or would have been) helped by mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence. (4) (Smith, 2000) (Quant.)	There is no point in arresting men who abuse their partners because they are just released again with a slap on the wrist. (23) (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)
Arresting a man who has hit his partner stops the violence underway and the woman is safe while he is gone. This is important because it gives her time to make plans such as finding a place to live. (5, 6, 8, 9, 10) (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended) (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000) and (Lewis et al., 2000)	Mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence can make things worse for the woman. If she defends herself by hitting him back she might also be arrested. (24) (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)
An abused woman is too frightened to ask for arrest, so it is better that that decision is out of her hands. (14, 16, 17) (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	If the police know that a man has abused his partner, they should calm him down, warn him, and provide advice and contact numbers for both him and his partner. They <u>should not</u> arrest him. (26, 27) (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000) (Qual.)

Level c: Attorneys	
Positive Perspectives	Negative Perspectives
Crown attorneys listen to women who have been abused by their partners and believe what they have to say. For example, they write down what women say in a careful and accurate manner. (1, 5) (Fleury, 2000) (Quant.) (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)	Crown attorneys often reduce charges against men who abuse their partners. It gets to a point where the charges do not reflect the seriousness of the assault. (6) (Cretney & Davis, 1997) (Byrne et al., 1999) (Quant.)
Crown attorneys support women who have been abused by their partners. (2)	Crown attorneys are too busy to do a good job with domestic violence cases.

¹⁴ A letter following a number indicates that a concurrence statement from a different level was also incorporated into this statement. In this case concurrence statement 26 from level f (why use the criminal justice system) was incorporated into this Q statement.

(Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended) (London Family Court Clinic Inc., 1991) (Quant.) (Fleury, 2000) (Quant.)	They don't have time to prepare, so they just go from one case to the next without seeming to care about any of the cases. (7) (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)
I am very satisfied with the way Crown attorneys deal with cases of domestic violence. (3) (Fleury, 2000) (Quant.) (London Family Court Clinic Inc., 1991) (Quant.)	Crown attorneys are very mean to women who want to drop charges against their partners. It can make the woman feel like a victim of the court system. (8) (Landau, 2000) (Open-ended)
Crown attorneys help women who have been abused by their partners to stay involved with the case. For example, they tell her that a conviction is possible if she testifies. (4) (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)	Crown attorneys don't really care what the woman thinks when they make decisions about a domestic violence case. (9) (Byrne et al., 1999) (Quant.)

Level d. Prosecution and Mandatory prosecution	
Positive Perspectives	Negative Perspectives
I support no-drop prosecution in cases of domestic violence. (11) (Smith, 2000) (Quant.)	A woman who has been abused by her partner should have the option of dropping the charges against him. Why should she get in trouble for not showing up for court? (15) (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)
I would be (or would have been) helped by no-drop prosecution in cases of domestic violence. (12). (Smith, 2000) (Quant.)	If a woman is forced to testify against her partner when she doesn't want to, she has no choice but to lie in court. (16, 17) (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended) (Landau, 1998) (Open-ended)
A woman who has been abused by her partner should not drop the charges or fail to show up to testify. If she does the violence will continue. (1) (Erez & Belknap, 1998)(Open-ended)	If my partner were charged for assaulting me, he would kill me before the court date if I didn't get the charges dropped. (7, 18, 23) ((Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)
Continuing with prosecution in cases of domestic violence stops the man from getting away with the abuse. He committed a crime and he deserves to be punished. (2, b18) (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended) (Hoyle et al., 2000) (Qual.)	A no-drop prosecution policy makes the woman who has been abused feel powerless. This is because she has no control over whether or not her partner is prosecuted . (10, 19, 20, 21) (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended) (Landau, 2000) (Open-ended)
Being prosecuted teaches the violent partner that you can't be abusive and get away with it. He'll learn not to do it again. (3, 14) (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	If a woman doesn't want to end the relationship with a partner who has hit her, there is no point in prosecuting him. (24) (Hoyle et al., 2000) (Qual.)
When an abusive partner is prosecuted , the criminal justice system is on the woman's	

side. Prosecution means that the violence is being treated seriously. (4, 9) (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	
A no-drop prosecution policy is helpful because a woman can't change her mind about having her partner prosecuted for hitting her. (5) (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	
Women who are abused by their partners aren't in the right state of mind to decide whether or not their partner should be arrested and charged . They are afraid of him, so the law needs to make that decision for them. (6, 8, 13) (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended) (Landau, 2000) (Open-ended)	

Level e: Judges/Courtroom experiences/Verdict	
Positive Perspectives	Negative Perspectives
Most men who are charged with abusing their partners are sentenced to receive treatment. I think this is the best kind of sentence. (1) (Cretney & Davis, 1997) (Quant.)	Even when an abusive partner is convicted, the sentence does not reflect the seriousness of the assault. Abusive partners rarely receive jail time. (2, 8, 12, 18) (Cretney & Davis, 1997) (Quant.) (Byrne et al., 1999) (Quant.)
I am very satisfied with the court process and with the way judges deal with domestic violence. (3, 4, 5) (Fleury, 2000) (Quant.) (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Quant.)	Women who are abused by their partners might as well <u>not</u> go to court. I think it's a waste of time. (9, 18) (Bennett et al., 1999; Cretney et al., 1997) (Quant.)
	Women who are abused by their partners are portrayed badly in court. They are seen as jealous, vengeful, unreliable, violent, alcoholic, crazy or worse. (10) (Cretney & Davis, 1997) (Quant.)
	Women who are abused by their partners should not be required to testify because they have been through enough. Testifying causes more stress and fear. (6, 7, 13, 14) (Bennett et al., 1999) (Qual.) (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)
	My partner would (or would have) come after me if I put him in jail for hitting me. I'd be scared to find out what he would do once he was free. (15) (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)

Level f: Why use the Criminal Justice System	
Positive Perspectives (why use)	Negative Perspectives (why don't use)
If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case. It would help stop my partner from hurting me and make me feel safer. (1, 11, 19, 28, 29, 33) (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended) (Bennett et al., 1999) (Qual.) (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended) (Fischer & Rose, 1995) (Qual.) (Hoyle et al., 2000) (Qual.)	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him prosecuted because involving the criminal justice system is too much of a hassle. It wouldn't be worth the stress. It just wouldn't be good for me. (21, 34) (Barata, 1999) (Ford, 1991) (Qual.)
I want (or wanted) my partner prosecuted because you get to a point where you say, "enough is enough." You just can't take the abuse any longer. (2, 5, 13, 16) (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended) (Landau, 2000) (Quant.) (Wiist & McFarlane, 1998) (Quant.)	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him I prosecuted . I wouldn't want him to lose his job or go to jail because what he would need is help, not punishment. (22, 23, 24, 30) (Bennett et al., 1999) (Qual.) (Ford, 1991) (Qual.) (Lewis et al., 2000) (Qual.)
If my partner hit me, I would want him prosecuted because that is the safest thing for my children. I wouldn't want them to grow up thinking it's okay to hit a woman. (3, 4, 37) (Barata, 1999) (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended) (Lewis et al., 2000) (Qual.)	I am (or was) very emotionally attached to my partner and would have (or would have had) a hard time even calling the police on him. Involving the criminal justice system would end the relationship, and this is not what I want (or wanted). (25, 27, 32) (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended) (Fischer & Rose, 1995) (Qual.)
If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case to show him that he can't get away with abusing me. This would show him that society takes domestic violence seriously. (8, 10) (Lewis et al., 2000) (Qual.) (Fischer & Rose, 1995) (Qual.)	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want the criminal justice system involved in my case because the system is racist. It is very unfair to Black, Aboriginal, and other minority men. (31) (Bennett et al., 1999) (Qual.) (Tim Roberts Focus Consultants, 1996) (Quant.)
I want (or wanted) my partner prosecuted in order to get him to do something (for example, to give me a divorce, give me custody of the children, get himself into counseling, stop abusing me, etc.). If he did this, I would want to drop the charges . (7, 20) (Ford, 1991) (Qual.)	If my partner hit me, I would not call the police because I wouldn't want him arrested. (35) (Smith, 2000) (Quant.)
If my partner hit me, I would want him prosecuted so that I could tell my story and let people know what he did. (9) (Lewis et al., 2000) (Qual.)	After you leave and get away from an abusive partner, there doesn't seem to be any point in having him prosecuted . (38) (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000) (Qual.)
Women who are abused by their partners will use the criminal justice system when	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want the criminal justice system involved because it

they finally decide to make a real change in their lives. Sometimes that means getting angry enough to want him arrested. (14, 15) (Fischer & Rose, 1995) (Qual.)	would leave me without money. (36) (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)
I want (or wanted) the criminal justice system involved in my case because they could get my partner into treatment. (18) (Lewis et al., 2000) (Qual.)	
If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case because that is what he deserves. This would punish and straighten him out. (6, 17) (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended) (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000)	

Level g: General comments on the CJS (and restraining orders)	
Positive Perspectives	Negative Perspectives
Beating your partner is certainly not a family matter. It's a criminal offence. I think if more people were arrested, prosecuted , and convicted of assaulting their partners, this kind of abuse would be taken more seriously. (1, 4, 11b, 12b) (Barata, 1999) (Open-ended)	When a man hits his partner, the law isn't on the woman's side unless she is very sure she wants him charged and convicted. (8, 13) (Stephens et al., 2000) (Qual.) (Landau, 2000) (Open-ended)
Knowing I can call the police if my partner hits me gives me a sense of control over the situation. (5, 7) (Fischer & Rose, 1995) (Quant.)	If a woman wants the violence to end, but does <u>not</u> want the relationship to end, the criminal justice system can't help her. (10) (Landau, 1998)(Quant.)
There should be special domestic violence officers and special courts for domestic violence. (6) (Lewis et al., 2000) (Qual.)	The criminal justice system doesn't work well enough for women who are abused by their partners. The system is very difficult to understand and the whole process is too slow. (11, 15, 16) (Bennett et al., 1999) (Qual.) (London Family Court Clinic Inc., 1991) (Quant.) (Erez & Belknap, 1998) (Open-ended)
	The criminal justice system makes the woman feel like a victim again. If the system could just give women a little more power, women would have the confidence to get out of violent relationships. (12) (Landau, 2000) (Open-ended)
	The criminal justice system makes such a big deal about violence against women and then they don't do very much. That upsets me. (14) (Landau, 2000) (Open-ended)

Appendix C: Q Statement Template

*Note that the actual template is substantially larger spanning almost 4 legal size pages.

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree				
-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(12)	(8)	(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
		—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
			—	—	—	—	—			
				—	—	—				
					—	—				
					—					
					—					
					—					

Appendix D: Record Sheet

On this sheet record each statement number (1 – 72) under the number that you sorted it under.

