When "Shelter-in-Place" Isn't Shelter That's Safe: A Rapid Analysis of Domestic Violence Case Differences During the COVID-19 Pandemic and Stay-at-Home Orders

Author:

Molly M. McLay, MSW, LCSW, Brown School, Washington University in St. Louis

Corresponding Author:

Molly M. McLay, MSW, LCSW

Doctoral Student

Brown School at Washington University in St. Louis

Campus Box 1196

One Brookings Drive

Saint Louis, MO 63130

mmclay@wustl.edu

Abstract

Purpose: This study explored the COVID-19 pandemic's impacts on domestic violence (DV) with the following research questions: 1) Did DV occurring during the pandemic differ on certain variables from cases occurring on a typical day the previous year? 2) Did DV occurring after the implementation of shelter-in-place orders differ (on these same variables) from cases occurring prior to shelter-in-place orders? **Methods**: Two logistic regression models were developed to predict DV case differences before and during the pandemic. DV reports (N=4618) were collected from the Chicago Police Department. Cases from March 2019 and March 2020 were analyzed based on multiple variables. One model was set to predict case differences since the pandemic began, and another model was set to predict case differences during the shelter-in-place period later that month. **Results**: Both models were significant with multiple significant predictors. During the pandemic period, cases with arrests were 3% less likely to have occurred, and cases at residential locations were 22% more likely to have occurred. During the shelter-in-place period, cases at residential locations were 64% more likely to have occurred, and cases with child victims were 67% less likely to have occurred. **Conclusions**: This study offers a rapid analysis of DV case differences since the pandemic and shelter-in-place began. Additional variables and data sources could improve model explanatory power. Research, policy, and practice in this area must pivot to focus on protecting children whose access to mandated reporters has decreased and moving victims out of dangerous living situations into safe spaces.

Key words: domestic violence; family violence; COVID-19; coronavirus; pandemic

When "Shelter-in-Place" Isn't Shelter That's Safe: A Rapid Analysis of Domestic Violence Case Differences During the COVID-19 Pandemic and Stay-at-Home Orders

Purpose

Background

The COVID-19 pandemic has wreaked havoc across the world since late 2019, causing 4,801,282 of individuals to fall ill and 318,465 to die, according to the Johns Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center as of May 18, 2020 (Dong, Du, & Gardner, 2020). COVID-19's impact on the United States began in late January 2020, and the numbers of individuals impacted is still rising exponentially, with a total of 1,508,291 cases and 90,340 deaths (Dong, Du, & Gardner, 2020). While research has jump-started to develop testing, treatment, and vaccines, the impact of the COVID-19 on social factors cannot be ignored. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) have recommended that individuals stay six feet away apart, not gather in groups, and only venture out for necessities (CDC, 2020b). As a result, businesses have closed or reduced operations, schools have moved online, and many are now working from home (CDC, 2020a). In March 2020, states began issuing statewide stay-at-home orders to their residents, including Illinois (Petrella, St. Clair, Johnson, & Pratt, 2020), which has the third largest number of COVID-19 cases of all states (Dong, Du, & Gardner, 2020). Given the unique circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic, research is needed to identify its impacts on individuals, families, and communities.

With social distancing recommendations and shelter-in-place orders making abrupt changes to the ways people interact, this study aimed to understand the COVID-19 pandemic's potential impacts on one of the most volatile of such interactions: domestic violence. Often referring to violence experienced within an intimate or familial relationship, domestic violence

continues to impact individuals across the world and can include physical, verbal, and sexual forms as well as stalking (Perilla, Lippy, Rosales, & Serrata, 2011). The U.S. is no different, with 1 in 3 women and 1 in 4 men having experienced some form of this violence over the life course (Black et. al., 2011). Children are impacted as well, with some estimates indicating that 68-80% of children have witnessed domestic violence (Jaffe, 2018). Domestic violence has devastating effects on its victims and their loved ones, with mental health consequences and physical injuries being common, and 1 in 6 homicide victims being killed by their intimate partners (CDC, 2019).

