

August 2003

Battered Women Whose Cases Have Gone Through the System: The Role of Social Support

Heather Melton
University of Utah

Joanne Belknap
University of Colorado

Cris Sullivan
Michigan State University

Ruth Fleury-Steiner
University of Delaware

Amy Leisenring
University of Colorado

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/sociology_pub



Part of the [Domestic and Intimate Partner Violence Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Heather Melton, Joanne Belknap, Cris Sullivan, Ruth Fleury-Steiner, and Amy Leisenring. "Battered Women Whose Cases Have Gone Through the System: The Role of Social Support" *American Sociological Association Annual Meeting* (2003).

This Presentation is brought to you for free and open access by the Sociology and Interdisciplinary Social Sciences at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications, Sociology by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

**Battered Women Whose Cases Have Gone Through the System:
The Role of Social Support**

By

**Heather C. Melton
Joanne Belknap
Cris M. Sullivan
Ruth Fleury Steiner
Amy Leisenring**

Abstract

This paper explores the role of social support in the lives of battered women whose cases have gone through the criminal justice system. Using longitudinal data collected from almost 200 battered women whose cases went through the criminal justice system in three jurisdictions in the United States, explored are the types of support they received, variations in who receives support, differences between informal support and formal support, and the implications of social support in terms of violence and victims use of the criminal justice system.

Crucial to domestic violence victims' experiences (i.e. experiences with violence, with the criminal justice system, and so on) is their level of social support. One tactic of control used by many abusers is to socially isolate their victims (El-Bassel, 2001; Mitchell and Hodson, 1983; Stets, 1991). This isolation may impact various aspects of domestic violence victims' lives. Social support, defined as the "belief that one is cared for, loved, esteemed, and valued by others in a network of common and mutual obligation" may act as a buffer against the stress created by a domestic violence situation, may facilitate a victim's ability to leave an abusive situation, and may enable victims to be more active in the prosecution of their abuser (El-Bassel, 2000: 247; Goodman and Dutton, 1999).

Research on Social Support and Domestic Violence

Prior research focuses on several areas regarding social support and domestic violence. The majority of the research has concentrated on the relationship between the social support domestic violence victims receive and their psychological health. Studies have found that battered women with less social support report more depression (Campbell, Sullivan, and Davidson, 1995; El-Bassel, 2001; Tan, Basta, Sullivan, and Davidson, 1995; Mitchell and Hodson, 1983). In a study of domestic violence victims who utilized a shelter, Campbell and colleagues (1995) reported that the level of social support ten weeks after victims left the shelter predicted depression at 6 months later: those with less social support were more likely to report depression. Examining positive psychological well-being, Tan and colleagues (1995) found that satisfaction with the social support received was highly correlated to victim's overall well-being: women with more close friends also reported being more pleased with their lives (Tan et al., 1995). Conversely, victims with few close friends reported being less satisfied with their lives (Tan et al., 1995). Other studies have concluded that social support is related to feelings of self-blame in domestic violence victims (Barnett and Martinez, 1996). Barnett and Martinez (1996) reported that the higher the amount of social support reported by their participants, the lower the extent of self-blame expressed by participants. Among other effects, psychological well-being may impact a victim's ability to leave an abusive situation. Clearly, social support is an important component in the psychological well-being of domestic violence victims, which in turn may have other effects on her life.

Additionally, research on domestic violence and social support has focused the distribution of social support or who is most likely to receive social support. Some research has found that younger women receive less social support than older women, especially from friends (Barnett and Martinez, 1996). However, Tan and colleagues (1995) reported that younger women were more likely to report being satisfied with the level of social support they received. Examining the level of violence experienced by women and social support received, the more violence they experienced, the less social support they received (Mitchell and Hodges, 1983; Tan et al., 1995). This may be because victims experiencing more severe violence are less likely to want to disclose it to friends and family (Dunham and Senn, 2000). Much more research on this is needed specifically addressing domestic violence victims.