Strongly Strongly Disagree											Agree
-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
		—	—	—	—	—	—	—			
			—	—	—	—	—				
				—	—	—					
					—	—					
						—					
							—				
								—			
									—		
										—	

Appendix E: Relationship Events

R1. Have you every been emotionally hurt or scared by something a male romantic partner purposely said or did? (For example, put you down, demanded obedience, treated you rudely, said you were dumb, insulted you in front of others, told you that you were ugly or fat, demanded sex, threatened to hit you etc.)

yes no

If you said no to R1, skip to question R2.

If you said yes to R1, please answer questions a to e before you move on to R2.

a) Did what this partner say or do to you ever reach a level where you thought it was not acceptable (i.e., you think he went too far)? yes no

b) Did you ever feel scared or threatened by what he said or did? yes no

c) Did what he say or do make you confused about yourself? yes no

d) Would you describe this partner as wanting to control your actions?

yes no

e) Would you describe your relationship with this partner as abusive?

yes no

f) Are you still in this relationship? yes no (if no, skip to R2)

g) **If you said yes you are still in the relationship,** do you think that things will improve?

yes no they already have; he has not emotionally hurt me in over a year

R2. Have you ever been physically hurt by something a male romantic partner purposely did? (For example, pushed or shoved you violently, hit, slapped or punched you, beat you, twisted your fingers, arms, or legs, bit or scratched you, tried to choke or strangle you, physically forced you to have sex etc.)

yes no

If you said no to R2, skip to question R3 on the next page.

If you said yes to R2 please answer questions a to c before you move on to R3.

a) Would you describe your relationship with this partner as abusive?

yes no

b) Are you still in this relationship? yes no (if no, skip to R3 on the next page)

c) **If you said yes you are still in the relationship,** do you think that things will improve?

yes no they already have; he has not physically hurt me in over a year

Please move on to R3 on the next page.

R3. If you have not experienced emotional or physical hurt by a partner, you can stop now, and move onto **the second questionnaire on purple paper.**

If you have experienced emotional or physical hurt by a partner, what kinds of things have you done to try to stop or minimize the emotional or physical hurt that you experienced? Check everything that you have tried even if it did not help.

- Covered up the situation so others would not find out.
- Tried to avoid fights or avoid getting him angry.
- Tried to ignore the problem.
- Changed my behaviour to please him.
- Focused on other aspects of my life.
- Tried to be a better partner.
- Tried to understand him and why he says or does things to hurt me.
- Tried to predict his bad moods, so I could get out of the way.
- Tried to defend myself by yelling back at him.
- Tried to defend myself by hitting him back.
- Asked my friends or family for advice.
- Moved into a hotel or in with friends or family for awhile.
- Stayed at a shelter.
- Called the police.
- Pressed criminal charges against him.
- Testified against him in court
- Talked myself into staying away from him.
- Took financial action to strengthen my independence from him (for example, started a separate bank account, got a job, saved money without his knowledge etc.)
- Called an agency that helps victims of domestic violence.
- Called a lawyer.
- Sought a divorce.
- Left him temporarily.
- Left him forever.

Please move onto R4 on the next page.

R4. Have you ever had a 'turning point' in your relationship with the partner who emotionally or physically hurt you when you **suddenly realized** that things were getting worse and things were not going to change without something drastic happening? (For example, you leaving him, you having him charged, him seeking counseling etc.)

yes no

If you said no to R4, please skip to R5.

If you said yes to R4, describe this 'turning point' before you move on to R5. (Use the back of this page if you need more room.)

R5. Have you ever tried to leave or have you ever actually left this partner one or more times?

yes no

If you said no to R5, please move onto R6

If you said yes to R5, how many times have you tried to leave or have you actually left your partner? _____

R6. Has your partner completely stopped emotionally and physically hurting you?

yes no

If you said no to R6, please move onto R11 on the next page.

If you said yes to R6, please answer the last few questions on this page before you move on to R11

R7. How long ago did he stop emotionally or physically hurting you? (Estimate in months or years.) _____

R8. What do you think made him stop hurting you? (Use the back of this page if you need more room.)

R9. In your regular day-to-day life, do you feel pretty sure that he will not emotionally and/or physically hurt you again? yes no **If you said no, explain why?**

R10. Do you believe that you have begun to heal from the emotional and/or physical hurt that you experienced?

yes no

Please move onto R11 on the next page.

R11. What is/or was your relationship with the partner that emotionally or physically hurt you?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Casually dating | <input type="checkbox"/> Living together (common law) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Exclusively dating | <input type="checkbox"/> Separated |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Engaged | <input type="checkbox"/> Divorced |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Married | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: (please specify) _____ |

R12. How long have you been in (were you in) the relationship mentioned above? _____

Please move onto to the second questionnaire on purple paper.

Appendix F: Definitions of Stages

Directions:

Use the definitions below to identify the stage that best illustrates the participant's current experience of the relationship she describes. Remember that the stages are not necessarily sequential. Stages can be skipped. For example a woman does not have to have experienced all the stages to arrive at stage four.

Not abused (these women will be excluded from the study)

Some women may never have experienced an abusive relationship. These women should answer no to questions R1 and R2. Some women may answer yes to question R1; however, if they go on to answer no to questions R1a – R1e, consider them to be not abused.

Stage 1: Prelude to physical abuse

Women in this stage must have experienced emotional abuse, but not physical abuse. They must answer at least one of R1a – R1e yes. They must still be in the relationship or have left the relationship less than 1 year ago. They must have experienced emotional abuse within the past year. They are not likely to define the relationship as abusive. They are likely to believe that the relationship will improve. They may have tried some of the first nine strategies (passive coping) on the questionnaire to minimize the abuse, but they are not likely to have tried other strategies. They are not likely to have had a 'turning point'. They are not likely to have tried to leave their partner.

Stage 2: Denying the abuse and hoping for better times

Women in this stage must have experienced physical abuse. They are likely to have experienced emotional abuse as well. They must still be in the relationship or have left the relationship less than 1 year ago. They must have experienced physical abuse within the past year. They are not likely to define the relationship as abusive. They are likely to believe that the relationship will improve. They may have tried some of the first ten strategies (passive coping) on the questionnaire to minimize the abuse, but they are not likely to have tried other strategies (active coping). They are not likely to have had a 'turning point'. They are not likely to have tried to leave or actually left their partner.

Stage 3: Labeling the abuse and actively coping with escalating violence

Women in this stage must have experienced physical abuse. They are likely to have experienced emotional abuse. They must still be in the relationship or have left the relationship less than 1 year ago. They must have experienced physical abuse within the past year. They are likely to define the relationship as abusive. They are not likely to believe the relationship will improve. They are likely to have tried some of the first ten strategies (passive coping) and some of the other strategies (active coping). They are likely to have had a 'turning point'. They are likely to have tried to leave or actually left their partner one or more times.

Stage 4a: Arriving at nonviolence and healing

Women in this stage may belong to one of two versions. Women in version A will have experienced physical abuse. They are likely to have experienced emotional abuse. They

have left the relationship or continue to be in the relationship, but have not experienced emotional or physical abuse in over one year. They must feel that the abuse will not happen again. They are likely to believe that they have begun to heal from the abuse. They are likely to have tried both some of the first ten strategies (passive coping) and some of the other strategies (active coping). They are likely to have had a 'turning point'. They are likely to have tried to leave or actually left their partner one or more times.

Stage 4b: Arriving at nonviolence and healing

Women in version B will have experienced only emotional abuse. They have left the relationship or continue to be in the relationship, but have not experienced emotional abuse in over one year. They feel that the abuse will not happen again. They are likely to believe that they have begun to heal from the abuse. They are likely to have tried both some of the first nine strategies (passive coping) and some, although not many, of the other strategies (active coping). They are likely to have had a 'turning point'. They are likely to have tried to leave or actually left their partner one or more times.

Appendix G: Background Questionnaire

B1. What is your age? _____

B2. What is the highest level of education that you have achieved?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> No formal education | <input type="checkbox"/> Some college/university (year level ____) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Some elementary school | <input type="checkbox"/> College diploma |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Finished elementary school | <input type="checkbox"/> University degree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Some high school | <input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate degree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Graduated from high-school (completed grade 12) | |

B3. To which ethnic group(s) do you belong? (Check as many as apply)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> European Canadian (i.e., White) | <input type="checkbox"/> Latin, Central, and South American Canadian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> African Canadian | <input type="checkbox"/> South Asian Canadian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> First Nations/Native | <input type="checkbox"/> East or Southeast Asian Canadian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caribbean Canadian | <input type="checkbox"/> Arab Canadian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): _____ | |

B4. What is your religious affiliation?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> None | <input type="checkbox"/> Jewish |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Roman Catholic | <input type="checkbox"/> Muslim |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Protestant | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: (please specify) _____ |

B5. What is your sexual orientation?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Heterosexual (straight) | <input type="checkbox"/> Bisexual |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lesbian | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: (please specify) _____ |

B6. Are you currently in a romantic relationship? yes no

If yes, what is your relationship?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Casually dating | <input type="checkbox"/> Living together (common law) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Exclusively dating | <input type="checkbox"/> Separated |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Engaged | <input type="checkbox"/> Divorced |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Married | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: (please specify) _____ |

B7. If you are currently in a relationship, how long have you been in that relationship? ____

B8. How many children do you have if any? _____

B9. How old are your children? _____

B10. How many children live with you, and what are their ages? _____

B11. What city do you live in? _____

B12. How long have you lived in the city you mentioned above? _____

B13. Check any or all of the victim services that you have used below and indicate how many times you have used that service.

- Stayed in a shelter for women. How many times? _____
- Used shelter services while living elsewhere (for example, support groups, phoned for information, victim counseling etc.) How many times? _____
- Called an assaulted women's hotline. How many times? _____
- Used victim services at a hospital. How many times? _____
- Used victim services provided by the courts system. How many times? _____
- Other: (please specify) _____
- Did not use any service.

B14. Indicate the number of times each of the following things has happened.
If it has never happened write 0.

- a. How many times have you called the police because your partner hurt you? _____
- b. How many times has someone else called the police because your partner hurt you or they thought he was going to hurt you? _____
- c. How many times did the police come to your home because your partner hurt you? _____
- d. How many times has your partner been arrested because he hurt you? _____
- e. How many times did you want the police to arrest your partner when they arrived, but they did not arrest him? _____
- f. How many times has your partner been charged for hurting you? _____
- g. How many times has your partner been prosecuted (taken to court) for hurting you? _____

h. How many times have you been subpoenaed (required) to attend court as a Crown witness against your partner because he hurt you? _____

i. How many times have you testified against your partner in court because he hurt you? _____

j. How many times have you wanted your partner prosecuted, but the Crown Attorney did not prosecute him? _____

You have now completed the study.

