

Underreporting of Intimate Partner Violence in Brazil

Diego de Maria André^{*} and José Raimundo Carvalho[†]

April, 2025

Abstract

According to [WHO \(2013\)](#), in general 30% of all women worldwide who have been in a relationship have experienced physical and/or sexual violence by their intimate partner. However, only a small percentage of intimate partner violence (IPV) victims report it to the police. This phenomenon of under-reporting is known as “dark figure”. This paper aims to investigate the factors associated with the reporting decision of IPV victims to the police in Brazil using the third wave of the *Pesquisa de Condições Socioeconômicas e Violência Doméstica e Familiar contra a Mulher (PCSVDF^{Mulher})*. Using a bivariate probit regression model with sample selection, we found that older white women, those who do not tolerate domestic violence, and women who have experienced physical violence are more likely to report IPV to the police. In contrast, married women, those with partners who abuse alcohol and those who witnessed or knew that their mothers had experienced IPV, are less likely to report it to law enforcement.

Keywords: Intimate Partner Violence, Police reporting, Underreporting

^{*}Professor at the Graduate Program in Economics (PPECO), Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte (UFRN) and Intelligence Analyst at CENSIPAM/Ministry of Defense. E-mail: diego.andre@ufrn.br. ORCID: 0000-0003-3142-8336. (Author for correspondence)

[†]Full Professor at the Graduate Program in Economics, CAEN/UFC and Intelligence Analyst at CENSIPAM/Ministry of Defense. E-mail: josecarv@ufc.br. ORCID: 0000-0001-5774-5925.

1 Introduction

Intimate partner violence (IPV) is defined as any act of physical violence, sexual violence, stalking, and psychological aggression, including coercive tactics, by a current or former intimate partner, such as a spouse, boyfriend/girlfriend, dating partner, or ongoing sexual partner (Breiding et al., 2015). According to WHO (2013), overall, 30% of all women worldwide who have been in a relationship have experienced physical and/or sexual violence by their intimate partner (WHO, 2013). Facing these statistics, the World Health Organization recognized violence against women as a “global health problem of epidemic proportions”(WHO, 2013).

Despite these alarming numbers, only a small fraction of women victims of IPV seek help and denounce their aggressor. Only between 2. 5% and 15% of IPV victims report having suffered this type of violence (Gracia, 2004). This phenomenon, known as the “dark figure”, limits the capacity of public authorities to address the problem, since the real impacts of IPV on society are not known (Skogan, 1994). Therefore, understanding the phenomenon of under-reporting and what leads a victim of IPV to report or not report the case to the authorities is fundamental to implementing effective and efficient public policies to prevent and combat IPV.

Some studies, such as Skogan (1994) and MacDonald (2001b), seek to understand the factors that lead a victim of a crime to report or not a crime to the police. In general, they assume that the victims have rational behavior, i.e. they will report the crime if the reporting incentives are greater than the cost. So, if the perceived outcome of the report is negligible, one could expect that individuals would not report a crime (MacDonald, 2001b). In the context of IPV, there are several well-documented barriers in the literature to victims reporting domestic violence to the police, such as fear of not being believed by the police, the desire to protect the offender, the fear of removal of children and/or dissolution of the relationship, the economic dependence on the perpetrator, privacy concerns, fear of exposing their own illegal activities and fear of reprisal and the escalation of the violence (Voce and Boxall, 2018). However, self-protection, history of victimization, details of the incident, such as drunken offender, severity of violence, and witnesses of IPV as children, are factors that increase the probability of reporting violence to the police (Felson et al., 2002; Voce and Boxall, 2018).

There are several studies around the world, such as Felson et al. (2002), Akers and Kaukinen (2009), Podaná (2010), Kim and Ferraresso (2022), Juarros-Basterretxea et al. (2024), among others, that seek to explain the woman’s decision to report IPV. However, to our knowledge, there are no quantitative studies in Brazil that seek to explain the woman’s decision to report IPV. So, to fill this gap and shed light on this important issue, this paper uses data from the third wave of the *PCSVDF^{Mulher}*¹, the most extensive survey on domestic violence against women

¹*Pesquisa de Condições Socioeconômicas e Violência Doméstica e Familiar contra a Mulher*

carried out in Latin America. Through face-to-face interviews, $PCSVDF^{Mulher}$ collected information, among others, on victimization and reporting decisions of 8447 women in the cities of Fortaleza/CE, Recife/PE, Salvador/BA, Goiânia/GO, Porto Alegre/RS, São Paulo/SP and Belém/PA between August and December 2019.

To understand the phenomenon of the “dark figure” of IPV in Brazil, we followed two steps: The first was to analyze the responses given by women who were victims of domestic violence about the reasons that led them to report or not the violence they suffered to the police. After this first moment, following MacDonald (2001b), we estimate a bivariate probit regression model with sample selection to identify the factors that influence the reporting decision.

In addition to this introduction, the remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents a brief review of the theories that seek to explain the woman’s decision to report IPV to the police and some empirical studies on it. Section 3 introduces the data set and the measures used in our estimates. We also present the model used to estimate the factors that influence the decision to report IPV. Section 4 presents the results and Section 5 discusses the results obtained by the estimation of the model presented in the previous section. We conclude with a brief conclusion.

2 Background

Under-reporting of IPV occurs when victims do not report an incident of violence to the police or do not seek help (Lohani et al., 2021). Unfortunately, the vast majority of IPV cases go unreported, and only a small fraction of the cases are reported to the police. Gracia (2004) calls this phenomenon the “iceberg” of domestic violence. This large number of invisible IPV cases can cause great harm to society since the real extent of the problem is unknown, hindering the design of more effective and efficient public policies to combat and prevent the problem. Therefore, it is essential to understand the causes of under-reporting of IPV cases.

Some theories aim to explain why a woman who is a victim of IPV might choose to report or not report the abuse she has experienced. For example, *Social Learning theory* suggests that aggression is learned by observation of the behavior of others, especially within the family (Copp et al., 2019). Thus, this theory suggests that victims of IPV have learned to accept violence as a norm and, therefore, are less likely to report violence to the police.

Another theory that tries to explain the victim’s decision to report or not violence is the *Secondary Victimization theory*. Secondary victimization is defined as the second victimization that occurs after the violent episode, and is the result of people’s judgments regarding the victim

$(PCSVDF^{Mulher})$

and results in the absence of social support and negative judgments, and may be more painful and traumatic than the IPV itself, as it is perpetrated by those who should be the caregivers or protectors of the victim (Oliveira and Pereira, 2024).