While research on domestic violence prevention and treatment is ongoing, and several sources have conjectured COVID-19's impact on it based on available statistics (Abramson, 2020; Bosman, 2020; Kumar & Nayar, 2020) and lessons learned thus far (Usher, Bhullar, Durkin, Gyamfi, & Jackson, 2020; Van Gelder et. al., 2020), no published peer-reviewed studies have analyzed domestic violence rates in light of the pandemic. Location is of critical note; with more individuals at home, violence may happen more frequently behind closed doors. During this time of increased stress and fear (Brooks et. al., 2020), changes may also be seen in the ways domestic violence looks, the factors comprising it, and the individuals experiencing it. Given that first responders and service providers are experiencing reduced staffing and virtual interactions in response to the threat of COVID-19 (CDC, 2020a), research is needed to understand what domestic violence looks like in this unprecedented moment, so that prevention and treatment can shift to appropriately respond.

Research Questions

This study analyzed the potential impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on domestic violence reports in the U.S. through logistic regression analysis. Two models were developed to predict changes in the presentation of domestic violence before and during the pandemic at

different time points, utilizing data from a large U.S. city before and during the height of key policy changes in March 2020. This study analyzed relationships between the timeframe of domestic violence occurrence and a number of key variables. This study poses the following research questions:

1. Will domestic violence that occurred during the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020 have key differences in the presence of a sex offense, weapon use, resulting arrest, presence of child victims, and residential locationality than domestic violence occurring on a typical day in March 2019?
2. Will domestic violence that occurred after the implementation of COVID-19 shelter-in-place orders on March 21, 2020 have key differences in these same variables than domestic violence occurring during the pandemic but prior to shelter-in-place orders?

Methods

Sampling

The study's sample is comprised of police reports from the Chicago Police Department (CPD). Reports on cases that occurred during the months of March 2019 and March 2020 were utilized. Data was downloaded from the Chicago Data Portal (2020). March 2019 was used as a "usual circumstances" comparison to the March 2020 calls, which occurred toward the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic hitting this city. It is also the month in which a shelter-in-place order was put into effect (Petrella, St. Clair, Johnson, & Pratt, 2020), which was also a point of analysis.

There were 19,747 police reports documented by CPD on March 2019 cases, and there were 15,852 reports on March 2020 cases. The data was then narrowed to any reports considered domestic incidents, for a total of 6,560 reports. Data was then imported from a CSV file into a

Stata data file. The sample was then reduced only to reports involving some kind of physical or sexual violence. These offenses included any kind of assault, any kind of battery, homicide, criminal sexual assault, any sex offense, and physical or sexual offenses against children. The final sample consisted of 4,618 police reports. There was no missing data in the entire sample. However, this dataset did not include any demographic information about victims or perpetrators; information was limited to basic descriptors of the case, its crime code and characteristics, location data, and basic date/time information.

Variables and Instrumentation

Two dependent variables were analyzed: occurrence of domestic violence during the pandemic or not, and occurrence of domestic violence during shelter-in-place order or not. These two dependent variables, as well as several independent variables, are described as follows:

Occurrence of domestic violence during COVID-19 pandemic. One dependent variable for this study is whether or not a domestic violence case occurred during the COVID-19 pandemic. For this study's purposes, March 2019 and March 2020 police calls were the two groups analyzed and represented the dummy coding for this variable, with March 2020 cases being the group of interest and March 2019 being the reference group. This coding reflects the study's purpose of determining whether or not there are significant differences in the composition of domestic violence cases before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. To create this variable, any report for domestic violence happening between March 1-31, 2020, was coded as "pandemic" = "1." Any report for domestic violence happening between March 1-31, 2019, was coded as "pandemic" = "0."

Occurrence of domestic violence during shelter-in-place order. The other dependent variable for this study is whether or not a domestic violence case occurring during the pandemic

happened before or after the shelter-in-place order for the city of Chicago took effect, as this order placed additional constraints on individual's interactions and whereabouts. The shelter-in-place, or "stay at home" order went into effect on March 21, 2020, at 5:00pm (Petrella, St. Clair, Johnson, & Pratt, 2020). Cases occurring at or after this time were the group of interest, and cases before this time (but still during March 2020) were the reference group. This coding reflects the study's purpose of determining whether or not there are significant differences in the composition of domestic violence cases before and during shelter-in-place. To create this variable, any report for domestic violence happening between March 21 at 5:00pm and March 31 at 11:59pm, was coded as "stayhome" = "1." Any report for domestic violence happening between March 1 at 12:00am and March 21 at 4:59pm was coded as "stayhome" = "0."