Thank-you very much for participating in this study. There would be no way I could have completed this study without women like you. You have contributed to something very important. I will share the information collected in this study with people who work with women using the criminal justice system, so that they will better understand women's beliefs about the system. I would also like you to know that you have helped me in obtaining my educational goals.

Optional Meeting

I would like to meet with a small number of women who have participated in this research study about their answers. The purpose of this meeting is to help me better understand your perspectives, and what you were thinking when you sorted the cards. This meeting will take about half an hour and I could meet you at a place and time that is convenient for you. I will be arranging the meetings in a few weeks to a few months. You will be paid an additional \$10 for this meeting.

If you agree to meet with me, you can change your mind when I call you back. At that time you can tell me that you no longer want to meet with me.

Would you be willing to meet with me? yes no

If yes, please provide me with your first name and a safe telephone number where I can call you or leave a message for you. For instance, you can give me the number of a friend or relative that will be able to contact you for me if you do not want to give me your home number, or you do not know where you'll be living in a few months. If it will be easier to contact you by e-mail, please provide me with your e-mail address.

First name: _____

Phone number: _____

Is this your home number? yes no

If no, what is the first name of the person I should speak with _____

E-mail (optional): _____

The next page tells you what to do with all these papers.

What to do with all these papers:

If you are returning the envelope to me or to a service provider today, you will receive the \$10.00 today. If you are returning this package to me by mail, **please write your name and address on the front of the small white envelope**. Put this envelope in the larger white envelope that has my address on it and put it in the mail. The postage is already paid. I will mail you your \$10.00.

If you would like to be mailed information about the final results of the study, you can call Paula Barata at (416) 946-2271 or leave a message for her at the University of Windsor (519) 253-3000 ex. 2256. Or you can fill out the blue card by putting your name and address on it and mailing it to me in the white envelope with my address on it.

Please read the **debriefing form, the wife assault pamphlet, and the hidden information**. These items contain information and phone numbers that might be helpful to you. You are free to take these with you, but if you feel that any of these materials will put you at increased risk for abuse should your partner find them, please do not take them. The hidden information is in the form of a lipstick container or a mini pad. Other women have found that this is a helpful way to carry the emergency information safely.

Put everything else back in the original envelope and seal the envelope. Either give the envelope back to the person who gave it to you, so that I can pick it up, or put it in the mail. The postage is already paid.

Thank-you again.

Appendix H: Interview Guide

1. Overall, do you think that most women who have been abused by their partners should use the criminal justice system? Why or why not?
2. Do you think that you would ever call on the criminal justice system for help? Why or why not?
3. Do you think that your own personal experiences with the criminal justice system have shaped the way you feel about system?
 - If no, then what kinds of things have shaped your views on the criminal justice system?
 - If yes, can you give me some examples of personal experiences that you believe have shaped your experience of the system?
4. What parts of the criminal justice system do you think work well for women who have been abused by their partners? (prompt if needed: For example do you think that police interaction, arrest, prosecution, attorneys, court room procedures, judges, verdicts, dispositions etc. works well for victims of domestic violence?)
5. What parts of the criminal justice system do you think do not work well for women who have been abused by their partners?
- 6¹⁵. I notice that you strongly agreed with a, b, and c (woman's top Q statements). Why did you pick these statements as the ones you most strongly agreed with?
7. You placed x, y, and z on the other extreme. Why do you strongly disagree with these statements.
8. Your views were similar to other women's views around these areas X, Y, and Z. Based on how you and others sorted the statements, I am thinking of calling this factor X. Does that make sense to you?
9. (Probe for unusual sorting: for example she placed most statements about the police in such a way that it looks like she is not pleased with their work, but then places the satisfaction card in an agree position.) For example: It is interesting that you placed d and e under number n, but g quite far away. When I made up those statements, I believed that they would have been sorted together. I am very interested in your unique view. How did you interpret them and come to sort them so differently?

¹⁵ Questions 6, 7,8, 9 will vary slightly depending on the woman's q sort. For example I may probe about items that she placed under the 0.

Appendix I: General instructions

This study looks at women's thoughts about how the criminal justice system deals with domestic violence.

If you choose to participate there are 4 main tasks that you will do. It is important that you do them in the right order. Check now to make sure you have all the pieces.

1. First, on University of Windsor letterhead an **Informed Consent Form**.
2. Second, the envelope called **Card-Sorting Exercise**.
3. Third, the green packet of stapled papers called **Relationship Events Questionnaire**.
4. Fourth, the purple packet of stapled papers called **Background Questionnaire**.

You will be given directions for each task as you go along. Begin by reading the consent form, which is on University letterhead and is titled "**Informed Consent Form**." You will notice that there are two copies. Sign one copy and put it back in the large envelope that it came in. Keep the other copy for yourself.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study!

Appendix J: Informed Consent Letter

This research study is looking at women's thoughts about how the criminal justice system deals with domestic violence. Paula Barata is conducting this study in partial fulfillment of the requirements of her PhD degree in psychology at the University of Windsor. Dr. Charlene Senn is supervising her.

If you choose to participate you will be asked to read statements about how the criminal justice system deals with domestic violence. These statements are written on cards and you will be asked to sort the cards depending on how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement. You will also be asked to fill out two short surveys. One will ask you questions about your relationship with your partner (or ex-partner), and the second will ask you a few questions about your background (for example, your age and ethnicity).

This study should take approximately one hour, and you will receive \$10 for participating. All the information you provide will be kept completely confidential. The signed consent form, and any other identifying information that you provide, will be kept separate from your questionnaire to protect your identity.

It is possible that some of the statements on the cards may be upsetting to you if you have had negative experiences with the criminal justice system. It is also possible that you will find this study satisfying because you will be able to express your opinions. There is a section in this study that will ask you questions about whether or not you have been emotionally or physically hurt by a romantic partner. Thinking about these experiences may be upsetting to you.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose not to participate which will in no way affect any services that you may be receiving. You can also refuse to answer any questions, or stop participating at any time without any consequences. You may ask Paula Barata any questions in person or by calling her at 416-946-2271 or leaving a message for her at (519) 253-3000, ex. 2256. You can call her before you begin, during the study, or at the end. If you would like her to be present when you do this study you can call her and arrange to meet with her.

The University of Windsor's Ethics Board has cleared this research. If you have any ethical concerns about this study you may contact Dr. Muldoon, chair of the ethics board (519-253-3000, ex. 3916). If you have any other questions or comments about this study, you should contact Paula Barata (416-946-2271 or 519-253-3000 ex.2256) or Charlene Senn (519-253-3000 ex.2255). If you would like to know the results of this study Paula Barata can send you a summary of the findings. (Continued on the next page.)

(Continued)

I have read the above informed consent information regarding the study of perspectives about the criminal justice system in cases of domestic violence. I understand the information I have been given. I consent to participate with my signature below. My signature also acknowledges that I have been given a copy of this consent form to keep for my own records.

Printed Name

Signature

Date

Now begin the study with the **Card Sorting Exercise**. The instructions are on the envelope.

Appendix K: Card Sorting Instructions

The card sorting exercise is the main task in this study. You will need lots of room to spread the material out when you are doing the card sorting. Begin by making sure you have all the materials. Put everything except this small envelope and its contents over to the side. You will not need the green and purple papers until the end. Empty the contents of this envelope. You should have:

- a deck of 72 cards with words printed on them
- a sheet of paper with some definitions on it
- a long sheet of paper with numbers on it to help you sort the cards
- a record sheet to mark the order of your cards

The statements on the cards refer to thoughts, feelings or experiences that you may have about how the criminal justice system handles cases of domestic violence. You will notice that some words are highlighted. When you come across these words, read the definition of the word in the **Definitions of Criminal Justice Terms** sheet. Follow the 3 steps for card sorting:

Step One: As you read through the cards sort them into three piles.

- 1) One pile for cards you disagree with
- 2) One pile for cards you don't have strong feelings about one way or the other or for cards that do not apply to you
- 3) One pile for cards you agree with

Begin step one now, and when you are done continue with step two.

Step Two: This time sort the cards into piles using the long sheet of paper with numbers across the top. The '-' or '+' number tells you how strongly you disagree or agree. You will place the cards you disagree with to the left of the 0 and the cards you agree with to the right of the 0. The exact placement will depend on **how strongly** you agree or disagree. The more you agree or disagree with the statement the further away it will be from the middle.

The number in brackets () is the number of cards that go in that column. Under each position **try to place the suggested number of cards**, but if you really want to place a few more cards under some positions and less cards under others, you can do this. Feel free to move the cards around as often as you like until you are satisfied that they are in the order that best expresses how you feel about the statements.

Under the **0** position you will place **12 cards that you don't have strong feelings about one way or the other or which do not apply to you**. For example, one card says, "If my partner were charged for assaulting me, he would kill me before the court date if I didn't get the charges dropped." If your partner has never assaulted you, you would place this card under the 0 position. For another example, one card says, "The police help decrease long-term violence in cases of domestic abuse." You may disagree or agree with this statement, but you may also neither agree nor disagree. If you don't have strong feelings about this one way or the other, you would place it under the 0 position.

I know that this task can take a while and be difficult because it asks you to make subtle distinctions. However, it is important that I understand how much you disagree or agree with each statement. If you get tired, you can always take a break and come back to it later.

Begin step two now, and when you are done continue with step three.

The last step is on the next page.

Step Three: Use the record sheet to record your responses. Notice that each card has a number in the right most corner. This is the number that you will use to record your sorting exercise. Under each position in the record sheet write the number of each card that you placed in that position. If you chose to place more cards in that position, just write the number down underneath the last dash. **This record sheet is very important since it is the only way I will know how you sorted the cards.**

When you have finished the card sorting exercise **and written down your answers**, place everything back into the small envelope. Put the small envelope into the larger envelope that it came in and move on to the **Relationship Events Questionnaire**, which is the green packet of stapled papers.

Appendix L: Definitions of Criminal Justice Terms

Crown Attorney	-the attorney who prosecutes the case and tries to show that the person accused of the assault is guilty of a crime.
Mandatory Arrest	-a policy that directs police officers who are called to a domestic dispute to arrest the person if there is probable cause to believe that that person committed an assault. In other words, if there is physical evidence of an assault (for example, visible injury, property damage, the presence of weapons, etc.) or if there is a witness to the assault (for example, the victim says that she was assaulted, a neighbour witnessed the assault etc.) the responding officer <u>must</u> arrest the person. An arrest means that the person will be taken to the police station and charged with an offense.
No-drop Prosecution	-a policy that says the person who was assaulted cannot withdraw a charge against the person who committed the assault and the Crown attorney must follow strict guidelines that greatly limit when he or she may withdraw the charge. This means that in almost every case when a charge is laid, it will be prosecuted.
Special Domestic Violence Officers	- these are police officers who are specifically trained to work on domestic violence cases. For instance, they are trained on how to interview women who have been assaulted by their partners and they are well informed about victim services throughout the community.
Charge	-to be legally accused of a crime
Prosecution	-the pursuit of legal action; the trial of somebody in a court of law for a criminal offence.

