

# UC Riverside

## UC Riverside Electronic Theses and Dissertations

### Title

Gender, Sexual Orientation, and Intimate Partner Violence: An Analysis of Risk and Recidivism

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7h2781m5>

### Author

Gerstenberger, Caryn Bell

### Publication Date

2017

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
RIVERSIDE

Gender, Sexual Orientation, and Intimate Partner Violence: An Analysis of Risk and  
Recidivism

A Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction  
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Sociology

by

Caryn Bell Gerstenberger

December 2017

Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Tanya Nieri, Chairperson

Dr. Kirk R. Williams

Dr. Augustine J. Kposowa

Copyright by  
Caryn Bell Gerstenberger  
2017

The Dissertation of Caryn Bell Gerstenberger is approved:

---

---

---

Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

## Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank my chair, Dr. Tanya Nieri, for her support and willingness to step up in the middle of my dissertation. Without her advice and encouragement, I am not sure I could have stuck to my timeline and completed this dissertation. I next want to thank Dr. Kirk R. Williams for acting as my mentor for most of my graduate career, despite leaving UCR and continuing on his academic path at other institutions. I am so appreciative of his willingness to share both his data and his expertise on this subject. I am a better scholar for having worked under him. In addition, I'd like to thank Dr. Augustine Kposowa for serving on my dissertation committee and being flexible in accommodating my rather accelerated timeline. I would also like to thank Dr. Robert Nash Parker for his guidance before his retirement. Next, thank you to Anna Wire. Without her patience, know-how and inclination towards helping me, I could not have moved through this program.

To my graduate student cohort and other fellow graduate students, thank you for your support and encouragement. In particular, I'd like to thank Anthony Roberts, Erin Wolbeck, and Sooji Han for providing camaraderie, feedback, and encouragement throughout this process. Thank you to Amanda Admire, Seher Rowther, and Marlen Rios-Hernandez aka my "dissertation writing intensive group" for reading my many, many drafts and for serving as my cheerleading team when needed.

Finally, I would be remiss not to thank my friends and family. I literally could not have done this without your support. Specifically, I would like to thank Anita

Oakley, who is my role model and guiding light in life. Thank you to my husband, Todd Gerstenberger, for being my rock, and for making so many sacrifices so that I could achieve my dream. His support through triumphs and (many) setbacks has been invaluable. I want to thank Courtney Bell for being my person. Finally, a huge thank you to my son, Ezra Gerstenberger. It is my hope that getting my PhD will show him that if I can do this, he can reach any goal that he can imagine.

This research was conducted with assistance from the Judicial Branch, Court Support Services Division (CSSD) of the State of Connecticut. This agency owns the copyright for the Revised Domestic Violence Screening Instrument (DVSI-R).

## Dedication

In loving memory of Dr. Elizabeth Dermody Leonard, who ignited my passion for academics, justice, and the pursuit of knowledge through science

## ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Gender, Sexual Orientation, and Intimate Partner Violence: An Analysis of Risk and Recidivism

by

Caryn Bell Gerstenberger

Doctor of Philosophy, Graduate Program in Sociology  
University of California, Riverside, December 2017  
Dr. Tanya Nieri, Chairperson

The goal of the current study is to compare gay, lesbian, and bisexual (GLB) couples to heterosexual couples on measures of risk for and recidivism of intimate partner violence (IPV). Additionally, the study seeks to compare GLB couples and heterosexual couples involved in a dual versus single arrest for IPV. Finally, the third aim is to determine whether two different measures of risk accurately predict dangerousness and IPV recidivism for same-sex couples and heterosexual couples. It is hoped that this study can provide insight as to whether IPV among GLB couples can be categorized as bi-directional, mutual, and less serious Common Couple Violence (as prevailing ideology indicates) or unidirectional, more serious Intimate Terrorism (as research and social services aimed at this population finds).

Results indicate that GLB couples most closely resemble couples with male-to-female violence—that is, IPV with a male perpetrator and female victim. Contrary to the societal stereotype that all GLB IPV is a “fight between equals,” this research



demonstrates that at least some of GLB IPV can be considered serious and unidirectional, a finding that remains regardless of dual versus single arrest status. Finally, results support the validity of the Danger Assessment in predicting dangerousness and the Domestic Violence Screening Instrument-Revised in predicting recidivism for both GLB and heterosexual couples. This research can inform future of IPV theorizing and police intervention for all couple types.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1		
	INTRODUCTION	
	Introduction	1
	Specific Aims	2
	Organization	3
Chapter 2		
	BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	
	Introduction	4
	Comparing GLB and Heterosexual IPV	6
	Pro/Mandatory-Arrest Policies...	11
	Risk Assessment	15
	THEORETICAL APPROACHES	
	Explaining Heterosexual IPV	17
	Explaining GLB IPV	20
	IPV and Masculinity...	24
	Arrest Data and Theorizing IPV	28
Chapter 3		
	METHODS	
	Sample	30
	Variable Measurement	31
	Analytical Procedure	35
Chapter 4		
	EMPIRICAL RESULTS	
	Aim One	42
	Aim Two	46
	Aim Three	54
Chapter 5		
	DISCUSSION	
	Directionality of IPV	58
	Dual Arrest	59
	Theoretical Implications	60
	Risk Assessment	61
	Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research	62
	Conclusion	63
References		64
Appendix		72

# **Gender, Sexual Orientation, and Intimate Partner Violence: an Analysis of Risk and Recidivism**

**Caryn Bell Gerstenberger**

## **Chapter 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Intimate partner violence (IPV) has long been regarded as a problem plaguing families in America and abroad. In the last 50 years efforts have been made to determine the forms, phases, correlates, and prevention of IPV. According to both activists and academics, IPV affects people of all ethnicities, ages, social classes, educational levels, religious backgrounds, genders, and sexual orientations (National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, n.d.). Despite this fact, much research regarding IPV focuses on white, middle-class heterosexual couples with a male perpetrator and female victim (Dobash et al. 1992; Dutton 2006; Felson 2002; Kimmel 2002; Stets & Straus 1989; Straus 1979; 1999; 2005; 2009; Tjaden & Thoennes 1998; Walker 1979; Yllö 1993). Therefore, IPV within same-sex relationships is an understudied phenomenon.

The goal of the current study is to compare gay, lesbian, and bisexual (GLB) couples to heterosexual couples on measures of IPV risk and recidivism over an 18-month period. Specifically, the goal is to determine whether GLB couples involved in IPV are likely to have higher or lower risk than heterosexual couples, including risk for life-threatening IPV, and whether couples involved in a single arrest are likely to have

higher risk than couples involved in a dual arrest. Dual arrest has often been used as a barometer for less serious IPV since both parties are arrested, but little prior research has explored this assumption. These analyses will be conducted using the Domestic Violence Screening Instrument-Revised (DVSI-R) and selected items from the Danger Assessment (DA), labeled Supplemental Dangerousness Items (SDI). It is hoped that this study can provide insight as to whether IPV among same-sex couples can be categorized as bi-directional, mutual, and less serious Common Couple Violence (as prevailing ideology indicates) or unidirectional, more serious Intimate Terrorism (as research and social services aimed at this population finds). Additionally, the current study seeks to determine whether the two measures of risk accurately predict dangerousness and recidivism for GLB couples and heterosexual couples.

### **Specific Aims**

This study aims to:

(1) Compare GLB couples and heterosexual couples, varying gender, in regards to:

- (a) Assessed risk utilizing the DVSI-R.
- (b) Assessed risk utilizing the SDI.
- (c) Recidivism.

(2) Compare GLB couples and heterosexual couples, varying gender, involved in a single arrest versus those involved in a dual arrest in regards to:

- (a) Assessed risk utilizing the DVSI-R.
- (b) Assessed risk utilizing the SDI.

(c) Recidivism.

(3) Compare GLB couples and heterosexual couples, varying gender, in regards to whether risk (utilizing both DVSI-R and SDI) predicts recidivism and dangerousness.

### **Organization**

Chapter 2 of this dissertation summarizes relevant background literature and the significance of the current research, including relevant policy and theoretical perspectives. Chapter 3 presents the methods used for the current study, specifically the research design, measurement of variables, and analytical procedure. Chapter 4 presents the empirical results from all three parts of the analysis. Finally, Chapter 5 discusses contributions of the research to the areas of the directionality of IPV, dual arrest, future theorizing of GLB IPV, and risk assessment, including limitations and directions for future research.

## Chapter 2<sup>1</sup>

### BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Domestic violence came to the forefront of the American consciousness throughout the 1970s and 80s, when feminist groups began openly protesting and lobbying for protection for victims of violence. Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) in particular became etched into the minds of the American public during this time with numerous graphic accounts of women experiencing extreme violence committed by their boyfriends and husbands (see Thurman v. City of Torrington 1985).

Many details of forms and patterns of violence followed. Perhaps most famously, Lenore Walker uncovered much of the specifics of violence in her book *The Battered Woman* (1979). Here, Walker (1979) details the forms and patterns of abuse that are still relevant today. First, Walker (1979) defined the act of “wife battery,” as physical, emotional, or sexual abuse perpetrated by a husband against his wife.

A hallmark of Walker’s (1979) research was her discovery of the “cycle of violence.” In abusive relationships Walker found that this cycle begins with honeymoon

---

<sup>1</sup> Notes on terminology: Throughout this dissertation, close attention was paid to terminology. A few explanations are necessary. First, this dissertation uses the term “victim” as an official and criminological term. The researcher understands that, often, the term “survivor” is deemed preferable to the term “victim” in research on IPV. However, the term victim is chosen specifically here because it is meant to indicate that the person in question is the reported victim of a crime on official police data. To attribute the term “survivor” to all who are classified “victims” in this data would be to downplay the trauma actual survivors go through and the difficulties they face in getting out of abusive relationships. It is unknown whether the victims reported in this data can be classified as survivors, and thus the term victim is used.

Second, the terms “male” and “female” are used throughout this dissertation because this is how they appear on official forms and police data. The data used does not provide information about the gender identity of the respondents in question. “Gender” is a term used throughout this dissertation even though the terms above are widely used to indicate sex; this is largely to avoid confusion between sex and sexual orientation. However, the researcher is aware that these are in fact analytically separate concepts.

phase. In this phase, the partner is kind, compassionate, and caring, and, often, the victim reports falling in love with the abuser. Next is the tension-building phase, where victims report that they can feel tension mounting. Many victims describe this phase as “walking on eggshells,” taking great care to act in accordance with the desires of the abuser in an attempt to diffuse the tension. However, these attempts prove futile when the tension escalates into a violent explosion phase, which can involve various forms of physical, psychological, and sexual abuse. After the explosive violence, the honeymoon phase returns, often with the abuser promising the abuse will not happen again in the future and profusely apologizing for past behavior (Walker 1979). Violence often escalates over the course of the relationship, in some cases turning deadly, but the reoccurrence of the honeymoon phase often traps victims in violent relationships.

Although this research dates back almost 50 years, much of the research since then has corroborated Walker’s findings on the forms and patterns of abuse. The cycle of violence is commonly taught within the classroom and among social workers and even to victims themselves. However, over time, scholars and activists began to challenge Walker’s research on several fronts, problematizing three of her findings. First, many have taken issue with Walker’s terminology of “wife battery,” as research has shown that IPV affects a broad range of relationship types. Therefore, the nomenclature has been largely abandoned in favor of the more inclusive “intimate partner violence” (IPV), and the definition of violence was expanded to include all physical, emotional, sexual, or financial abuse of a current or former intimate partner. Forms of IPV are numerous, including physical violence such as hitting, kicking, biting, pushing etc.;

emotional/psychological violence such as threats, gas-lighting, name-calling, etc.; financial abuse such as control of funds, theft of paycheck, etc.; and sexual abuse such as sexual assault and rape. Second, researchers have also found that some IPV is mutual—that is, both partners perpetrate abuse against one another. Finally, some researchers have also found that some IPV relationships are episodic, meaning that the violence happens only occasionally does not escalate over time. These findings provided a starting point for more nuanced research on the topic of IPV.

Including GLB couples in analyses of IPV is an important step in exploring this nuance, and is a goal of the current study. This study has three major aims, all related to comparing GLB and heterosexual couples. As aim one seeks to determine similarities and differences in terms of risk and recidivism, it is important to determine how GLB and heterosexual couples currently compare in terms of their IPV experience. Aim Two delves into the issue of dual arrest, the history and meaning of which is covered extensively below. Aim Three seeks to explore the validity of two specific risk measures; therefore, a short overview of IPV risk assessment will be summarized. Finally, theorizing of both GLB and heterosexual IPV will be outlined, including how the current study may speak to debates within the theorizing of IPV.

### **Comparing GLB and Heterosexual IPV**

Little research exists that fully incorporates violence among gay, lesbian, and bisexual (GLB) couples. Stereotypes about and prejudicial attitudes towards GLB couples leads many researchers, legal professionals, and even social welfare workers to assume that violence within GLB relationships is mutual and minor. However, the limited



research that exists on this topic indicates that IPV in GLB couples functions similarly to violence within heterosexual couples. GLB and heterosexual couples have been compared in terms of rates of violence, forms and patterns of violence, help-seeking behavior, and reasons victims stay in abusive relationships.

### *Rates*

Although some research has indicated that same-sex relationships tend to be more egalitarian than heterosexual relationships (Kurdek & Schmitt 1986; Carrington 1999; Walker 1996), the limited research that has been conducted on same-sex IPV indicates that IPV is a serious problem in GLB relationships (Renzetti 1992; Merrill & Wolfe 2000). Turell (2000) found that 9% of her lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered (LGBT) sample reported physical violence in their current relationship, while 32% reported physical violence in a previous relationship. Island and Letellier (1991) estimate 500,000 gay male IPV victims annually and nationally. Similarly, physical violence occurs in 25% (Tjaden & Thoennes 1998) to 33% (Straus & Gelles 1990) of heterosexual couples. Although assessing rates is difficult as most samples are non-random, research seems to suggest that GLB couples experience at least as much abuse as heterosexual couples.

Some researchers have found that gay men and lesbians are more likely than heterosexual women to be victims of IPV. However, the findings here are somewhat mixed. While Messinger (2011) found that lesbians are more likely to experience IPV than heterosexual women, Tjaden, Thoennes, and Allison (1999) found that among cohabitants, those victims with a male partner were more likely to experience IPV; that

is, gay men and heterosexual women experienced more IPV than lesbian women. Turell (2000) found that lesbians experienced more physical abuse than gay men, but Kelly & Warshafsky (1987) found that gay men had more physically aggressive partners than lesbians. Despite these discrepancies, it is clear that IPV is a serious problem among GLB couples.

