

Violence Against Women

2015, Vol. 21(1) 65–86

© The Author(s) 2014

Reprints and permissions:

sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/1077801214564078

vaw.sagepub.com

Li e-In Children

[The page contains dense, mirrored text that is heavily distorted and illegible. It appears to be a scan of a document where the text has been rendered as a complex pattern of black and white shapes, possibly due to a scanning artifact or a specific image processing effect. The text is arranged in approximately 15 horizontal lines, with each line containing a dense, chaotic arrangement of characters and symbols.]

Inter ie s and S r e Instr ment

[The text in this block is illegible due to extreme blurriness and appears to be a list of items with small icons or symbols.]

Table 1. Percentage and Frequency Distribution of Sample Demographics (N = 101).

Characteristic variables	n	%
Victim education		
Less than high school	23	22.8
High school graduate/GED	46	45.5
Some college or beyond	32	31.7
Victim age (years)		
18-25	17	16.8
26-35	34	33.7
36-45	25	24.8
46+	25	24.8
Victim race		
Race/ethnic minority	57	56.4
White (non-Hispanic)	44	43.6
Victim support for mandatory arrest		
Rarely/never a good thing	14	13.9
Not sure	25	24.8
A good thing on some occasions	35	34.7
Always a good thing	27	26.7
Presence of children		
Yes	52	51.5
No	49	48.5
Abuser substance use		
Yes	68	67.3
No	33	32.7
Law enforcement notification		
Yes	65	64.4
No	36	35.6

Variables

Dependent variable. The dependent variable in this study is the victim's perception of the mandatory arrest law. This variable was measured using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The mean score for the dependent variable was 3.2, indicating that victims generally agreed with the mandatory arrest law. The standard deviation was 0.8, suggesting a moderate level of variability in responses. The distribution of scores was as follows: 1 (10%), 2 (20%), 3 (30%), 4 (25%), and 5 (15%).

Independent (predictor) variables

Victim's support for mandatory arrest ...

...

Control ariables.

...

Victim ed cation

...

Victim race

Table 3. Reporting IPV to Police Regressed on Mandatory Arrest Support, Presence of Children, and Abuser Substance Use.

	Model 1 (n = 101)		Model 2 (n = 101)	
	b	OR	b	OR
Control variables				
Victim education (1 = less than high school; 3 = some college or be ond)	0.304	1.356	0.339	1.404
Victim age (1 = 18-25; 4 = 46+)	-0.332	0.717	-0.427	0.652065 0 Td(0.717)

Discussion

...
...
...
...
...

The first step in the process of identifying the problem is to define the problem clearly. This involves identifying the symptoms of the problem and determining the scope of the problem. Once the problem has been defined, the next step is to identify the causes of the problem. This involves identifying the factors that are contributing to the problem and determining the underlying causes of the problem. Once the causes of the problem have been identified, the next step is to develop a plan of action to address the problem. This involves identifying the steps that need to be taken to address the problem and determining the resources that will be needed to implement the plan. Once a plan of action has been developed, the next step is to implement the plan. This involves carrying out the steps of the plan and monitoring the progress of the plan. Finally, the last step in the process is to evaluate the results of the plan. This involves determining whether the plan has been successful in addressing the problem and identifying any lessons learned from the process.

Conclusion

The process of identifying the problem is a complex one that involves several steps. The first step is to define the problem clearly, followed by identifying the causes of the problem, developing a plan of action, implementing the plan, and finally evaluating the results of the plan. Each of these steps is essential to the process and must be carried out carefully to ensure that the problem is addressed effectively.

One of the key challenges in the process of identifying the problem is to identify the underlying causes of the problem. This can be difficult because there are often many factors that contribute to a problem, and it can be difficult to determine which of these factors are the most important. However, by carefully identifying the causes of the problem, it is possible to develop a plan of action that addresses the root causes of the problem and prevents the problem from recurring.

Another key challenge in the process is to develop a plan of action that is realistic and achievable. This involves identifying the steps that need to be taken to address the problem and determining the resources that will be needed to implement the plan. It is important to ensure that the plan is realistic and achievable, as otherwise it is unlikely to be successful.

Finally, it is important to monitor the progress of the plan and evaluate the results of the plan. This involves determining whether the plan has been successful in addressing the problem and identifying any lessons learned from the process. By monitoring the progress of the plan and evaluating the results, it is possible to ensure that the problem is addressed effectively and to identify any areas for improvement.

[The text in this section is extremely faint and illegible.]

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

[The text in this section is extremely faint and illegible.]

Funding

[The text in this section is extremely faint and illegible.]

References

[The text in this section is extremely faint and illegible.]



... ..

Journal of Family Violence 18

Author Biographies

Meghan A. Novisky is an associate professor of psychology at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. She has published research on intimate partner violence, child abuse, and family violence.

Robert L. Peralta is an associate professor of psychology at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. He has published research on intimate partner violence, child abuse, and family violence.