Other researchers have examined the different types of social support for domestic violence victims. Most research has found that domestic violence victims report receiving the most social support from their family and friends, with their family being the number one source for most victims (El-Bassel, 2001; Tan et al., 1996). Researchers have explored the differences between the sources of social support—family versus nonfamilial. El-Bassel (2001) found that in a population of domestic violence victims with drug problems, most women reported strained relationships with their family. Moreover, she found that victims reported that their families offered extremes in social support—either leave the abusive partner or stay and work it out. Most women expressed dissatisfaction with the amount of support they received from their families, however, their abusive partners were less successful at isolating them from their families than they were from their friends (the victims in the study were more likely to maintain contact with their families and were less likely to do so with their friends) (El-Bassel, 2001). Most women reported that they were unlikely to talk to their friends about the abuse (El-Bassel, 2001). Other studies have confirmed that many women either minimize the violence they experience or fail to fully disclose it (Dunham and Senn, 2000).

One potential impact of social support received by domestic violence victims relates to the criminal justice system. Logically, one could argue that victims who are not supported may be less likely to utilize the criminal justice system. Goodman and Dutton (1999) examine the relationship between the amount and type of social support received and the criminal justice system. Specifically, they are interested in how social support impacts a victim's cooperation in the prosecution of her abuser (Goodman and

Dutton, 1999). Goodman and Dutton (1999) discuss three types of social support as being important to domestic violence victims and their experiences: emotional, tangible or material, and institutional. They found that only tangible support is related to a victim's cooperation with the system: victims who reported a high level of availability of people to help with a range of practical issues were about twice as likely to cooperate with the system than victims who had low tangible support (Goodman and Dutton, 1999). They reported that emotional support and institutional support were not significantly related to whether or not a victim will cooperate.

Finally, other studies on domestic violence and social support have focused on the social support of the abusers. One study comparing abusive men involved in court and those not involved in courts found that those not involved in court were more likely to have high social support (Barrera, Palmer, Brown, and Kalaher, 1994). Abusers level of social support may be related to the likelihood of victims turning to the criminal justice system. Another study of African-American abusive men found that although social support was not specifically related to abuse, feeling a sense of belonging was. Thus, social support may have an indirect effect of the likelihood of abuse occurring (e.g., the greater the sense of belonging, the more social support one has, the less abuse perpetrated) (Rankin, Saunders, and Williams, 2000). Finally, in a study examining the impacts of natural disasters on domestic violence, Clemens and Hietala (1999) report that social support for potential abusers may act as a buffer against abuse: men who may be likely to be abusive after experiencing the stress of the disaster of a flood, may be buffered by their social support. Reviewing the literature on social support and abusers, DeKeserday (1988) provides further support for the buffer effect of social support (e.g. the more positive social support abusers receive, the less likely they are to abuse).

Clearly, social support is an important component in domestic violence situations. Social support or, more specifically, lack of social support may lead to a decrease in psychological well-being among domestic violence victims. Social support may play a key role in the ability of domestic violence victims to leave their abusers. Social support may play a part in domestic violence victims' experiences with the criminal justice system. Lastly, social support of the abusers may be important to the act of abuse itself. All of the research implicates that social support must be a component in the prevention, intervention, and treatment of domestic violence. Moreover, more research is needed exploring social support and domestic

violence. Although much research exists on the distribution of social support in the general literature, greater examination of this is needed specifically for domestic violence (i.e. which victims are most likely to have social support). This may have important implications for intervention/prevention of domestic violence. More research is needed on the types of social support and the differences between those types of social support. More research is needed on domestic violence victims satisfaction with the social support they receive. Finally, also very important is to add to the little research that explores the impact of social support and victims' utilization of the criminal justice system. This has important implications for how we respond to domestic violence and thus must be explored in more detail. In sum, social support plays a key role in the lives of domestic violence victims. It is of critical import that we continue to examine this important relationship.

This paper focuses on the role social support plays in the lives of domestic violence victims whose cases against their perpetrators have entered the criminal justice system. The following research questions were addressed: 1) types of social support that this group of domestic violence victims have and how this varies; 2) differences between informal social support (i.e. family, friends, and so on) versus institutional support (i.e. police, doctors, lawyers, shelters, and so on); 3) and the implications of the social support received by the domestic violence victims (i.e. how this effects their revictimization, their use of the system, their cooperation with the system and so on).