Presence of sex crime. The presence of a sex crime during domestic violence cases was one independent variable analyzed. For the purposes of this research, sex crime was operationalized as any of the following crimes: criminal sexual assault, sex offense, and any sexual offenses against children. Data was also manually searched in Excel to ensure that no additional sex crimes were missed. A variable called "sexcrime" was created, and any case containing one of these elements was coded as "1," and any case that did not contain a sex crime was coded as "0."

Use of weapon. The use of a weapon during domestic violence cases was another independent variable contributing to these analyses. In CPD records, all cases involving weapons were designated as "aggravated" per the criminal code. Data was also manually searched in Excel to ensure that no additional crimes with weapons were missed. A variable called "weapon" was created, and any case involving the use of a weapon was coded as "1," and any case that did not was coded as "0."

Whether or not arrest was made. The issuance of an arrest during domestic violence cases was another independent variable contributing to these analyses. In CPD records, all cases in which an arrest was made were coded as such. A variable called "arrest" was created, and any case in which an arrest was made was coded as "1," and any case without was coded as "0."

Presence of child victim(s). The presence of one or more child victims during domestic violence cases was another independent variable contributing to these analyses. In CPD records, cases involving children were categorized as "offenses against children." Data was also manually searched in Excel to ensure that no crimes with child victims were missed, and a few crimes in which child victims were referenced in descriptions, but not categorized under "offenses against children," were manually recoded under this category. A variable called "child" was created, and any case involving a child victim was coded as "1." All cases without reported child victims were coded as "0." An interaction term was also created between presence of child victims and presence of sex crimes.

Location of offense. A final independent variable was location, or more specifically, whether or not the violence took place at someone's residence. For the purposes of this research, residence was operationalized as any of the following locations: apartment, residence, nursing home facility, or the grounds, parking lot, or yard of any of these locations. Hotels were not included as residences. Data was manually searched to ensure that all residential locations were coded as such. A variable called "residence" was located, and any case taking place at one of these residences was coded as "1." All cases taking place elsewhere were coded as "0."

Data Analysis Plan and Rationale

Logistic regression analysis was chosen as the primary data analysis tool for this study, as a number of independent variables were of interest, thus justifying the need for a multivariate

analysis. Utilizing a maximum likelihood estimator, logistic regression selects coefficients that maximize the probability of reproducing the sample data. Since two "whether or not" situations are being examined, it makes sense to analyze them in terms of probabilities or likelihood of each event occurring. The study offers two models with dichotomous dependent variables: one predicts whether or not a domestic violence case took place during the COVID-19 pandemic, and the other predicts whether or not a domestic violence case took place after the shelter-in-place order went into effect. While only five independent variables were available for the models due to the unique circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic and the limited data available as a result, there are still enough variables to justify the use of logistic regression. Each model utilized in the study and their formal specifications are outlined as follows.

Model 1: Occurrence of domestic violence during COVID-19, regressed on multiple variables. The first logistic regression model features occurrence of domestic violence before or during the COVID-19 pandemic regressed on the following independent variables: presence of a sex crime, weapon use, resulting arrest, presence of child victim(s), and residential locationality. Under this model, it is expected that, all other things being equal: when a sex crime is present, probability of domestic violence occurring during the COVID-19 pandemic changes; when a weapon is used, probability of domestic violence occurring during this pandemic changes; when an arrest is made, probability of domestic violence occurring during this pandemic changes; when a child victim is present, probability of domestic violence occurring during this pandemic changes; and when the location of the violence is a residence, probability of domestic violence occurring during this pandemic changes. The intercept in this model is the predicted log odds of domestic violence's occurrence before or during the COVID-19 pandemic when there is no sex crime present, no weapon use, no resulting arrest, no child victim(s), and the location of the

violence was not a residence. The formal model specification is as follows:

$$P(pandemic = 1) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\beta_0 + \beta_1 sexcrime + \beta_2 weapon + \beta_3 arrest + \beta_4 child + \beta_5 residence}}$$