Akers and Kaukinen (2009) summarize the feminist perspectives in the decision to report or not IPV. The *feminist theory* holds that women are considered “culturally legitimate victims”. In marriage and marriage-like relationships, the partner controls the couple’s resources, preventing the woman from having free access to and control over their properties. This control may explain why some IPV victims seek help, and some do not. Another point of view from the feminist perspective is that the perpetuation of men’s power over women may make police officers and court officials reluctant to believe women who report incidents of IPV and hesitant to enforce existing arrest laws, which may discourage women from seeking help once they may feel that she will not be believed and their abusers will not be punished. Finally, marital dependency, which can increase due to the lack of educational and financial resources and the presence of young children, can reduce the possibility of the woman leaving a violent relationship and may also decrease the probability of reporting the experience of violence.

In the *rational choice framework*, the victim’s decision to report or not an IPV is influenced more by a sort of personal cost-benefit analysis (Gottfredson and Gottfredson, 1988). Victims are more likely to report an IPV to the police when incentives are high and costs are low (Felson et al., 2002). We can cite incentives to stop an ongoing attack, deter future attacks, desire for retribution or justice, protect other people, such as children, and the severity of the incident. The more serious the incident, with the use of weapons or serious injuries, the greater the likelihood that the victim will report the case to the police. However, the victim’s cost can include embarrassment and protection of status, the desire to protect the offender from prison, and fear of reprisals (Felson et al., 2002).

Having discussed the main theories explaining a woman’s decision to report or not report the IPV she experienced to the police, we will now review empirical studies that have investigated the underreporting of IPV cases.

Using data from the National Crime Victimization Survey (USA), Felson et al. (2002) analyzed the decision of reporters and non-reporters of domestic violence using an approach based on incentives and costs. Felson et al. (2002) found that privacy concerns, fear of reprisal, and desire to protect offenders are factors that prevent victims of domestic violence from calling the police. At the same time, self-protection and perceived domestic assaults as more serious are factors that encourage reporting. Felson et al. (2002) also found that victims are likely to view domestic assaults as more threatening and serious because they tend to occur at home.

Akers and Kaukinen (2009) analyzed how police notification decisions are influenced by the demographic characteristics of victims and incident-specific factors. Using data from the

1999 Canadian General Social Survey, Victimization (CAN), [Akers and Kaukinen \(2009\)](#) found that victims who live in a cohabiting relationship and with children are more willing to report IPV to the police, while income, education and employment status do not appear to influence reporting decisions. [Akers and Kaukinen \(2009\)](#) also found that, contrary to predictions, visible minority women more often call the police. Concerning the incident-specific factors, [Akers and Kaukinen \(2009\)](#) found that women who call the police are also likely to have experienced severe forms of violence, including threats with weapons, injury, and the destruction of their property.

In Europe, [Podaná \(2010\)](#) analyzed the reporting decisions of victims of domestic violence in the Czech Republic. For this, [Podaná \(2010\)](#) utilized the Czech part of the International Violence Against Women Survey. [Podaná \(2010\)](#) found that the reporting rate among the victims of IPV was extremely low, with only 8% of the victims of IPV reporting the case to the authorities. Using a logistic regression model, [Podaná \(2010\)](#) found that features of the particular incident and factors related to the history of violence in the relationship are relevant to explain the decision to report. At the same time, [Podaná \(2010\)](#) also found that distrust of the police is an important factor in deciding not to report to the police.

In Asia, [Kim and Ferraresso \(2022\)](#) examined the factors associated with the willingness to report IPV to police for both men and women using data from the 2013 Korean National Domestic Violence Survey. For both men and women, [Kim and Ferraresso \(2022\)](#) found that the willingness to report IPV to the police was statistically significant when the participants were young, had a strong knowledge of IPV-related laws, had lower levels of acceptance of violence, had lower levels of values of conservative gender roles, and when the severity of violence was greater. However, having children and having experienced child abuse are factors that exclusively affected women's willingness to report IPV to the police.

In South America, [Juarros-Basterretxea et al. \(2024\)](#) examined the effect of perceived reportability of IPV on women's decision to report IPV to the police. Using data from the Chilean National Institute of Youth (CHI), [Juarros-Basterretxea et al. \(2024\)](#) showed that perceived reportability was a significant predictor of choosing the police as a source of help compared to other informal sources of help, such as family and friends, but has no effect on the choices between the police and other formal sources of help, such as psychologists and public services. [Juarros-Basterretxea et al. \(2024\)](#) also found that participants who cohabit or have married married (thus assumed to cohabite) were more likely to seek the help of the police in the event of IPV than participants in less stable or more informal relationships, such as dating or short-term relationships.

After reviewing the main theories that explain why a woman who is a victim of domestic violence might decide to report the incident to the police, along with some empirical studies on

the topic, in the next section, we will present the dataset and methodology used in this article.

3 Methods

3.1 Sample

Data for this study come from the third wave (2019) of the *PCSVDF^{Mulher}* (Pesquisa de Condições Socioeconômicas e Violência Doméstica e Familiar contra a Mulher - Survey of Socioeconomic Conditions and Domestic and Family Violence against Women). The *PCSVDF^{Mulher}* is an interdisciplinary effort to build empirical longitudinal evidence that enables the study of violence against women (including IPV), its causes and consequences for direct and indirect victims, the allocation of resources in the household, women and children's health; child development; and the interrelationships among them through an ethical and methodological sound approach (Carvalho et al., 2018).

The third wave of *PCSVDF^{Mulher}* was approved by the Brazilian Ethics Committee (CONEP) under the number 20237519.0.0000.5054 and was carried out between 5 August 2019 and 15 December 2019 in the cities of Fortaleza / CE, Recife / PE, Salvador / BA, Goiânia / GO, Porto Alegre / RS, So Paulo / SP and Belém / PA.

According to Carvalho and André (2023), *PCSVDF^{Mulher}* uses a complex, stratified, multistage probability cluster sampling design with unequal selection probabilities to select participants in wave I. In the first stage, a random sample of neighborhoods was selected. In the second stage, a random sample of census tracts was selected within these neighborhoods. In the third stage, households were selected within these census tracts. Finally, a woman aged 15 to 59 years was selected in each selected household to answer the questionnaire. In Wave II, *PCSVDF^{Mulher}* interviewers attempted to reinterview the same women who had participated in Wave I. In cases where they were unable to reinterview the same woman, replacement by another woman within the same household or by another woman from a different household was allowed. In the latter case, the choice was made using the same protocol as in Wave I.

In wave III, the cities of Goiânia / GO, Porto Alegre / RS, So Paulo / SP and Belém / PA participated for the first time in *PCSVDF^{Mulher}*. Thus, the protocol used to select participants in these cities was the same protocol used in Wave I. For the cities of Fortaleza / CE, Recife / PE and Salvador / BA, which have been in *PCSVDF^{Mulher}* since Wave I, the same protocol as in Wave II was used. The final sample of *PCSVDF^{Mulher}* Wave III consisted of 8,447 women.