Appendix M: Relationship Events Questionnaire Instructions (the green packet)

The following questions ask you about events that may or may not have occurred in a relationship that you have had with a male romantic partner. The first two questions will ask you if a romantic partner has emotionally or physically hurt you. If more than one partner has hurt you, think about **only the most recent relationship** when you answer all of the questions in this questionnaire.

Most questions will ask you to place a tick beside the answer that applies to you. A few questions will ask you to fill in the answer.

Fill out the questions in the order in which they appear. Depending on your answers to some questions you may be directed to skip ahead because some questions will not apply to you. **Follow the arrows and the directions in bold** to ensure that you answer all the questions that apply to you.

Feel free to write on the questionnaire if you want to make comments about the questions themselves or about your answers. Use the back of the page if you need to.

Appendix N: Background Questionnaire Instructions (the purple packet)

The following questions ask you specific things about your background. Fill in the answer or place a tick beside the answer that applies to you. These questions are used for statistical purposes, (for example, so that I can describe the ages of the women who filled out the study). These questions cannot be used to identify you.

Appendix O: Debriefing Form

As you know this research study is looking at women's thoughts about how the criminal justice system deals with domestic violence. You were asked to sort cards with statements on them about the criminal justice system. I'm going to use this information to try to understand how women's thoughts and feelings about the criminal justice system might be influenced by their experiences in a difficult romantic relationship. This is why I also asked you questions about your relationship.

Sorting the cards and answering questions about your relationship may have been difficult for you, especially if you have been emotionally or physically hurt by a romantic partner. It is completely normal to find that answering questions about past experiences can bring up a range of feelings that can be both positive negative. For instance, you may feel sad or angry. If you are feeling upset because these questions have brought up negative experiences from your past or your present, I would like to encourage you to talk someone that you trust, or call one of the numbers in the resources that I have provided.

In this envelope, I have included a pamphlet called "Let's break the silence" and information about wife assault that is hidden in a lipstick container or a mini pad. This information contains phone numbers that you can use if you want to talk to someone about your experiences, or about how you are feeling. You can take one or both of these items with you. Other women have found that the hidden information is a helpful way to carry the emergency information safely. If you think these items will put you at greater risk for abuse because your partner will find them, then you don't have to take them with you.

Once again, thank-you so much for participating.

Appendix P: Informed Consent for Meeting

As you know this research study is looking at women's thoughts about how the criminal justice system deals with domestic violence. During this meeting, you will be asked to give more information in your own words about your views on the criminal justice system. Paula Barata is conducting this study in partial fulfillment of the requirements of her PhD degree in psychology at the University of Windsor. Dr. Charlene Senn is supervising her.

If you choose to participate you will be asked a series of questions about your views on how the criminal justice system deals with cases of domestic violence. You will also be asked to expand on and clarify some of the choices you made when you sorted the cards.

This study should take approximately half an hour, and you will receive \$10 for participating. All the information you provide will be kept completely confidential. The signed consent form, and any other identifying information that you provide, will be kept separate from your questionnaire to protect your identity.

Like the first part of this study, it is possible that some of the questions may be upsetting to you if you have had negative experiences with the criminal justice system. It is also possible that you will find this component of the study satisfying because you will be able to express your opinions.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose not to participate which will in no way affect any services that you may be receiving. You can choose not to answer any question or to stop participating at any time without any consequences. You may ask Paula Barata any questions before you begin, throughout the study, or at the end.

The University of Windsor's Ethics Board has cleared this research. If you have any ethical concerns about this study you may contact Dr. Muldoon, chair of the ethics board (519-253-3000, ex. 3916). If you have any other questions or comments about this study, you should contact Paula Barata (416-946-2271 or 519-253-3000 ex.2256) or Charlene Senn (519-253-3000 ex.2255). If you would like to know the results of this study Paula Barata can send you a summary of the findings.

I have read the above informed consent information regarding the study of perspectives about the criminal justice system in cases of domestic violence. I understand the information provided and give my consent to participate with my signature below. My signature also acknowledges that I have been given a copy of this consent form to keep for my own records.

Printed Name

Signature

Date

Tape-recording

With your permission the interview will be tape-recorded. Paula Barata will be the only person to hear the tape recording, and it will be erased when it has been transcribed. All identifying information will be removed from the transcription. You can still participate in the interview without having the interview tape-recorded.

Your signature below will indicate that you give permission to have the interview tape-recorded. If you do not sign, the interview will not be tape-recorded and Paula Barata will take notes during the interview.

Signature

Date

Appendix Q: Prototype Factor Q Sorts

Factor 1

Unit	#	Statement
+5	2	I support mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence.
+5	37	There should be special domestic violence officers and special courts for domestic violence.
+5	7	Beating your partner is certainly not a family matter. It's a criminal offence. I think if more people were arrested, prosecuted, and convicted of assaulting their partners, this kind of abuse would be taken more seriously.
+5	17	Crown attorneys support women who have been abused by their partners.
+4	6	If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case. It would help stop my partner from hurting me and make me feel safer.
+4	50	If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case to show him that he can't get away with abusing me. This would show him that society takes domestic violence seriously.
+4	36	If my partner hit me, I would want him prosecuted because that is the safest thing for my children. I wouldn't want them to grow up thinking it's ok to hit a woman.
+4	32	I would be (or would have been) helped by mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence.
+4	3	Crown attorneys listen to women who have been abused by their partners and believe what they have to say. For example, they write down what women say in a careful and accurate manner.
+3	60	Women who are abused by their partners aren't in the right state of mind to decide whether or not their partner should be arrested and charged. They are afraid of him, so the law needs to make that decision for them.
+3	20	I am very satisfied with the court process and with the way judges deal with domestic violence.
+3	31	Special domestic violence officers help women stay involved with the criminal justice system so that their partner can be taken to court.
+3	35	When an abusive partner is prosecuted the criminal justice system is on the woman's side. Prosecution means that the violence is being treated seriously.
+3	21	I want (or wanted) my partner prosecuted because you get to a point where you say, "enough is enough." You just can't take the abuse any longer.
+3	49	A no-drop prosecution policy is helpful because a woman can't change her mind about having her partner prosecuted for hitting her.
+2	15	Police officers tell women who have been abused by their partners to think about having their partner arrested and prosecuted.
+2	33	I am very satisfied with the way Crown attorneys deal with cases of domestic violence.
+2	46	Arresting a man who has hit his partner stops the violence underway and the woman is safe while he is gone. This is important because it gives her time to make plans such as finding a place to live.

+2	22	Knowing I can call the police if my partner hits me gives me a sense of control over the situation.
+2	48	Continuing with prosecution in cases of domestic violence stops the man from getting away with the abuse. He committed a crime and he deserves to be punished.
+2	69	Women who are abused by their partners will use the criminal justice system when they finally decide to make a real change in their lives. Sometimes that means getting angry enough to want him arrested.
+2	4	I support no-drop prosecution in cases of domestic violence.
+1	34	A woman who has been abused by her partner should not drop the charges or fail to show up to testify. If she does the violence will continue.
+1	58	In cases of domestic violence the police provide short-term protection from the immediate threat of abuse.
+1	59	An abused woman is too frightened to ask for arrest, so it is better that that decision is out of her hands.
+1	65	My partner would (or would have) come after me if I put him in jail for hitting me. I'd be scared to find out what he would do once he was free.
+1	18	I would be (or would have been) helped by no-drop prosecution in cases of domestic violence.
+1	57	The criminal justice system makes the woman feel like a victim again. If the system could just give women a little more power, women would have the confidence to get out of violent relationships.
+1	5	Most men who are charged with abusing their partners are sentenced to receive treatment. I think this is the best kind of sentence.
+1	1	I am very satisfied with police response to domestic violence.
0	9	Arresting a man who has abused his partner will make him angrier and he will take his anger out on the woman.
0	71	I want (or wanted) the criminal justice system involved in my case because they could get my partner into treatment.
0	72	If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case because that is what he deserves. This would punish and straightened him out.
0	45	The police help decrease long-term violence in cases of domestic abuse.
0	47	Crown attorneys help women who have been abused by their partners to stay involved with the case. For example, they tell her that a conviction is possible if she testifies.
0	56	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want the criminal justice system involved in my case because the system is racist. It is very unfair to Black, Aboriginal, and other minority men.
0	62	If my partner hit me, I would want him prosecuted so that I could tell my story and let people know what did.
0	30	If a woman wants the violence to end, but does <u>not</u> want the relationship to end, the criminal justice system can't help her.
0	19	Being prosecuted teaches the violent partner that you can't be abusive and get away with it. He'll learn not to do it again.
0	41	If my partner were charged for assaulting me, he would kill me before the

		court date if I didn't get the charges dropped.
0	43	I am (or was) very emotionally attached to my partner and would have (or would have had) a hard time even calling the police on him. Involving the criminal justice system would end the relationship and this is not what I want (or wanted).
0	44	The criminal justice system doesn't work well enough for women who are abused by their partners. The system is very difficult to understand and the whole process is too slow.
-1	52	Mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence can make things worse for the woman. If she defends herself by hitting him back she might also be arrested.
-1	24	If my partner were arrested or taken to court for hitting me, I would feel guilty and worry about what people would think of me.
-1	12	Even when an abusive partner is convicted, the sentence does not reflect the seriousness of the assault. Abusive partners rarely receive jail time.
-1	40	Crown attorneys are very mean to women who want to drop charges against their partners. It can make the woman feel like a victim of the court system.
-1	55	Women who are abused by their partners should not be required to testify because they have been through enough. Testifying causes more stress and fear.
-1	66	If my partner hit me, I would not call the police because I wouldn't want him arrested.
-1	61	I want (or wanted) my partner prosecuted in order to get him to do something (for example, to give me a divorce, give me custody of the children, get himself into counseling, stop abusing me, etc.). If he did this, I would want to drop the charges.
-1	14	When a man hits his partner, the law isn't on the woman's side unless she is very sure she wants him charged and convicted.
-2	70	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want the criminal justice system involved because it would leave me without any money.
-2	54	A no-drop prosecution policy makes the woman who has been abused feel powerless. This is because she has no control over whether or not her partner is prosecuted.
-2	42	Women who are abused by their partners are portrayed badly in court. They are seen as jealous, vengeful, unreliable, violent, alcoholic, crazy or worse.
-2	68	The criminal justice system makes such a big deal about violence against women and then they don't do very much. That upsets me.
-2	10	Crown attorneys often reduce charges against men who abuse their partners. It gets to a point where the charges do not reflect the seriousness of the assault.
-2	63	When responding to domestic disputes police officers often act cocky and macho.
-2	53	Crown attorneys don't really care what the woman thinks when they make decisions about a domestic violence case.