Method

The data for the study were collected through intensive and longitudinal interviews with female victims of domestic violence whose cases had at least entered the criminal justice system (i.e. the abuser was arrested) in one of three jurisdictions in the United States¹. The respondents were recruited from the District Attorney's offices in the three jurisdictions. After their case closed, they were mailed a flyer briefly describing the research with a phone number to call for more information, as well as a stamped return postcard. Cases were closed for a number of reasons. The case may have been closed because the charges were dismissed, the defendant may have reached a plea bargain, or the case may have gone to trial. Only

¹ The study was funded by a National Institute of Justice grant (#98-WT-VX-0024) entitled, "A Longitudinal Study of Battered Women in the System: The Victims' and Decision Makers' Perceptions

women who contacted the project by either calling or returning the card were included in the study².

Women were interviewed right after their case closed, six months later, and one year later. The time frames covered in each interview are as follows: at interview one, six months before the arrest; at interview two, the six months between the case closing and the second interview; and at interview three, the six months between the second and third interview. They were paid forty dollars for the first interview and fifty dollars for each of the two subsequent interviews. The final sample included 178 women at Time 1 (right after the case closed), 160 at time 2 (six months later) and 148 at Time 3 (1 year later).

Measures

Dependent

Social support is used as both a dependent variable and an independent variable in this paper. At the first interview, a series of questions were asked about who knew about the violence and how supportive that person was. In terms of support, respondents could answer from a range of very unsupportive (0) to very supportive (4). For the analysis, a scale was created by, by collapsing the neutral and unsupportive answers together and collapsing the two degrees of supportiveness answers into two categories for each person who knew. Then, this was summed up and a degree of social support scale was created (i.e. the higher the number, the more social support a respondent received).

In addition, in order to test for the differences between informal and institutional social support, two sub-scales were created. First, a sub-scale sum of informal social support was created including the sums of supportiveness for relatives, friends, neighbors, and co-workers. Second, a sub-scale sum of institutional support was created including the sums of supportiveness for doctors, religious leaders, the police, victim assistance, shelters, victim advocates, prosecuting attorney, other attorney or legal advisor, and/or a therapist or counselor.

Using a modified Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979), respondents were asked about whether they experienced a variety of physical abuses. The responses ranged from never (0) to everyday (7). If the

² Due to the fact that personnel from the D.A.'s and prosecutor's offices controlled the mailing of the flyers, the overall response rate is unknown (i.e. they did not keep track of how many flyers they handed or sent out).

respondent experienced any one of the physical abuses at least once during the time frames covered at interview 2 or 3, they were considered to have been revictimized.

The criminal justice variables were measured in a variety of ways. Use of the criminal justice system was operationalized by the lowest level of use—whether or not the respondents called or asked someone to call the police relating to her experiences with domestic violence (including stalking behaviors). Although all the defendants in the study were arrested at Time 1 and thus logically the police had to be called, in some cases others (i.e. friends, neighbors, family members, and so on) could have called the police without the victim's permission. If this was the case, the respondent was not defined as using the system. Only if she called herself or asked or told someone to call for her was she defined as using the system. She was asked this question about calling the police for domestic violence and she was asked how many times she called the police or asked or told someone else to call the police because of the domestic violence or stalking she was experiencing. For the univariate analysis, presented is whether or not she used the system herself (yes, she called the police or asked someone to call the police) or whether she did not (no, someone else called the police without the victim's permission). For the multivariate analysis, the number of times she called the police or asked someone else to call the police was used. Due to the skewness of the variable, use of the system was logged for analysis.

The respondents' cooperation with the system is measured. There are a variety of different ways in which a victim could have cooperated with the prosecution of the offender. Cooperation was defined as any action taken by the victim that could be construed by the offender as helping the prosecution. Thus, this could be as simple as talking with the prosecutor to actually testifying against the offender or going to court. This variable was measured by responses to the following questions:

Did you ever talk to the prosecuting attorney before the case went to court?

Did you go to court (controlling for whether or not there was a court case)?

Did you testify in court (controlling for whether or not she went to court and whether or not she testified for the assailant)?

For each question, the respondent could answer yes (1) or no (0).

Independent

A variety of demographic variables were measured, including race, age, income, and relationship with the abuser. Race and relationship with the abuser were recoded into dichotomous variables (for race, white is

(0) and nonwhite is (1) and for relationship, no relationship with the abuser is (0) and some form of intimate relationship with the abuser is (1).