### *Forms and patterns*

Victims of all genders and sexual orientations report sexual, physical, psychological and financial abuse (Merrill & Wolfe 2000; Renzetti 1992). Specifically, psychological abuse and physical abuse are quite common in all IPV relationships (Renzetti 1992). Additionally, some research has found that lesbians and gay men experience a “cycle of violence” that involves a tension phase, violence phase, and subsequent honeymoon phase as outlined by Walker in 1979 (Renzetti 1992; Island & Letellier 1991). Therefore, much research on same-sex IPV has found a high prevalence of what Johnson (1995) terms “Intimate Terrorism” (Renzetti 1992), refuting the myth that all same-sex IPV is “Common Couple Violence” (Renzetti 1992; Merrill & Wolfe 2000).

Nevertheless, there are some distinct differences in the forms of violence experienced by heterosexual and gay/lesbian victims. For example, homophobia in larger society provides an opportunity for perpetrators to further victimize their GLB partners. Specifically, gay men and lesbian victims must contend with their partner threatening to “out” them to friends, family, or coworkers (Renzetti 1992; Island & Letellier 1991). Additionally, a few studies have found that some gay male perpetrators have threatened

to infect their partner with HIV, withhold HIV medication or medical treatment from the partner, or inform family and/or coworkers of the partner's HIV status (Merrill & Wolfe 2000; Letellier 1996; Island & Letellier 1991). Homophobia thus provides a platform for perpetrators to further victimize their GLB intimate partners in a way that heterosexual perpetrators cannot.

#### *Help-seeking behavior*

Much research on same-sex IPV has focused on the help-seeking behaviors of victims, with the purpose of increasing awareness and increasing the help available to GLB victims of IPV. Although GLB victims are more likely to seek help from friends than other sources, they are also often not believed by friends or are even encouraged to stay in the relationship because many people don't believe that abuse can happen in gay and lesbian relationships (Renzetti 1992). The myth of mutual battery is much more prevalent among same-sex partners in that many argue that, unlike heterosexual relationships, battery among same-sex couples is a "fight between equals" (Island & Letellier 1991; Letellier 1996). This widely held belief leads many friends and service providers to wonder why the victim didn't just defend him/herself (Island & Letellier 1991; Letellier 1996).

Victims of same-sex IPV are less likely to seek help from police or domestic violence organizations than heterosexual victims (Renzetti 1992; Merrill & Wolfe 2000; Island & Letellier 1991; McClennen, Summers & Vaughan 2002) due to a number of factors, such as a reluctance to call police because of homophobic experiences in the criminal justice system (Island & Letellier 1991; Letellier 1996), or a reluctance to seek

help and admit abuse because of fear of bad press against the GLB community and fueling homophobia (Island & Letellier 1991; Renzetti 1992; Letellier 1996). This reluctance on the part of victims to reach out to police for help is backed by research finding that arrests for IPV are less likely when the victim is male (Brown 2004; Buzawa and Buzawa 2003; Buzawa et al. 2017). Both heterosexual and gay male victims are impacted by masculine socialization that encourages men to be tough, aggressive and dominant which often clouds their ability to conceptualize themselves as victims (Turell 2000). These societal expectations likely also impact officers' perspectives of whether a victim needs assistance, as police may often assume that men are able to protect themselves against violence and are, therefore, unworthy of police intervention.

Finally, victims fail to report violence because they are generally silenced from all sides—from a gay community that does not want to recognize the existence of IPV because it may fuel homophobia, and a homophobic and heterosexist society/IPV movement that refuses to acknowledge that gay men and lesbians can be victims of IPV (Island & Letellier 1991; Renzetti 1992; Letellier 1996; Turell 2000).

#### *Why do victims stay?*

Victims report that they stay in the violent relationship for a variety of reasons: they hope for change, they fear increased violence if they leave, they have been isolated by their partner, and they have genuine love for their partner (Merrill & Wolfe 2000; Renzetti 1991; Island & Letellier 1991). Additionally, the roadblocks to leaving, such as limited access to resources, only compound the difficulty victims experience when attempting to leave an abusive relationship.

Although much research has found that heterosexual victims often stay due to financial dependence, research has not found this to be true for GLB victims (Renzetti 1992; Merrill & Wolfe 2000). In fact, in many cases, the victim actually made more money than the batterer, and the batterer made victims feel that s/he was entitled to the victim's financial support (Merrill & Wolfe 2000). Also, many gay men stay in abusive relationships for reasons relating to HIV. A batterer may play up his own HIV status to look weak so that outsiders are unlikely to view him as the batterer, and to gaslight (convince by altering past details) the victim into second-guessing his own victimized status (Island & Letellier 1991; Letellier 1996; Merrill & Wolfe 2000).

Taken as a whole, these findings indicate that IPV, although understudied within same-sex relationships, is clearly a problem in the GLB community. However, to the researcher's knowledge, no study to date has compared GLB and heterosexual couples in terms of risk or recidivism, which Aim One of this analysis addresses.

### **Pro/Mandatory-Arrest Policies and the Problem of Dual Arrest**

Aim Two of this analysis addresses a phenomenon that has increased in recent years: dual arrest (the arrest of both members of a couple for violent behavior during a domestic violence incident). Dual arrest has increased for both heterosexual and GLB couples due largely to pro- and mandatory-arrest policies, which were adopted in the United States throughout the 1980s and 90s as a result of research arguing that arrest was the best deterrent of future violence (Sherman & Berk 1984a; 1984b). These policies increase arrest in general, since they either strongly encourage or require an arrest to be made any time police respond to a domestic violence call. States have enacted three main

policies concerning domestic violence arrests: the use of officer's discretion, pro-arrest, or mandatory-arrest (Hirschel 2008). Just under one-half (22) of the states in the US have opted to allow police to use their discretion when deciding whether or not and who to arrest. However, Hirschel et al. (2007) found that even among police departments in discretionary states, many departmental policies enact mandatory-arrest. Six other states have pro-arrest policies, in which arrest is strongly encouraged in domestic violence situations where the police are called. The remaining 22 states, and Washington, DC, mandate warrantless arrests for all domestic violence situations with probable cause (American Bar Association 2007; Hirschel et al. 2007; Hirschel 2008).

#### *History of the emergence of pro- and mandatory-arrest policies*

Before pro- and mandatory-arrest policies, many feminist scholars and organizations critiqued police and lawmakers for failing to take domestic violence seriously. Specifically, they argued that even though domestic violence had been recognized by the state as a crime, police often did not treat it as such by failing to make arrests (Ferraro 1989; Hoctor 1997; Langley & Levy 1977). In addition, highly publicized cases in which police failed to protect victims from their abusers led many to question domestic violence policies and practices (Thurman v. City of Torrington 1985).

Partly in response to these critiques, the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment was conducted in 1984 (Sherman & Berk 1984a; 1984b). This experiment marked a dramatic change in approaches to dealing with domestic violence. This experiment showed that arrested offenders were less likely to re-offend in the follow-up period, a finding in support of deterrence theory. In the Minneapolis Domestic Violence

Experiment, arrest was found to be more effective than separation (mandating separation of the parties for a given period of time) or advising (which was measured as attempting to mediate the conflict or doing nothing) (Sherman & Berk 1984). This deterrent effect was significant not only immediately after arrest, but also six months after arrest, according to victim interviews and police data. Though the researchers “suggest a cautious interpretation of the findings” due to the limited scope and location of the research, many states began passing pro- and mandatory-arrest policies shortly after the findings were published (Berk et al. 1992; Sherman & Berk 1984a: 8).

Therefore, beginning in 1984, pro- and mandatory-arrest policies began to be adopted throughout the United States. These policies arose despite several forms of evidence citing problems with the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment (see Binder and Meeker 1988) and a failure to replicate results in other cities throughout the United States (see Dunford, Huizinga & Elliot 1990; Garner, Fagan & Maxwell 1995; Hirschel & Hutchison 1992; Pate & Hamilton 1992; Berk et al. 1991). Additionally, it should be noted that all perpetrators in the above-mentioned studies were male, and that it is likely that these respondents were heterosexual as well since rampant homophobia during the 1980s and 90s may have pushed GLB couples to hide the intimate nature of their relationship.

Although subsequent research failed to confirm the findings of the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment, arrest still remains a common police response to domestic violence, as shown by the large number of states and police departments that

have adopted pro- and mandatory-arrest policies. However, despite their popularity, these policies are not without criticism or limitations.

*Unintended consequences: Dual arrest*

Originally created to shield victims of violence from being forced to press charges against an abusive partner, over time, pro- and mandatory-arrest policies brought about an unintended consequence: an increase in dual arrest. When pro- and mandatory-arrest policies are in effect, the arrest of both parties is much more likely (Finn et al. 2004; Frye, Haviland & Rajah 2007; Hirschel et al. 2007; Miller 2001; 2005). Dual arrest becomes even more likely when battering is perpetrated within same-sex relationships, especially in same-sex intimate relationships, largely due to the endorsement of myths by police. This condition is further fueled by the fact that police do not have clear gender ideologies to fall back on in making arrest decisions; so often both same-sex partners are arrested (Hirschel et al. 2007).

*Does dual arrest indicate Common Couple Violence?*

Some researchers argue that dual arrest is indicative of those cases involving what is referred to as Common Couple Violence, or mutual battering (Straus 1979; 1999; 2005; 2009). Dual arrest is likely to occur when a primary aggressor cannot be easily determined; that is, when violence has been perpetrated by both partners and no serious injuries are present to indicate a clear perpetrator/victim dynamic. In keeping with this ideology, prior research on heterosexual couples and dual arrest has discovered that (1) men (in this case, with female victims) are more likely to recidivate over an 18-month period than women and (2) and those arrested as part of a dual arrest are less likely to



recidivate over an 18-month period than those arrested alone (Gerstenberger and Williams 2012). However, this research also found that even among people arrested as part of a dual arrest, male perpetrators with female victims were more likely to recidivate than female perpetrators with male victims. This finding indicates that, at least for heterosexual couples, dual arrest may not be a proper indicator of less serious Common Couple Violence (Gerstenberger and Williams 2012). To the researcher's knowledge, no research has examined the effect of dual arrest on recidivism among GLB couples, which Aim Two of this analysis seeks to rectify. In examining dual arrest in conjunction with sexual orientation by gender, it is hoped that the current study can shed some light on whether dual arrest is an indicator of Common Couple Violence, and whether this varies by sexual orientation.

### **Risk Assessment**

Aim Three of this analysis addresses measures of risk, and whether they are correlated with future recidivism. A large portion of IPV research has focused on risk assessment, or the determination of the likelihood that a case will lead to IPV recidivism, or an escalation of life-threatening violence. By systematically determining which relationships are likely to lead to future danger, increased criminal justice interventions can curb the effects of violence. Commonly used risk assessment tools such as the Spousal Assault Risk Assessment (SARA), the Propensity for Abusiveness Scale (PAS), the Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment (ODARA) and the Revised Domestic Violence Screening Instrument (DVSI-R) were created to predict IPV recidivism. The SARA includes 20 risk factors for violence, including items such as past assaults of

family or strangers, violence in family of origin, perpetrator personality disorders, and use of weapons (Kropp and Hart 2000). Prior research found that those who were deemed “high risk” by this scale were more likely to recidivate than those rated “low risk,” although it is worth mentioning that all perpetrators in the study were male (Kropp and Hart 2000). The PAS similarly consists of 29 items including information about the perpetrators personality, childhood experiences, and disorders in adulthood (Dutton 1995; Dutton et al. 2001; Clift, Thomas, and Dutton 2005). High risk on this scale has been correlated with abusiveness and persistence in IPV for men and women college students. The ODARA consists of 13 items, including perpetrator demographics, domestic violence history, criminal history, relationships characteristics, victim characteristics, and offense details such as substance use (Hilton et al. 2004). This predictive validity of this assessment has been established in several studies, all utilizing male perpetrators and female victims (Hilton et al 2004; Hilton & Harris 2009). The DVSI-R includes 11 items, focusing on the previous behavior of the perpetrator, perpetrator characteristics, and situational characteristics. Predictive validation studies found that those scoring higher on the DVSI-R were significantly more likely to recidivate within an 18-month period than those who scored lower (see Stansfield and Williams 2014; Williams and Houghton 2004; Williams and Grant 2006; Williams 2012 for detailed validation studies). Although Williams and Grant (2006) have validated the instrument for male and female perpetrators, no studies to date have examined the validity of the DVSI-R specifically for same-sex couples.

Unlike many other risk assessment tools, the Danger Assessment (DA) was created to predict the likelihood of life-threatening violence, particularly intimate partner homicide. The first part of the DA asks about the severity and frequency of battering over the course of the last year. Respondents are asked to mark violent incidents on a calendar to help with memory and recall, and to help identify patterns or escalation of abuse. The second part includes 5 yes or no items, again including perpetrator characteristics and past behaviors (Campbell 2005; Campbell, Webster and Glass 2009). In numerous studies, people who scored higher on DA were more likely to commit intimate partner homicide than those who scored lower, although research to date has focused only on male perpetrators and female victims (Campbell 2005; Campbell, Webster and Glass 2009).

## **THEORETICAL APPROACHES**

### **Explaining Heterosexual IPV**

Two competing perspectives on IPV exist: the feminist perspective and the family conflict approach. Researchers utilizing the feminist perspective argue that IPV is a gendered crime, with largely male perpetrators. At the core of IPV is an ideology that supports patriarchal notions that men are superior to women (Kimmel 2002; Tjaden & Thoennes 1998; Walker 1979). Feminist researchers assert that once a domestic violence incident has occurred, it is rarely a one-time occurrence and is nested in patterns of control and abusive behavior. From this perspective and research, injuries to women occur frequently, along with psychological effects that may be difficult to recognize as consequences of IPV (Tjaden & Thoennes 1998; Walker 1979).

The second perspective, called the family conflict approach, argues that there is little to no empirical proof that patriarchal ideology is a motivation for domestic violence (Dutton 2006; Felson 2002). Researchers utilizing this perspective view IPV as stemming from a variety of factors: daily stress or conflict, lack of communication skills, financial difficulties, psychological and/or personality disorders, or a general desire for control in relationships (Dutton 2006; Felson 2002; Straus 1979; 1999; 2005). Family conflict researchers all agree, however, that domestic violence is not motivated by patriarchal or chauvinistic ideology. Research has shown that young and cohabiting couples are more likely to be involved in IPV than older and married couples (Stets & Straus 1989). Conceivably this would not be the case if patriarchal ideologies and the notion of ownership of women were the causes of intimate violence against women, as marriage is often thought to concretize male rights over women. Some scholars argue that notions of chivalry actually prevent women from having the same high rates of violent victimization as men in larger society; that is, men's deferential treatment towards women extends to intimate relationships where they are insulated from violence due to chivalrous notions of respect and courtesy (Dutton 2006; Felson 2002).