3.2 Measures

Dependent Variables

The approach used in this paper requires two dependent variables: The first is victimization, and the second is reporting to the police. The *PCSVDF^{Mulher}* survey assesses victimization using questions adapted from [Garcia-Moreno et al. \(2005\)](#) to assess the prevalence of domestic violence. Thus, for each type of violence (emotional, physical, or sexual), a series of acts were listed and asked, one by one, whether the interviewee had already suffered any of them at some point in her life. In case of an affirmative answer, we ask whether the act occurred in the last 12 months. Thus, the dichotomous variable *violence12* was coded as 1 if the respondent suffered any type of violence in the last 12 months and 0 if the respondent did not. For the second variable, *PCSVDF^{Mulher}* asked women who have been victims of violence in the last 12 months if “In the last 12 months, have you ever gone to any of the following for help due to domestic violence?” and listed a series of service networks for women in situations of violence. If the respondent answered that she sought help at Ordinary police stations, Military police, or Specialized Police Offices for Assistance to Women, then the dichotomous variable *report_police* was coded as 1, and 0 if she did not seek help at any of these locations.

Independent variables

The independent variables in the current study are: *Know Victim*, a dichotomous variable coded as 1 if the respondent knows any woman from her social network (i.e., acquaintance or woman that she is friendly with) who has been a victim of physical domestic violence in the past 12 months committed by a man. *Mother Victim*, a dichotomous variable that takes the value 1 if, during the respondent’s childhood, her mother was a victim of domestic violence. *Police Perception* is a categorical variable that measures the respondents’ perception about police patrol in the past 30 days in their neighborhood (0 = Never, 1 = Once/Twice, 2 = 3–5 times, 3 = 6–10 times, 4 = 11–20 times, 5 = More than 20 times). The variable *Know DEAM* is a categorical variable that measures the respondent’s knowledge about the Women’s Specialized Police Station (DEAM) (= 1 if never heard of, = 2 if heard a little, 3 = if heard a lot). The variable *Tolerate Violence* is a categorical variable that measures women’s attitudes about gender relations. In the *PCSVDF^{Mulher}* survey, the respondents were asked “If necessary, do you believe that you should tolerate/accept physical violence in order to keep your family together?” (1 = Agree, 2 = Neither agree nor disagree, 3 = Disagree). To measure the impact of the type of violence on the probability of reporting, we also include the variables *Vio_Emo_12* (=1 if the respondent suffered any act of emotional violence in the last 12 months), *Vio_Fis_12*

(=1 if the respondent suffered any act of physical violence in the last 12 months), and *Vio_Sex_12* (=1 if the respondent suffered any act of sexual violence in the last 12 months). We also include partner characteristics, such as *Partner Alcohol Abuse* (= 1 if drink every day or nearly every day or once or twice a week) and *Partner Job* (= 1 if employed). Finally, we also include some respondent's demographic characteristics, such as *Age* (in years), *White* (= 1 if White or Asian), *Education* (1 = No education, 2 = Incomplete or some fundamental school, 3 = Fundamental school, 4 = Incomplete or some high school, 5 = High school, 6 = Technical course, 7 = Incomplete or some University/College, 8 = University/College degree, 9 = At least some graduate program - treated as a continuous variable), *Job* (= 1 if employed), *Married* (= 1 if currently married), *Children* (Number of children), *Alcohol Abuse* (= 1 if drink every day or nearly every day or once or twice a week), and *City* (1 = Fortaleza/CE, 2 = Recife/PE, 3 = Salvador/BA, 4 = Goiânia/GO, 5 = Porto Alegre/RS, 6 = São Paulo/SP, 7 = Belém/PA)

3.3 Analytic strategy

The analysis used in this study consisted of the following steps. First, we analyzed the prevalence of domestic violence disaggregated by type in the last 12 months. Then, we divided our sample into two groups (victims versus non-victims) and performed a chi-square test of independence and independent sample t-tests to check whether there were differences in the independent variables in the two groups. Third, we analyzed the reasons that victims of domestic violence used to report or did not report violence suffered to the police. Fourth, we again use a chi-square test of independence and independent sample t-tests to check whether there are differences in the independent variables now between the group of women victims of violence who reported the violence suffered and the group of women victims who did not report it. Finally, to understand the determinants of underreporting, we will use an approach similar to that used by MacDonald (2001a), with the estimation of a bivariate probit regression model with sample selection. The choice of this model is due to the fact that victimization is highly correlated with socioeconomic factors that influence crime reporting behavior (MacDonald, 2001a).

Therefore, first consider Eq. (1), which relates the unobservable individual tendency to report with observable individual characteristics:

$$r_i^* = \beta' x_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

Where r_i^* is the latent variable that denotes the individual propensity to report a crime, x_i is a vector of individual attributes that may contain socioeconomic characteristics of the interviewee, presence in the neighborhood of care services for women victims of violence, and the severity of the violence suffered, β is the vector of parameters to estimate, and ε_i is the normally distributed

error term with zero mean and variance one, conditioned on x , that captures the unobserved determinants of the propensity to report. The latent variable r_i^* determines the observable result of the decision to report or not, through Equation (2).

$$r_i = \begin{cases} 1, & r_i^* > 0 \\ 0, & r_i^* \leq 0 \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Eq. (1) can be estimated by a simple *probit* or *logit* model, with the results providing us with a direct measure of the impact of the explanatory variables on the probability of reporting the violence suffered. However, as suggested by (MacDonald, 2001a), we can only estimate Eq. (1) if we observe an episode of violence and if this is completely random, the estimation would not be a problem. However, being a victim of domestic violence or not is not a completely random event. There are individual characteristics of the woman and her partner that affect the probability of a woman being a victim of domestic violence (See Yakubovich et al. (2018), Dias et al. (2020), Tiruye et al. (2020), Kebede et al. (2022), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (2021), among others). Suppose then that the probability of being a victim of domestic violence is represented by a latent variable b_i^* , which is determined by:

$$b_i^* = \gamma' z_i + \mu_i \quad (3)$$

where z_i is a vector of socioeconomic variables of the woman and her partner, γ is the vector of parameters to estimate, and μ_i is the normally distributed error term with mean zero and variance one, conditioned on z . Like in Eq. (1), the latent variable b_i^* is related to the result observed of violence through Eq. (4)

$$b_i = \begin{cases} 1, & b_i^* > 0 \\ 0, & b_i^* \leq 0 \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

So, note that we will only observe the result of reporting or not when there is violence, that is, when $b_i = 1(b_i^* > 0)$.

The Separate Estimation of Eq. (1) and Eq. (3) assumes that the covariance ρ between ε and μ is zero. However, if there are unobserved characteristics that influence both r_i and b_i , then ε and μ will be correlated, that is, $\rho \neq 0$ and the estimates obtained by a univariate *probit* (or *logit*) model will be biased. Thus, to avoid this problem, we can estimate a bivariate *probit* from the joint results of Eq. (1) and Eq. (3), where the joint probability of being a victim of domestic violence and reporting the incident is given by:

$$Pr(r_i = 1, b_i = 1) = \Phi(\beta'x_i, \gamma'z_i, \rho) \quad (5)$$

where Φ is the cumulative distribution function of a bivariate normal distribution. Empirically, this model will be identified if there is an exclusion restriction; that is, we need a variable in z_i that influences the probability of being a victim of domestic violence but that does not impact the propensity to report the incident, that is, not in x_i (Maddala, 2010).