Similar to the measure for revictimization, for severity of violence experienced, a modified Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) was used. Respondents were asked about a variety of physical abuses. They could respond that they experienced these from never (0 to everyday (7). These scores were then summed up to create a severity of violence scale. The higher the number, the more severe the violence experienced by that respondent.

Findings

Demographic characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1. The majority of the respondents were from the Denver site at all three time periods. The overall retention rate at Time 2 was 90.0 percent and at Time 3 83.1 percent. More than half of the respondents were white. The average age was 32, with a range from 18 to 60. The majority of the respondents either had a high school diploma or attended some college by the time of the first interview. The majority of the respondents had a household income level between \$1000.00 and \$2999.99 per month at the first interview. Most of the respondents had at least one child. Finally, most of the respondents were no longer in relationships with their abusers at each of the three interviews.

-----Insert Table 1-----

A variety of people knew about the violence these respondents experienced. By far the most common person to know was a relative. Ninety-three point three percent of the respondents reported that a relative knew about the violence. The next most prevalent group to know about the violence were friends (91.5) followed by co-workers (66.0) and neighbors (65.8). In terms of institutional support, by far the most common person or people to know were the police. Ninety-eight point two percent of the respondents reported that the police knew about this violence. This makes sense considering that in order for the respondent to be in the study, the offender had to have been arrested. The next most prevalent were prosecutors (96.3), followed by victims advocates (67.7), other legal advisors (49.4), and with the least prevalent type of institutional support being religious leaders (22.4).

-----Insert Table 2-----

In terms of social support, the majority of respondents had both some degree of both informal and institutional social support (see Tables 2 and 3). Specifically, over ninety percent (93.9) of the respondents had at least one person in the informal support category react supportively to their situation and similarly over ninety percent (93.9) had someone in the institutional category react supportively. In the informal category, friends were the most supportive (85.4%), while neighbors were the least (54.3%). In the institutional category, counselors were the most supportive (94.4%), while prosecutors were the least (60.5%)

-----Table 3-----

In terms of how social support varied across respondents, demographic and severity of violence was explored. Regarding demographics, the only significant differences were for age and relationship with the abuser. Older respondents had significantly more social support than respondents who were younger ($p < .01$; .006). While respondents not in relationships with the abuser at the time of the first interview also were more likely to have more total support than those in relationships ($p < .001$; -2.57). The severity of violence experienced also significantly predicted the level of social support received: the more severe the violence, the more total social support the respondent received ($p < .01$; .003).

In addition, two models were created to examine the differences in informal support and institutional support. Overall, the only significant predictor of informal social support was relationship with the abuser: respondents had more informal social support when they were not in relationships with their abusers ($p < .001$; -.851). In terms of institutional support, the significant predictors were the same as for the total social support (i.e. age, relationship with the abuser, and severity of violence.)

-----Table 4-----

A number of models examine the impact of social support of different variables. In particular, several models were created to examine the impact of social support on violence in the relationship and a number of models were developed examining the impact of social support on how respondents then used the criminal justice system. Regarding the impact of respondents' social support on their likelihood of experiencing violence, two dependent variables were examined: the severity of violence experienced and the likelihood that the respondent would be revictimized. Examining the severity of violence experienced (see Table 5), respondents with more social support in general (1.184; $p < 0.01$) and more formal social

support (1.580; $p < 0.05$) were more likely to experience more severe violence. Informal support had no significant impact on her experiences with severity of violence. Race also significantly impacted the respondents' experiences with severity of violence, with going from white to nonwhite significantly increasing women's risk for experiencing more severe violence. Regarding victimization, no significant findings were found in regards to social support. Thus, level of social support, either informal or formal, did not significantly predict which respondents were most likely to be revictimized over time (the time frames covered six months after the initial court case to one year after the initial court case).

-----Insert Table 5-----

Several models were created to examine the impact of respondents' social support on criminal justice variables. Specifically studied were the impacts of various types of social support on whether or not she used the system herself, whether or not she went to court, whether or not she talked directly with the prosecutor, and whether or not she testified in court. Significant findings relating to social support were only found for whether or not she went to court and whether or not she talked directly with the prosecutor. Her level of both informal and formal social support did not impact whether or not she used the system herself or whether or not she testified³.