Methodologically, most family conflict researchers utilize the Conflict Tactics scale (CTS) developed by Murray Straus (1979). The CTS treats domestic violence largely as a conflict-based problem in the family. Researchers using the CTS have found very high levels of domestic violence in the family. However, most of these conflicts are minor in nature, resulting in low levels of serious injury. Additionally, researchers utilizing this perspective usually find that women are as likely to be perpetrators of

domestic violence as men, and that not all violence escalates after an initial violent episode (for meta-analysis see Archer 2000; Dutton 2006; Felson 2002; Straus 1979; 1999; 2005; 2009). Family conflict researchers attribute crime victimization studies' discovery of low rates of domestic violence to the way in which violence is framed in these studies. These scholars have argued that when domestic violence is framed as a crime, violence will be underestimated because individuals do not always identify the violence perpetrated against them as criminal in nature. This is especially true for men, who underreport their victimization (Felson & Pare 2005; Stets & Straus 1990).

Feminist researchers have criticized research coming from the family conflict perspective and using the CTS for failing to capture the patterns of power and control that are often present in domestic violence situations (Dobash et al. 1992; see Kimmel 2002 for overview). Feminist researchers have also noted that the CTS does not take into account other variables important in domestic violence relationships, including the context of the violence, the initiator of the violence, the perpetrator's intentions and motivations, injuries that result from violence, and instances of sexual assault and assault by former partners (Dobash et al. 1992; Kimmel 2002).

Although these two perspectives differ considerably, attempts have been made to reconcile their differences. Johnson (1995) developed a typology of domestic violence that could account for both types of violence discussed by family conflict and crime victimization researchers. Within this typology, Johnson differentiates between what he calls "Common Couple Violence" and "Intimate Terrorism." Common Couple Violence captures the violence explained by the family conflict perspective—violence that is

largely mutual, minor in nature, and less chronic. Intimate Terrorism, however, indicates the violence explained by the crime victimization perspective—violence that is largely committed by men and is nested in patterns of power and control motivated by patriarchal ideology. While this typology has been neither confirmed nor refuted empirically, it is an ambitious attempt to organize conceptually the nature and patterns of domestic violence.

Missing from this debate, however, is how violence in GLB couples fits into this typology. GLB couples conceivably cannot be involved in Intimate Terrorism, since this violence is characterized as being caused by notions of male superiority. By definition, then, this would not include men who are violent towards their male partners, or women who engage in violence against their female partners. Although Johnson (1995) himself presented his typology as gender-neutral, the gendered underpinnings of the ideological camps above make a purely gender-neutral analysis problematic. However, given the research on prevalence and forms of violence discussed below, it is likely that this more serious form of violence is occurring in GLB relationships, calling the typology and stated etiology of abuse into question. Nevertheless, since a more inclusive typology of violence does not currently exist to this researcher's knowledge, the terms "Common Couple Violence" and "Intimate Terrorism" will be used in this study to differentiate between episodic mutual violence and more serious unidirectional violence that is nested in patterns of abusive and controlling behavior.

### **Explaining GLB IPV**

Although commonly utilized as explanations of IPV, these theories have been oriented around arguments regarding gender symmetry, making them difficult to apply to

GLB IPV. Several scholars have argued that feminist theory, in particular, cannot explain same-sex IPV (Johnson & Ferraro 2000; McClennen 2005). In their summary of research on IPV from the 1990s, Johnson & Ferraro (2000) encourage scholars to increase theorizing about IPV, drawing on a more complex framework of power and control that can include, but not primarily be based on, patriarchal notions of power and control. Several theorists have attempted to apply these theories specifically to same-sex IPV, or create new perspectives that can explain IPV across relationship types. There are three major perspectives that have dominated the discussion on same-sex IPV.

Island & Letellier (1991) have been most critical of the feminist perspective, arguing that it blames patriarchal society for IPV and therefore, fails to place necessary blame on the abuser for his/her actions. Additionally, they argue that this perspective also fails to explain battering perpetrated by women, and does not explain why not all men become batterers (Island & Letellier 1991; Merrill 1996). In fact, the feminist perspective contributes to many myths about same-sex IPV: that lesbian IPV does not exist, that same-sex partner abuse is a “fight between equals” and therefore battering must be mutual, and that the perpetrator must be the “man” or the “butch” while the victim must be the “woman” or the “femme,” emulating heterosexual relationship structure (Island & Letellier 1991; Merrill 1996). Therefore, Island & Letellier proposed a psychological theory, arguing that domestic violence is not a gender issue, as shown by the variability in gender of both perpetrator and victim. They further assert “...batterers suffer from a diagnosable, progressive mental disorder in their domestic setting, with their partners as the targets of their unhealthy condition...” (Island & Letellier 1991: 2-3).

Several scholars have attempted to incorporate the feminist perspective and the psychological perspective into a “social-psychological model” (Merrill 1996; Zemsky 1990; Gilbert, Poorman & Simmons 1990). Integration of these two perspectives is necessary because these perspectives both have shortcomings: just as feminist theory has been criticized above, Island and Letellier’s theory fails to explain why so many more men are batterers than women (Merrill 1996). In addition, these perspectives do share some tenets: that victims are not in need of treatment and do not suffer any mental illness, and that male batterers are unclear on the concept of masculinity, often equating masculinity with violence (Merrill 1996). Therefore, Merrill (1996) argues that IPV can only fully be understood when applying elements from both psychological and sociological theories. This social-psychological framework places the locus of battering into three categories: learning to abuse, having the opportunity to abuse, and choosing to abuse (Merrill 1996; Zemsky 1990; Gilbert, Poorman & Simmons 1990). First, batterers must learn to abuse through instruction, observation, and operant conditioning, in which one sees rewards given for violent behavior. This learning process usually takes place in one’s family of origin (Merrill 1996). Because of this process, men may be more likely to abuse because of sex role socialization. Second, abusers must have the opportunity to get away with abuse. Merrill (1996) argues that a sexist, homophobic, classist, ageist, and racist society provide this opportunity. This means that those who are oppressed by one or more of these systems are at risk for victimization. “While the social phenomenon of prejudice does not cause battering, it does create an opportune environment that supports abusive behavior by its refusal to challenge it” (Merrill 1996: 15). Therefore,



people who have power are likely to abuse others who have less (or sometimes equal) power because they are more likely to get away with it (Merrill 1996; Zemsky 1990). Finally, the abuser must choose to abuse, thereby placing responsibility on the abuser for his or her violence (Merrill 1996; Zemsky 1990; Gilbert, Poorman & Simmons 1990). Merrill (1996) argues that this model can explain all forms of IPV. The only caveat is women who batter their male partners: Merrill (1996) argues that these women are ‘severe’ batterers who have little impulse control and will, therefore, batter despite the consequences of their actions. Overall, Merrill calls for a more nuanced examination of power, specifically of the idea that some victims are physically stronger or have more social capital, but have been able to be manipulated by the batterer into not utilizing that power.

McClennen (1999) slightly amended Merrill’s (1996) social-psychological theory, arguing that this theory is inadequate in explaining lesbian IPV. McClennen (1999) argues that feminist tenets must be further incorporated into social-psychological theory in order to make it applicable to lesbian IPV. Therefore, patriarchal social-psychological theory incorporates the dual oppression experienced by lesbians—both in terms of gender and sexuality. McClennen (1999) argues: “[t]he addition of the term ‘patriarchal’ is in recognition of the physical, sexual, emotional, financial and spiritual sexism toward women and of women’s gender socialization” (p. 6-7). Because lesbians experience sexism in larger society and are gender socialized to be relational to the point of “enmeshing” with their partner, they experience IPV in a qualitatively different way than gay men or heterosexual women.

## **IPV and Masculinity: Incorporating the “Doing Gender” Perspective**

Because McClennen’s (1999) focus is on women, she omits any discussion of the ways in which men are also gender socialized. Although Merrill (1996) hints at this fact, both have failed to incorporate the ways in which men enact masculinity. Filling this gap, the study of masculinities seeks uncover how men are affected by a gender system that places them in a privileged position over women and the ways in which men accomplish masculinity in everyday interaction. While this research has led scholars in many directions, most scholars agree that one way in which men can assert and/or respond to threats to their masculinity is through violence.

### *“Doing gender”*

Unlike McClennen (1999) and Merrill (1996), masculinities scholarship is largely informed by the ‘doing gender’ perspective, which argues that gender is a social construction. That is, gender is not a characteristic of an individual, but rather something that one “does” in everyday interaction (Fenstermaker, West and Zimmerman 2002; Lorber 1993; West and Zimmerman 1987). How individuals accomplish gender is not determined by childhood socialization, as gender is not a static phenomenon that remains stable over time. Rather, the way in which individuals do gender is fluid and historically contingent (West and Zimmerman 1987). Though gender is fluid and socially constructed, existing power arrangements heavily influence the ways in which individuals accomplish gender in everyday interactions (Fenstermaker et al. 2002; West and Zimmerman 1987). When individuals act in accordance with power structures, it serves to legitimize them as normal and natural. The doing of gender, therefore, provides

men with immense benefits, as it validates their dominant status over women. Integral to this perspective is the notion that gender is omnirelevant; that is, unlike a role that can be suppressed or changed at the will of the individual actor, the doing of gender can never be avoided. While enacting any role in an individual's repertoire (student, friend, sister, father, worker, parent, etc.), gender heavily shapes and influences the way in which one is expected to play that role. Therefore, one can never avoid doing gender (West and Zimmerman 1987).

*What is masculinity?*

This doing-gender perspective has implications for the study of masculinity. The notion that gender is an accomplishment means that men must find ways to achieve masculinity. However, masculinity itself is very difficult to define for a number of reasons. First, the very nature of masculinity makes it difficult to define; masculinity is not a concrete thing but is rather (re)created in everyday interactions. Second, masculinity does not take just one form. Men are not a homogeneous group that enacts the same masculinity. Rather, it is more appropriate to talk about masculinities in the plural, since men are stratified along the same lines as women—by race, class, age, sexual orientation, etc. (Connell 1987; 1995). The manifestation of masculinity that is considered normative in society is often called “hegemonic masculinity” (Connell 1987; 1995). This masculinity is upheld as the standard to which all men must measure their manliness, and it is based on white, middle and upper class notions of what a man should be. Although not all, or even most, men are successful in enacting this type of masculinity, it is what all men “should” aspire to. On the other hand, masculinities

(re)created by those who occupy lower status positions in society are often called “subordinate masculinities” (Connell 1987; 1995). Often, these ideals stand in stark contrast to those of hegemonic masculinity. However, hegemonic masculinity is hegemonic in that it reinforces the subordination of women and non-white, lower class men largely through consent; that is, hegemonic notions of masculinity convince both men and women that what is in the best interest of white, middle and upper class men is in everyone’s best interest (Pyke 1996). Again, hegemonic masculinity is a tool for the subordination of all women to all men, and some men to other men.

Within the research on masculinities, hegemonic masculinity is most often defined in relation to what it is not; that is, it is defined in opposition to femininity and homosexuality (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005; Harris 2000; Kimmel and Mahler 2003; Martin and Hummer 1989; Messner 2002; Totten 2003). While most researchers do not define masculinity any further, many delineate characteristics that a man must embody in order to be considered masculine. Though these are subtly different from one another, taken together they form a comprehensive picture of the masculinity to which men aspire. As identified by both researchers and their respondents, in order to be assessed as truly masculine, a man must be “tough,” “aggressive,” “muscular,” “competitive,” “athletic,” “dominant,” “competent,” “cool,” “rational,” willing to consume large amounts of alcohol; and demonstrate “material wealth,” “power,” “control of others,” “sexual prowess,” and “repression of emotion” (Anderson and Umberson 2001: 362 and 365; Connell 1995; Martin and Hummer 1989; Messerschmidt 2000: 297; Totten 2003: 84; Umberson et al. 2003: 244). An overarching theme to these elements

recognized as masculine is the concept that masculinity involves displays of aggression, and often even violence (Anderson and Umberson 2001; Harris 2000; Messerschmidt 2000; Schrock and Schwalbe 2009; Umberson et al. 2003). Violence is not only a part of hegemonic masculinity, but also a part of subordinated masculinities, as "...men use violence or the threat of violence as an affirmative way of proving individual or collective masculinity, or in desperation when they perceive their masculine self-identity to be under attack" (Harris 2000:781).

Understanding masculinities scholarship as applying only to men, however, would be a mistake. Scholars have recognized that both men and women can enact and "perform" masculinities (West and Zimmerman 1987). It would be tempting to simply assume that GLB relationships function similarly to heterosexual relationships, with one partner playing the "masculine" role while the other plays the "feminine." In this case, it could be assumed that the more masculine partner would be the perpetrator in an IPV situation, while the more feminine would be the victim. This understanding of GLB relationships has been perpetuated in scholarship on the topic, with several scholars arguing that all women and men, regardless of sexual orientation, may internalize power relations they see patterned in heterosexual relationships (Hart 1986; Island & Letellier 1996). Specifically, in Island & Letellier's (1996) book, Walker and Rhodus argue, "[p]ower, not gender, underlies gay male abuse. Yet, we must not forget that most gay men and lesbians were raised in heterosexual homes where power differences between men and women fueled the sex role socialization patterns that they model in their own relationships" (p. xix). However, other scholars argue that the assumption that the

batterer in a same-sex relationship is the “man” or the “butch” and the victim must necessarily be the “woman” or the “femme” is a myth (Island & Letellier 1996). Furthermore, Peplau, Veniegas, and Campbell (1996) have found that GLB individuals defy gender norms and expectations in their relationships and perform many different gender norms irrespective of gender stereotypes. Messinger’s (2017) overview of research to date on IPV summarizes the idea that feminist theories can apply to GLB IPV:

“...scholars suggest that at their core, gender-based IPV theories are pointing out that a partner who has access to greater societal power of any kind (e.g., on average greater economic wealth, greater protection by the law, greater levels of prestige, lower likelihoods of being discriminated against, etc.) may also feel entitled to power over a demographically marginalized intimate partner and will have greater resources to achieve that power” (p. 110-111).

Therefore, the power dynamics so heavily relied-upon by feminist theorists are clearly also present in GLB relationships. It is, therefore, possible that Intimate Terrorism, although based on heterosexist assumptions of relationships, could be applied to GLB relationships as well.