-3	23	I don't think police officers believe women who are abused by their partners unless they're really hurt.
-3	25	Crown attorneys are too busy to do a good job with domestic violence cases. They don't have time to prepare, so they just go from one case to the next without seeming to care about any of the cases.
-3	67	After you leave and get away from an abusive partner, there doesn't seem to be any point in having him prosecuted.
-3	38	Police officers are cold. In most cases of domestic violence they don't sympathize or even listen to the woman.
-3	27	If a woman doesn't want to end the relationship with a partner who has hit her, there is no point in prosecuting him.
-3	29	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him prosecuted. I wouldn't want him to lose his job or go to jail because what he would need is help, not punishment.
-4	11	A woman who has been abused by her partner should have the option of dropping the charges against him. Why should she get in trouble for not showing up for court?
-4	8	When the police arrive at a domestic dispute they act as if nothing important has happened. They don't even make an effort to collect all the evidence.
-4	64	If the police know that a man has abused his partner, they should calm him down, warn him, and provide advice and contact numbers for both him and his partner. They <u>should not</u> arrest him.
-4	26	If a woman is forced to testify against her partner when she doesn't want to, she has no choice but to lie in court.
-4	51	The police are still sexist. They aren't fair to women and instead protect her partner because he is a man.
-5	13	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him prosecuted because involving the criminal justice system is too much of a hassle. It wouldn't be worth the stress. It just wouldn't be good for me.
-5	28	Women who are abused by their partners might as well <u>not</u> go to court. I think it's a waste of time.
-5	16	If a man is arrested for abusing his partner he will not hit her again because he will not want to be arrested again.
-5	39	There is no point in arresting men who abuse their partners because they are just released again with a slap on the wrist.

Factor 2

Unit	#	Statement
+5	37	There should be special domestic violence officers and special courts for domestic violence.
+5	68	The criminal justice system makes such a big deal about violence against women and then they don't do very much. That upsets me.
+5	12	Even when an abusive partner is convicted, the sentence does not reflect the seriousness of the assault. Abusive partners rarely receive jail time.
+5	23	I don't think police officers believe women who are abused by their

		partners unless they're really hurt.
+4	44	The criminal justice system doesn't work well enough for women who are abused by their partners. The system is very difficult to understand and the whole process is too slow.
+4	7	Beating your partner is certainly not a family matter. It's a criminal offence. I think if more people were arrested, prosecuted, and convicted of assaulting their partners, this kind of abuse would be taken more seriously.
+4	14	When a man hits his partner, the law isn't on the woman's side unless she is very sure she wants him charged and convicted.
+4	57	The criminal justice system makes the woman feel like a victim again. If the system could just give women a little more power, women would have the confidence to get out of violent relationships.
+4	50	If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case to show him that he can't get away with abusing me. This would show him that society takes domestic violence seriously.
+3	42	Women who are abused by their partners are portrayed badly in court. They are seen as jealous, vengeful, unreliable, violent, alcoholic, crazy or worse.
+3	63	When responding to domestic disputes police officers often act cocky and macho.
+3	10	Crown attorneys often reduce charges against men who abuse their partners. It gets to a point where the charges do not reflect the seriousness of the assault.
+3	8	When the police arrive at a domestic dispute they act as if nothing important has happened. They don't even make an effort to collect all the evidence.
+3	52	Mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence can make things worse for the woman. If she defends herself by hitting him back she might also be arrested.
+3	21	I want (or wanted) my partner prosecuted because you get to a point where you say, "enough is enough." You just can't take the abuse any longer.
+2	36	If my partner hit me, I would want him prosecuted because that is the safest thing for my children. I wouldn't want them to grow up thinking it's ok to hit a woman.
+2	9	Arresting a man who has abused his partner will make him angrier and he will take his anger out on the woman.
+2	6	If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case. It would help stop my partner from hurting me and make me feel safer.
+2	51	The police are still sexist. They aren't fair to women and instead protect her partner because he is a man.
+2	48	Continuing with prosecution in cases of domestic violence stops the man from getting away with the abuse. He committed a crime and he deserves to be punished.
+2	34	A woman who has been abused by her partner should not drop the charges or fail to show up to testify. If she does the violence will continue.

+2	32	I would be (or would have been) helped by mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence.
+1	46	Arresting a man who has hit his partner stops the violence underway and the woman is safe while he is gone. This is important because it gives her time to make plans such as finding a place to live.
+1	38	Police officers are cold. In most cases of domestic violence they don't sympathize or even listen to the woman.
+1	25	Crown attorneys are too busy to do a good job with domestic violence cases. They don't have time to prepare, so they just go from one case to the next without seeming to care about any of the cases.
+1	40	Crown attorneys are very mean to women who want to drop charges against their partners. It can make the woman feel like a victim of the court system.
+1	71	I want (or wanted) the criminal justice system involved in my case because they could get my partner into treatment.
+1	2	I support mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence.
+1	72	If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case because that is what he deserves. This would punish and straightened him out.
+1	69	Women who are abused by their partners will use the criminal justice system when they finally decide to make a real change in their lives. Sometimes that means getting angry enough to want him arrested.
0	35	When an abusive partner is prosecuted the criminal justice system is on the woman's side. Prosecution means that the violence is being treated seriously.
0	65	My partner would (or would have) come after me if I put him in jail for hitting me. I'd be scared to find out what he would do once he was free.
0	4	I support no-drop prosecution in cases of domestic violence.
0	49	A no-drop prosecution policy is helpful because a woman can't change her mind about having her partner prosecuted for hitting her.
0	47	Crown attorneys help women who have been abused by their partners to stay involved with the case. For example, they tell her that a conviction is possible if she testifies.
0	18	I would be (or would have been) helped by no-drop prosecution in cases of domestic violence.
0	30	If a woman wants the violence to end, but does <u>not</u> want the relationship to end, the criminal justice system can't help her.
0	39	There is no point in arresting men who abuse their partners because they are just released again with a slap on the wrist.
0	31	Special domestic violence officers help women stay involved with the criminal justice system so that their partner can be taken to court.
0	11	A woman who has been abused by her partner should have the option of dropping the charges against him. Why should she get in trouble for not showing up for court?
0	53	Crown attorneys don't really care what the woman thinks when they make decisions about a domestic violence case.

0	41	If my partner were charged for assaulting me, he would kill me before the court date if I didn't get the charges dropped.
-1	62	If my partner hit me, I would want him prosecuted so that I could tell my story and let people know what did.
-1	26	If a woman is forced to testify against her partner when she doesn't want to, she has no choice but to lie in court.
-1	55	Women who are abused by their partners should not be required to testify because they have been through enough. Testifying causes more stress and fear.
-1	19	Being prosecuted teaches the violent partner that you can't be abusive and get away with it. He'll learn not to do it again.
-1	58	In cases of domestic violence the police provide short-term protection from the immediate threat of abuse.
-1	15	Police officers tell women who have been abused by their partners to think about having their partner arrested and prosecuted.
-1	54	A no-drop prosecution policy makes the woman who has been abused feel powerless. This is because she has no control over whether or not her partner is prosecuted.
-1	3	Crown attorneys listen to women who have been abused by their partners and believe what they have to say. For example, they write down what women say in a careful and accurate manner.
-2	17	Crown attorneys support women who have been abused by their partners.
-2	24	If my partner were arrested or taken to court for hitting me, I would feel guilty and worry about what people would think of me.
-2	61	I want (or wanted) my partner prosecuted in order to get him to do something (for example, to give me a divorce, give me custody of the children, get himself into counseling, stop abusing me, etc.). If he did this, I would want to drop the charges.
-2	22	Knowing I can call the police if my partner hits me gives me a sense of control over the situation.
-2	13	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him prosecuted because involving the criminal justice system is too much of a hassle. It wouldn't be worth the stress. It just wouldn't be good for me.
-2	59	An abused woman is too frightened to ask for arrest, so it is better that that decision is out of her hands.
-2	27	If a woman doesn't want to end the relationship with a partner who has hit her, there is no point in prosecuting him.
-3	60	Women who are abused by their partners aren't in the right state of mind to decide whether or not their partner should be arrested and charged. They are afraid of him, so the law needs to make that decision for them.
-3	56	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want the criminal justice system involved in my case because the system is racist. It is very unfair to Black, Aboriginal, and other minority men.
-3	43	I am (or was) very emotionally attached to my partner and would have (or would have had) a hard time even calling the police on him. Involving the criminal justice system would end the relationship and this is not what I

		want (or wanted).
-3	5	Most men who are charged with abusing their partners are sentenced to receive treatment. I think this is the best kind of sentence.
-3	16	If a man is arrested for abusing his partner he will not hit her again because he will not want to be arrested again.
-3	70	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want the criminal justice system involved because it would leave me without any money.
-4	28	Women who are abused by their partners might as well <u>not</u> go to court. I think it's a waste of time.
-4	45	The police help decrease long-term violence in cases of domestic abuse.
-4	1	I am very satisfied with police response to domestic violence.
-4	33	I am very satisfied with the way Crown attorneys deal with cases of domestic violence.
-4	20	I am very satisfied with the court process and with the way judges deal with domestic violence.
-5	67	After you leave and get away from an abusive partner, there doesn't seem to be any point in having him prosecuted.
-5	64	If the police know that a man has abused his partner, they should calm him down, warn him, and provide advice and contact numbers for both him and his partner. They <u>should not</u> arrest him.
-5	29	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him prosecuted. I wouldn't want him to lose his job or go to jail because what he would need is help, not punishment.
-5	66	If my partner hit me, I would not call the police because I wouldn't want him arrested.

Factor 3

Unit	#	Statement
+5	37	There should be special domestic violence officers and special courts for domestic violence.
+5	30	If a woman wants the violence to end, but does <u>not</u> want the relationship to end, the criminal justice system can't help her.
+5	19	Being prosecuted teaches the violent partner that you can't be abusive and get away with it. He'll learn not to do it again.
+5	5	Most men who are charged with abusing their partners are sentenced to receive treatment. I think this is the best kind of sentence.
+4	36	If my partner hit me, I would want him prosecuted because that is the safest thing for my children. I wouldn't want them to grow up thinking it's ok to hit a woman.
+4	11	A woman who has been abused by her partner should have the option of dropping the charges against him. Why should she get in trouble for not showing up for court?
+4	31	Special domestic violence officers help women stay involved with the criminal justice system so that their partner can be taken to court.
+4	14	When a man hits his partner, the law isn't on the woman's side unless she is very sure she wants him charged and convicted.

