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ABSTRACT

Domestic Violence is a public health issue that is affecting millions of people annually. Police reports can give a unique aspect of cases that involve domestic violence because the narrative is a firsthand report of the violent incident. Using domestic violence case reports gathered from a law enforcement database at a county Sheriff’s office in Florida, the current study examines whether alcohol use in domestic violence incidents influences threats that the victim receives during the incident. Logistic regression analysis indicates that alcohol use does not significantly impact threats that the victim receives during a domestic violence altercation. However, the study found that if there is a history of domestic violence mentioned in the police report, it is more likely that threats are also mentioned. The findings suggest that more research should be done on domestic violence cases involving alcohol use and non-violent forms of abuse such as threats.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Center for Disease Control and Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTS</td>
<td>Straus Conflict Tactics Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPV</td>
<td>Intimate Partner Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCADV</td>
<td>National Coalition Against Domestic Violence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

In the United States from 2006-2015 there were on average 1.3 million domestic violence incidents that were nonfatal (Reaves, 2017). In the state of Florida there were 108,030 domestic violence altercations in 2013, and in that same year there were 170 domestic violence homicides in the state (NCADV, 2015e). Domestic violence (DV) has been and still is a topic of interest when it comes to public health. The CDC (2009) has discussed that DV is a public health issue because of the injuries that the victim can obtain, both physical and mental. Many health professional organizations have become involved to try to put a stop to this violence (CDC, 2009). Over a ten-year period between 2003-2012, DV accounted for 21% of victimization that occurred in the U.S. Of these DV victimizations, 15% involved intimate partners, 4% involved immediate family members, and the remaining 2% involved other relatives in the family (Truman & Morgan, 2014).

DV has been shown to take many forms and anyone could be a victim, regardless of their religion, sex, ethnicity, or other demographic factors (United States Department of Justice, 2016). It is important to make a distinction between IPV and DV because sometimes people have used the term interchangeably or think they are the same term. IPV refers to violence against individuals who are currently or have been in an intimate relationship. DV is a broader term including other people living in the household. O’Campo et al. (2005) found that IPV and DV can be more prevalent for people in a low economic status, dealing with unemployment, and living in poverty. Examining IPV specifically, Smith et al. (2017) found through the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey 2010-2012 state report that prevalence rates of different forms of violence that can take place. They found that the greatest
percentage of respondents experienced psychological abuse, the next common was physical abuse, and then sexual abuse. Specifically, they found that 47.1% of women and 47.3% of men experienced psychological abuse, 32.4% of women and 28.3% of men experienced physical violence, and 16.4% of women and 7% of men experienced sexual abuse.

Similarly to DV, extant research exists examining the consequences of alcohol use. The Center for Disease Control (CDC, 2016) has shown that drinking can have severe consequences on one’s health, as well as consequences on other individuals who are around the intoxicated individual. For instance, research has shown that alcohol use is related to criminal offending, especially with regard to violent offending. Research has shown that higher levels of IPV occur when alcohol use is present in a relationship (Abramsky et al., 2011). Additionally, alcohol use has been connected to severity of violence (Cunradi, Caetano, & Schafer, 2002) particularly, with research indicating that alcohol is related to a higher level of severity in DV cases. For instance, Cunradi et al. (2002) found alcohol problems present in intimate relationships led to having a more severe level of reported IPV. Additionally, Klostermann and Fals-Stewart’s (2006) review found that alcohol can have a prominent role in the occurrence of IPV.

Though the connection between alcohol and physical abuse is prevalent in the literature, less research has been done examining the consequences of alcohol on psychological abuse, a form of abuse that is common in domestic violence situations. The current study examines alcohol use in DV cases. Specifically, the aim is to study a form of psychological abuse – threats of abuse – in cases when alcohol use is present, compared to when it is absent. First, there will be a discussion of the literature explaining domestic violence and the role it plays in society. Next, the different types of non-violent abuse such as threats, verbal abuse, or jealousy
will be discussed as well as physical violence. Then, the paper will examine alcohol use, and how it is associated with DV/IPV.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Domestic Violence

Domestic violence comes in various forms and can affect anyone. Historically, females tend to be the primary victims of DV; out of the total of serious violent crimes by domestic relationships, 37% of victims were female compared to 10% being male victims. States such as Florida, define domestic violence as an act by one household/family member to another household/family member (Florida Statutes, 2016), though research indicates that the majority of DV cases (77%) involve current and former intimate partners (Truman & Morgan, 2014).