### **Arrest Data and Theorizing IPV**

While arrest data may not directly speak to theorizing IPV among GLB couples, information on people who are arrested for domestic violence can offer a glimpse into the nature and patterns of these violent relationships. While not definitive, looking at both GLB and heterosexual men and women who are arrested as a part of dual arrest and those arrested alone can shed some light on this phenomenon. Specifically, determining directionality of abuse may be made easier when examining arrest data. Determining whether abuse among GLB couples is primarily Intimate Terrorism or Common Couple

Violence can contribute to the above theorizing by determining whether GLB couples and heterosexual couples share directionality of abuse, which can address on-going theoretical debates within the IPV literature.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODS

#### Sample

This study utilized data on domestic violence arrests from the state of Connecticut. Initial data were collected between July 1 and December 31, 2014 and then follow-up data were collected for 18 months (period ending June 30, 2016). Connecticut is a good location for this research because it is a mandatory arrest state without a primary aggressor provision and thus has a very high dual arrest rate (Conn. Gen. Stat. § 46b-38a). Without this provision, dual arrest is more likely because police are neither encouraged nor trained to determine a primary aggressor before making an arrest (Hirschel et al. 2007).

In Connecticut, domestic violence has a broad definition, including various non-romantic relationships involving relatives and roommates. For the purposes of this study, the sample will be restricted to intimate partners, including current or former married partners, unmarried couples currently or previously living together, couples currently or previously involved in a dating relationship, and couples who have a child in common. Because this data does not contain any measures of self-identity, a respondent will be considered “heterosexual” if the initial event leading to arrest involved an intimate relationship with a person of a different gender. An individual will be considered “GLB” if the incident arrest involved a person of the same gender. Although it would be ideal to ask respondents about their sexual identity, both perpetrators and victims are asked about the nature of their relationship; that is, whether the relationship involved roommates,



family, or romantic partners. Therefore, we can assume that a person is gay, lesbian, or bisexual if they experience intimate partner violence with a person of the same gender.

The unit of analysis for the current study is the perpetrator of an incident of intimate partner violence. Restricting the sample to IPV incidents only (excluding other forms of domestic violence) resulted in a total of 7,010 perpetrators. Male-to-female heterosexual violence accounted for 4,838 (69%) of these cases. Female-to-male heterosexual violence made up 1,808 (26%) of cases. Cases of GLB violence were much less numerous, with male-to-male violence accounting for 152 (2%) of cases, and female-to-female violence accounting for 189 (3%) of cases. Roughly 30% of cases involved a dual arrest, while the remaining 70% involved a single arrest of the perpetrator. Additionally, 42% (2,959) of the IPV perpetrators were non-Latino White and 58% (4,051) were ethnic minorities, predominantly Latinos and African-Americans. Age of perpetrator ranged from about 19 to 93 years of age, with an average age of 35 (SD = 11.24) years.

## **Variables Measurement**

### *Dependent variables*

In the state of Connecticut, as part of the Family Violence Risk Assessment Project, whenever an arrest is made for domestic violence, a risk assessment is conducted by Family Relations Counselors to determine the likelihood that the offender will recidivate. This risk assessment is conducted using the Revised Domestic Violence Screening Instrument (DVSI-R) and the Supplemental Dangerousness Items (SDI). The DVSI-R items are scored from zero (no evidence of risk) to two or zero to three,

depending on the item. The scores on each item are summed by the counselors, creating a range of risk scores from zero to 28. For this sample, the mean is 9.54 (standard deviation=5.36). Questions of the perpetrator cover topics such as: prior non-family assaults, arrests, or convictions; prior family violence assaults, threats or arrests; prior family violence intervention or treatment; a history of violation of orders of protection; substance abuse; use of a weapon; presence of children during violent incidents; employment status of the perpetrator; prior verbal or emotional abuse; frequency of family violence in the last 6 months; and escalation of family violence in the past 6 months.

The SDI items are scored yes or no, and then summed to create a possible range of scores from 0 to 5. Items include questions addressing: whether the perpetrator and victim were estranged or separated after living together during the previous year; whether the perpetrator had ever threatened to kill his/her partner; whether the perpetrator had threatened to use or used a deadly weapon against the victim; whether the perpetrator had ever choked or grabbed the victim around the neck (non-fatal strangulation); and whether the perpetrator has threatened or attempted to commit suicide. The mean for this sample is .99 (standard deviation=1.15). The DA was originally created to predict risk of homicide, but has been used to predict the reoccurrence of IPV incidents—specifically escalation or life-threatening instances of violence (Messing et al. 2013). Specific to this data set, both victims and perpetrators were asked to fill out the SDI. In all estimated models, the victims' accounts of the perpetrator's dangerousness will be used as the measure of the SDI, as this method of collection has been validated in prior research

(Campbell 2005; Campbell et al 2009). In the analysis for Aims One and Two, additional regressions will be conducted using two of the five parts of the Supplemental Dangerousness Items: threats to kill and non-fatal strangulation to measure power, coercion and control (Williams forthcoming).

Another outcome in this study is recidivism for any domestic violence offense or violation of protective or restraining order, excluding arrests involving other criminal offenses. Whether a perpetrator recidivated was dummy coded, with “no recidivism present” meaning no arrests for any offenses during the 18-month follow-up period, and “recidivism present” indicating some domestic violence within the 18-month follow-up period—either a new domestic violence offense or a violation of a protective or restraining order. In this sample, about 71% of perpetrators did not reoffend within the follow-up period (n=4,958), while 29% were arrested for a family violence offense (n=2,052).

In some estimated models, dual arrest will also be used as a dependent variable, measured as a dichotomous variable (zero=single arrest, one=dual arrest).

Finally, other outcome measures will be used to act as proxies of “dangerousness”—that is, risk of serious and potentially life-threatening violence. One such variable is item 11 on the DVSI-R, “escalation of abuse,” which asks whether the abuse has escalated in the past 6 months (dummy coded as yes/no). Answers to this question were split evenly with 50% reporting yes and 50% reporting no. The second variable is whether there was any jail time recommended by the court for the initial incident (dummy coded as yes/no); about 87% of perpetrators had no jail time

recommended while 13% had at jail time recommended by the court. Another is whether the perpetrator faced any felony charges for the initial incident (also dummy coded as yes/no), with 63% facing no felony charges and 37% being charged with a felony. Finally, whether the perpetrator was incarcerated at intake during the initial incident was also dummy coded as yes/no. For this sample, about 78% were not incarcerated at intake, while 22% were incarcerated at intake.

#### *Predictor variables*

Sexual orientation was a dummy-coded variable, with one indicating heterosexual and zero indicating GLB. Sexual orientation by gender was measured by four dummy variables: a female offender/male victim (female-to-male violence), a male offender/female victim (male-to-female violence), a male offender/male victim (male-to-male violence) and a female offender/female victim (female-to-female violence). These measures were determined by the genders of the perpetrator and victim at the initial IPV incident, although the gender configuration of perpetrator-to-victim could change in subsequent IPV incidents. Female-to-male violence was the reference category, given that according to prior research, violence perpetrated by female victims against their male partners can largely be considered Common Couple Violence (Gerstenberger and Williams 2012). Therefore, a finding of significant difference for any other sexual orientation by gender dummy variable from this female-to-male violence would indicate more serious violence.

In all estimated models, perpetrator ethnicity (dummy-coded as zero for –non-white and one for white) and perpetrator age in years were included as control variables.

## **Analytical Procedure**

Three sets of analysis were conducted, one for each aim. All analyses were conducted with StataSE 14.2.

### *Aim One Analyses*

Part one of the analysis involved comparing GLB couples and heterosexual couples, varying gender configurations, in regards to: (a) assessed risk utilizing the DVSI-R, (b) assessed risk utilizing the SDI, (c) specific measures of the SDI which capture coercive and controlling behavior and (d) actual recidivism in the 18-month follow-up period.

This analysis involved conducting regressions to determine the estimated effects of the sexual orientation by gender dummy variables on assessed risk as well as IPV recidivism. Five separate models estimated the effects of sexual orientation by gender on: (a) the DVSI-R score, (b) the SDI score, (c) threats to kill and non-fatal strangulation and (d) IPV recidivism. Negative binomial regression was used in models predicting risk since these measures have a positive skew. Logistic regression was used in the models predicting individual SDI measures and recidivism, as these measures are dichotomous.

In consideration of prior research, it was hypothesized that the male-to-female violence, female-to-female violence, and male-to-male violence would all have significantly higher risk and higher likelihood of recidivism than female-to-male violence. More specifically, it was hypothesized that:

- (1) Male-to-female violence would be associated with (a) higher risk according to the DVSI-R (b) higher risk according to the SDI (c) higher likelihood of

threatening to kill and of nonfatal strangulation, and (d) higher likelihood of recidivism than female-to-male violence.

(2) Male-to-male violence would be associated with (a) higher risk according to the DVSI-R (b) higher risk according to the SDI (c) higher likelihood of threatening to kill and of nonfatal strangulation, and (d) higher likelihood of recidivism than female-to-male violence.

(3) Female-to-female violence would be associated with (a) higher risk according to the DVSI-R (b) higher risk according to the SDI (c) higher likelihood of threatening to kill and of nonfatal strangulation, and (d) higher likelihood of recidivism than female-to-male violence.

Prior research has shown that female-to-male violence likely reflects Common Couple Violence rather than Intimate Terrorism (Gerstenberger and Williams 2012). Although some female perpetrators terrorize their male partners, this type of violence has been shown to be less severe with less risk for future violence in prior research (Gerstenberger and Williams 2012), which justifies this group serving as the reference category. A finding of significance of the GLB couple types would support prior research that has theorized that a vast majority of IPV among same-sex couples should be considered Intimate Terrorism, providing empirical evidence to support claims that have been largely based on anecdotal evidence (Renzetti 1992; Merrill & Wolfe 2000).

#### *Aim Two Analysis*

Part two of this analysis sought to investigate the role of dual arrest in changing the likelihood of higher risk and recidivism. The purpose was to compare GLB couples

and heterosexual couples, varying gender, involved in a single arrest versus those involved in a dual arrest in regards to: (a) assessed risk utilizing the DVSI-R, (b) assessed risk utilizing the SDI, (c) threats to kill and non-fatal strangulation and (d) IPV recidivism (any versus none). The overall idea was to compare GLB and heterosexual couples, varying gender, involved in a single arrest versus dual arrest in regards to the above risk measures, as well as actual recidivism during the follow-up period. Therefore, the second part of this analysis built upon the first, utilizing the same outcome and control variables, and was conducted in three stages.

The first stage regression determined whether sexual orientation by gender predicted the likelihood of dual arrest, as has been indicated by prior research (Hirschel et al. 2007). For this stage, consistent with prior research, it was hypothesized that:

- (4) Overall, GLB couples would be more likely than heterosexual couples to be involved in a dual arrest versus a single arrest.
- (5) Male perpetrators with female victims would be less likely than female perpetrators with male victims to be involved in a dual arrest versus a single arrest.
- (6) Male perpetrators with male victims would be more likely than female perpetrators with male victims to be involved in a dual arrest versus a single arrest.
- (7) Female perpetrators with female victims would be more likely than female perpetrators with male victims to be involved in a dual arrest versus a single arrest.

For the second stage, analyses were conducted using the three sexual orientation by gender dummy variables, and the dual arrest dummy variable. Effects will be estimated of these variables on each of the 3 outcome variables: (a) the DVSI-R numeric risk score, (b) the SDI score, and (c) threats to kill and non-fatal strangulation and (d) IPV recidivism. It was hypothesized that:

(8) Controlling for dual arrest would not change the results of models testing hypotheses 1-3.

(9) Relative to single arrest, dual arrest would be significantly and negatively associated with (a) risk according to the DVSI-R, (b) risk according to the SDI, (c) threats to kill and non-fatal strangulation and (d) IPV recidivism.

These hypotheses are based on the fact that single arrests should signify particularly egregious cases of IPV, especially for same-sex couples where dual arrest has shown to be more common (Hirschel et al 2007).

The third stage regression entailed adding interaction terms (dual arrest by each sexual orientation by gender variable) to the model to determine whether the estimated effects of sexual orientation by gender on risk and recidivism differ significantly between dual arrest and single arrest conditions. The purpose of this stage of the analysis was to shed some light on whether dual arrest conditions affect risk and the likelihood of recidivism for all couple types. As with other analyses, female-to-male violence was used as the reference category.

For the interaction terms, it was hypothesized that there would be no significant findings; that is, that there would be no significant difference between dual arrest and



single arrest cases in the effect of sexual orientation by gender on risk and recidivism.

Otherwise stated as:

- (10) The association of dual arrest with (a) risk as measured by the DVSI-R, (b) risk as measured by the SDI, (c) threats to kill and non-fatal strangulation and (d) IPV recidivism will not depend on whether the IPV is a male-to-female or female-to-male.
- (11) The association of dual arrest with (a) risk as measured by the DVSI-R, (b) risk as measured by the SDI, (c) threats to kill and non-fatal strangulation and (d) IPV recidivism will not depend on whether the IPV is a male-to-male or female-to-male.
- (12) The association of dual arrest with (a) risk as measured by the DVSI-R, (b) risk as measured by the SDI, (c) threats to kill and non-fatal strangulation and (d) IPV recidivism will not depend on whether the IPV is a female-to-female or female-to-male.

In Gerstenberger and Williams' (2012) research (which utilized a similar methodology), no evidence was found of a statistically significant interaction effect involving dual arrests by gender. This suggested that although dual arrest did lead to decreased risk and a decreased likelihood of recidivism, dual arrest did not moderate the effect between offender/victim gender and risk and recidivism. Whether or not an arrest is a dual arrest, male offenders with female victims were still more likely to recidivate within an 18-month period of time after initial arrest (Gerstenberger and Williams 2012). Therefore, it was expected that dual arrest would also not moderate the effect between

sexual orientation by gender and risk and recidivism. Such a finding would indicate that whether or not an arrest is a dual arrest, GLB couples would be more likely to have higher risk than females with male victims.

### *Aim Three Analysis*

Part three of the analysis involved determining whether risk utilizing the DVSI-R predicts recidivism and whether the SDI is associated with dangerousness for GLB as well as heterosexual couples. The outcome measure for the analyses involving the DVSI-R is the same recidivism measure used in analyses for Aims One and Two (any versus no recidivism). To account for dangerousness, analyses involving the SDI will include the following as outcome measures: (a) item 11 from the DVSI-R regarding whether the abuse has escalated in the last 6 months, (b) whether jail time was recommended by the court at the initial incident arrest (c) whether the perpetrator was incarcerated at initial incident intake and (d) whether felony charges pressed at the initial incident arrest. Logistic regression was used for all above measures, as they were measured dichotomously. First, logistic regressions were conducted utilizing the risk measures along with control variables; second, interaction terms were calculated to determine whether sexual orientation by gender moderates the relationship between each risk measure and each outcome measure. The goal was to support or refute the validity of these measures for the total sample as well as each sub-sample.