+4	24	If my partner were arrested or taken to court for hitting me, I would feel guilty and worry about what people would think of me.
+3	50	If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case to show him that he can't get away with abusing me. This would show him that society takes domestic violence seriously.
+3	23	I don't think police officers believe women who are abused by their partners unless they're really hurt.
+3	27	If a woman doesn't want to end the relationship with a partner who has hit her, there is no point in prosecuting him.
+3	54	A no-drop prosecution policy makes the woman who has been abused feel powerless. This is because she has no control over whether or not her partner is prosecuted.
+3	43	I am (or was) very emotionally attached to my partner and would have (or would have had) a hard time even calling the police on him. Involving the criminal justice system would end the relationship and this is not what I want (or wanted).
+3	8	When the police arrive at a domestic dispute they act as if nothing important has happened. They don't even make an effort to collect all the evidence.
+2	29	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him prosecuted. I wouldn't want him to lose his job or go to jail because what he would need is help, not punishment.
+2	61	I want (or wanted) my partner prosecuted in order to get him to do something (for example, to give me a divorce, give me custody of the children, get himself into counseling, stop abusing me, etc.). If he did this, I would want to drop the charges.
+2	69	Women who are abused by their partners will use the criminal justice system when they finally decide to make a real change in their lives. Sometimes that means getting angry enough to want him arrested.
+2	34	A woman who has been abused by her partner should not drop the charges or fail to show up to testify. If she does the violence will continue.
+2	6	If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case. It would help stop my partner from hurting me and make me feel safer.
+2	58	In cases of domestic violence the police provide short-term protection from the immediate threat of abuse.
+2	22	Knowing I can call the police if my partner hits me gives me a sense of control over the situation.
+1	26	If a woman is forced to testify against her partner when she doesn't want to, she has no choice but to lie in court.
+1	52	Mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence can make things worse for the woman. If she defends herself by hitting him back she might also be arrested.
+1	7	Beating your partner is certainly not a family matter. It's a criminal offence. I think if more people were arrested, prosecuted, and convicted of assaulting their partners, this kind of abuse would be taken more seriously.

+1	57	The criminal justice system makes the woman feel like a victim again. If the system could just give women a little more power, women would have the confidence to get out of violent relationships.
+1	56	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want the criminal justice system involved in my case because the system is racist. It is very unfair to Black, Aboriginal, and other minority men.
+1	2	I support mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence.
+1	15	Police officers tell women who have been abused by their partners to think about having their partner arrested and prosecuted.
+1	38	Police officers are cold. In most cases of domestic violence they don't sympathize or even listen to the woman.
0	35	When an abusive partner is prosecuted the criminal justice system is on the woman's side. Prosecution means that the violence is being treated seriously.
0	55	Women who are abused by their partners should not be required to testify because they have been through enough. Testifying causes more stress and fear.
0	17	Crown attorneys support women who have been abused by their partners.
0	71	I want (or wanted) the criminal justice system involved in my case because they could get my partner into treatment.
0	51	The police are still sexist. They aren't fair to women and instead protect her partner because he is a man.
0	16	If a man is arrested for abusing his partner he will not hit her again because he will not want to be arrested again.
0	42	Women who are abused by their partners are portrayed badly in court. They are seen as jealous, vengeful, unreliable, violent, alcoholic, crazy or worse.
0	47	Crown attorneys help women who have been abused by their partners to stay involved with the case. For example, they tell her that a conviction is possible if she testifies.
0	10	Crown attorneys often reduce charges against men who abuse their partners. It gets to a point where the charges do not reflect the seriousness of the assault.
0	12	Even when an abusive partner is convicted, the sentence does not reflect the seriousness of the assault. Abusive partners rarely receive jail time.
0	32	I would be (or would have been) helped by mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence.
0	3	Crown attorneys listen to women who have been abused by their partners and believe what they have to say. For example, they write down what women say in a careful and accurate manner.
-1	21	I want (or wanted) my partner prosecuted because you get to a point where you say, "enough is enough." You just can't take the abuse any longer.
-1	68	The criminal justice system makes such a big deal about violence against women and then they don't do very much. That upsets me.
-1	63	When responding to domestic disputes police officers often act cocky and macho.

-1	25	Crown attorneys are too busy to do a good job with domestic violence cases. They don't have time to prepare, so they just go from one case to the next without seeming to care about any of the cases.
-1	72	If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case because that is what he deserves. This would punish and straightened him out.
-1	33	I am very satisfied with the way Crown attorneys deal with cases of domestic violence.
-1	46	Arresting a man who has hit his partner stops the violence underway and the woman is safe while he is gone. This is important because it gives her time to make plans such as finding a place to live.
-1	39	There is no point in arresting men who abuse their partners because they are just released again with a slap on the wrist.
-2	44	The criminal justice system doesn't work well enough for women who are abused by their partners. The system is very difficult to understand and the whole process is too slow.
-2	53	Crown attorneys don't really care what the woman thinks when they make decisions about a domestic violence case.
-2	1	I am very satisfied with police response to domestic violence.
-2	40	Crown attorneys are very mean to women who want to drop charges against their partners. It can make the woman feel like a victim of the court system.
-2	70	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want the criminal justice system involved because it would leave me without any money.
-2	64	If the police know that a man has abused his partner, they should calm him down, warn him, and provide advice and contact numbers for both him and his partner. They <u>should not</u> arrest him.
-2	45	The police help decrease long-term violence in cases of domestic abuse.
-3	13	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him prosecuted because involving the criminal justice system is too much of a hassle. It wouldn't be worth the stress. It just wouldn't be good for me.
-3	9	Arresting a man who has abused his partner will make him angrier and he will take his anger out on the woman.
-3	18	I would be (or would have been) helped by no-drop prosecution in cases of domestic violence.
-3	28	Women who are abused by their partners might as well <u>not</u> go to court. I think it's a waste of time.
-3	66	If my partner hit me, I would not call the police because I wouldn't want him arrested.
-3	20	I am very satisfied with the court process and with the way judges deal with domestic violence.
-4	65	My partner would (or would have) come after me if I put him in jail for hitting me. I'd be scared to find out what he would do once he was free.
-4	41	If my partner were charged for assaulting me, he would kill me before the court date if I didn't get the charges dropped.
-4	60	Women who are abused by their partners aren't in the right state of mind to

		decide whether or not their partner should be arrested and charged. They are afraid of him, so the law needs to make that decision for them.
-4	48	Continuing with prosecution in cases of domestic violence stops the man from getting away with the abuse. He committed a crime and he deserves to be punished.
-4	62	If my partner hit me, I would want him prosecuted so that I could tell my story and let people know what did.
-5	67	After you leave and get away from an abusive partner, there doesn't seem to be any point in having him prosecuted.
-5	4	I support no-drop prosecution in cases of domestic violence.
-5	59	An abused woman is too frightened to ask for arrest, so it is better that that decision is out of her hands.
-5	49	A no-drop prosecution policy is helpful because a woman can't change her mind about having her partner prosecuted for hitting her.

Factor 4

Unit	#	Statement
+5	24	If my partner were arrested or taken to court for hitting me, I would feel guilty and worry about what people would think of me.
+5	37	There should be special domestic violence officers and special courts for domestic violence.
+5	23	I don't think police officers believe women who are abused by their partners unless they're really hurt.
+5	9	Arresting a man who has abused his partner will make him angrier and he will take his anger out on the woman.
+4	13	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him prosecuted because involving the criminal justice system is too much of a hassle. It wouldn't be worth the stress. It just wouldn't be good for me.
+4	52	Mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence can make things worse for the woman. If she defends herself by hitting him back she might also be arrested.
+4	69	Women who are abused by their partners will use the criminal justice system when they finally decide to make a real change in their lives. Sometimes that means getting angry enough to want him arrested.
+4	29	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him prosecuted. I wouldn't want him to lose his job or go to jail because what he would need is help, not punishment.
+4	43	I am (or was) very emotionally attached to my partner and would have (or would have had) a hard time even calling the police on him. Involving the criminal justice system would end the relationship and this is not what I want (or wanted).
+3	59	An abused woman is too frightened to ask for arrest, so it is better that that decision is out of her hands.
+3	26	If a woman is forced to testify against her partner when she doesn't want to, she has no choice but to lie in court.
+3	39	There is no point in arresting men who abuse their partners because they

		are just released again with a slap on the wrist.
+3	63	When responding to domestic disputes police officers often act cocky and macho.
+3	57	The criminal justice system makes the woman feel like a victim again. If the system could just give women a little more power, women would have the confidence to get out of violent relationships.
+3	8	When the police arrive at a domestic dispute they act as if nothing important has happened. They don't even make an effort to collect all the evidence.
+2	22	Knowing I can call the police if my partner hits me gives me a sense of control over the situation.
+2	46	Arresting a man who has hit his partner stops the violence underway and the woman is safe while he is gone. This is important because it gives her time to make plans such as finding a place to live.
+2	67	After you leave and get away from an abusive partner, there doesn't seem to be any point in having him prosecuted.
+2	58	In cases of domestic violence the police provide short-term protection from the immediate threat of abuse.
+2	65	My partner would (or would have) come after me if I put him in jail for hitting me. I'd be scared to find out what he would do once he was free.
+2	60	Women who are abused by their partners aren't in the right state of mind to decide whether or not their partner should be arrested and charged. They are afraid of him, so the law needs to make that decision for them.
+2	27	If a woman doesn't want to end the relationship with a partner who has hit her, there is no point in prosecuting him.
+1	2	I support mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence.
+1	25	Crown attorneys are too busy to do a good job with domestic violence cases. They don't have time to prepare, so they just go from one case to the next without seeming to care about any of the cases.
+1	14	When a man hits his partner, the law isn't on the woman's side unless she is very sure she wants him charged and convicted.
+1	30	If a woman wants the violence to end, but does <u>not</u> want the relationship to end, the criminal justice system can't help her.
+1	47	Crown attorneys help women who have been abused by their partners to stay involved with the case. For example, they tell her that a conviction is possible if she testifies.
+1	32	I would be (or would have been) helped by mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence.
+1	10	Crown attorneys often reduce charges against men who abuse their partners. It gets to a point where the charges do not reflect the seriousness of the assault.
+1	61	I want (or wanted) my partner prosecuted in order to get him to do something (for example, to give me a divorce, give me custody of the children, get himself into counseling, stop abusing me, etc.). If he did this, I would want to drop the charges.
0	12	Even when an abusive partner is convicted, the sentence does not reflect