Two-tailed significance testing was performed on each regression coefficient, and odds ratios and their confidence intervals were reported. Two-tailed testing was chosen due to the unprecedented nature of the COVID-19 pandemic and its yet unknown effects on domestic violence. Given the exploratory nature of this study, this test is appropriate. Multicollinearity and influential data checks were performed to ensure these assumptions of logistic regression were met. Joint hypothesis testing and interaction effects were explored based on various bivariate analyses.

Model 2: Occurrence of domestic violence during shelter-in-place order, regressed on multiple variables. The second logistic regression model features occurrence of domestic violence before or during the shelter-in-place order regressed on the same independent variables as the first model: presence of a sex crime, weapon use, resulting arrest, presence of child victim(s), and residential locationality. Under this model, it is expected that, all other things being equal: when a sex crime is present, probability of domestic violence occurring during shelter-in-place changes; when a weapon is used, probability of domestic violence occurring during shelter-in-place changes; when an arrest is made, probability of domestic violence occurring during shelter-in-place changes; when a child victim is present, probability of domestic violence occurring during shelter-in-place changes; and when the location of the violence is a residence, probability of domestic violence occurring during shelter-in-place changes. The intercept in this model is the predicted log odds of domestic violence's occurrence before or during the shelter-in-place order when there is no sex crime present, no weapon use, no resulting arrest, no child victim(s), and the location of the violence was not a residence. The formal model

specification is below:

$$P(stayhome = 1) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\beta_0 + \beta_1 sexcrime + \beta_2 weapon + \beta_3 arrest + \beta_4 child + \beta_5 residence}}$$

Two-tailed significance testing was performed on each regression coefficient, and odds ratios and their confidence intervals were reported. Two-tailed testing was chosen because of the unprecedented nature of the shelter-in-place orders and their yet unknown effects on domestic violence. Given the exploratory nature of this study, two-tailed significant tests are appropriate. Multicollinearity and influential data checks were performed to ensure these assumptions of logistic regression were met. Similar to the first model, joint hypothesis testing using the likelihood ratio test examined whether or not weapon use and resulting arrest jointly contribute to the model fit. Also similarly, joint hypothesis testing and interaction effects were explored based on various bivariate analyses.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

The study's dataset of March 2019 and March 2020 domestic violence cases contains 4,618 records, with complete information on sex offenses, weapon use, arrests made, child victims, and crime locations. The sample is large enough to meet the assumptions of logistic regression. All variables are dichotomous. Descriptive statistics are reported for March 2019 and March 2020 separately and in aggregate (Table 1).

In terms of total domestic violence cases, 51.26% (n=2367) of the sample's cases occurred in March 2019 and 48.74% (n=2251) took place in March 2020. The number of total cases was slightly lower during the pandemic month than they were during the previous year's "typical" month. During March 2020, 70.32% (n=1583) of cases took place prior to the shelter-in-place, and 29.68% (n=668) of cases took place after. This finding is consistent with the fact

that the shelter-in-place began on March 21—just over two-thirds of the way through the month.

In terms of overall trends, the overall sample contained cases with sex crimes 2.84% of the time, weapon use 14.83% of the time, arrests made 20.23% of the time, child victims involved 2.97% of the time, and residential locations involved 77.85% of the time. The amount that these varied by occurrence before or during the COVID-19 pandemic are described in Table 1 and was explored in the multiple regression analyses.

[INSERT TABLE 1]

Bivariate Analyses

Bivariate analyses were conducted on a few independent variables of interest to determine potential need for interaction terms and joint hypothesis testing.

Several interaction effects were tested preliminarily. The most promising was the potential interaction between the presence of a sex crime and the presence of child victims, for both theoretical and data-driven reasons. Victims of sex crimes and child victims are two particularly vulnerable groups who may lack in-person access to resources during a pandemic, and the experience of child sexual victimization is particularly alarming (Finkelhor, Shattuck, Turner, & Hamby, 2014). Chi-square analysis revealed a strong association between presence of a sex crime and presence of child victims (Table 2), leading to later testing of interaction effects.