Domestic Violence Forms.

According to the United States Department of Justice (2016), DV occurs in five main forms: physical, sexual, economic, emotional, and psychological. Physical violence can involve any intentional harm to the body of the victim, such as hitting, punching, or pulling the victim’s hair. Reports indicate that there are 10 million victims of DV who have been physically abused annually. According to statistics roughly one in three females and one in four males are victims (NCADV, 2015a).

Sexual abuse is one of the most intimate forms of violence that can take place (United States Department of Justice, 2016). Sexual abuse in DV cases can include coercive sexual acts, marital rape, or unwanted sexual touching by the offender. Sexual abuse is used as a way of control to remain in power over the victim (NCADV, 2015b). Until 1976, spousal rape was
exempt from general rape laws, and it was not until 1993 that all states had removed the exemption of spousal rape in their laws. Unfortunately, many Americans still do not believe that spousal rape is “actual” rape, thus giving power to the offender. Additionally, many victims of spousal rape may not report sexual abuse because victims do not believe it is a crime (NCADV, 2015b). Alsaker et al. (2012) examined IPV sexual assault and found that 68% of the 85 participants had been demanded sex by their intimate partner, despite their wishes. Results also showed that 40% of the 80 participants had been raped by their intimate partner.

Economic abuse is one of the most common forms of abuse that can happen in DV relationships. This can be one of the main reasons that a partner is unable to leave an abusive relationship. Examples of economic abuse include the offender controlling how much the victim can spend, making the victim buy everything so they are in debt, or only allowing the victim to have access to money when the offender wants them to. Economic abuse leads to the victim solely relying on the offender for support, and this gives the offender the power/control he or she wants. This can take a psychological toll on the victim over time (NCADV, 2015c).

Emotional and psychological abuse are the most difficult to prosecute. Emotional abuse is often the first of type of abuse used in DV with abuse typically escalating to physical forms (CDC, 2014). This form of abuse can be hard to prove since emotional abuse is shone mainly through verbal acts such as name calling, criticizing the victim, or damaging the relationships the victim has with family and friends (United States Department of Justice, 2016). Psychological abuse can include intimidation, isolating the victim, threats to harm a victim’s loved ones, or other tactics that are intended to scare a victim (NCADV, 2015d). Due to the similarity in emotional and psychological abuse, they tend to be discussed together. However, O’Hagan
(1995) distinguished the difference between these two types of abuse. With regards to emotional abuse the offender is inflicting emotional pain on the victim. This includes manipulating the victim's emotions or inflicting emotional pain, such as humiliation or fear. What makes psychological abuse different, is that it affects the mental processes of the victim, such as cognitive function or memory (O’Hagan, 1995). Estimates indicate that psychological abuse is experienced by 48.4% of women and 48.8% of men with their intimate partners, demonstrating that almost 1 in 2 people experience some form of psychological abuse. This shows that men and women are equally affected by this form of abuse (NCADV, 2015d). Also, Lund (2014) documented in 1,363 women residing in 47 shelters in Norway that psychological abuse and physical abuse frequently co-occurred.

Additionally, Coker et al. (2000a) studied female participants who were seeking health care. They examined physical abuse, sexual abuse, and non-physical violence among the victims. Of the 1,401 women who participated in the study, a little over half of the women (55.1%) had experienced some form of IPV. Among the 772 women who had experienced IPV, 77.3% reported either physical or sexual abuse. The remaining 22.7% had experienced non-physical violence. Another study done by Coker et al. (2000b) surveyed 1,152 women about their experiences with IPV. They found that 53.6% had experienced IPV, with 13.6% of the 53.6% having experienced psychological abuse without the use physical abuse. Also, women victims who experienced psychological abuse had a significantly higher risk of having mental and/or physical health issues.

Coker et al. (2002) conducted a study to examine effects of physical violence and mental health issues on men and women derived from IPV. They also examined two aspects of
psychological abuse. The first was power and control, and the second was verbal. They found that females reported more use of power and control without any sign of physical abuse than males. The results also showed that the abuse form of power and control was strongly connected with depression than verbal abuse. Overall, the study found that males experience more psychological abuse than females.