4 Results

Prevalence of IPV

As stated previously, the main objective of this paper is to understand the under-reporting of IPV in Brazil. Therefore, we first need to understand the prevalence of IPV. The Table (1) presents the prevalence of IPV disaggregated by type of violence in the last 12 months in our sample.

Table 1: Prevalence of IPV disaggregated by type of violence in the last 12 months

Type of Violence	%	CI	n (Unw)	N (Unw)
Emotional	13.77	12.35 - 15.33	528	3618
Physical	4.92	4.1 - 5.89	208	3576
Sexual	2.77	2.16 - 3.56	108	3583
Any type	15.55	14.05 - 17.19	596	3621

Source: Elaborated by the authors

As we can see, 15.55% ($n = 596$) of the women in our sample were victims of IPV in the last 12 months. By disaggregating by type of violence, we can see that the most frequent type of violence was emotional, with 13.77% ($n = 528$) of women having suffered this type of violence in the last 12 months. Physical violence appears next, with 4.92% ($n = 208$), and then sexual violence, with 2.77% ($n = 108$).

Table (2) shows the difference in the composition of the group of women who were victims and those who were not victims of IPV. The results indicate a statistically significant difference in some variables between the two groups. The *Violence Group* is slightly younger (Dif = -1.84, $p = 0.008$), with a slightly lower level of education (Dif = -0.24, $p = 0.0737$), a lower percentage of married women (Dif = -6.53, $p = 0.0255$), and a higher average number of children (Dif = 0.17, $p = 0.0311$) than the *Non-Violence Group*.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics for factors associated with violence versus non violence

Variable	Category	Victim		Non Victim		<i>t</i> -test	
		%	se	%	se	Dif	<i>p</i> -val
Age	In years	34.57	0.66	36.4	0.3	-1.84	0.008
White	1 = White and Asian	29.25	2.85	32.91	2.21	-3.66	0.178
Education	1 = No education ... 9 = Postgraduate	5.44	0.13	5.68	0.07	-0.24	0.0737
Job	1 = Employed	64.45	2.61	60.62	1.37	3.83	0.1629
Married	1 = Yes	32.01	2.75	38.54	1.49	-6.53	0.0255
Children	Number of Children	1.48	0.07	1.31	0.04	0.17	0.0311
Alcohol Abuse	1 = Yes	25.01	2.64	17.55	1.43	7.47	0.0025
Know Victim	1 = Yes	37.64	2.61	25.3	1.28	12.35	0
Mother Victim	1 = Yes	41.63	3.34	25.91	1.15	15.73	0
Police Perception	0 = Never ... 5 = +20 times	2.29	0.11	2.27	0.06	0.02	0.8465
Partner Alcohol Abuse	1 = Yes	45.23	2.62	35.84	1.65	9.39	0.0008
Partner Job	1 = Employed	76.99	1.99	77.58	1.13	-0.59	0.794
Variable	Category	Victim		Non Victim		χ^2 -test	
		%	N(Unw)	%	N(Unw)	F	<i>p</i> -val
Know DEAM	Never	6.37	51	7.35	267	0.3721	0.6896
	A few	31.9	188	32.14	995		
	Many times	61.74	352	60.5	1751		
Tolerate Violence	Agree	10.83	60	3.54	121	8.5783	0.0002
	Neither agree nor disagree	1.88	13	0.96	32		
	Disagree	87.29	518	95.5	2848		
City	Fortaleza/CE	16.74	100	18.6	582	1.3179	0.2488
	Recife/PE	12.13	82	13.48	391		
	Salvador/BA	18.33	102	20.22	619		
	Goiânia/GO	14.27	80	10.67	328		
	Porto Alegre/RS	11.54	77	12.68	355		
	São Paulo/SP	14.7	79	14.99	446		
	Belém/PA	12.28	76	9.36	304		

Source: Elaborated by the authors

Concerning alcohol abuse, the *Violence Group* has a higher percentage of both women who abuse alcohol (Dif = 7.47, $p = 0.0025$) and their partners or ex-partners (Dif = 9.39, $p = 0.0008$).

Among the *Violence Group*, there is a higher percentage of women who know other

women in their social circle who were also victims of physical violence than in the *Non-Violence Group* (Dif = 12.35, $p = 0.0000$). Furthermore, the percentage of women who knew that their mothers suffered IPV during their childhood is also higher in the *Violence Group* (Dif = 15.73, $p = 0.0000$).

Finally, we can see that among the *Violence Group*, there is a higher percentage of women who believe that they should tolerate violence to keep the family together. In this group, 10.83% of the women agreed, compared to only 3.54% in the *non-violence group* ($F = 8.5783$, $p = 0.0002$).

On the other hand, the variables *White*, *Job*, *Police Perception*, *Partner Job*, *Know DEAM*, and *City* did not show statistically significant differences between the two groups.

Reporting the IPV to the police

As shown in Table (1), 596 women in our sample were victims of IPV in the last 12 months. However, only 71 (11.91%) reported the incident to the police, while 376 (63.09%) did not report it, and 149 (25%) did not want to answer. This difference between the number of incidents that occurred and the number of incidents reported is what experts call the “dark figure” (Skogan, 1994). Tables (3) and (4) below show, respectively, the main reasons that IPV victims in our sample reported or did not report the incident to the police.

Table 3: Reasons for Calling the Police [N = 71 (11.91%)]

Reason	%	N (Unw)
Encouraged by friends/family	28.12	22
Could not endure more	44.91	36
Badly injured	7.27	3
He threatened or tried to kill you	16.29	11
He threatened or hit children	7.16	6
Saw that children were suffering	8.62	6
Thrown out of the home	1.48	2
Afraid you would kill him	0.52	1
Afraid he would kill you	11.41	10
Other	21.49	11

Source: Elaborated by the authors

The reason most cited by women who reported IPV to the police was “Could not endure more” with 44.91% ($n = 36$), followed by “Encouraged by friends/family” (28.12%, $n = 22$) and “He threatened or tried to kill you” (16.29%, $n = 11$). Furthermore, 11.41% ($n = 10$) of the

women in our sample stated that they reported it because they were “afraid that he would kill you”.

Regarding the reasons for not reporting IPV to the police, the three most cited reasons were the following. Firstly, many victims did not consider the incident serious enough to warrant the involvement of the police (approximately 67%). Secondly, some victims were afraid of the consequences of reporting violence, such as further violence or threats (approximately 5%). Third, they were either too embarrassed, ashamed or afraid to report the incident, fearing that they would not be believed or blamed for the violence (approximately 3%).