In keeping with prior research (Stansfield and Williams 2014; Williams and Houghton 2004; Williams and Grant 2006; Williams 2012), it was hypothesized that:

- (13) The estimated effect of the DVSI-R risks score on recidivism would be positive and statistically significant.

Additionally, since the DA was created to predict intimate partner homicide or “dangerousness” (Campbell 2005; Williams and Houghton 2004), it was hypothesized that:

- (14) The SDI would have a positive and statistically significant effect on the likelihood of: (a) whether the abuse has escalated in the last 6 months, (b) whether jail time was recommended by the court at the initial incident arrest (c) whether the perpetrator was incarcerated at initial incident intake and (d) whether felony charges pressed at the initial incident arrest.

Regarding the interaction terms, it was hypothesized that:

- (15) The association of the DVSI-R with recidivism will not depend on whether the IPV is (a) male-to-female (b) male-to-male or (c) female-to-female as compared to female-to-male.
- (16) The association of the SDI with each of the four measures of dangerousness will not depend on whether the IPV is (a) male-to-female (b) male-to-male or (c) female-to-female as compared to female-to-male.

## CHAPTER 4

### EMPIRICAL RESULTS

#### **Aim One: Estimating the Effects of Perpetrator Sexual Orientation by Gender on Risk and Recidivism**

The purpose of this part of the analysis was to determine whether sexual orientation and gender configurations impacted risk (as measured by the DVSI-R and the SDI) and recidivism (measured as any new IPV arrest within an 18-month period following the initial arrest). A significant finding on any regression models would indicate that sexual orientation by gender impacted risk or the likelihood of recidivism; that is, that some dyads of violence are more or less serious than others.

Of 7,010 initial violent incidents, 364 (5%) were same-sex violence (considered GLB in this analysis) and 6,646 (95%) were heterosexual violence. As stated previously, male-to-female violence was the most common in this sample, accounting for 69% of cases, while female-to-male violence made up 26%, male-to-male violence accounting for 2%, and female-to-female violence making up 3% of cases.

#### *Hypotheses*

For the first portion of the analysis, it was hypothesized that there would be a significant relationship between each of the three sexual orientation by gender variables and higher risk and IPV recidivism.

These hypotheses are based on prior research that indicates that male-to-female violence is more serious than female-to-male violence, and the idea that GLB couples most closely resemble male-to-female heterosexual violence, and will therefore have

higher risk and recidivism when compared to female-to-male violence (the reference category).

### *Empirical results*

The results of estimating the effects of the sexual orientation dummy variable on the DVSI-R are reported in Table 1 (see Appendix). As predicted, holding perpetrator ethnicity and age constant, being a male perpetrator with a female victim resulted in a 32% increase in the DVSI-R risk score as compared to a female perpetrator with a male victim ( $IRR=1.32$ ;  $p<.000$ ). Similarly, male-to-male violence increased the risk score by 29% ( $IRR=1.29$ ;  $p<.000$ ). Female-to-female violence resulted in a slightly higher percentage of risk (8%), but this effect was not statistically significant, indicating that female-to-female violence does not differ considerably in terms of risk from female-to-male violence ( $p<.100$ ). The estimated effect of perpetrator age was statistically significant; however, the effect size was so negligible that direction was indeterminable.

The results using the SDI risk score as the dependent variable are recorded in Table 2. Once again, male-to-female violence and male-to-male violence resulted in significant increases in the SDI risk score as compared to female-to-male violence (42% and 50% respectively, both  $p<.000$ ). In this analysis, being a female perpetrator with a female victim resulted in a statistically significant 24% increase in the SDI risk score as compared to female perpetrators with male victims ( $IRR=1.24$ ;  $p<.018$ ). The estimated effects of perpetrator ethnicity and age were statistically significant in this model, but effect sizes (although positive) were very small.

The empirical results of the logistic regression analysis involving threats to kill are reported in Table 3. Both male perpetrators with female victims and male perpetrators with male victims were significantly more likely to threaten to kill their partners than female perpetrators with male victims ( $OR=2.54$  and  $2.87$  respectively;  $p<.001$ ). However, although being a female perpetrator with a female victim resulted in a 26% increase in the likelihood of threatening to kill one's partner compared to female perpetrators with male victims, this increase was not statistically significant ( $OR=1.26$ ). Age also had a statistically significant effect, although the effect size was negligible ( $OR=1.00$ ,  $p<.001$ ).

Table 4 shows the effect of the sexual orientation by gender variables on non-fatal strangulation. Here, all three dyads are significantly more likely to choke their partners than female perpetrators with male victims. Male perpetrators with female victims were 3.9 times more likely to choke/strangle ( $OR=3.86$ ,  $p<.001$ ), male perpetrators with male victims were nearly 2.4 times more likely to choke/strangle ( $OR=2.38$ ,  $p<.001$ ), and female perpetrators with female victims were 2.7 times more likely to choke/strangle their partners ( $OR=2.69$ ,  $p<.001$ ) than female perpetrators with male victims. Again we see here that age had a small but statistically significant positive effect on non-fatal strangulation ( $OR=1.01$ ,  $p<.001$ ).

The results of the analysis involving sexual orientation by gender and IPV recidivism are reported in Table 5. Similar to prior analyses, all three relationship types were significantly more likely to recidivate during the 18-month follow-up period than female perpetrators with male victims. Male perpetrators with female victims were 78%

more likely to recidivate than female perpetrators with male victims ( $OR=1.78$ ,  $p<.000$ ). Similarly, male-to-male violence resulted in a 56% increase in likelihood of recidivism as compared to female-to-male violence ( $OR=1.56$ ,  $p<.018$ ). Finally, being a female perpetrator with a female victim resulted in an 82% increased risk of recidivism during the 18 month follow-up period, when compared with female perpetrators with male victims ( $OR=1.82$ ,  $p<.000$ ). Perpetrator age also had a small a statistically significant negative estimated effect.

### *Discussion*

The three hypotheses for part one of the analysis were mostly confirmed: as compared with female perpetrators with male victims, all three other relationship types were likely to have higher assessed risk and a higher likelihood of actual recidivism over the 18-month follow-up period. The only caveat was the finding of non-significance for female-to-female violence in terms of threats to kill. These findings support the idea that heterosexual and GLB couples experience similar forms, patterns, and seriousness of violence (Renzetti 1992; Merrill & Wolfe 2000) and that GLB violence most closely resembles male-to-female heterosexual violence. These findings of higher risk and recidivism support the idea of previous researchers that at least some of the violence perpetrated in GLB relationships should be considered Intimate Terrorism (Renzetti 1992; Merrill & Wolfe 2000). However, in consideration of prior research, it is likely that whether or not the initial arrest was single or dual could be a contributing factor in risk and recidivism, an issue addressed in Aim Two of this analysis.

## **Aim Two: Estimating the Effects of Dual Arrest on Risk and Recidivism**

The second part of this analysis built upon the first, utilizing the same outcome and control variables. The purpose of this analysis is to determine the effect of dual arrest on risk and recidivism and to explore its interaction with gender and sexual orientation. A finding that dual arrest has a negative association with risk and recidivism would indicate that dual arrest may be indicative of Common Couple Violence rather than Intimate Terrorism. Alternately, a finding that dual arrest is not correlated with significantly lower risk or recidivism would indicate that dual arrest may not be indicative of Common Couple Violence.

Including the interaction term into the analysis, however, determined whether dual arrest moderated the effect of sexual orientation by gender on risk and recidivism. A statistically significant interaction term in a positive direction would indicate that the relation between sexual orientation by gender on risk or recidivism is stronger for dual arrest situations, compared to those involving single arrest. A finding of non-significance, however, would indicate that this relation is basically the same within the two arrest categories (i.e., dual or single arrest). Finding a statistically significant and negative interaction term would indicate that the relation between sexual orientation by gender and risk or recidivism is weaker in the dual, compared to the single arrest category.

In this sample, dual arrest cases accounted for about 30% of all IPV arrests. Of 4,838 cases of male-to-female violence, roughly 79% were single arrests and 21% were dual arrests. Female-to-male violence was more likely to result in dual arrest, with 48%



of the 1,808 cases involving a single arrest, and 52% dual arrests. Perhaps surprisingly, male-to-male violence looked roughly similar to male-to-female violence; of the 152 cases, 72% were single arrests and 28% were dual arrests. Of 189 cases of female-to-female violence, 58% were single arrests, while 42% were dual arrests.

### *Hypotheses*

The hypotheses for Aim Two centered on the inclusion of dual arrest. It was expected that the likelihood of dual arrest would vary depending upon the couple type (see hypotheses above). Additionally, it was expected that dual arrest would be significantly and negatively associated with (a) risk according to the DVSI-R, (b) risk according to the SDI, (c) threats to kill and non-fatal strangulation and (d) recidivism. Finally, it was expected that all calculated interaction terms would fail to be significant in all estimated models.

### *Empirical Results*

The analyses were conducted in three stages. In the first logistic regression predicting dual arrest, Table 6 shows that being heterosexual resulted in statistically significant decrease in the likelihood of being arrested as part of a dual arrest by 27% ( $OR=0.73$ ) as compared to GLB couples ( $p<.005$ ). Alone, this finding could corroborate earlier assertions that GLB couples are more likely to engage in Common Couple Violence and therefore their violence is less serious and more mutual than violence perpetrated in heterosexual relationships. Thus, to clarify this finding, it is necessary to move on to more in-depth parts of the analysis.

There were mixed findings on the question of whether same-sex couples are more likely to be arrested as part of a dual arrest, as shown in Table 7. Holding age and ethnicity constant, being a male perpetrator with a female victim reduced the likelihood of dual arrest by 75% as compared to female perpetrators with male victims ( $OR = 0.25$ ;  $p < .000$ ). However, there were mixed findings for GLB couples. Opposite of what was hypothesized, male-on-male violence accounted for a statistically significant reduction in the likelihood of being arrested as part of a dual arrest by 62% ( $OR = 0.38$ ) as compared to female-to-male violence ( $p < .000$ ). However, for female-to-female violence, there was a slight reduction (about 25%) but this reduction was not statistically significant. Therefore, male perpetrators, regardless of the gender of their victims, were less likely than female perpetrators with male victims to be arrested as part of a dual arrest.

The second stage involved controlling for dual arrest when predicting risk and recidivism. The results of the effect of sexual orientation by gender and dual arrest on the DVSI-R risk score are reported in Table 8. As predicted, being involved in a dual arrest is associated with a statistically significant reduction in risk in the DVSI-R score by 19% ( $IRR = 0.81$ ;  $p < .000$ ). Holding dual arrest, perpetrator ethnicity and age constant, being a male perpetrator with a female victim was associated with in a 24% increase in the DVSI-R risk score as compared to female perpetrators with male victims ( $IRR = 1.24$ ;  $p < .000$ ). Similarly, male-to-male violence increased the risk score by 23% ( $IRR = 1.23$ ;  $p < .000$ ). However, as with part one of the analysis, female-to-female violence resulted in a slightly higher percentage of risk (6%), but this variable was not significant, indicating

that female-to-female violence does not differ considerably in terms of risk from female-to-male violence.

Consider now the results for the SDI, as reported in Table 9. Again, dual arrest is highly significant, with a dual arrest resulting in an average decrease in the overall SDI risk score by 26% ( $IRR=.74$ ;  $p<.000$ ). As with prior analyses, male perpetrated violence resulted in significant increases in the SDI risk score as compared to female-to-male violence (31% for female victims and 41% for male victims, both  $p<.000$ ). In this analysis, being a female perpetrator with a female victim resulted in a statistically significant 22% increase in the SDI risk score as compared to female perpetrators with male victims ( $p<.030$ ). Results also show that being a white perpetrator resulted in a significant 12% increased ( $IRR=1.12$ ) in the SDI risk score as compared to perpetrators of color. The estimated effects of perpetrator age were also statistically significant in this model, but effect sizes were so small that directionality could not be determined ( $IRR=1.00$ ).

Next, consider the results reported in Tables 10 and 11 regarding threats to kill and non-fatal strangulation. As shown in Table 10, being arrested as part of a dual arrest resulted in a 52% decrease in the likelihood of threatening to kill one's partner ( $OR=0.48$ ,  $p<.001$ ). Findings regarding sexual orientation by gender are similar to the Aim One analysis, with male perpetrators being significantly more likely to threaten to kill than female perpetrators with male victims, but with female-to-female violence remaining not significant. Age here has a small but statistically significant positive effect ( $OR=1.02$ ,  $p<.001$ ).

Table 11 shows that being arrested as part of a dual arrest (as compared to being arrested alone) resulted in a statistically significant 20% decrease in the likelihood of non-fatally strangling one's partner ( $OR=0.80$ ,  $p<.01$ ). All findings regarding sexual orientation by gender are similar to Aim One analysis, with all three couple types being significantly more likely to non-fatally strangle their partners than female perpetrators with male victims. Age here also has a statistically significant positive effect ( $OR=1.01$ ,  $p<.05$ ).

The results of the analysis involving sexual orientation by gender, dual arrest, and IPV recidivism are reported in Table 12. Holding sexual orientation by gender, age, and ethnicity constant, being arrested as part of a dual arrest results in a decrease in risk of recidivism by 28% ( $IRR=.72$ ;  $p<.000$ ). Findings regarding sexual orientation by gender are similar to part one of the analysis, with all three relationship types being significantly more likely to recidivate during the 18-month follow-up period than female perpetrators with male victims, holding dual arrest constant. Therefore, regardless of dual or single arrest, male perpetrators with female victims were 63% more likely to recidivate in the follow-up period than female perpetrators with male victims ( $OR=1.63$ ,  $p<.000$ ). Comparably, male-to-male violence resulted in a statistically significant 46% increase in likelihood of recidivism as compared to female-to-male violence ( $OR=1.46$ ,  $p<.047$ ). Finally, being a female perpetrator with a female victim resulted in a 78% increased risk of recidivism during the 18 month follow-up period, when compared with female perpetrators with male victims. Perpetrator age also had a negligible but statistically significant negative effect.

It is clear from the above results that even holding dual arrest constant, sexual orientation/gender still plays a role in risk and likelihood of recidivism. To further explore this relationship, the third stage of this part involved creating three interaction terms to determine whether dual arrest moderates the relationship between sexual orientation by gender and risk/recidivism. Table 13 shows the result of this analysis with the DVSI-R risk score as the dependent variable. All three interaction terms, dual arrest\*f-to-f violence, dual arrest\*m-to-f violence, and dual arrest\*m-to-m violence are not significant in this analysis, signifying that dual arrest does not moderate this relationship between sexual orientation by gender and the DVSI-R risk score. Table 14 shows a similar picture for the SDI total risk score; all effect sizes for the interaction terms are negligible in size and fail to attain statistical significance, indicating that dual arrest does not moderate this relationship. Again, we see similar findings in Tables 15 and 16 regarding threats to kill and non-fatal strangulation; all interaction terms fail to attain statistical significance. Finally, the interaction terms are also not statistically significant in the model with recidivism as the dependent variable, as shown in Table 17. This logistic regression showed a slight reduction in the estimated effects of sexual orientation by gender on recidivism for those involved in dual arrest situations. However, as with risk, this change is not significant.