Research has also examined risk factors associated with DV, particularly IPV. The CDC (2014; 2016) has shown that alcohol use and other risk factors such as a history of aggression, loss of job, and being a victim of DV in the past can influence IPV perpetration. Other studies, for instance, Field, Caetano, and Nelson (2004) found that there was a significant difference among whites, blacks, and Hispanics when it came to attitudes of marital violence and the expectations of alcohol. Approval of marital aggression was less common in whites compared to blacks and Hispanics. Hispanics had the highest approval of marital aggression. Also, gender played a role in the approval of marital aggression and alcohol being an excuse for violence. Males were significantly higher when it came to the approval of marital aggression and alcohol being an excuse for violence compared to females. The authors found that followed by consuming alcohol, expectations of aggressive behavior were the main predictor of IPV perpetration among people drinking (Field et al., 2004).

Alcohol

Alcohol has many effects on society. The CDC (2016) reported that excessive drinking expenditures cost the U.S. economy 249 billion dollars in 2010 and each year excessive drinking leads to roughly 88,000 deaths. Additionally, alcohol is associated with short-term and long-term
health risks. In addition to risks of chronic diseases, cancer, social problems, and mental health concerns, risks can include violence such as IPV, sexual assault, or homicide.

Greenfeld (1998), looked at data from the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) for the year 1995 and found that in roughly 3 million violent crimes the victim perceived the attacker to be under the influence of alcohol. Specifically, it was found that offenders who had been drinking had committed over one third of the sexual assaults of individuals older than the age of 12 years old. Similarly, Cannon and Carmona (2006) found that between 31% and 36% of perpetrators convicted of IPV had been drinking at the time of the attack. Two-thirds of IPV victims stated that the perpetrator had consumed alcohol before the violence took place. Roughly 27% of the offenders who had consumed alcohol had physically injured the victim.

**Domestic Violence and Alcohol**

Since intoxication can impair the overall ability to problem solve in situations and control anger as well as increase the risk of confrontation, a large body of literature has examined the impact of alcohol on IPV and has shown that alcohol can influence the abuse the victim receives in these incidents (Leonard & Quigley, 2017; Foran & O'Leary, 2008; Greenfeld, 1998; World Health Organization, 2006; Livingston, 2011; Devries et al., 2013; Field et al., 2004; Thompson and Kingree, 2006). Leonard and Quigley (2017) reviewed research done over the last thirty years on alcohol related IPV incidents and concluded that studies in the last ten years have shown and supported that drinking excessively causes violence in general, as well as in cases of IPV. Additionally, Foran and O'Leary (2008) conducted a meta-analysis and saw that previous
research has consistently found a strong connection between alcohol and IPV victimization. For instance, Greenfeld (1998) found that 40% of intimate partner victimizations involved the perpetrator consuming alcohol at the time of the abuse/assault. Also, they found that two-thirds of the IPV victims had reported that alcohol was a factor in the assault that occurred. Similarly, the World Health Organization (2006) showed that in England, Wales, and the U.S. combined, victims of IPV said that the offender had been drinking alcohol 55% of the time before they were physical abused. It was shown that offenders who had drinking problems had an increased chance of violence and victimization.

In addition, research has shown that the access to alcohol may play a role in increasing the likelihood of DV. For instance, Livingston (2011) conducted a longitudinal study in Australia to see if alcohol outlet density is associated to DV victimization. Alcohol outlets included bars, stores that sold alcohol, or drinking at home. Results showed that all forms of alcohol outlets are positively related to an increased level of DV. Though, off-the-premise alcohol consumption had the strongest relationship to DV and IPV. An off-the-premises alcohol outlet mainly involved drinking alcohol at home. Livingston argued that there is an increased risk of DV occurring because the potential offender is drinking in the home with potential victims.

Furthermore, Devries et al. (2013) examined previous longitudinal studies to estimate the relationship between alcohol use and IPV. Overall, the authors concluded that IPV had a correlation to alcohol use among female victims. Results showed that women who were drinking were more likely to report that physical violence had occurred and that this violence was more likely directed towards them. In addition, Field et al. (2004) found that one of the most influential predictors for IPV perpetration was aggressive behavior following alcohol use.
Thompson and Kingree (2006) examined how alcohol use in IPV affects level of injury. They looked at both victim and offender alcohol use during an incident and measured physical injuries by using the Straus Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS), which accounts for various types of physical violence (objects thrown, being pushed/grabbed/shove, hair pulled, being hit, kicked, bit, choked or even being threatened with a firearm). In their results, roughly one-third of female victims reported that the offender used alcohol at the time of the incident compared to one-fifth of male victims. Additionally, female victims were more likely to be physically injured when the offender was drinking.