Table 4: Most Important Reasons for Not Calling the Police [(N = 376 - 63.09%)]

Reason	Police Patrol		Police Station		DEAM	
	%	N (Unw)	%	N (Unw)	%	N (Unw)
I did not consider what happened to me a serious incident	66.89	237	67.28	241	67.14	241
Embarrassed/Ashamed/Afraid would not be believed or would be blamed	3.29	21	2.93	17	3.35	19
Fear or threats/Consequences/More violence	5.28	18	5.06	19	5.32	19
Believed it would not help	3.92	15	4.22	15	4.03	14
Know other women that were not helped	0.45	4	0.94	6	0.1	1
Afraid he would be arrested	3.23	14	2.78	12	1.41	7
This service does not exist in the city/community	-	-	0.39	2	1.05	4
Don't know/Didn't answer	16.94	58	16.38	55	17.58	62

Source: Elaborated by the authors

Now, we will turn our attention to analyzing the difference in the composition of the group of women who reported IPV to the police and those who did not.

Table (5) highlights significant differences between the two groups. In the *Reporting group*, we can see a higher percentage of white women than in the *Non-Reporting group* (Dif = 15.79, $p = 0.0561$), just as there is a lower percentage of married women (Dif = -22.86, $p = 0.0008$). Concerning the variable *Know DEAM*, we found that in the *Reporting group*, there is a higher percentage of women who heard *A lot* about DEAM than in the *Non-Reporting group* ($F = 3.7116$, $p = 0.0255$). In addition, as expected, we found that women who believe that they should tolerate domestic violence to keep their family together are present in a higher percentage in the *non-reporting group* than in the *report group* ($F = 7.7715$, $p = 0.0005$). Finally, we also found that in the groups of women who reported IPV to the police, there was a higher percentage of women who suffered physical violence (Dif = 26.01, $p = 0.0081$).

Table 5: Descriptive statistics for factors associated with police notification for the victims who reported the IPV to the police

Variable	Category	Reported		Not Reported		<i>t</i> -test	
		%	se	%	se	Dif	<i>p</i> -val
Age	In years	35.69	2.06	34.36	0.85	1.33	0.5462
White	1 = White and Asian	41.89	7.36	26.1	3.52	15.79	0.0561
Education	1 = No education ... 9 = Postgraduate	5.39	0.4	5.53	0.16	-0.14	0.7478
Job	1 = Employed	75.74	6.09	65.92	3.33	9.82	0.1651
Married	1 = Yes	14.97	5.5	37.83	3.7	-22.86	0.0008
Children	Number of Children	1.59	0.2	1.43	0.1	0.16	0.497
Alcohol Abuse	1 = Yes	28.39	6.84	24.01	2.97	4.38	0.5416
Know Victim	1 = Yes	48.13	7.26	37.35	3.14	10.78	0.1669
Mother Victim	1 = Yes	34.96	8.63	43.57	3.63	-8.61	0.3401
Police Perception	0 = Never ... 5 = +20 times	2.22	0.38	2.23	0.13	-0.02	0.9623
Partner Alchool Abuse	1 = Yes	51.77	7.29	46.19	3.41	5.59	0.4947
Partner Job	1 = Employed	71.17	6.34	79.51	2.38	-8.34	0.2342
Variable	Category	Reported		Not Reported		χ^2 -test	
		%	N(Unw)	%	N(Unw)	F	<i>p</i> -val
Know DEAM	Never	1.71	3	7.03	33	3.7116	0.0255
	A little	22.89	19	31.86	118		
	A lot	75.4	48	61.11	223		
Tolerate Violence	Agree	1.15	2	14.3	51	7.7715	0.0005
	Neither agree nor disagree	1.31	1	2.44	11		
	Disagree	97.53	68	83.26	313		
City	Fortaleza/CE	13.91	14	17.49	66	0.3849	0.8885
	Recife/PE	15.66	12	12.5	52		
	Salvador/BA	19.13	13	22.07	79		
	Goiânia/GO	11.29	10	13.77	47		
	Porto Alegre/RS	21.61	9	8.6	39		
	São Paulo/SP	11.07	8	14.78	50		
	Belém/PA	7.33	5	10.78	43		
Type of Violence		Reported		Not Reported		<i>t</i> -test	
		%	N(Unw)	%	N(Unw)	Dif	<i>p</i> -val
Emotional Violence		92.00	64	88.97	329	3.03	0.4988
Physical Violence		54.36	36	28.36	116	26.01	0.0081
Sexual Violence		18.24	16	17.68	68	0.55	0.9291

Source: Elaborated by the authors

Econometric Model

Before presenting the results of the bivariate probit with sample selection model, it is worth stressing that we utilized an adaptive Lasso for variable selection, as described in [Ogundimu \(2022\)](#). We utilized the R package *HeckmanSelect* ([Ogundimu, 2024](#)). The following table (6) shows the result of the model with the variables chosen by adaptive Lasso for the selection and outcome equations. The final model was estimated using the R package *Sample-Selection* ([Toomet and Henningsen, 2008](#)) and employing the simulated annealing algorithm.

Table 6: Results of the bivariate probit with sample selection model

	<i>Dependent Variable</i>	
	Violence	Report to police
Intercept	-0.3550 (0.2718)	0.4738 (0.4664)
Age	-0.0136*** (0.0030)	0.0150*** (0.0052)
White	-	0.2741** (0.1229)
Education	-	-0.0266 (0.0284)
Job	0.1037* (0.0604)	-
Married	-0.0886 (0.0670)	-0.2406** (0.1220)
Children	0.0908*** (0.0230)	-0.0321 (0.0410)
Know Victim	-	0.0793 (0.0994)
Mother Victim	0.3488*** (0.0650)	-0.3209*** (0.1060)
Police Perception	-	0.0063 (0.0268)
Partner Alcohol Abuse	0.2661*** (0.0634)	-0.2202** (0.1041)
Partner Job	-0.0471 (0.0684)	-
Emotional Violence	-	0.1673 (0.1625)
Physical Violence	-	0.2459** (0.1085)
Sexual Violence	-	0.1118 (0.1373)
Know DEAM		
Never (ref)	-	-
A little	-	0.1166 (0.1951)
A lot	-	0.2535 (0.1876)
Tolerate Violence		
Neither agree nor disagree (ref)	-	-
Agree	-0.0597 (0.2583)	-0.0991 (0.3598)
Disagree	-0.7435*** (0.2351)	0.5960* (0.3320)
Observations	3,049	374
Log Likelihood	-1442.785	
ρ	-0.7901*** (0.1031)	

Source: Elaborated by the authors

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

For the selection equation, except *Married* and *Partner job*, all other variables are statistically significant. We found that younger women are more likely to suffer from IPV, as well as women who have a job. Having children also increases the probability of women suffering from IPV. As expected, having a partner who abuses alcohol increases the probability of the woman suffering IPV, and not tolerating domestic violence decreases the probability of the woman suffering IPV. Finally, having a mother who was a victim of domestic violence also increases the likelihood of the woman suffering IPV.