### *Discussion*

These results show mixed support for the hypotheses for Aim Two of this analysis. Hypotheses 4 and 5 were confirmed. However, contrary to expectations laid out in hypotheses 6 and 7, GLB couples were not more likely to be arrested as part of a

dual arrest than female perpetrators with male victims. Male-to-male violence was actually associated with a significant decrease in the likelihood of being arrested as part of a dual arrest as compared to female-to-male violence. Being a female perpetrator with a female victim was also associated with a small decrease, but this finding was not statistically significant. Therefore this analysis shows that that female perpetrators are more likely to be arrested as part of a dual arrest regardless of the gender of their victim. This finding is surprising given prior research that indicates that GLB couples have a higher likelihood of dual arrest than heterosexual couples (Hirschel et al 2007). However, it does make sense in the context of some research on police bias that has indicated that officers are sometimes more likely to treat women with chivalry in making arrests for IPV; specifically, that police may be less likely to view women as primary aggressors (Admire 2017). Therefore, it is likely that police are more likely to make a dual arrest when faced with the potential of female aggression, regardless of the gender of the victim in the encounter. Prior analyses may have failed to capture this dynamic in simply comparing heterosexual violence to GLB violence rather than breaking down these categories further.

Hypotheses 8 was also confirmed in that controlling for dual arrest did not change the results for the three sexual orientation by gender dummy variables. Hypothesis 9 related to the effects of dual arrest on risk and recidivism were supported; in all analyses, being involved in a dual arrest versus a single arrest resulted in a statistically significant decrease in risk and the likelihood of recidivism. This lends some support to the idea that dual arrest could be indicative of Common Couple Violence, or less serious and possibly

bidirectional violence. This, however, supports earlier assertions by other scholars that not all violence among GLB couples can be considered Common Couple Violence.

Perhaps one of the most surprising findings here involves female-to-female violence. Being a female perpetrator with a female victim was associated with a slight but not statistically significant increase in the DVSI-R (6%), a small but significant increase in the SDI (22%), a non-significant increase in likelihood of threatening to kill, and a large and significant increase in non-fatal strangulation (2.6 times), but was associated with a significant and large increase in the likelihood of recidivism (78%) as compared to female-to-male violence. This calls into question whether the DVSI-R and the SDI, both of which were created to assess risk among heterosexual couples, can adequately capture risk among lesbian couples. If nothing else, this finding shows that, despite the likelihood of dual arrest, there is serious violence happening among lesbian couples which could be considered Intimate Terrorism since the likelihood of recidivism is so high compared to female perpetrators with male victims, as well as the likelihood of non-fatal strangulation. The idea here is that all three couple types, as compared to female-to-male violence, were more likely to recidivate and more likely to engage in patterns of power and control. Another significant finding here is that, overall, the sexual orientation by gender variables demonstrated significant effects on both risk and recidivism despite holding dual arrest constant.

To further explore this finding, interaction terms were created to determine whether dual arrest moderated the effect between sexual orientation by gender and risk/recidivism. Findings here were not significant, lending support to the initial

hypotheses 10-12. This provides evidence that GLB couples are not ensnared in only Common Couple Violence, as is often thought by police and the general public. Rather, the finding that dual arrest does not moderate the effect between sexual orientation by gender and risk indicates that whether or not an arrest is a dual arrest, female-to-female, male-to-female, and male-to-male are likely to have higher risk than females with male victims.

These findings suggest that we are seeing Intimate Terrorism in GLB relationships, and that male-to-male and female-to-female GLB relationships more closely resemble male-to-female violent relationships rather than female-to-male ones. This finding signifies that GLB relationships affected by IPV may actually be plagued with Intimate Terrorism rather than Common Couple Violence as has been demonstrated to be the case with male-to-female violence (Gerstenberger and Williams 2012). If this is the case, it lends to support to the idea that feminist theorizing on IPV may be applicable to GLB violence as it is to male on female violence, as argued by Messinger (2017).

### **Aim Three: Estimating the Effects of the DVSI-R and SDI on Recidivism**

The purpose of part three of the analysis was to determine whether the risk measures significantly predict recidivism for both GLB and heterosexual couples. Ultimately, a finding of statistical significance for these risk measures would indicate that the measure is able to predict recidivism and/or dangerousness, validating future use of this risk assessment.



### *Hypotheses*

The hypotheses for Aim Three indicated that the DVSI-R would be positively and significantly associated with recidivism, while the SDI would be positively and significantly associated with measures of dangerousness. These relationships would not change based on the couple type.

### *Empirical Results*

Consider the results of the logistic regression predicting recidivism reported in Table 18. Holding perpetrator sexual orientation by gender, age, and ethnicity constant, a one-unit change to the DVSI-R resulted in a statistically significant 9% increase in the likelihood of recidivism during the 18-month follow-up period ( $OR=1.09$ ;  $p<.000$ ).

Results determining an association between the SDI and Dangerousness can be found in Tables 19, 20, 21, and 22 below. Consider the results on Table 19, utilizing item 11, “abuse escalation,” from the DVSI-R about whether the abuse has escalated in the last 6 months. Here, we see that the SDI is highly significant, with a one unit increase on the total SDI score accounting for a 72% increase in the likelihood of reported escalation of abuse ( $OR=1.72$ ;  $p<.000$ ), confirming expectations. As seen in Table 20, a one-unit increase in the SDI is associated with a 35% increase in the likelihood that the court would recommend jail time for the perpetrator for the initial incident. All three sexual orientation by gender variables were statistically significant, with large positive effect sizes: male perpetrators with female victims were nearly 6 times more likely to have recommended jail time, male perpetrators with male victims were 4 times more likely to have recommended jail time, and female perpetrators with female victims were about

twice as likely to have recommended jail time than female perpetrators with male victims. Perpetrator ethnicity also has a high degree of statistical significance, with white perpetrators being 28% less likely to be recommended to serve jail days than non-white perpetrators ( $OR=0.72$ ;  $p<.000$ ). This perhaps hints to racialized, gendered, and sexually bias in courts since in this model risk measures were controlled. As shown in Table 21, the SDI was statistically significantly associated with a 39% higher likelihood of being incarcerated at intake ( $OR=1.39$ ,  $p<.001$ ). Again, we see statistical significance and large positive effect sizes for each gender by sexuality variable (with the exception of female-to-female, which barely fails to attain significance with  $p=.059$ ), and a statistically significant negative effect for perpetrator ethnicity. Similarly, when looking at whether felony charges pressed at the initial incident arrest in Table 22, the validity of the SDI is supported: a one unit increase in the SDI was significantly associated with a 41% increase in the likelihood of a felony charge being filed ( $OR=1.41$ ,  $p<.000$ ). Being a male perpetrator was also significantly associated with felony charges: male perpetrators with female victims were nearly twice as likely to have a felony charge ( $OR=1.98$ ,  $p<.000$ ), male perpetrators with male victims were 1.8 times more likely to have a felony charge than female perpetrator with male victims ( $OR=1.83$ ,  $p<.000$ ). The effect of being a female perpetrator with a female victim was not statistically significant.

The results pertaining to the interaction terms can be found in tables 23-27. Table 23 shows the result of this analysis with the DVSI-R risk score interaction terms and recidivism as the dependent variable. All three interaction terms, DVSI-R\*m-to-f violence, DVSI-R\*m-to-m, and DVSI-R\*f-to-f violence are not significant in this

analysis, signifying that the DVSI-R does not moderate the relationship between sexual orientation by gender and recidivism. We see similar results for all 4 dangerousness measures: Tables 24, 25, 26, and 27 show that all three interaction terms failed to attain significance for any of the four measures of dangerousness.

### *Discussion*

The hypotheses for part three of this analysis were supported. Higher DVSI-R risk scores were significantly and positively associated with an increased likelihood of recidivism, supporting Hypothesis 13. Additionally, the SDI was positively and statistically significantly associated with all four measures of dangerousness, supporting Hypothesis 14. Additionally, in support of Hypotheses 15 and 16, there were no significant interaction terms in the models, indicating that regardless of the couple type, the association of the risk measures with outcome measures remained. Therefore, the validity of both measures was supported.

The findings here provide support for continued usage of the DVSI-R for predicting likelihood of recidivism during the 18-month follow-up period for heterosexual couples and for GLB couples. Additionally, the findings support the validity of the SDI in its association with measures of dangerousness.

## **Chapter 5**

### **DISCUSSION**

This study was the first of its kind to compare heterosexual and GLB couples in terms of IPV risk and recidivism and to validate for GLB couples commonly used risk assessments, the DVSI-R and the SDI. This research can aid in the understanding of IPV for both GLB and heterosexual couples. Taken as a whole, the findings advance understandings of the directionality of abuse, the nature and consequences of dual arrest, theoretical causes and correlates of IPV, and risk assessment for IPV recidivism.

#### **Directionality of IPV**

Contrary to societal stereotype that all IPV is a “fight between equals” (Island & Letellier 1991; Letellier 1996; Merrill 1996), this research demonstrated that at least some of GLB IPV can be considered serious and unidirectional. Aim One analyses showed that compared to female heterosexual perpetrators of IPV, both GLB and male-to-female IPV are likely to have higher risk and recidivism during the 18-month follow-up period. They are also more likely to engage in the coercive and controlling behavior of threatening to kill and non-fatally strangling their victims. These findings add empirical support to prior, largely untested assertions that GLB violence is not limited to bidirectional, mutual abuse or Common Couple Violence (Island & Letellier 1996; Renzetti 1992; Merrill & Wolfe 2000). However, rather than suggesting that GLB violence resembles heterosexual violence generally, the current study suggests that GLB violence resembles male-to-female heterosexual violence specifically, a form of which is

more likely than female-to-male heterosexual violence to entail Intimate Terrorism (Gerstenberger & Williams 2012).

Aim Two results demonstrated that even when holding dual arrest constant, male-to-female, female-to-female, and male-to-male violence involved greater risk and recidivism than female-to-male violence. Further, it showed that dual arrest moderates the relation of between sexual orientation by gender to neither risk nor recidivism, indicating that even when a couple is arrested as part of a dual arrest, male perpetrators with female victims and GLB couples are involved in more serious violence than female-to-male perpetrators. This finding suggests that male-to-female and GLB violence is likely to be unidirectional, or indicative of Intimate Terrorism rather than Common Couple Violence.

### **Dual Arrest**

The study's findings on dual arrest run contrary to many prior assertions about dual arrest and sexual orientation. Although Hirschel et al (2007) found that same-sex couples were more likely than heterosexual couples to be arrested as part of a dual arrest, the present study did not replicate this finding. Aim Two analyses found that male-to-male perpetrators were less likely to be arrested as part of a dual arrest than female-to-male perpetrators. Female-to-female violence was no different from female-to-male violence in terms of the likelihood of dual arrest. Prior findings on a higher likelihood of dual arrest for GLB couples may have been due to a failure to separate out gender and sexual orientation into four distinct variables. This study's results indicate that male-to-

female and female-to-male violence differ so substantially from one another that they should not be combined in future analyses.

Prior research has argued that dual arrest may be indicative of Common Couple Violence; that is, violence that is bidirectional (or mutual) and less serious in nature than Intimate Terrorism (Straus 1979; 1999; 2005; 2009). However, prior analyses of dual arrest among heterosexual couples did not empirically support that argument; instead they showed that female-to-male violence was associated with lower risk and recidivism when compared to male-to-female violence, regardless of whether the arrest was single or dual (Gerstenberger & Williams 2012). The current analysis supported the findings of Gerstenberger and Williams (2012) by showing that even when holding dual arrest constant, male-to-female violence and GLB violence is likely to result in higher risk and likelihood of recidivism compared to female-to-male violence.

### **Theoretical Implications**

This research speaks to the debate about whether IPV among same-sex couples can be explained by theories that explain heterosexual IPV. Although this study does not address the causes, correlates, or etiology of IPV, it shows that some kinds of violence look similar in terms of risk and recidivism. Thus, the theoretical implications are that if violence takes on the same pattern, it may be explained by the same factors. Analyses for Aims One and Two of the current study demonstrated that male-perpetrated heterosexual and GLB IPV tends to look more serious in terms of risk, controlling behavior, and likelihood of recidivism than female-to-male violence. Male perpetrators (regardless of sexual orientation) and lesbians consistently demonstrated higher risk, likelihood of

controlling behavior, and a higher likelihood of recidivism than female heterosexual perpetrators. Although dual arrest led to somewhat lower levels of risk and recidivism, the results indicate that dual arrest does not moderate the relationship between sexual orientation by gender and risk nor between sexual orientation by gender and IPV recidivism.

Since this research provided a consistent narrative of seriousness, it is likely that the same factors that influence male-to-female IPV also influence GLB IPV. While it cannot be determined based on this analysis whether feminist or masculinities theorizing adequately captures GLB IPV, this research suggests that moving forward with a more inclusive line of theorizing is an important next step. Because at least some of GLB IPV can be considered Intimate Terrorism, future research should aim to determine the causes and correlates of IPV for both male and female perpetrators of all sexual orientations.

### **Risk Assessment**

The current study contributes to the understanding of the assessment of risk of IPV recidivism. This analysis supported the validity of the SDI in its association with measures of dangerousness and reinforced the validity of DVSI-R in predicting recidivism.

However, further research is needed on the ability of the SDI and the DVSI-R to adequately address dangerousness and recidivism for lesbian couples. Specifically, Aim Two analyses showed that although female-to-female violence resulted in a small increase in risk according to the DVSI-R (although this finding was not statistically significant) and the SDI (significant), being a female perpetrator with a female victim

was associated with a large and significant increase in the likelihood of recidivism as compared to female perpetrators with male victims. If these results are replicated by future analyses, these risk assessment tools may require modification in the future to adequately capture female-to-female violence. Future research could also explore intimate partner homicide among GLB couples to determine the validity of this measure for GLB couples.

### **Limitations and Future Research**

There are several limitations to this study that highlight the need for more research in this area. The largest limitation of this research is its geographic specificity. This data was gathered from one state; therefore, future research should address the research questions using data from multiple states. Ideally, this research could be replicated in areas that are not mandatory arrest or that have a primary aggressor provision. Additionally, it would be helpful to find data on a larger number of GLB couples, as there was a small number of GLB couples in this sample (n= 341) compared to the number of heterosexual couples (n=6,646).