Additionally, weapon use and the involvement of an arrest in domestic violence posed an interesting relationship. Logically, it makes sense that there may be a relationship between a weapon used in domestic violence and subsequent arrest in that situation. Chi-square analysis revealed a significant association between these two variables (Table 2). Joint hypothesis testing using likelihood ratio was utilized on these two significantly associated variables, because the size and significance of their association was smaller than the association between sex crimes

and child victims, and because these two variables are less critical to understand fully than the experiences of vulnerable youth who may be further impacted during the pandemic.

[INSERT TABLE 2]

Logistic Regression Analyses

Models were constructed for both dependent variables after several experimental runs. Since chi-square analysis revealed a strong association between presence of a sex crime and presence of child victims, an interaction term of these two variables was included in preliminary runs. The interaction term was not significant for either model, and both models were improved with its removal, so this term was dropped. Results of each model are presented in Tables 3 and 4 and are detailed as follows.

Model 1: Occurrence of domestic violence during COVID-19, regressed on multiple variables. The results of the first logistic regression model, predicting occurrence of domestic violence during COVID-19 regressed on several key variables, provided interesting findings with low explanatory value (Table 3). A chi-square test was performed on the log-likelihood ratio, and because its value was greater than the critical chi-square value for a two-tailed test, df=5, the null hypothesis that all coefficients are equal to zero was rejected. In addition to the significant intercept, the variables of resulting arrest and residential location were both significant. All other things being equal, a domestic violence case with an arrest made was 3% less likely (than cases without arrests) to have occurred during the COVID-19 pandemic. Similarly, all other being equal, a domestic violence case occurring at a residential location was 22% more likely (than cases at other locations) to have occurred during the pandemic.

In terms of overall model appropriateness, Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test indicated that the logistic response function was appropriate with a non-significant chi-square

value of 9.07, p=.97. To check for multicollinearity problems, a variance inflation factor (VIF) test was run, resulting in a low mean VIF of 1.09, indicating no problems. Influential data was assessed with Cook's distance and was not a problem for this model. The pseudo R^2 was .004, meaning that the model only accounted for .4% of the variation in the dependent variable.

A joint hypothesis test was also conducted to determine whether or not weapon use and resulting arrest jointly contributed to the model fit. The model was run with all variables, and then run again with weapon use and resulting arrest dropped from the model. In comparing (minus two times) the log-likelihood between the two models and obtaining a test chi-square, a significant chi-square of 8.95, p=.01 was found, indicating that at least one of the variables tested—either weapon use, resulting arrest, or both—was significant.

[INSERT TABLE 3]

Model 2: Occurrence of domestic violence in shelter-in-place, regressed on multiple variables. The results of the second logistic regression model, predicting occurrence of domestic violence during the shelter-in-place period regressed on several key variables, provided additional significant findings, but again with low explanatory value (Table 4). A chi-square test was performed on the log-likelihood ratio, and because its value was greater than the critical chi-square value for a two-tailed test, df=5, the null hypothesis that all coefficients are equal to zero was rejected. In addition to the significant intercept, in this model, residential location was once again significant. This time, however, resulting arrest was not at all significant, whereas the presence of a child victim was. All other being equal, a domestic violence case occurring at a residential location was 64% more likely (than cases at other locations) to have occurred during the shelter-in-place. Similarly, a domestic violence case with a child victim was 67% less likely (than cases without child victims) to have occurred during the shelter-in-place order.

In terms of overall model appropriateness, Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test indicated that the logistic response function was appropriate with a non-significant chi-square value of 13.66, p=.62. To check for multicollinearity problems, a variance inflation factor (VIF) test was run, resulting in a low mean VIF of 1.05, indicating no problems. Influential data was assessed with Cook's distance and was not a problem for this model. The pseudo R^2 was .01, meaning that the model only accounted for 1% of the variation in the dependent variable. This was a slight improvement over the previous model.