Other research has indicated that alcohol use in DV situations result in more serious injuries (Brecklin, 2002; Graham et al., 2011; Cunradi, Caetano, Schafer, 2002) and an increase likelihood of weapon use (Brecklin, 2002; Folkes, Hilton, & Harris, 2012). For instance, Cunradi, Caetano, and Schafer (2002) conducted a study that looked at alcohol and drug use on the severity of male perpetrated IPV cases. Cunradi et al. measured severity by utilizing items from the conflict tactics scale (e.g., kicking, biting, slapping, shoving, choking, etc). They found that both male and female alcohol problems can be attributed to an increase chance of severe male IPV. Their overall results showed that male and female alcohol use and female drug use were correlated with the severity level in couples with the male being the offender. Additionally, in their study of U.S. couples, they found that those who live in a high unemployment area are at the greatest risk for having severe IPV from male offenders. Brecklin (2002) concluded that 75% of the perpetrators used alcohol in an act of violence with their partner. Furthermore, they found that possible weapon use increased when the perpetrator drank alcohol. Results yielded that 83% of the offenders used physical violence and 20.6% used a weapon in the altercation. Victims reported injuries 72% of the time, and 38% of injuries required medical attention. Truman and
Morgan (2014) further showed that for cases involving immediate family violence, 37.4% had a form of injury, and 19% of these cases had a weapon involved.

A great deal of research has studied the connection between alcohol use and physical violence; however, limited research has examined the relationship of alcohol on non-violent forms of abuse such as emotional and psychological abuse. The research that has looked at non-violent forms of abuse has found them to be quite common in violent relationships (Coker et al. 2000a; 2000b; 2002; Crane et al., 2013; Smith et al., 2007; Thompson & Kingree, 2006) and more common when alcohol is present in the relationship (Crane et al., 2013). For instance, Crane et al. (2013) conducted a study to see how acceptance of the relationship status and alcohol use affected verbal abuse perpetration in DV. The measure of the acceptance of the relationship status refers to the individual being satisfied in the relationship and accepting the status. Alcohol use and the acceptance of the relationship status was unrelated. However, they found that offenders who had a heavy drinking history were more likely to be verbally abusive to their partners.
CURRENT STUDY

Research shows evidence of alcohol’s role in DV situations, particularly as it relates to physical injury and its severity (Field et al., 2004; Valdez et al., 2016; Folkes et al., 2013; Leonard, & Quigley, 2017). Generally, it shows that physical injuries and violence is more severe when alcohol is present (Valdez et al., 2016). Research also indicates that violence can take many forms, both physical and non-physical (Coker et al., 2000). Research that has examined non-physical abuse indicates that psychological abuse is common in DV situations (Coker et al., 2000a; 2000b; Smith et al., 2007). Looking at threats, Thompson and Kingree (2006) found that 39.9% of female victims and roughly 20% of male victims had experienced threats to harm or kill themselves or loved ones, suggesting that threats are prominent in DV situations. The current study plans to expand upon previous literature by examining a type of non-violent abuse – threats – that occurs in domestic violence cases when alcohol is involved compared to cases where it is not involved.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Threats will be more likely in the DV incident when alcohol use is present compared to when it is not.

This hypothesis is based upon previous literature that indicates that alcohol plays a prominent role in the occurrence of IPV (Klostermann & Fals-Stewart, 2006; Abramsky et al.; 2011; Crane et al., 2013; De Campos Moreira, 2011; Smith et al., 2017). For instance, Abramsky et al. (2011) found when alcohol was used by a partner, there is a greater likelihood of IPV
occuring. Additionally, Smith et al. (2017) research results showed that psychological abuse had been the most common type of IPV, followed by physical violence, with the last form being sexual violence. Also, Crane et al. (2013) conducted a study and found that offenders who had a drinking history prior to their treatment were more likely to be verbally abusive to their partners.