Because there were no measures of self-identity in this dataset, it is not clear whether perpetrators and victims identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender. Future analyses could provide more detail on each of these categories by clearly asking about self-identity. This would also allow for a thorough exploration of violence among couples involving transgender people; a population that was unfortunately left out of the current analysis due to data limitations.



## **Conclusion**

These findings indicate that GLB violence most closely resembles male-to-female heterosexual violence. They provide support for looking at GLB IPV as indicative of much more than non-serious mutual abuse and as capable of including Intimate Terrorism as much as heterosexual couples. This research contributes to a body of literature that indicates that IPV among GLB couples is not exclusively Common Couple Violence, and therefore must be theorized and policed with this research in mind. Theorizing must fully capture what dynamics can lead both GLB and heterosexual perpetrators to engage in patterns of control and domination of their partners. Similarly, research such as this necessarily calls into question the practice of relying on dual arrest, specifically in GLB relationships, rather than training police to determine a primary aggressor in most instances of IPV. Though the results are not definitive, it is hoped that this research will impact the future of IPV theorizing and police intervention for all couple types.

## References

- Admire, Amanda. 2017. Unpublished dissertation. University of California, Riverside.
- American Bar Association Commission on Domestic Violence. 2007. "Domestic Violence Arrest Policies by State." Retrieved February 2, 2010 (<http://www.abanet.org/domviol>).
- Anderson, Kristin L. and Debra Umberson. 2001. "Gendering Violence: Masculinity and Power in Men's Accounts of Domestic Violence." *Gender and Society* 15(3):358-380.
- Archer, John. 2000. "Sex Differences in Aggression Between Heterosexual Partners: A Meta-Analytic Review." *Psychological Bulletin*, 126: 651-680.
- Berk, Richard A, Howard Black, J. Lilly, and G. Rikoski. 1991. "Colorado Springs Spouse Assault Replication Project: Final Report." Final Report to the National Institute for Justice, National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC.
- Berk, Richard A., Alec Campbell, Ruth Klap and Bruce Western. 1992. "The Deterrent Effect of Arrest in Incidents of Domestic Violence: A Bayesian Analysis of Four Field Experiments." *American Sociological Review*, 57(5): 698-708.
- Binder, Arnold, and James W. Meeker. 1988. "Experiments As Reforms." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 16: 347-358.
- Brown, Grant A. 2004. "Gender as a Factor in the Response of the Law-Enforcement System to Violence Against Partners." *Sexuality and Culture*, 8(3-4): 3-139.
- Buzawa, Eve S. and Carl G. Buzawa. 1993. "The Scientific Evidence is Not Conclusive: Arrest is No Panacea." Pp. 337-356 in *Current Controversies on Family Violence*, edited by Richard J. Gelles and Donileen R. Loseke. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- , 2017. *Responding to Domestic Violence: The Integration of Criminal Justice and Human Services (5<sup>rd</sup> edition)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Campbell, Jacquelyn C. 2005. "Assessing Dangerousness in Domestic Violence Cases: History, Challenges, and Opportunities." *Criminology*, 4(4): 653-672.
- Campbell, Jacquelyn C., Daniel W. Webster, and Nancy Glass. "The Danger Assessment: Validation of a Lethality Risk Assessment Instrument for Intimate Partner Femicide." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(4): 653-674.
- Carrington, Christopher. 1999. *No Place Like Home: Relationships and Family Life Among Lesbians and Gay Men*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Clift, Robert J. W., Lindsay A. Thomas, and Donald G. Dutton. 2005. "Two-Year Reliability of the Propensity for Abusiveness Scale." *Journal of Family Violence*, 20(4): 231-234.
- Connell, R.W. and James W. Messerschmidt. 2005. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender & Society* 19(6):829-859.
- Dobash, Russell P., R. Emerson Dobash, Margo Wilson, and Martin Daly. 1992. "The Myth of Sexual Symmetry in Marital Violence." *Social Problems*, 39(1): 71-91.
- Dunford, Franklyn W., David Huizinga, and Delbert S. Elliot. 1990. "The Role of Arrest in Domestic Assault: The Omaha Police Experiment." *Criminology*, 28: 183-206.
- Dutton, Donald G. 1995. "A Scale for Measuring the Propensity for Abusiveness." *Journal of Family Violence*, 10(2): 203-221.
- , 2006. *Rethinking Domestic Violence*. Vancouver, British Columbia: UBC Press.
- Dutton, Donald G., Monica A. Landolt, Andrew Starzomski, and Mark Bodnarchuk. 2001. "Validation of the Propensity for Abusiveness Scale in Diverse Male Populations." *Journal of Family Violence*, 16(1): 59-73.
- Felson, Richard B. 2002. *Violence & Gender Reexamined*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Felson, Richard B. and Paul-Phillipe Pare. 2005. "The Reporting of Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault by Nonstrangers to the Police." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(3): 597-610.
- Fenstermaker, Sarah, Candace West, and Don H. Zimmerman. 2002. "Gender Inequality: New Conceptual Terrain." Pp. 25-39 in *Doing Gender, Doing Difference: Inequality, Power and Institutional Change*, edited by S. Fenstermaker and C. West. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ferraro, Kathleen J. 1989. "Policing Woman Battering." *Social Problems*, 36: 61-74.
- Finn, Mary, Brenda Sims Blackwell, Loretta Stalans, Shelia Studdard, and Laura Dugan. 2004. "Dual Arrest Decision in Domestic Violence Cases: The Influence of Departmental Policies." *Crime & Delinquency*, 50: 565-589.
- Frye, Victoria, Mary Haviland and Valli Rajah. 2007. "Dual Arrest and Other Unintended Consequences of Mandatory Arrest in New York City: A Brief Report." *Journal of Family Violence*, 22(6): 397-405.

- Garner, Joel, Jeffrey Fagan and Christopher Maxwell. 1995. "Published Findings from the Spouse Assault Replication Program: A Critical Review." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 11(1): 3-28.
- Gerstenberger, Caryn Bell, and Kirk R. Williams. 2012. "Gender and Intimate Partner Violence: Does Dual Arrest Reveal Gender Symmetry or Asymmetry?" *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(8): 1561-1578.
- Gilbert, Luan, Paul Poorman, and Susan Simmons. 1990. "Guidelines for Mental Health Systems' Response to Lesbian Battering." Pp. 105-117 in *Confronting Lesbian Battering: A Manual for the Battered Women's Movement*, edited by P. Elliot. St Paul: Minnesota Coalition for Battered Women.
- Harris, Angela P. 2000. "Gender, Violence, Race, and Criminal Justice." *Stanford Law Review* 52:777-807.
- Hart, Barbara. 1986. "Lesbian Battering: An Examination." Pp. 172-189 in *Naming the Violence*, edited by K. Lobel. Seattle: Seal Press.
- Hilton, N. Zoe, Grant T. Harris, Marnie E. Rice, Carol Lang, and Catherine A. Cormier. 2004. "A Brief Actuarial Assessment for the Prediction of Wife Assault Recidivism: The Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment." *Psychological Assessment*, 16(3): 267-275.
- Hilton, N. Zoe and Grant T. Harris. 2009. "How Nonrecidivism Affects Predictive Accuracy: Evidence from a Cross-Validation of the Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(2): 326-337.
- Hirschel, J. David and Ira W. Hutchison. 1992. "Female Spouse Abuse and the Police Response: The Charlotte, North Carolina Experiment." *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 83(1): 73-119.
- Hirschel, David, Eve Buzawa, April Pattavina, Don Faggiani, and Melissa Reuland. 2007. "Explaining the Prevalence, Context, and Consequences of Dual Arrest in Intimate Partner Cases." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Hirschel, David. 2008. "Domestic Violence Cases: What Research Shows about Arrest and Dual Arrest Rates." Washington, DC: Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice. Retrieved March 8, 2010 (<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/publications/dv-dual-arrest-222679/welcome.htm>).
- Hoctor, Machaela M. 1997. "Domestic Violence as a Crime against the State: The Need for Mandatory Arrest in California." *California Law Review*, 85(3): 643-700.
- Island, David and Patrick Letellier. 1991. *Men Who Beat the Men Who Love Them: Battered Gay Men and Domestic Violence*. Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press.

- Johnson, Michael P. 1995. "Patriarchal Terrorism and Common Couple Violence: Two Forms of Violence Against Women." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 57: 283-294.
- Johnson, Michael P., and Kathleen J. Ferraro. 2000. "Research on Domestic Violence in the 1990s: Making Distinctions." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62:948-963.
- Kelly, C. E., & Warshafsky, L. 1987. *Partner abuse in gay male and lesbian couples*. Paper presented at the Third National Conference for Family Violence Researchers, Durham, NH.
- Kimmel, Michael S. 2002. "'Gender Symmetry' in Domestic Violence." *Violence Against Women* 8:1332-1363.
- Kimmel, Michael S. and Matthew Mahler. 2003. "Adolescent Masculinity, Homophobia, and Violence: Random School Shootings 1982-2001." *American Behavioral Scientist* 46(10):1439-1458.
- Kropp, P. Randall, and Stephen D. Hart. 2000. "The Spousal Assault Risk Assessment (SARA) Guide: Reliability and Validity in Adult Male Offenders." *Law and Human Behavior*, 24(1): 101-118.
- Kurdek, Lawrence A. and J. Patrick Schmitt. "Relationship Quality of Partners in Heterosexual Married, Heterosexual Cohabiting, and Gay and Lesbian Relationships." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(4): 711-720.
- Langley, Richard and Roger C. Levy. 1977. *Wife Beating: The Silent Crisis*. New York: E.P. Dutton.
- Letellier, Patrick. 1996. "Twin Epidemics: Domestic Violence and HIV Infection Among Gay and Bisexual Men." Pp. 69-82 in *Violence in Gay and Lesbian Domestic Partnerships*, edited by C. M. Renzetti and C. H. Miley. Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Press.
- Lorber, Judith. 1993. "Believing is Seeing: Biology as Ideology." *Gender and Society*, 7(4): 568-581.
- Martin, Patricia Yancey and Robert A. Hummer. 1989. "Fraternities and Rape on Campus" *Gender and Society* 3(4):457-473.
- McClennen, Joan C. 1999. "Prevailing Theories Regarding Same-Gender Partner Abuse: Proposing the Feminist Social-Psychological Model." Pp. 3-12 in *A Professional's Guide to Understanding Gay and Lesbian Domestic Violence*:

- Understanding Practice Interventions*, edited by J. C. McClennen and J. Gunther. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- , 2005. "Domestic Violence Between Same-Gender Partners: Recent Findings and Future Research." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(2): 149-154.
- McClennen, Joan C., Anne B. Summers, and Charles Vaughan. 2002. "Gay Men's Domestic Violence: Dynamics, Help-Seeking Behaviors, and Correlates." *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services* 14(1):23-49.
- Merrill, Gregory S. 1996. "Ruling the Exceptions: Same-Sex Battering and Domestic Violence Theory." Pp. 9-21 in *Violence in Gay and Lesbian Domestic Partnerships*, edited by C. M. Renzetti and C. H. Miley. Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Press.
- Merrill, Gregory S. and Valerie A. Wolfe. 2000. "Battered Gay Men." *Journal of Homosexuality* 39(2):1-30.
- Messerschmidt, James W. 2000. "Becoming 'Real Men': Adolescent Masculinity Challenges and Sexual Violence." *Men and Masculinities* 2(3):286-307.
- Messinger, Adam M. 2011. "Invisible Victims: Same-Sex IPV in the National Violence Against Women Survey." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 26(11):2228-2243.
- Messinger, Adam M. 2017. *LGBTQ Intimate Partner Violence*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Messner, Michael. 1993. *Taking the Field: Women, Men, and Sports*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Miller, Susan L. 2001. "The Paradox of Women Arrested for Domestic Violence: Criminal Justice Professionals and Service Provider Respond." *Violence Against Women*, 7: 1339-1376.
- , 2005. *Victims as Offenders: The Paradox of Women's Violence in Relationships*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- National Coalition Against Domestic Violence. n.d. "Facts about Domestic Violence and Physical Abuse." (ncadv.org).
- Pate, Antony M, and Edwin E. Hamilton. 1992. "Formal and Informal Deterrents to Domestic Violence: The Dade County Spouse Assault Experiment." *American Sociological Review*, 57: 691-697.
- Peplau, L.A. Veniegas, R.C. and S.M Campbell. 1996. "Gay and Lesbian Relationships." Pp. 250-273 in *The Lives of Lesbians, Gays, and Bisexuals: Children to Adults*,

edited by .C. Savin-Williams and K.M. Cohen. Orlando: FL: Harcourt Brace College.

- Pyke, Karen. 1996. "Class-Based Masculinities: The Interdependence of Gender, Class and Interpersonal Power." *Gender and Society* 10(5):527-49.
- Renzetti, Claire M. 1992. *Violent Betrayal: Partner Abuse in Lesbian Relationships*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Schrock, Douglas and Michael Schwalbe. 2009. "Men, Masculinity, and Manhood Acts." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 35: 277-295.
- Sherman, Lawrence W. and Richard A. Berk. 1984a. "The Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment." *Police Foundation Reports*, 1:1-8.
- 1984b. "The Specific Deterrent Effects of Arrest for Domestic Assault." *American Sociological Review*, 48(2): 261-272.
- Stansfield, Richard, and Kirk R. Williams. 2014. "Predicting Family Violence Recidivism Using the DVSI\_R: Integrating Survival Analysis and Perpetrator Characteristics." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 41(2): 162-180.
- Stets, Jan E and Murray A. Straus. 1989. "The Marriage License as a Hitting License: A Comparison of Assaults in Dating, Cohabiting, and Married Couples." *Journal of Family Violence*, 41(2): 33-52.
- Straus, Murray A. 1979. "Measuring Intrafamily Conflict and Violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 41: 75-88.
- 1999. "The Controversy Over Domestic Violence by Women." Pp. 17-44 In *Violence In Intimate Relationships*, edited by Ximena B. Arriaga & Stuart Oskamp. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 2005. "Women's Violence Toward Men is a Serious Social Problem." Pp. 55-77 in *Current Controversies on Family Violence*, edited by Richard J. Gelles & Donileen R. Loseke. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- 2009. "Why the Overwhelming Evidence on Partner Physical Violence by Women has Not Been Perceived and is Often Denied." *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 18: 552-571.
- Straus, Murray A. and Richard J. Gelles. 1990. *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Totten, Mark. 2003. "Girlfriend Abuse as a Form of Masculinity Construction among Violence, Marginal Male Youth." *Men and Masculinities*, 6(1): 70-92.