In terms of whether or not she went to court, logistic regression was used to analyze the impact of social support on this. It was found that only her level of social support in general and her level of formal social support effected whether or not she ended up going to court. Specifically, respondents who had more social support in general (0.175; $p < 0.01$) and more formal support (0.226; $p < 0.01$) were more likely to go to court. Level of informal social support did not significantly predict whether or not she went to court. These findings have clear implications for the criminal justice response to domestic violence.

-----Insert Table 6-----

Finally, a logistic regression was run to examine the impact of level of social support on whether or not the respondent spoke directly with the prosecutor about the case in question. Only her level of formal support was significantly related to her talking directly to the prosecutor. Those respondents with higher

³ It should be noted that whether or not she used the system was measured by whether or not she called the police herself or asked or told someone to call the police for her. And regarding whether or not she testified, what is not known is whether or not she was asked to testify.

levels of formal support were more likely to speak directly to the prosecutor (0.217; $p < 0.05$). Her level of general support and her level of informal support did not significantly predict whether she was more or less likely to talk directly to the prosecutor.

-----Insert Table 7-----

Discussion

A number of important findings emerged from the analyses, particularly relating to how the criminal justice system needs to respond to domestic violence. First, the majority of the respondents had both some informal and formal social support. Thus, victims of domestic violence whose cases have gone through the criminal justice system do, for the most part, have at least some social support. This is important and indicates that we as a society are moving forward in our attitudes and views on domestic violence as an important social and criminal problem. By far the most common type of informal social support was from friends, while for formal social support it was from counselors. This supports some prior research on this issue (El-Bassel, 2001; Tan et al., 1996).

In terms of variance in the levels of social support received across respondents, older respondents and respondents not in relationships with the abusers were more likely to feel more supported. In terms of older respondents, they may be more likely to receive informal support because they may be more likely to have established social support networks (i.e. have more friends, keep in touch with relatives, work and thus have co-workers, live in areas where they may know their neighbors). Once again, this supports some prior research (Barnett and Martinez, 1996). In terms of formal social support, older respondents may receive more respect from criminal justice personnel. Likewise, victims who are no longer with the abuser may receive more respect from both their informal support networks and their formal support networks. They may be seen as more deserving of support because they have taken the steps to leave the situation. Regardless of all of the legitimate reasons victims stay in abusive situations (**see.....**), people continue to not understand why women stay and may see women who do leave as more legitimate victims.

Interestingly, the more severe the violence, the more social support in general that the victim received. This conflicts with prior research on social support and domestic violence, which has found that the more severe violence a victim experiences the less social support they receive (Mitchell and Hodges,

1983; Tan et al., 1995). The finding from this study may be due to the fact, once again, that victim may be seen by both informal and formal support persons as more legitimate victims. Moreover, those who experience more severe violence may have received more attention from criminal justice, medical, and other agency personnel, and thus, may have felt more supported. Conversely, the level of social support impacted the severity of violence experienced: victims who had higher levels of social support in general and formal social support were more likely to experience more severe violence than those who did not have as high levels of social support. More research is needed on this issue.

Numerous important findings emerged regarding the impact of social support on victims interactions with the criminal justice system. These findings have some very critical implications for the criminal justice response to domestic violence. In general, victims who experienced higher levels of support were both more likely to go to court and more likely to talk directly to the prosecutor. This confirms prior research by Goodman and colleagues in which they found that social support impacted victims cooperation with the system (Goodman and Dutton, 1999). However, they only found that tangible support was related to cooperation (Goodman and Dutton, 1999), whereas this study highlighted the importance of institutional support. This finding has important implications because research has shown that in cases where victims actively cooperate with the prosecution of their abusers, the case is more likely to end up in a conviction or in a guilty plea. Thus, if we want more domestic violence cases to end up in conviction, it would be beneficial to assure that victims of domestic violence feel supported, particularly by members of formal organizations (i.e. the criminal justice system, the medical profession, the legal profession, and so on).