A joint hypothesis test was conducted once more to determine whether or not weapon use and resulting arrest jointly contributed to the model fit. This model was run with all variables, and then run again with weapon use and resulting arrest dropped from the model. This time, in comparing (minus two times) the log-likelihood between the two models and obtaining a test chi-square, the chi-square value was not significant at 1.95, p=.38 was found, so the null hypothesis cannot be rejected, and the conclusion is that that neither variable was significant. Weapon use and resulting arrest did not jointly contribute to this model, unlike the previous one.

[INSERT TABLE 4]

Conclusions

Interpretation of Findings

This study offers a rapid comparison of domestic violence cases occurring in a large midwestern city before and during the COVID-19 pandemic, contributing to the lack of literature in this critical area. The two models explored—one predicting occurrence of domestic violence during the pandemic, and the other predicting occurrence of domestic violence during the shelter-in-place period—offer multidimensionality in analyzing the pandemic's impact, taking its rapidly-changing nature in terms of impacts and regulations into account. While both models had

little explanatory power (.4% and 1%, respectively), the models were highly significant. More important, multiple key characteristics were identified as important predictors of how domestic violence may differ during the pandemic and under shelter-in-place orders.

Residential location was a significant predictor in both models, with greater impact during the shelter-in-place period (22% versus 64%). This makes sense—if more people are staying at home, violence is more likely going to occur in the home than not. This finding may suggest that individuals are taking precautions and staying at home, which suggests compliance with shelter-in-place orders. However, this finding also suggests that domestic violence first responders and service providers may need to focus their efforts on residential areas and methods of reaching individuals who are staying at home. Usual surveillance practices of observing public spaces will not be as useful during a time when violence is happening in private residences.

Two other predictor variables were significant. Arrests were less likely during the pandemic, but only by 3%; this impact did not hold shift when shelter-in-place was ordered. What did change during shelter-in-place was the presence of child victims—by quite a margin. With cases with child victims being 67% less likely to have occurred during the shelter-in-place order, the question may be less about occurrence and more about reporting. What happens to reporting violence with child victims when everyone is sheltering in place—especially in terms of access to mandated reporters—and what can be done about it?

While a lesser focus of this analysis, one more notable finding is on the total number of domestic violence cases during the pandemic, as compared to the previous year. With 51.26% (n=2367) of these cases occurring before the pandemic, in this sample, domestic violence cases actually went down. This contradicts previously reported statistics of domestic violence increases during the COVID-19 pandemic (Bosman, 2020). While variables and case types may differ

across reports, greater attention may be needed on the source of the report—police versus hotline data—than is currently being given in the public sphere.

Limitations and Strengths

This study is limited in a few key ways. A major limitation is the lack of available data. Several data sources in both Chicago and St. Louis were searched and contacted throughout the research process, without producing anything other than administrative police data. Additionally, this data was limited in scope, and extensive recoding was done to fit it within the confines of quantitative analysis. Particularly concerning was the lack of demographic information about perpetrators and victims, which limited the richness of the analysis and the ability to understand the pandemic's impact on domestic violence for certain communities. It is understandable that data would be sparse during this time, with reduced staffing and competing priorities. Some data, especially confidential domestic violence organization data, is simply not available as quickly as a pandemic would necessitate.

Additionally, there were time and methodological constraints that impacted the depth of analysis with the data available. With more time to explore different crime codes, types of abuse such as telephone harassment, stalking, and order of protection violations could have been included. Finally, low pseudo R^2 results and the limitation to one metropolitan area reduce generalizability and explanatory power of the findings, significant though they may be.

The study's strengths are the large sample, the innovation in working with available data, and the rapidness of response. Utilizing a large city's data allowed for nearly 5,000 domestic violence cases to be analyzed, offering great statistical power for this exploratory study. The study was also able to adapt to available data, quickly recoding as much useful qualitative data as was available into dichotomous variables for testing. The use of both pandemic and shelter-in-

place timeframes for analysis, with a direct comparison group to the year prior, made for a more robust analysis and provides a glimpse at the rapid changes data can take on during this unprecedented time. Lastly, the study was able to make quick use of data that was available only a month prior to analysis. Its rapid approach to analysis and writing during such limitations and strain can serve as a model for other social work research during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Implications