Furthermore, De Campos Moreira (2011) conducted a study in Brazil to examine the relationship of alcohol to domestic violence. The authors examined the household level of intoxication. They looked at if a person arrived intoxicated in the home or if they became intoxicated in the household. The authors found that 39% of participants had either come home intoxicated or became intoxicated at home. Of those participants that were intoxicated, there were 32 (7%) acts of verbal abuse, and 4 (1%) incidents of physical abuse. Also, Field et al. (2004) showed that when the person is intoxicated, the ability to problem solve and control one’s actions are diminished.
METHODOLOGY

Data and Sample

The present study examined 572 police reports of domestic violence from the Brevard County Sheriff’s Office in Florida. The cases that were used were assault and battery domestic violence reports from November 2015 to April 2016. Missing information was present in 37 cases, which brought the total sample down to 535 cases. It was determined that too much information was missing when it was unclear who the offender or victim was, and when there were control variables missing. This was done so that none of the data would be skewed. The domestic violence reports included information on both victims and offenders (e.g., demographics) as well as case characteristics (e.g., abuses mentioned, history of domestic violence, alcohol present). For purposes of this study, the Florida definition of domestic violence was used, as such domestic violence incidents included assaults and batteries between intimate partners (spouses, boyfriend/girlfriend, ex-partners), family members (son, daughter, mother, uncle), and roommates.

Procedure

The cases were retrieved from the Brevard County Sheriff’s office. All of the cases were kept confidential. The database that was used was the Law Enforcement Record Management System (LERMS). This database contained all the reports done by the Sheriff’s office during the study period (November 2015- April 2016). For this study, the police report narratives were examined and then coded into a file. The coding included demographics and other identifying
information of the case (e.g., sex, race, age). Information was also collected about other DV abuse (0=no other acts, 1=yes, physical only, 2=yes, sexual only, 3=yes, stalking only, 4=yes, physical and sexual only, 5=yes, physical and stalking only, 6=yes, sexual and stalking only, 7=yes, physical, sexual, and stalking), threats against the victim (0=no threats, 1=threatened to harm victim, 2=threatened to kill victim, 3=threatened to kill self, 4=threatened to kill victim and self, 5=threatened to harm or kill others) and whether the victim experienced verbal abuse (1=yes, 2=no), jealousy (1=yes, 2=no), or controlling behaviors (1=yes, 2=no). Lastly, substance(s) used by the victim or offender was recorded from the narrative. Information was gathered about alcohol and various forms of drugs; however, for this paper the focus will be on the alcohol use in the domestic violence cases.

**Dependent Variable**

The main dependent variable in this study is whether threats by the offender were mentioned in the police report to harm or kill the victim, harm or kill him or herself, or harm or kill others (coded 0=no, 1=yes).

**Independent Variables**

The main independent variable that is examined in this study is whether alcohol use was mentioned in the police report involving either the victim or offender (0=no, 1=yes).
Control Variables

The control variables for this study include various information about the victim and offender listed in each police report. The victim’s and offender’s sex is coded into whether the victim was female (0=no, 1=yes) and whether the offender was male (0=no, 1=yes). The victim’s and offender’s age is a continuous variable. The victim’s and offender’s intraracial race is coded (1=yes, 0=no). The victim-offender relationship is coded (1) intimate partner (current and former spouses and boyfriends/girlfriends) and (0) other (other family members and roommates). A history of DV in the current relationship is coded (1) yes and (0) no.

Analytic Procedure

A series of Logistic regression analyses will be performed. Logistic regression is conducted because the dependent variable is a binary/dichotomous variable (0 and 1). Multicollinear between the independent variable was examined, however, no issues were present (VIF scores <4).
RESULTS