Conclusion

Clearly, social support plays an important role in domestic violence victim's lives. It affects both the violence they experience and their experiences with the criminal justice system. In an effort to eradicate domestic violence, we must assure that victims are receiving adequate social support—both informal and formal. Although this study did attempt to explore the differences between informal and formal social support and found that formal social support had more significant implications, that does not indicate that informal social support is not important (see the literature review). Both informal and formal social support

are important for domestic violence victims and important in our response to the criminal problem of domestic violence.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Variables	Time 1 (N=178)	Time 2 (N=160)	Time 3 (N=148) ^a
Site			
Lansing	21.4 (38)	22.5 (36)	23.0 (34)
Boulder	27.0 (48)	28.8 (46)	29.7 (44)
Denver	51.7 (92)	48.8 (78)	47.3 (70)
Race			
White	55.1 (98)	57.5 (92)	57.4 (85)
African American	20.2 (36)	18.1 (29)	18.2 (27)
Latina	16.3 (29)	15.6 (25)	16.9 (25)
Other	8.4 (15)	8.8 (14)	7.4 (11)
Age^b			
18-29	44.4 (79)	43.1 (69)	41.9 (62)
30-44	39.3 (70)	43.8 (70)	43.9 (65)
45+	13.5 (24)	13.1 (21)	14.2 (21)
Education			
Less than High School	14.0 (25)	13.8 (22)	12.9 (19)
High School Graduate	25.3 (45)	23.8 (38)	23.8 (35)
Trade School	5.1 (9)	5.6 (9)	6.1 (9)
Some College	30.3 (54)	31.8 (50)	30.6 (45)
Associate's Degree	5.1 (9)	3.8 (6)	4.1 (6)
College Graduate	15.2 (27)	16.3 (26)	16.3 (24)
Professional Degree	5.1 (9)	5.6 (9)	6.1 (9)
Income^c			
0.00-499.99	12.4 (22)	10.6 (17)	11.5 (17)
500.00-999.99	19.2 (34)	18.8 (30)	17.6 (26)
1000.00-2999.99	48.6 (86)	52.5 (84)	49.3 (73)
3000.00+	19.7 (35)	15.6 (25)	20.9 (31)
Number of Children			
0	27.5 (49)	25.0 (40)	23.6 (35)
1-3	60.1 (107)	64.4 (103)	64.2 (95)
4+	12.4 (22)	10.6 (17)	12.2 (18)
Relationship w/Assailant			
Married	9.6 (17)	10.6 (17)	8.8 (13)
Separated	14.0 (25)	10.6 (17)	11.5 (17)
Divorced	10.1 (18)	12.5 (20)	15.5 (23)
Girlfriend, Boyfriend	13.5 (24)	12.5 (20)	10.1 (15)
Dating	1.1 (2)	0.6 (1)	2.7 (4)

Ex-Girlfriend Boyfriend	46.1 (82)	46.3 (74)	47.3 (70)
Other	5.6 (10)	6.9 (11)	4.1 (6)

^a Significant demographic differences between women who participated in the study at all three time periods and women who dropped out were only found for the variable “site”—women were significantly more likely to drop out from Denver than from Boulder or Lansing.

^b The mean age for Time 1 was 32.8, with a range from 18 to 60 years old; the mean age for Time 2 was 33.1 with a range from 18 to 60 years old; and the mean age for Time 3 was 33.4, with a range from 18 to 60 years old.

^c The mean income at Time 1 was \$2042.00, with a range from \$0.00 to \$20,000 a month; the mean income at Time 2 was \$1813.00, with a range from \$0.00 to \$8000.00; the mean income at Time 3 was \$1956.00, with a range from \$0.00 to \$10,000.

Table 2: Who Knew About the Violence

Who Knew	N	%
INFORMAL SUPPORT		
Relative	165	
Yes		93.3 (154)
No		6.7 (11)
Friend	165	
Yes		91.5 (151)
No		8.5 (14)
Neighbor	161	
Yes		65.8 (106)
No		34.2 (55)
Co-worker	159	
Yes		66.0 (105)
No		34.0 (54)
INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT		
Doctor	165	
Yes		44.3 (73)
No		55.8(92)
Religious Leader	165	
Yes		22.4 (37)
No		77.6 (128)
Police	165	
Yes		98.2 (162)
No		1.8 (3)
Victim Advocates	164	
Yes		67.7 (111)
No		32.3 (53)
Shelter	165	
Yes		30.3 (50)
No		69.7 (115)
Restraining Order Officer	161	
Yes		34.8 (56)
No		65.2 (105)
Prosecutor	162	
Yes		96.3 (156)
No		3.7 (6)
Other Legal Advisor	164	
Yes		49.4 (81)
No		50.6 (83)
Counselor	165	
Yes		43.0 (71)
No		57.0 (94)