		the seriousness of the assault. Abusive partners rarely receive jail time.
0	54	A no-drop prosecution policy makes the woman who has been abused feel powerless. This is because she has no control over whether or not her partner is prosecuted.
0	56	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want the criminal justice system involved in my case because the system is racist. It is very unfair to Black, Aboriginal, and other minority men.
0	11	A woman who has been abused by her partner should have the option of dropping the charges against him. Why should she get in trouble for not showing up for court?
0	40	Crown attorneys are very mean to women who want to drop charges against their partners. It can make the woman feel like a victim of the court system.
0	33	I am very satisfied with the way Crown attorneys deal with cases of domestic violence.
0	50	If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case to show him that he can't get away with abusing me. This would show him that society takes domestic violence seriously.
0	44	The criminal justice system doesn't work well enough for women who are abused by their partners. The system is very difficult to understand and the whole process is too slow.
0	55	Women who are abused by their partners should not be required to testify because they have been through enough. Testifying causes more stress and fear.
0	68	The criminal justice system makes such a big deal about violence against women and then they don't do very much. That upsets me.
0	7	Beating your partner is certainly not a family matter. It's a criminal offence. I think if more people were arrested, prosecuted, and convicted of assaulting their partners, this kind of abuse would be taken more seriously.
0	42	Women who are abused by their partners are portrayed badly in court. They are seen as jealous, vengeful, unreliable, violent, alcoholic, crazy or worse.
-1	64	If the police know that a man has abused his partner, they should calm him down, warn him, and provide advice and contact numbers for both him and his partner. They <u>should not</u> arrest him.
-1	31	Special domestic violence officers help women stay involved with the criminal justice system so that their partner can be taken to court.
-1	5	Most men who are charged with abusing their partners are sentenced to receive treatment. I think this is the best kind of sentence.
-1	3	Crown attorneys listen to women who have been abused by their partners and believe what they have to say. For example, they write down what women say in a careful and accurate manner.
-1	71	I want (or wanted) the criminal justice system involved in my case because they could get my partner into treatment.
-1	53	Crown attorneys don't really care what the woman thinks when they make decisions about a domestic violence case.

-1	51	The police are still sexist. They aren't fair to women and instead protect her partner because he is a man.
-1	38	Police officers are cold. In most cases of domestic violence they don't sympathize or even listen to the woman.
-2	6	If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case. It would help stop my partner from hurting me and make me feel safer.
-2	66	If my partner hit me, I would not call the police because I wouldn't want him arrested.
-2	15	Police officers tell women who have been abused by their partners to think about having their partner arrested and prosecuted.
-2	17	Crown attorneys support women who have been abused by their partners.
-2	28	Women who are abused by their partners might as well <u>not</u> go to court. I think it's a waste of time.
-2	21	I want (or wanted) my partner prosecuted because you get to a point where you say, "enough is enough." You just can't take the abuse any longer.f
-2	34	A woman who has been abused by her partner should not drop the charges or fail to show up to testify. If she does the violence will continue.
-3	36	If my partner hit me, I would want him prosecuted because that is the safest thing for my children. I wouldn't want them to grow up thinking it's ok to hit a woman.
-3	49	A no-drop prosecution policy is helpful because a woman can't change her mind about having her partner prosecuted for hitting her.
-3	72	If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case because that is what he deserves. This would punish and straightened him out.
-3	45	The police help decrease long-term violence in cases of domestic abuse.
-3	4	I support no-drop prosecution in cases of domestic violence.
-3	41	If my partner were charged for assaulting me, he would kill me before the court date if I didn't get the charges dropped.
-4	48	Continuing with prosecution in cases of domestic violence stops the man from getting away with the abuse. He committed a crime and he deserves to be punished.
-4	20	I am very satisfied with the court process and with the way judges deal with domestic violence.
-4	18	I would be (or would have been) helped by no-drop prosecution in cases of domestic violence.
-4	1	I am very satisfied with police response to domestic violence.
-4	70	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want the criminal justice system involved because it would leave me without any money.
-5	35	When an abusive partner is prosecuted the criminal justice system is on the woman's side. Prosecution means that the violence is being treated seriously.
-5	19	Being prosecuted teaches the violent partner that you can't be abusive and get away with it. He'll learn not to do it again.
-5	62	If my partner hit me, I would want him prosecuted so that I could tell my

		story and let people know what did.
-5	16	If a man is arrested for abusing his partner he will not hit her again because he will not want to be arrested again.

Factor 5

Unit	#	Statement
+5	48	Continuing with prosecution in cases of domestic violence stops the man from getting away with the abuse. He committed a crime and he deserves to be punished.
+5	71	I want (or wanted) the criminal justice system involved in my case because they could get my partner into treatment.
+5	5	Most men who are charged with abusing their partners are sentenced to receive treatment. I think this is the best kind of sentence.
+5	55	Women who are abused by their partners should not be required to testify because they have been through enough. Testifying causes more stress and fear.
+4	68	The criminal justice system makes such a big deal about violence against women and then they don't do very much. That upsets me.
+4	42	Women who are abused by their partners are portrayed badly in court. They are seen as jealous, vengeful, unreliable, violent, alcoholic, crazy or worse.
+4	36	If my partner hit me, I would want him prosecuted because that is the safest thing for my children. I wouldn't want them to grow up thinking it's ok to hit a woman.
+4	46	Arresting a man who has hit his partner stops the violence underway and the woman is safe while he is gone. This is important because it gives her time to make plans such as finding a place to live.
+4	60	Women who are abused by their partners aren't in the right state of mind to decide whether or not their partner should be arrested and charged. They are afraid of him, so the law needs to make that decision for them.
+3	2	I support mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence.
+3	7	Beating your partner is certainly not a family matter. It's a criminal offence. I think if more people were arrested, prosecuted, and convicted of assaulting their partners, this kind of abuse would be taken more seriously.
+3	18	I would be (or would have been) helped by no-drop prosecution in cases of domestic violence.
+3	16	If a man is arrested for abusing his partner he will not hit her again because he will not want to be arrested again.
+3	37	There should be special domestic violence officers and special courts for domestic violence.
+3	14	When a man hits his partner, the law isn't on the woman's side unless she is very sure she wants him charged and convicted.
+2	19	Being prosecuted teaches the violent partner that you can't be abusive and get away with it. He'll learn not to do it again.
+2	59	An abused woman is too frightened to ask for arrest, so it is better that that decision is out of her hands.

+2	22	Knowing I can call the police if my partner hits me gives me a sense of control over the situation.
+2	4	I support no-drop prosecution in cases of domestic violence.
+2	72	If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case because that is what he deserves. This would punish and straightened him out.
+2	23	I don't think police officers believe women who are abused by their partners unless they're really hurt.
+2	21	I want (or wanted) my partner prosecuted because you get to a point where you say, "enough is enough." You just can't take the abuse any longer.
+1	32	I would be (or would have been) helped by mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence.
+1	45	The police help decrease long-term violence in cases of domestic abuse.
+1	35	When an abusive partner is prosecuted the criminal justice system is on the woman's side. Prosecution means that the violence is being treated seriously.
+1	58	In cases of domestic violence the police provide short-term protection from the immediate threat of abuse.
+1	44	The criminal justice system doesn't work well enough for women who are abused by their partners. The system is very difficult to understand and the whole process is too slow.
+1	31	Special domestic violence officers help women stay involved with the criminal justice system so that their partner can be taken to court.
+1	49	A no-drop prosecution policy is helpful because a woman can't change her mind about having her partner prosecuted for hitting her.
+1	34	A woman who has been abused by her partner should not drop the charges or fail to show up to testify. If she does the violence will continue.
0	24	If my partner were arrested or taken to court for hitting me, I would feel guilty and worry about what people would think of me.
0	69	Women who are abused by their partners will use the criminal justice system when they finally decide to make a real change in their lives. Sometimes that means getting angry enough to want him arrested.
0	10	Crown attorneys often reduce charges against men who abuse their partners. It gets to a point where the charges do not reflect the seriousness of the assault.
0	38	Police officers are cold. In most cases of domestic violence they don't sympathize or even listen to the woman.
0	50	If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case to show him that he can't get away with abusing me. This would show him that society takes domestic violence seriously.
0	26	If a woman is forced to testify against her partner when she doesn't want to, she has no choice but to lie in court.
0	6	If my partner hit me, I would want the criminal justice system involved in my case. It would help stop my partner from hurting me and make me feel safer.
0	43	I am (or was) very emotionally attached to my partner and would have (or

		would have had) a hard time even calling the police on him. Involving the criminal justice system would end the relationship and this is not what I want (or wanted).
0	40	Crown attorneys are very mean to women who want to drop charges against their partners. It can make the woman feel like a victim of the court system.
0	8	When the police arrive at a domestic dispute they act as if nothing important has happened. They don't even make an effort to collect all the evidence.
0	28	Women who are abused by their partners might as well <u>not</u> go to court. I think it's a waste of time.
0	29	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him prosecuted. I wouldn't want him to lose his job or go to jail because what he would need is help, not punishment.
-1	61	I want (or wanted) my partner prosecuted in order to get him to do something (for example, to give me a divorce, give me custody of the children, get himself into counseling, stop abusing me, etc.). If he did this, I would want to drop the charges.
-1	12	Even when an abusive partner is convicted, the sentence does not reflect the seriousness of the assault. Abusive partners rarely receive jail time.
-1	15	Police officers tell women who have been abused by their partners to think about having their partner arrested and prosecuted.
-1	9	Arresting a man who has abused his partner will make him angrier and he will take his anger out on the woman.
-1	25	Crown attorneys are too busy to do a good job with domestic violence cases. They don't have time to prepare, so they just go from one case to the next without seeming to care about any of the cases.
-1	51	The police are still sexist. They aren't fair to women and instead protect her partner because he is a man.
-1	65	My partner would (or would have) come after me if I put him in jail for hitting me. I'd be scared to find out what he would do once he was free.
-1	56	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want the criminal justice system involved in my case because the system is racist. It is very unfair to Black, Aboriginal, and other minority men.
-2	41	If my partner were charged for assaulting me, he would kill me before the court date if I didn't get the charges dropped.
-2	53	Crown attorneys don't really care what the woman thinks when they make decisions about a domestic violence case.
-2	13	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him prosecuted because involving the criminal justice system is too much of a hassle. It wouldn't be worth the stress. It just wouldn't be good for me.
-2	57	The criminal justice system makes the woman feel like a victim again. If the system could just give women a little more power, women would have the confidence to get out of violent relationships.
-2	11	A woman who has been abused by her partner should have the option of dropping the charges against him. Why should she get in trouble for not

		showing up for court?
-2	64	If the police know that a man has abused his partner, they should calm him down, warn him, and provide advice and contact numbers for both him and his partner. They <u>should not</u> arrest him.
-2	47	Crown attorneys help women who have been abused by their partners to stay involved with the case. For example, they tell her that a conviction is possible if she testifies.
-3	39	There is no point in arresting men who abuse their partners because they are just released again with a slap on the wrist.
-3	63	When responding to domestic disputes police officers often act cocky and macho.
-3	30	If a woman wants the violence to end, but does <u>not</u> want the relationship to end, the criminal justice system can't help her.
-3	1	I am very satisfied with police response to domestic violence.
-3	3	Crown attorneys listen to women who have been abused by their partners and believe what they have to say. For example, they write down what women say in a careful and accurate manner.
-3	54	A no-drop prosecution policy makes the woman who has been abused feel powerless. This is because she has no control over whether or not her partner is prosecuted.
-4	62	If my partner hit me, I would want him prosecuted so that I could tell my story and let people know what did.
-4	17	Crown attorneys support women who have been abused by their partners.
-4	70	If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want the criminal justice system involved because it would leave me without any money.
-4	27	If a woman doesn't want to end the relationship with a partner who has hit her, there is no point in prosecuting him.
-4	66	If my partner hit me, I would not call the police because I wouldn't want him arrested.
-5	33	I am very satisfied with the way Crown attorneys deal with cases of domestic violence.
-5	20	I am very satisfied with the court process and with the way judges deal with domestic violence.
-5	52	Mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence can make things worse for the woman. If she defends herself by hitting him back she might also be arrested.
-5	67	After you leave and get away from an abusive partner, there doesn't seem to be any point in having him prosecuted.