For the outcome equation, as expected, victims of physical IPV and women who do not tolerate domestic violence are more likely to report the incident to the police. However, having a partner who abuses alcohol and being married decreases the probability of the woman reporting the violence suffered to the police. Regarding sociodemographic characteristics, white and older women are more likely to report IPV. Finally, having a mother who suffered domestic violence decreases the likelihood of the woman reporting IPV to the police. All other variables do not seem to play an important role in a woman's decision to report the IPV to the police.

5 Discussion and Conclusions

The underreporting of cases of domestic violence in Brazil is still unknown, with few studies seeking to estimate this number. [Senado Federal do Brasil \(2024\)](#) estimates the number of women who were victims of physical and/or sexual violence and did not report it to the authorities at 61%. [Vasconcelos et al. \(2023\)](#) estimate that 75.9% of victims of physical violence do not report the violence they suffered. This number increases even more for cases of sexual (89.4%) and psychological (98.5%) violence. Therefore, to shed light on this topic, this study sought to estimate the underreporting of IPV in Brazil and identify the factors associated with the decision to report or not the violence suffered to the police.

We found that only 11.91% of the IPV victims report the case to the police. Of the women who reported it, the two main reasons for asking the police for help were because they could no longer support the violent situation they were experiencing and the support they received from family and friends. Thus, we can highlight two important points from these results: i) The act of reporting the violence suffered seems to have a component of resistance, where the woman does not report the violence suffered, believing that the perpetrator will change his behavior, resisting reporting until a breaking point, where she can no longer bear the aggression. For example, [Podaná \(2010\)](#) showed that the history of incidents is a key variable in explaining the decision to report IPV to the police; ii) Having a support network is essential for women who are victims of violence to break the cycle of violence. [Jong et al. \(2008\)](#) identified that

many IPV victims who filed a complaint against the aggressor resorted to the help of friends and family to support their complaint.

Concerning IPV victims who did not report, we found that the vast majority did not report it because they considered that the violence suffered was not serious. This finding is consistent with [Felson et al. \(2002\)](#), which also found that the main reason for not calling the police was because the victim believed that the incident was trivial. [Akers and Kaukinen \(2009\)](#) also found that women who called the police were more likely to have experienced severe forms of violence. Another important finding is that the second most cited reason not to report to police is fear of more violence. [Felson et al. \(2002\)](#) also found that fear of reprisal is one important key to not reporting violence to the police.

In Brazil, the Maria da Penha law ([Brasil, 2006](#)) created mechanisms to protect women victims of violence by implementing the so-called protective measures. Among the measures imposed on the aggressor are the suspension or restriction of carrying weapons and the prohibition of approaching and contacting the victim. Despite the progress made, unfortunately, these measures were not enough. In 2023, 20% of the victims of femicide in Porto Alegre / RS had protective measures ([GZH, 2023](#)). In Fortaleza / CE, 9. 5% of the victims of attempted femicide had protective measures ([Quezado and Macêdo, 2023](#)). These results show that the Brazilian government needs to improve the application of the Maria da Penha law to ensure that victims of IPV feel safe to report the violence they suffered.

In order to answer our question about the factors associated with the report decision, we estimated a bivariate probit with sample selection. In this model, the first stage, that is, the selection equation, estimates the factors associated with the probability of a woman being a victim of IPV. We found that older women are less likely to be victims of IPV. In a systematic review, [Capaldi et al. \(2012\)](#) found relatively consistent results that age is protective against IPV in adulthood. [Yakubovich et al. \(2018\)](#) also found that being older is a protective factor against women experiencing IPV.

An interesting result we found is that employed women are more likely to become victims of IPV. This result is opposite to the one found by [Aizer \(2010\)](#) and [Anderberg et al. \(2015\)](#). [Aizer \(2010\)](#) found that decreases in the wage gap reduce violence against women, and [Anderberg et al. \(2015\)](#) found that an increase in the female unemployment rate causes an increase in the incidence of physical abuse against women. On the other hand, our results are similar to those found by [Bhalotra et al. \(2019\)](#) who, using representative data from 31 developing countries, found that a decrease in female unemployment rates is associated with an increase in the probability of victimization.

We also found that women whose mothers were victims of domestic violence are more likely to be victimized. This result was expected, as studies such as [Whitfield et al. \(2003\)](#),

Pollak (2004), and Ludermir et al. (2017) show that children who grow up exposed to IPV are more likely to become perpetrators (boys) or victims (girls) when they reach adulthood compared to children who were not exposed to IPV. We also found a positive association between having children and being a victim of IPV. This result is worrying, as it intensifies the intergenerational cycle of violence.

Another important finding is that women whose partners/ex-partners have problems with alcoholic beverages are more likely to be victims of domestic violence. It should be noted that the literature indicates that the use of alcohol by one or both partners contributes to increasing the risk and severity of IPV (Wilson et al., 2014; Ally et al., 2016; Sontate et al., 2021).

Concerning the second stage, i.e., the outcome equation, we estimated the factors associated with the probability of reporting IPV to the police, given that the woman is a victim of IPV. Our results show that although age is a protective factor for the risk of IPV, once it has occurred, it becomes a relevant factor for the decision to report it to the police, i.e. older women tend to report more of the violence suffered. This result corroborates what was found by Akers and Kaukinen (2009).

Regarding race, we found that white women are more likely to report IPV than black and brown women. This result is the opposite, as found by Holliday et al. (2019) and Powers and Bleeker (2022). Using data for the US, both found that black women are more likely to report IPV to the police than white women.

As in Akers and Kaukinen (2009), we also found that married women are less likely to report IPV. Akers and Kaukinen (2009) states that married women have stronger emotional and financial ties to the relationship, which leads them to decide not to report the aggressor.

As we found in age, having a mother who was a victim of domestic violence has the opposite effect in being a victim of IPV and reporting IPV. We found that women whose mothers were victims of IPV are less likely to report IPV to the police. This result is in line with the hypothesis Pollak (2004) that women who witness domestic violence as children are more likely to stay with an abusive spouse. A similar result, but with a focus on child abuse, was found by Kim and Ferraresso (2022). They found that women with experience of child abuse were less willing to report IPV to the police.

Having a partner who has problems with alcoholic beverages not only increases the likelihood of the woman becoming a victim of IPV but also decreases the probability that the woman reports IPV. A possible explanation is that, once alcohol consumption is associated with the risk and severity of IPV (Wilson et al., 2014; Ally et al., 2016; Sontate et al., 2021), victims of IPV are afraid of the retaliation that may occur because they have reported the aggressor to the police, fearing their physical integrity and that of their families.