Table 3: Supportiveness of People Who Knew About the Violence

INFORMAL SUPPORT	N	%
Relative	153	
Not Supportive		12.4 (19)
Neutral		6.5 (10)
Supportive		81.0 (124)
Friend	151	
Not Supportive		5.3 (8)
Neutral		9.3 (14)
Supportive		85.4 (129)
Neighbor	105	
Not Supportive		13.3 (14)
Neutral		32.4 (34)
Supportive		54.3 (57)
Co-worker	105	
Not Supportive		7.6 (8)
Neutral		9.5 (10)
Supportive		82.9 (87)
DID SHE HAVE ANY INFORMAL SUPPORT	165	
No		6.1 (10)
Yes		93.9 (155)
INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT		
Doctor	72	
Not Supportive		6.9 (5)
Neutral		15.3 (11)
Supportive		77.8 (56)
Religious Leader	37	
Not Supportive		2.7 (1)
Neutral		8.1 (3)
Supportive		89.2 (33)
Police	160	
Not Supportive		22.5 (36)
Neutral		16.3 (26)
Supportive		61.3 (98)
Victim Advocates	110	
Not Supportive		10.9 (12)
Neutral		10.0 (11)
Supportive		79.1 (87)
Shelter	50	
Not Supportive		10.0 (5)
Neutral		4.0 (2)
Supportive		86.0 (43)
Restraining Order Officer	56	
Not Supportive		8.9 (5)
Neutral		1.8 (1)
Supportive		89.3 (50)
Prosecutor	147	
Not Supportive		25.2 (37)
Neutral		14.3 (21)
Supportive		60.5 (89)
Other Legal Advisor	77	
Not Supportive		23.4 (18)
Neutral		24.7 (19)

Supportive Counselor	71	51.9 (40)
Not Supportive		0.0 (0)
Neutral		5.6 (4)
Supportive		94.4 (67)
DID SHE HAVE ANY INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT	165	
No		6.1 (10)
Yes		93.9 (155)

Table 4: OLS Regression Analysis Models with Social Support as the Dependent Variable

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Sum of Social Support		Sum of Informal Social Support		Sum of Formal Social Support	
Race	-0.535	(0.454)	-0.288	(0.195)	-0.213	(0.327)
Age	0.006**	(0.022)	0.007	(0.009)	0.053**	(0.016)
Monthly Income	0.001	(0.000)	0.000	(0.000)	0.000	(0.000)
Relationship with Abuser	-2.571***	(0.531)	-0.851***	(0.228)	-1.618***	(0.383)
Severity of Violence	0.003**	(0.012)	0.009	(0.005)	0.023*	(0.009)
r ²	.217		.114		.206	

* P ≤.05, **P<0.01, ***p<0.001

Table 5: OLS Regression with the Severity of Violence as the Dependent Variable

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Race	8.711***	(2.662)	8.755***	(2.699)	8.404**	(2.663)
Age	-0.107	(0.132)	-0.049	(0.131)	-0.119	(0.134)
Monthly Income	-0.000	(0.001)	-0.000	(0.001)	-0.000	(0.001)
Relationship with Abuser	-2.226	(3.402)	-3.824	(3.347)	-2.729	(3.355)
Sum of Social Support	1.184**	(0.451)				

Sum of Informal Social Support		1.838	(1.076)		
Sum of Formal Social Support				1.580*	(0.627)
R ²	0.133	0.113		0.130	