Appendix R: Standard Errors

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
SE of Normalized Factor Scores	0.186	0.218	0.277	0.243	0.277

SEs For Differences in Normalized Factor Scores	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
Factor 1	0.263	0.287	0.334	0.305	0.334
Factor 2	0.287	0.309	0.353	0.326	0.353
Factor 3	0.334	0.353	0.392	0.368	0.392
Factor 4	0.305	0.326	0.368	0.343	0.368
Factor 5	0.334	0.353	0.392	0.368	0.392

Appendix S: Statements that Significantly Differentiate Between Factors

Factor 1 (p < .01)	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(17) Crown attorneys support women who have been abused by their partners.	5	-2	0	-2	-4
(3) Crown attorneys listen to women who have been abused by their partners and believe what they have to say. For example, they write down what women say in a careful and accurate manner.	4	-1	0	-1	-3
(20) I am very satisfied with the court process and with the way judges deal with domestic violence.	3	-4	-3	-4	-5
(1) I am very satisfied with police response to domestic violence.	1	-4	-2	-4	-3
(14) When a man hits his partner, the law isn't on the woman's side unless she is very sure she wants him charged and convicted.	-1	4	4	1	3
(10) Crown attorneys often reduce charges against men who abuse their partners. It gets to a point where the charges do not reflect the seriousness of the assault.	-2	3	0	1	0
(23) I don't think police officers believe women who are abused by their partners unless they're really hurt.	-3	5	3	5	2
(8) When the police arrive at a domestic dispute they act as if nothing important has happened. They don't even make an effort to collect all the evidence.	-4	3	3	3	0
(26) If a woman is forced to testify against her partner when she doesn't want to, she has no choice but to lie in court.	-4	-1	1	3	0
(51) The police are still sexist. They aren't fair to women and instead protect her partner because he is a man.	-4	2	0	-1	-1
(39) There is no point in arresting men who abuse their partners because they are just released again with a slap on the wrist.	-5	0	-2	3	-3
Factor 1 (p < .05)	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(5) Most men who are charged with abusing their partners are sentenced to receive treatment. I think this is the best kind of sentence.	1	-3	5	-1	5
(52) Mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence can make things worse for the woman. If she defends herself by hitting him back she might also be arrested.	-1	3	1	4	-5
(42) Women who are abused by their partners are portrayed badly in court. They are seen as jealous, vengeful, unreliable, violent, alcoholic, crazy or worse.	-2	3	0	0	4

(25) Crown attorneys are too busy to do a good job with domestic violence cases. They don't have time to prepare, so they just go from one case to the next without seeming to care about any of the cases.	-3	1	-1	1	-1
(38) Police officers are cold. In most cases of domestic violence they don't sympathize or even listen to the woman.	-3	1	1	-1	0
(11) A woman who has been abused by her partner should have the option of dropping the charges against him. Why should she get in trouble for not showing up for court?	-4	0	4	0	-2
(13) If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him prosecuted because involving the criminal justice system is too much of a hassle. It wouldn't be worth the stress. It just wouldn't be good for me.	-5	-2	-3	4	-2

Factor 2 (p < .01)	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(12) Even when an abusive partner is convicted, the sentence does not reflect the seriousness of the assault. Abusive partners rarely receive jail time.	-1	5	0	0	-1
(44) The criminal justice system doesn't work well enough for women who are abused by their partners. The system is very difficult to understand and the whole process is too slow.	0	4	-2	0	1
(22) Knowing I can call the police if my partner hits me gives me a sense of control over the situation.	2	-2	2	2	2
(59) An abused woman is too frightened to ask for arrest, so it is better that that decision is out of her hands.	1	-2	-5	3	2
(43) I am (or was) very emotionally attached to my partner and would have (or would have had) a hard time even calling the police on him. Involving the criminal justice system would end the relationship and this is not what I want (or wanted).	0	-3	3	4	0
(5) Most men who are charged with abusing their partners are sentenced to receive treatment. I think this is the best kind of sentence.	1	-3	5	-1	5
Factor 2 (p < .05)	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(58) In cases of domestic violence the police provide short-term protection from the immediate threat of abuse.	1	-1	2	2	1
(56) If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want the criminal justice system involved in my case because the system is racist. It is very unfair to Black, Aboriginal, and other minority men.	0	-3	1	0	-1

Factor 3 (p < .01)	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(30) If a woman wants the violence to end, but does not want the relationship to end, the criminal justice system can't help her.	0	0	5	1	-3
(11) A woman who has been abused by her partner should have the option of dropping the charges against him. Why should she get in trouble for not showing up for court?	-4	0	4	0	-2
(46) Arresting a man who has hit his partner stops the violence underway and the woman is safe while he is gone. This is important because it gives her time to make plans such as finding a place to live.	2	1	-1	2	4
(59) An abused woman is too frightened to ask for arrest, so it is better that that decision is out of her hands.	1	-2	-5	3	2
(49) A no-drop prosecution policy is helpful because a woman can't change her mind about having her partner prosecuted for hitting her.	3	0	-5	-3	1
Factor 3 (p < .05)	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(37) There should be special domestic violence officers and special courts for domestic violence.	5	5	5	5	3
(24) If my partner were arrested or taken to court for hitting me, I would feel guilty and worry about what people would think of me.	-1	-2	4	5	0
(17) Crown attorneys support women who have been abused by their partners.	5	-2	0	-2	-4
(16) If a man is arrested for abusing his partner he will not hit her again because he will not want to be arrested again.	-5	-3	0	-5	3
(65) My partner would (or would have) come after me if I put him in jail for hitting me. I'd be scared to find out what he would do once he was free.	1	0	-4	2	-1

Factor 4 (p < .01)	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(24) If my partner were arrested or taken to court for hitting me, I would feel guilty and worry about what people would think of me.	-1	-2	4	5	0
(13) If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him prosecuted because involving the criminal justice system is too much of a hassle. It wouldn't be worth the stress. It just wouldn't be good for me.	-5	-2	-3	4	-2
(67) After you leave and get away from an abusive partner, there doesn't seem to be any point in having him prosecuted.	-3	-5	-5	2	-5
(5) Most men who are charged with abusing their partners are sentenced to receive treatment. I think	1	-3	5	-1	5

this is the best kind of sentence.					
(34) A woman who has been abused by her partner should not drop the charges or fail to show up to testify. If she does the violence will continue.	1	2	2	-2	1
(36) If my partner hit me, I would want him prosecuted because that is the safest thing for my children. I wouldn't want them to grow up thinking it's ok to hit a woman.	4	2	4	-3	4
(49) A no-drop prosecution policy is helpful because a woman can't change her mind about having her partner prosecuted for hitting her.	3	0	-5	-3	1
(35) When an abusive partner is prosecuted the criminal justice system is on the woman's side. Prosecution means that the violence is being treated seriously.	3	0	0	-5	1
(19) Being prosecuted teaches the violent partner that you can't be abusive and get away with it. He'll learn not to do it again.	0	-1	5	-5	2
(16) If a man is arrested for abusing his partner he will not hit her again because he will not want to be arrested again.	-5	-3	0	-5	3
Factor 4 (p < .05)	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(39) There is no point in arresting men who abuse their partners because they are just released again with a slap on the wrist.	-5	0	-2	3	-3

Factor 5 (p < .01)	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(48) Continuing with prosecution in cases of domestic violence stops the man from getting away with the abuse. He committed a crime and he deserves to be punished.	2	2	-4	-4	5
(71) I want (or wanted) the criminal justice system involved in my case because they could get my partner into treatment.	0	1	0	-1	5
(55) Women who are abused by their partners should not be required to testify because they have been through enough. Testifying causes more stress and fear.	-1	-1	0	0	5
(29) If my partner hit me, I wouldn't want him prosecuted. I wouldn't want him to lose his job or go to jail because what he would need is help, not punishment.	-3	-5	2	4	0
(30) If a woman wants the violence to end, but does not want the relationship to end, the criminal justice system can't help her.	0	0	5	1	-3
(52) Mandatory arrest in cases of domestic violence	-1	3	1	4	-5

can make things worse for the woman. If she defends herself by hitting him back she might also be arrested.					
Factor 5 (p < .05)	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
(16) If a man is arrested for abusing his partner he will not hit her again because he will not want to be arrested again.	-5	-3	0	-5	3
(8) When the police arrive at a domestic dispute they act as if nothing important has happened. They don't even make an effort to collect all the evidence.	-4	3	3	3	0
(28) Women who are abused by their partners might as well <u>not</u> go to court. I think it's a waste of time.	-5	-4	-3	-2	0
(57) The criminal justice system makes the woman feel like a victim again. If the system could just give women a little more power, women would have the confidence to get out of violent relationships.	1	4	1	3	-2
(47) Crown attorneys help women who have been abused by their partners to stay involved with the case. For example, they tell her that a conviction is possible if she testifies.	0	0	0	1	-2
(3) Crown attorneys listen to women who have been abused by their partners and believe what they have to say. For example, they write down what women say in a careful and accurate manner.	4	-1	0	-1	-3

Vita Auctoris

NAME: Paula Barata

PLACE OF BIRTH: Rueil Malmaison, France

YEAR OF BIRTH: 1972

EDUCATION: Killarney High School, Vancouver, BC
1985-1990

University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC
1990-1994 B.A. Honours

University of Windsor, Windsor, ON
1996-2004 M.A. and Ph.D.