This study provides a glimpse at how domestic violence may differ during the COVID-19 pandemic and its shelter-in-place orders, as well as a few key ways in which those differences manifest. Domestic violence first responders and service providers, as well as researchers, must pivot their approaches to understanding, preventing, and treating this problem given the rapidly-evolving nature of COVID-19. Given the significant findings of cases more likely to occur in residences and less likely to be reported on child victims during shelter-in-place, additional resources are needed in this critical areas, to make residential areas safer and protect children who are vulnerable at this time. The latter point is perhaps the most interesting finding of the study and one in which urgent responses may be needed. With in-person access to mandated reporters like teachers and social workers being restricted due to stay-at-home orders, innovative ways of understanding and responding to children's experiences in the home are needed to adapt to these new circumstances.

The low explanatory power of the two regression models could be improved with the identification of additional important predictors. For future research to improve, more sources of data are needed, as are greater availability of variables that might contribute to model explanatory power. Information such as the length of wait time for police response, location of first contact with police and service providers, co-occurring protective order violations, and

elements of virtual/cyber abuse would be useful to further understanding the problem. Future research could compare domestic violence reported to police, to hotlines, and both during the pandemic, compared to usual reporting rates, to determine which services individuals are accessing during this time that looks so different from the norm. Open data sharing between research and practice realms would assist in this regard.

Lastly, funding must be directed to service providers, to move victims out of dangerous living situations, where more violence is being reported, and into safe spaces. Sheltering in place may create safety from COVID-19, which is of great public benefit. However, if physical and emotional safety are put at greater risk as a result, research and resources are needed to make sure individuals are simultaneously safe from both kinds of threats.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks Brett Drake, Merriah Croston, Maxine Davis, Shenyang Guo, Melissa Jonson-Reid, and Nancy Jacquelyn Perez-Flores for their encouragement and methodological guidance. The author also thanks Amirrah Abou-Youssef and Andrew Houghton for their on-the-ground wisdom that motivated the continuation of this work, and for their service to the Chicago area community.

References

Abramson, A. (2020, April 8). How COVID-19 may increase domestic violence and child abuse. *American Psychological Association*. Retrieved from https://www.apa.org/topics/covid-19/domestic-violence-child-abuse

Black, M. C., Basile, K. C., Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Walters, M. L., Merrick, M. T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M. R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 Summary Report*. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers of Disease Control and Prevention.

Bosman, J. (2020, May 15). Domestic Violence Calls Mount as Restrictions Linger: 'No One Can Leave.' *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/15/us/domestic-violence-coronavirus.html

Brooks, S. K., Webster, R. K., Smith, L. E., Woodland, L., Wessely, S., Greenberg, N., & Rubin, G. J. (2020). The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: Rapid review of the evidence. *The Lancet*, *395*(10227), 912–920. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30460-8

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2019, October 3). Preventing intimate partner violence. *Violence Prevention and Injury Center*. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/fastfact.html

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2020). CDC COVID data tracker. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/index.html

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2020, February 11). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/social-distancing.html

Chicago Data Portal. (2020). *Crimes – 2001 to present* [Data file and code book]. Retrieved from https://data.cityofchicago.org/Public-Safety/Crimes-2001-to-present/ijzp-q8t2

Dong, E., Du, H., & Gardner, L. (2020). An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30120-1

Finkelhor, D., Shattuck, A., Turner, H. A., & Hamby, S. L. (2014). The lifetime prevalence of child sexual abuse and sexual assault assessed in late adolescence. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *55*(3), 329–333. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.12.026

Jaffe, P. (2018). *Children Exposed to Domestic Violence: Current Issues in Research, Intervention, Prevention, and Policy Development*. Routledge.