Physical violence, as opposed to emotional and sexual violence, proved to be an important factor in explaining the decision to report the IPV suffered. Women who have suffered physical violence are more likely to report the aggressor to the police. These results corroborate the hypothesis that the act of reporting IPV is related to the severity of violence (Kim and Ferraresso, 2022). However, an addendum needs to be made here. Although sexual violence can cause very serious psychological damage, many women cannot perceive this type of violence within a relationship, and when they do, they are unable to report it, either out of shame or because they think the authorities will not believe them.

Finally, as expected, we found that women who do not tolerate violence are more likely to report IPV. This result is in line with Shakya et al. (2022), which found that women who have reported IPV are more likely to report attitudes supporting IPV.

Considering our results, we can suggest two channels for action by authorities and public managers to reduce the number of unreported IPV cases. The first would be through educational actions so that women victims of IPV can identify that the acts they suffer are subject to reporting and punishment, given that approximately 67% of the victims of IPV in our sample did not report the case to the police because they considered the incident not serious enough. In addition, we also found that married women and women whose mothers were victims of violence are less likely to report the violence they suffered, which reinforces the need for educational actions that show these women that acts of violence within relationships are not normal and should not be tolerated. The second channel of action is through actions that guarantee the safety of the victim and their relatives, since the second most cited reason for not reporting IPV to the police was fear of further violence, violence that the partner's alcohol consumption can aggravate. Thus, improving the granting and enforcement of protective measures established under the Maria da Penha Law could encourage victims of IPV to report the crime, reducing underreporting.

This article aimed to contribute to the literature on under-reporting of IPV in Brazil. We believe that we achieved our goals and contributed to the literature on this important topic for society. Despite that, it is critical to acknowledge its limitations. A significant limitation is the geographic scope of the data collection for the PCSVDFMulher sample. Since the data were collected only in 7 capitals, it was not possible to capture all the differences that exist between the different regions of Brazil. Therefore, it is not possible to extrapolate the results obtained in this study to the entire country, especially to medium and small cities in the interior of the country, which often do not have specialized services of the network of care for women in situations of violence, which discourages them from reporting the IPV they have suffered. Another limitation is that, due to the use of only the third wave of the PCSVDFMulher, we cannot draw any causal implication from our results. However, this is not our intention. Our objective was

only to analyze the under-reporting of IPV cases and identify the main factors associated with it. For future studies, we can explore the longitudinal capacity of the PCSVDFMulher and try to establish causal relationships between the independent and dependent variables, in addition to analyzing the behavior of the IPV under-reporting rate over time.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared that they have no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001.

Ethical Approval

This article uses data from the third wave of the *PCSVDF^{Mulher}* survey, which was approved by the Brazilian Ethical Committee (CONEP) under the number 20237519.0.0000.5054.

Informed Consent

Informed consent was obtained from all participants of the *PCSVDF^{Mulher}* survey. For participants under 18 years of age, informed written parental consent was obtained.

Data Availability

The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

References

Aizer, A. (2010). The gender wage gap and domestic violence. *American Economic Review*, 100(4):1847–1859.

- Akers, C. and Kaukinen, C. (2009). The Police Reporting Behavior of Intimate Partner Violence Victims. *Journal of Family Violence*, 24(3):159–171.
- Ally, E. Z., Laranjeira, R., Viana, M. C., Pinsky, I., Caetano, R., Mitsuhiro, S., and Madruga, C. S. (2016). Intimate partner violence trends in Brazil: data from two waves of the Brazilian National Alcohol and Drugs Survey. *Revista Brasileira de Psiquiatria*, 38(2):98–105.
- Anderberg, D., Rainer, H., Wadsworth, J., and Wilson, T. (2015). Unemployment and domestic violence: Theory and evidence. *The Economic Journal*, 126(597):1947–1979.
- Bhalotra, S., Kambhampati, U., Rawlings, S., and Siddique, Z. (2019). Intimate partner violence: The influence of job opportunities for men and women. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 35(2):461–479.
- Brasil (2006). Cria mecanismos para coibir a violência doméstica e familiar contra a mulher, nos termos do § 8º do art. 226 da constituição federal, da convenção sobre a eliminação de todas as formas de discriminação contra as mulheres e da convenção interamericana para prevenir, punir e erradicar a violência contra a mulher; dispõe sobre a criação dos juizados de violência doméstica e familiar contra a mulher; altera o código de processo penal, o código penal ea lei de execução penal; e dá outras providências.
- Breiding, M., Basile, K., Smith, S., Black, M., and Mahendra, R. (2015). *Intimate Partner Violence Surveillance: Uniform Definitions and Recommended Data Elements, Version 2.0*. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA.
- Capaldi, D. M., Knoble, N. B., Shortt, J. W., and Kim, H. K. (2012). A systematic review of risk factors for intimate partner violence. *Partner Abuse*, 3(2):231–280.
- Carvalho, J. R. and André, D. d. M. (2023). Sample Design and Cross-sectional Weights for the Brazilian PCSVDF-Mulher Study: Integrating a Refreshment Sample with an Ongoing Longitudinal Wave to Calculate IPV Prevalence. Publisher: [object Object] Version Number: 2.
- Carvalho, J. R., de Oliveira, V. H., and da Silva, A. B. R. (2018). The pcsvdf study: New data, prevalence and correlates of domestic violence in brazil. Technical report.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (2021). Risk and protective factors for perpetration. <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/riskprotectivefactors.html>. Accessed: 2024-04-15.

- Copp, J. E., Giordano, P. C., Longmore, M. A., and Manning, W. D. (2019). The development of attitudes toward intimate partner violence: An examination of key correlates among a sample of young adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 34:1357–1387.
- Dias, N. G., Fraga, S., Soares, J., Hatzidimitriadou, E., Ioannidi-Kapolou, E., Lindert, J., Örjan Sundin, Toth, O., Barros, H., and Ribeiro, A. I. (2020). Contextual determinants of intimate partner violence: a multi-level analysis in six european cities. *International Journal of Public Health*, 65(9):1669–1679.
- Felson, R. B., Messner, S. F., Hoskin, A. W., and Deane, G. (2002). Reasons for reporting and not reporting domestic violence to the police. *Criminology*, 40(3):617–648.
- Garcia-Moreno, C., Jansen, H. A. F. M., Ellsberg, M., Heise, L., and Watts, C. (2005). Who multi-country study on women’s health and domestic violence against women: initial results on prevalence, health outcomes and women’s responses. Technical report, World Health Organization.
- Gottfredson, M. R. and Gottfredson, D. M. (1988). The Victim’s Decision to Report a Crime. In Gottfredson, M. R. and Gottfredson, D. M., editors, *Decision Making in Criminal Justice: Toward the Rational Exercise of Discretion*, pages 15–46. Springer US, Boston, MA.
- Gracia, E. (2004). Unreported cases of domestic violence against women: towards an epidemiology of social silence, tolerance, and inhibition. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 58:536–537.
- GZH (2023). Por que a medida protetiva não impediu o feminicídio de 21 mulheres? <https://gauchazh.clicrbs.com.br/grupo-de-investigacao/noticia/2023/06/por-que-a-medida-protetiva-nao-impediu-o-feminicidio-de-21-mulheres-claiua3u006q016xj5d1wdvd.html>. Accessed: 2024-05-22.
- Holliday, C. N., Kahn, G., Thorpe, R. J., Shah, R., Hameeduddin, Z., and Decker, M. R. (2019). Racial/ethnic disparities in police reporting for partner violence in the national crime victimization survey and survivor-led interpretation. *Journal of Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities*, 7(3):468–480.
- Jong, L. C., Sadala, M. L. A., and Tanaka, A. C. D. A. (2008). Desistindo da denúncia ao agressor: relato de mulheres vítimas de violência doméstica. *Revista da Escola de Enfermagem da USP*, 42(4):744–751.