Table 1 depicts the descriptive statistics of all variables in the study. The independent variable, alcohol use, was present in 29.2% of the cases. The dependent variable, threats, was present in 10.1% of the cases. In 92% of cases the offender and victim were intraracial. Over 50% of the cases included the act of DV occurring among previous or current intimate partners. Out of the 535 cases in the sample, 64.5% of the victims were females and 35.5% of the victims were males. Also, 65.8% of the offenders were male, and 34.2% were females. There were 73 cases (13.6%) that mentioned a history of DV in the police report. For the offenders, the average age was 36 years with the youngest offender being 9 and the oldest offender being 84. For the victims, the average age was 39 years old, the youngest victim being 2 and the oldest being 94.
Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Variables (n=535)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n/μ</th>
<th>Percent/SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Threats Mentioned in Report</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use Mentioned</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim is Female</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender is Male</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraracial</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender’s Age</td>
<td>35.96</td>
<td>14.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim’s Age</td>
<td>38.58</td>
<td>15.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate Partner</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of DV in Relationship</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the dependent variable, whether threats were mentioned in the police report, is a binary or dichotomous variable (1=yes, 0=no), logistic regression is used for the multivariate analysis. Table 2 shows the results that were found from the analysis. Overall, the results show that alcohol did not have a statistically significant influence on threats to harm or kill. Yet, the results indicate that police reports that mention a history of DV are significantly more likely to also mention threats. Specifically, the odds that a police report mentions threats to harm or kill are 2.499 times higher when a history of DV is mentioned than when it is not. However, it is important to note that overall the model is not significant (Chi-square=12.225, p>0.05)
suggesting that the predictors do not have a significant effect on the dependent variable and the constant-only model is a better fit of the data.
Table 2: Logistic Regression Results: Effects of Alcohol Use on Threats Used in Domestic Violence Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use Mentioned</td>
<td>-.487/.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.367)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of DV</td>
<td>.916/2.499*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.352)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraracial</td>
<td>.319/1.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.561)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender is Male</td>
<td>.587/1.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.362)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim is Female</td>
<td>-.435/.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.337)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender’s Age</td>
<td>.002/1.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim’s Age</td>
<td>-.001/.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate Partner</td>
<td>-.050/.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.338)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.651/.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.757)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nagelkerke $R^2$ : .047
Cox & Snell $R^2$ : .023
$-2 \text{ Log likelihood}$ : 337.806
$\chi^2 (df=8)$ : 12.225* 
$n$ : 535

Note: Cell entries are given as logistic regression coefficient/odds ratio with standard error given in parentheses.

* $p<.05$, + $p<.1$
DISCUSSION

Previous research has shown that psychological abuse is prevalent in DV relationships and that it has effects on the physical and mental health of the victim (Coker et al., 2000). Unfortunately, the current study did not yield significant results regarding alcohol having an impact on threats made against the victim. This was surprising since previous research has shown that psychological abuse is one of the most common forms of abuse in DV (e.g., Smith et al., 2017) and that alcohol influences physical abuse and severity of injuries (Cunradi et al., 2002; Folkes et al., 2012). Lund (2014) also found that psychological abuse is very commonly accompanied with physical abuse.

There were a few limitations, which may have had an impact on the lack of significant findings in the current study. The main limitation relates directly with using police report narratives. First, police officers use their discretion and judgement when responding to DV cases, and that can influence what the officers’ record in their reports. What is written in the DV report may be at the discretion of the reporting officer. As such, the officer who responded/recorded the report would be important to control for in future research. Lum (2011) found that the demographic characteristics (such as race, age, etc.) of the officers are not the only aspect that can influence the police. The environmental situation can influence police discretion. The authors found that if the places had higher proportions of black or a wealthy community influences the police discretion (Lum, 2011). Also, officers may not be getting the full picture of the abuse that is occurring between the victim and offender. Many times, they are responding to an isolated incident, and may not be aware of previous violence that has occurred in the relationship. Another limitation is the lack of clarity in some of the police reports. There were 20 cases that had to be removed from the
study because it was unclear who the victim and offender were. An additional 17 were removed because there was incomplete information on the key variables of interest. Lastly, there were limitations in the coding of the variables. It is important to consider that all types of threats were grouped together for analyses purposes instead of being disaggregated into different categories of threats (e.g., threats to harm or kill the victim, threats to harm or kill others, threats to harm or kill themselves). Also, it may be important to examine intimates separately, with regards to current or former intimate partners. This may yield different results because abuse has been shown to be severe and the greatest risk of death is when a victim tries to end a relationship (Fleury, Sullivan, & Bybee, 2000).
CONCLUSION

While there were limitations to this study and the non-violent model was not significant, there is still a need for research on alcohol use and non-violent abuse. It also should be noted that this study focused only on alcohol use, but there may be more to find by expanding it to drugs as well. In addition, the location of the cases may play a role in the results of the data. It may be important to look at different states, and rural vs. urban areas.

The current study aimed to examine if alcohol use in domestic violence influenced threats the victim received during the altercation. Though the study did not yield significant results there needs to be more research done considering the effects of alcohol on non-violent forms of DV. It will be important, if future research uses police reports, to have better training for law enforcement when it comes to police reports. If there is a set of standards for police reports it will make research more thorough. It would also be good to have the demographics more detailed in the police reports, such as including sexual orientation or other factors that may make that case different. Police bias in reports is something that is important to examine. The current study has brought a new aspect to the research of alcohol and its effects on threats in DV situations. Further research should be conducted to examine the non-violent forms of DV, and the role alcohol has on those types of abuse.
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