Kumar, A., & Nayar, K. R. (2020). COVID 19 and its mental health consequences. *Journal of Mental Health*, 1–2. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638237.2020.1757052

Perilla, J. L., Lippy, C., Rosales, A., & Serrata, J. V. (2011). Prevalence of domestic violence. In J. W. White, M. P. Koss, & A. E. Kazdin (Eds.), *Violence against women and children, Vol 1: Mapping the terrain.* (pp. 199–220). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/12307-009

Petrella, D., St. Clair, S., Johnson, S., & Pratt, G. (2020, March 20). Gov. J.B. Pritzker issues order requiring residents to 'stay at home' starting Saturday. *Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved from https://www.chicagotribune.com/coronavirus/ct-coronavirus-illinois-shelter-in-place-lockdown-order-20200320-teedakbfw5gvdgmnaxlel54hau-story.html

Usher, K., Bhullar, N., Durkin, J., Gyamfi, N., & Jackson, D. (2020). Family violence and COVID-19: Increased vulnerability and reduced options for support. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, inm.12735. https://doi.org/10.1111/inm.12735

Van Gelder, N., Peterman, A., Potts, A., O'Donnell, M., Thompson, K., Shah, N., & Oertelt-Prigione, S. (2020). COVID-19: Reducing the risk of infection might increase the risk of intimate partner violence. *EClinicalMedicine*, *21*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100348

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Domestic Violence Cases, March 2019 and March 2020, Chicago, IL

	March 2019		March 2020		Total	
Variable	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Presence of Sex Crime						
Yes	79	3.34%	52	2.31%	131	2.84%
No	2288	96.66%	2199	97.16%	4487	97.16%
Weapon Used						
Yes	360	15.21%	325	14.44%	685	14.83%
No	2007	84.79%	1926	85.56%	3933	85.17%
Arrest Made						
Yes	517	21.84%	417	18.53%	934	20.23%
No	1850	78.16%	1834	81.47%	3684	79.77%
Child Victim Involved						
Yes	84	3.55%	53	2.35%	137	2.97%
No	2283	96.45%	2198	97.65%	4481	97.03%
Residential Location						
Yes	1806	76.30%	1789	79.48%	3595	77.85%
No	561	23.70%	462	20.52%	1023	22.15%
Cases Before Shelter-in-Place			1583	70.32%		
Cases During Shelter-in-Place			668	29.68%		
Total Domestic Violence Cases	2367	51.26%	2251	48.74%	4618	100%

Table 2

Chi-Square Associations Between Independent Variables

	Presence of Child Victim	
Sex Crime	No	Yes
No	4406	81
Yes	75	56

Note. $x^2(1, N=4618)=741.21, p=.000$

	Arrest Made	
Weapon Used	No	Yes
No	3165	768
Yes	519	166

Note. $x^2(1, N=4618)=8.0094, p=.005$

Table 3

Occurrence of Domestic Violence During COVID-19, Regressed on Multiple Variables

Predictor Variable	Odds Ratio	Sign?	Coef.	*Std. E*	*z*	95% *CI OR*
Presence of Sex Crime	.753	?	-.284	.149	-1.43	[.510, 1.11]
Use of Weapon	.972	?	-.028	.081	-.34	[.825, 1.15]
Presence of Child Victim	.702	?	-.354	.136	-1.83	[.480, 1.03]
Arrest Made	.804**	?	-.218	.059	-2.95	[.696, .930]
Residential Location	1.224**	?	.202	.087	2.83	[1.06, 1.41]
_cons	.868*		-.142	.057	-2.16	[.763, .987]
Pseudo R^2	.004					
Model Likelihood Ratio X^2 (df)	24.12(5)***					
N	4618					

Note: * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001, from two-tailed test.

Table 4

Occurrence of Domestic Violence During Shelter-in-Place, Regressed on Multiple Variables

Predictor Variable	Odds Ratio	Sign?	Coef.	*Std. E*	*z*	95% *CI OR*
Presence of Sex Crime	1.043	?	.042	.358	.12	[.532, 2.05]
Use of Weapon	.835	?	-.180	.114	-1.33	[.639, 1.09]
Presence of Child Victim	.329**	?	-1.11	.139	-2.62	[.144, .755]
Arrest Made	.960	?	-.041	.115	-.34	[.759, 1.22]
Residential Location	1.638***	?	.123	.202	4.01	[1.29, 2.09]
_cons	.028***		.115	.034	-10.54	[.238, .373]
Pseudo R^2	.01					
Model Likelihood Ratio X^2 (df)	27.08(5)**					
N	2251					

Note: * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001, from two-tailed test.