- Juarros-Basterretxea, J., Fernández-Álvarez, N., Torres-Vallejos, J., and Herrero, J. (2024). Perceived reportability of intimate partner violence against women to the police and help-seeking: A national survey. *Psychosocial Intervention*, 33:55–64.
- Kebede, S. A., Weldesenbet, A. B., and Tusa, B. S. (2022). Magnitude and determinants of intimate partner violence against women in east africa: multilevel analysis of recent demographic and health survey. *BMC Women's Health*, 22(1).
- Kim, C. and Ferrareso, R. (2022). Factors Associated With Willingness To Report Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) to Police in South Korea. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(13-14):NP10862–NP10882.
- Lohani, S., Saffold, S.-H., Jules, T., Blackwell, B., Shurling, S., and Mayo-Gamble, T. (2021). Underreporting of intimate partner violence against women: An important public mental health implication. *Eagles Talking About the Public's Health*, (29).
- Ludermir, A. B., Araújo, T. V. B. D., Valongueiro, S. A., Muniz, M. L. C., and Silva, E. P. (2017). Previous experience of family violence and intimate partner violence in pregnancy. *Revista de Saúde Pública*, 51:85.
- MacDonald, Z. (2001a). Revisiting the dark figure : A microeconomic analysis of the under-reporting of property crime and its implications. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 41:127–149.
- MacDonald, Z. (2001b). REVISITING THE DARK FIGURE: A Microeconomic Analysis of the Under-reporting of Property Crime and Its Implications. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 41(1):127–149. Publisher: Oxford University Press.
- Maddala, G. S. (2010). *Limited-Dependent and Qualitative Variables in Econometrics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ogundimu, E. (2024). *HeckmanSelect: Regularization method for binary Heckman selection model*. R package version 0.1.0, commit fa0a1e2ed3f6a1e94a0b4ecea5ad59fe488f766.
- Ogundimu, E. O. (2022). On lasso and adaptive lasso for non-random sample in credit scoring. *Statistical Modelling*, 24(2):115–138.
- Oliveira, J. and Pereira, C. R. (2024). Vitimização secundária de mulheres que retornam ao relacionamento abusivo. *Revista Interamericana de Psicología/Interamerican Journal of Psychology*, 58:e1829.

- Podaná, Z. (2010). Reporting to the Police as a Response to Intimate Partner Violence. *Sociologický Časopis / Czech Sociological Review*, 46(3):453–474. Publisher: Institute of Sociology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic.
- Pollak, R. A. (2004). An intergenerational model of domestic violence. *Journal of Population Economics*, 17(2):311–329.
- Powers, R. A. and Bleeker, K. (2022). Self-defense and police reporting of intimate partner violent victimization: A comparison of white, black, and hispanic women victims. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 38(3–4):4189–4214.
- Quezado, S. R. S. and Macêdo, J. A. F. (2023). Panorama do crime de feminicídio cadastrado no tribunal de justiça do estado do ceará - comarca de fortaleza. In de Macêdo, J. A. F., Quezado, S. R. S., and da Silva, T. D., editors, *Feminicídio: mapeamento, prevenção e tecnologia*. Paco e Littera, Jundiaí-sp;, 1st ed. edition. Description based on publisher supplied metadata and other sources.
- Senado Federal do Brasil (2024). Mapa nacional da violência de gênero. <https://www9qs.senado.leg.br/extensions/violencia-genero-mashup/index.html#/inicio>. Accessed: 2024-05-21.
- Shakya, H. B., Cislighi, B., Fleming, P., Levto, R. G., Boyce, S. C., Raj, A., and Silverman, J. G. (2022). Associations of attitudes and social norms with experiences of intimate partner violence among married adolescents and their husbands in rural niger: a dyadic cross-sectional study. *BMC Women’s Health*, 22(1).
- Skogan, W. G. (1994). *Contacts between police and public*. A Home Office Research and Planning Unit report. HMSO, London, 1. publ. edition.
- Sontate, K. V., Rahim Kamaluddin, M., Naina Mohamed, I., Mohamed, R. M. P., Shaikh, M. F., Kamal, H., and Kumar, J. (2021). Alcohol, Aggression, and Violence: From Public Health to Neuroscience. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12:699726.
- Tiruye, T. Y., Harris, M. L., Chojenta, C., Holliday, E., and Loxton, D. (2020). Determinants of intimate partner violence against women in ethiopia: A multi-level analysis. *PLOS ONE*, 15(4):e0232217.
- Toomet, O. and Henningsen, A. (2008). Sample selection models in R: Package sampleSelection. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 27(7).

- Vasconcelos, N. M., Bernal, R., Souza, J., Bordoni, P., Stein, C., Coll, C. V. N., Murray, J., and Malta, D. C. (2023). Subnotificação de violência contra as mulheres: uma análise de duas fontes de dados. *ciência & saúde coletiva*.
- Voce, I. and Boxall, H. (2018). *Who reports domestic violence to police? A review of the evidence*. Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Whitfield, C. L., Anda, R. F., Dube, S. R., and Felitti, V. J. (2003). Violent Childhood Experiences and the Risk of Intimate Partner Violence in Adults: Assessment in a Large Health Maintenance Organization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18(2):166–185.
- WHO (2013). *Global and Regional Estimates of Violence Against Women: Prevalence and Health Effects of Intimate Partner Violence and Non-partner Sexual Violence*. World Health Organization.
- Wilson, I. M., Graham, K., and Taft, A. (2014). Alcohol interventions, alcohol policy and intimate partner violence: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health*, 14(1):881.
- Yakubovich, A. R., Stöckl, H., Murray, J., Melendez-Torres, G. J., Steinert, J. I., Glavin, C. E. Y., and Humphreys, D. K. (2018). Risk and protective factors for intimate partner violence against women: Systematic review and meta-analyses of prospective–longitudinal studies. *American Journal of Public Health*, 108(7):e1–e11.