* P ≤.05, **P<0.01, ***p<0.001

TABLE 6: LOGISTIC REGRESSION WITH DID SHE GO TO COURT AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Race	0.267	(0.358)	0.221	(0.351)	0.207	(0.355)
Age	-0.020	(0.017)	-0.011	(0.017)	-0.021	(0.017)
Monthly Income	0.000	(0.000)	0.000	(0.000)	0.000	(0.000)
Relationship with Abuser	-0.033	(0.429)	-0.300	(0.410)	-0.115	(0.420)
Severity of Violence	0.003	(0.010)	0.007	(0.010)	0.004	(0.010)
Sum of Social Support	0.175**	(0.062)				
Sum of Informal Social Support			0.194	(0.135)		
Sum of Formal Social Support					0.226**	(0.086)
-2 Log likelihood	222.241		227.708		222.394	
Cox and Snell R ²	0.069		0.034		0.062	
Model Chi Square	12.566*		6.099		11.413	

* P ≤.05, **P<0.01, ***p<0.001

TABLE 7: LOGISTIC REGRESSION WITH DID SHE TALK DIRECTLY TO THE PROSECUTOR AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Race	-0.298	(0.353)	-0.352	(0.350)	-0.333	(0.356)
Age	-0.007	(0.017)	-0.001	(0.016)	-0.013	(0.017)
Monthly Income	0.000*	(0.000)	0.000*	(0.000)	0.000*	(0.000)
Relationship with Abuser	-0.176	(0.454)	-0.468	(0.446)	-0.112	(0.451)
Severity of Violence	0.020+	(0.011)	0.024*	(0.011)	0.019	(0.011)

Sum of Social Support	0.106	(0.059)				
Sum of Informal Social Support			-0.032	(0.136)		
Sum of Formal Social Support					0.217*	(0.085)
-2 Log likelihood	222.376		225.570		218.800	
Cox and Snell R ²	0.085		0.068		0.104	
Model Chi Square	15.518*		12.325+		19.094**	

* P ≤.05, **p<0.01, ***p<

References

- Barnett, Ola and Tomas Martinez. 1996. "The Relationships Between Violence, Social Support, and Self-Blame in Battered Women." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 11(2):221-34.
- Barnett, Ola W., Cheok Y. Lee, and Rose E. Thelan. 1997. "Gender Differences in Attribution of Self-Defense and Control in Interpartner Aggression." *Violence Against Women* 3(5):462-81.
- Barrera, Maru, Sally Palmer, Ralph Brown, and Sue Kalaher. 1994. "Characteristics of Court-Involved Men and Non-Court Involved Men Who Abuse Their Wives." *Journal of Family Violence* 9(4):333-45.
- Campbell, Rebecca S. C. M. and William S. Davidson II. 1995. "Women Who Use Domestic Violence Shelters: Changes in Depression Over Time." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 19:237-55.
- Clemens, Petra and Jennifer Hietala. 1999. "Risk of Domestic Violence After Flood Impact: Effects of Social Support, Age, and History of Domestic Violence." *Applied Behavioral Science Review* 7(2):199-207.
- DeKeseredy, Walter. S. 1988. "Woman Abuse in Dating Relationships: The Relevance of Social Support Theory." *Journal of Family Violence* 3(1):1-13.
- Dunham, Katherine and Charlene Y. Senn. 2000. "Minimizing Negative Experiences: Women's Disclosure of Partner Abuse." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 15(3):251-63.
- El-Bassel, Nabila. 2001. "Social Support Among Women in Methadone Treatment Who Experience Partner Violence: Isolation and Male Controlling Behavior." *Violence Against Women* 7(3):246-75.
- Goodman, Lisa, Lauren Bennett, and Mary A. Dutton. 1999. "Obstacles to Victims' Cooperation With the Criminal Prosecution of Their Abusers: The Role of Social Support." *Violence and Victims* 14(4):427-44.
- Mitchell, Roger and Christine A. Hodson. 1983. "Coping With Domestic Violence: Social Support and Psychological Health Among Battered Women." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 11(6):629-54.
- Rankin, Larry B., Daniel G. Saunders, and Reg A. Williams. 2000. "Mediators of Attachment Style, Social Support, and Sense of Belonging in Predicting Woman Abuse by African American Men." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 15(10):1060-1081.
- Stes, Jan E. 1991. "Cohabiting and Marital Aggression: The Role of Social Isolation." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 53:669-80.
- Tan, Cheribeth, Joanne Basta, C. Sullivan, and W. Davidson. 1995. "The Role of Social Support in the Lives of Women Exiting Domestic Violence Shelters." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 10(4):437-52.