- Thurman v. City of Torrington. 1985. 595 F. Supp. 1521. (D. Conn).
- Tjaden, Patricia and Nancy Thoennes. 1998. "Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice Centers For Disease Control and Prevention.  
(<http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/172837.pdf>).
- Tjaden, Patricia, Nancy Thoennes, and Christine J. Allison. 1999. "Comparing Violence Over the Life Span in Samples of Same-Sex and Opposite-Sex Cohabitants." *Violence and Victims*, 14(4): 413-425.
- Turell, Susan C. 2000. "A Descriptive Analysis of Same-Sex Relationship Violence for a Diverse Sample." *Journal of Family Violence* 15(3):281-293.
- Umberson, Debra, Kristin L. Anderson, Kristi Williams, and Meichu D. Chen. 2003. "Relationship Dynamics, Emotion State, and Domestic Violence: A Stress and Masculinities Perspective." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 65:233-247.
- Walker, Lenore. 1979. *The Battered Woman*. New York: Harper Collins.
- West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender and Society* 1(2):125-151.
- Williams, Kirk R. forthcoming. "Coercive Control between Intimate Partners: An Application for Nonfatal Strangulation." Submitted for review at *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*.
- Williams, Kirk R. and Amy Barry Houghton. 2004. "Assessing the Risk of Domestic Violence Reoffending: A Validation Study." *Law and Human Behavior*, 28(4): 437-455.
- Williams, Kirk R. and Stephen R. Grant. 2006. "Empirically Examining the Risk of Intimate Partner Violence: The Revised Domestic Violence Screening Instrument (DVSI-R)." *Public Health Reports*, 121: 400-408.
- Williams, Kirk R. 2012. "Family Violence Risk Assessment: A Predictive Cross-Validation Study of the Domestic Violence Screening Instrument-Revised (DVSI-R)." *Law and Human Behavior*, 36(2): 120-129.
- Yllö, Kersti A. 1993. "Through a Feminist Lens: Gender, Power, and Violence." Pp. 47-62 in *Current Controversies on Family Violence*, edited by Richard J. Gelles & Donileen R. Loseke. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.



Zemsky, Beth. 1990. "Lesbian Battering: Considerations for Intervention." Pp. 64-67 in *Confronting Lesbian Battering: A Manual for the Battered Women's Movement*, edited by P. Elliot. St Paul: Minnesota Coalition for Battered Women.

## Appendix

Table 1

*Negative Binomial Regression of Sexual Orientation by Gender on the DVSI-R Risk Score*

	<i>IRR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i>	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Male-to-Female	1.32***	0.022	16.69	1.27	1.36
Male-to-Male	1.29***	0.063	5.14	1.17	1.42
Female-to-Female	1.08	0.049	1.64	0.99	1.18
Ethnicity	1.02	0.015	1.37	0.99	1.05
Age	1.00***	0.001	5.31	1.00	1.01
Constant	6.81	0.178	73.37	6.47	7.17

\*\*\*  $p < .001$

Table 2

*Negative Binomial Regression of Sexual Orientation by Gender on the SDI Risk Score*

	<i>IRR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i>	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Male-to-Female	1.42***	0.022	10.29	1.33	1.52
Male-to-Male	1.50***	0.141	4.30	1.25	1.80
Female-to-Female	1.24*	0.114	2.37	1.04	1.49
Ethnicity	1.11***	0.032	3.72	1.05	1.18
Age	1.00**	0.001	2.66	1.00	1.01
Constant	.640***	0.033	-8.60	0.58	0.71

\*\*\*  $p < .001$

\*\*  $p < .01$

\* $p < .05$

Table 3

*Logistic Regression of Sexual Orientation by Gender on SDI Item 2: Threats to Kill*

	OR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Male-to-Female	2.54***	0.227	19.45	2.13	3.03
Male-to-Male	2.87***	.0604	5.02	1.90	4.34
Female-to-Female	1.26	0.315	0.92	.077	2.06
Ethnicity	1.08	0.072	1.26	0.95	1.24
Age	1.00***	0.001	-6.07	1.00	1.00
Constant	0.13	0.014	-18.72	0.11	0.17

\*\*\* p &lt; .001

\*\* p &lt; .01

\*p &lt; .05

Table 4

*Logistic Regression of Sexual Orientation by Gender on SDI Item 4: Non-Fatal Strangulation*

	OR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Male-to-Female	3.86***	0.376	13.91	3.19	4.68
Male-to-Male	2.38***	0.573	3.61	1.49	3.82
Female-to-Female	2.69***	0.572	4.61	1.77	4.09
Ethnicity	0.96	0.062	-0.66	0.84	1.09
Age	1.01*	0.003	2.54	1.00	1.01
Constant	0.06***	0.008	-21.21	0.05	0.08

\*\*\* p &lt; .001

\*p &lt; .05

Table 5

*Logistic Regression of Sexual Orientation by Gender on IPV Recidivism*

	OR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Male-to-Female	1.78***	0.116	8.84	1.57	2.03
Male-to-Male	1.56*	0.295	2.36	1.08	2.26
Female-to-Female	1.82***	0.299	3.66	1.32	2.51
Ethnicity	1.01	0.056	0.15	0.90	1.12
Age	.982***	0.002	-7.28	0.98	0.99
Constant	0.50	0.050	-6.94	0.41	0.61

\*\*\* p &lt; .001

\*p &lt; .05

Table 6

*Logistic Regression of Sexual Orientation on Dual Arrest*

	OR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Heterosexual	0.73**	0.083	-2.82	0.58	0.91
Ethnicity	1.18**	0.066	3.07	1.06	1.32
Age	0.99***	0.002	-3.53	0.99	1.00
Constant	0.66**	0.090	-3.06	0.50	0.86

\*\*\* p &lt; .001

\*\* p &lt; .01

Table 7

*Logistic Regression of Sexual Orientation by Gender on Dual Arrest*

	<i>OR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i>	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Male-to-Female	0.25***	0.015	-23.00	0.23	0.28
Male-to-Male	0.38***	0.116	-1.86	0.26	0.55
Female-to-Female	0.75	0.071	-5.14	0.55	1.02
Ethnicity	1.06	0.061	0.93	0.94	1.18
Age	1.00	0.003	-1.14	0.99	1.00
Constant	1.03	0.100	0.29	0.85	1.25

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ 

Table 8

*Negative Binomial Regression of Sexual Orientation by Gender and Dual Arrest on the DVSI-R Risk Score*

	<i>IRR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i>	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Male-to-Female	1.24***	0.021	12.75	1.20	1.29
Male-to-Male	1.23***	0.060	4.20	1.12	1.35
Female-to-Female	1.06	0.048	1.35	0.97	1.16
Dual Arrest	0.81***	0.013	-12.58	0.79	0.84
Ethnicity	1.02	0.015	1.66	1.00	1.05
Age	1.00	0.001	5.18	1.00	1.00
Constant	7.52***	0.203	74.60	8.62	9.42

\*\*\*  $p < .001$

Table 9

*Negative Binomial Regression of Sexual Orientation by Gender and Dual Arrest on the SDI*

	<i>IRR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i>	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Male-to-Female	1.31***	0.463	7.62	1.22	1.40
Male-to-Male	1.41***	0.132	3.66	1.17	1.69
Female-to-Female	1.22*	0.111	2.17	1.02	1.46
Dual Arrest	0.74***	0.742	-8.69	0.69	0.79
Ethnicity	1.12***	0.032	3.92	1.06	1.18
Age	1.00*	0.001	2.52	1.00	1.00
Constant	0.73***	0.040	-5.71	0.80	0.95

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ \*  $p < .05$ 

Table 10

*Logistic Regression of Sexual Orientation by Gender and Dual Arrest on the SDI Item 2: Threats to Kill*

	<i>OR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i>	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Male-to-Female	2.12***	0.194	8.16	1.77	2.53
Male-to-Male	2.49***	0.529	4.31	1.65	3.78
Female-to-Female	1.21	0.304	0.75	0.74	1.98
Dual Arrest	0.48***	0.042	-8.41	0.40	0.57
Ethnicity	1.10	0.073	1.40	0.96	1.25
Age	1.02***	0.003	6.06	1.01	1.02
Constant	0.07***	0.009	-19.99	0.05	0.09

\*\*\*  $p < .001$

Table 11

*Logistic Regression of Sexual Orientation by Gender and Dual Arrest on the SDI Item 4: Non-fatal Strangulation*

	OR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Male-to-Female	3.63***	0.361	12.97	2.99	4.41
Male-to-Male	2.27***	0.548	3.40	1.42	3.64
Female-to-Female	2.65***	0.569	4.54	1.74	4.03
Dual Arrest	0.80**	0.062	-2.87	0.69	0.93
Ethnicity	0.96	0.063	-0.60	0.85	1.09
Age	1.01*	0.003	2.52	1.00	1.01
Constant	0.07***	0.009	-19.73	0.05	0.09

\*\*\* p &lt; .001

\*\* p &lt; .01

\* p &lt; .05

Table 12

*Logistic Regression of Sexual Orientation by Gender and Dual Arrest on IPV Recidivism*

	OR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Male-to-Female	1.63***	0.110	7.18	1.42	1.86
Male-to-Male	1.46*	0.276	1.99	1.01	2.11
Female-to-Female	1.78***	0.293	3.52	1.29	2.46
Dual Arrest	0.72***	0.047	-5.02	0.64	0.82
Ethnicity	1.01	0.560	0.22	0.91	1.13
Age	0.98***	0.002	-7.36	0.98	0.99
Constant	0.59***	0.061	-5.10	0.48	0.72

\*\*\* p &lt; .001

\* p &lt; .05

Table 13

*Negative Binomial Regression of Sexual Orientation by Gender and Dual Arrest on DVSI-R, with Interaction Terms Sexual Orientation by Gender\*Dual Arrest*

	IRR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Male-to-Female	1.26***	0.027	10.63	1.20	1.31
Male-to-Male	1.27***	0.072	4.13	1.13	1.42
Female-to-Female	1.06	0.063	1.06	0.95	1.19
Dual Arrest	0.83***	0.023	-6.72	0.78	0.87
Male-to-Female*Dual Arrest	0.97	0.034	-0.76	0.91	1.04
Male-to-Male*Dual Arrest	0.90	0.100	-0.98	0.72	1.11
Female-to-Female*Dual Arrest	1.00	0.092	0.01	0.83	1.20
Ethnicity	1.02	0.015	1.67	0.10	1.05
Age	1.00***	0.001	5.18	1.00	1.00
Constant	7.45***	0.218	68.56	7.03	7.89

\*\*\* p < .001

Table 14

*Negative Binomial Regression of Sexual Orientation by Gender and Dual Arrest on SDI, with Interaction Terms Sexual Orientation by Gender\*Dual Arrest*

	IRR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Male-to-Female	1.35***	0.060	6.91	1.24	1.47
Male-to-Male	1.35**	0.148	2.71	1.09	1.67
Female-to-Female	1.21**	0.141	1.65	0.96	1.52
Dual Arrest	0.79***	0.047	-3.99	0.70	0.88
Male-to-Female*Dual Arrest	0.90	0.067	-1.43	0.78	1.04
Male-to-Male*Dual Arrest	1.25	0.262	1.07	0.83	1.89
Female-to-Female*Dual Arrest	1.03	0.192	0.15	0.71	1.48
Ethnicity	1.12***	0.319	3.95	1.06	1.18
Age	1.00	0.001	2.55	1.00	1.00
Constant	0.72	0.042	-5.72	0.64	0.80

\*\*\* p < .001

\*\* p < .01



Table 15

*Logistic Regression of Sexual Orientation by Gender and Dual Arrest on SDI Item 2: Threats to Kill, with Interaction Terms Sexual Orientation by Gender\*Dual Arrest*

	OR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Male-to-Female	2.22***	0.243	7.27	1.79	2.75
Male-to-Male	1.30***	0.563	3.41	1.43	3.72
Female-to-Female	1.00	0.324	0.00	0.53	1.89
Dual Arrest	0.53***	0.090	-3.76	0.38	0.74
Male-to-Female*Dual Arrest	0.82	0.167	-0.97	0.55	1.22
Male-to-Male*Dual Arrest	1.56	0.759	0.92	0.60	4.05
Female-to-Female*Dual Arrest	1.73	0.886	1.07	0.63	4.72
Ethnicity	1.10	0.073	1.42	0.96	1.25
Age	1.02***	0.003	6.08	1.01	1.02
Constant	0.07***	0.010	-18.70	0.05	0.91

\*\*\* p < .001

Table 16

*Logistic Regression of Sexual Orientation by Gender and Dual Arrest on SDI Item 4: Non-fatal Strangulation, with Interaction Terms Sexual Orientation by Gender\*Dual Arrest*

	OR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Male-to-Female	3.75***	0.482	10.28	2.91	4.82
Male-to-Male	1.96*	0.581	2.26	1.09	3.50
Female-to-Female	3.06***	0.821	4.17	1.81	5.18
Dual Arrest	0.85	0.155	-0.88	0.60	1.22
Male-to-Female*Dual Arrest	0.92	0.187	-0.41	0.62	1.37
Male-to-Male*Dual Arrest	1.79	0.917	1.13	0.66	4.88
Female-to-Female*Dual Arrest	0.68	0.307	-0.86	0.28	1.65
Ethnicity	0.96	0.062	-0.58	0.85	1.09
Age	1.01*	0.003	2.54	1.00	1.01
Constant	0.07***	0.010	-17.38	0.05	0.09

\*\*\* p < .001

\* p < .05

Table 17

*Logistic Regression of Sexual Orientation by Gender and Dual Arrest on IPV Recidivism, with Interaction Terms Sexual Orientation by Gender\*Dual Arrest*

	OR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Male-to-Female	1.64***	0.138	5.83	1.39	1.93
Male-to-Male	1.53	0.335	19.4	1.00	2.35
Female-to-Female	1.93**	0.407	3.12	1.28	2.92
Dual Arrest	0.74**	0.085	-2.66	0.59	0.92
Male-to-Female*Dual Arrest	0.99	0.140	-0.06	0.75	1.31
Male-to-Male*Dual Arrest	0.83	0.370	-0.43	0.34	1.99
Female-to-Female*Dual Arrest	0.82	0.278	-0.59	0.42	1.59
Ethnicity	1.01	0.056	0.22	0.91	1.13
Age	0.98***	0.002	-7.36	0.98	0.99
Constant	0.58	0.066	-4.76	0.47	0.73

\*\*\* p < .001

\*\* p < .01

Table 18

*Logistic Regression of DVSI-R and Sexual Orientation by Gender on IPV Recidivism*

	OR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
DVSI-R	1.09***	0.006	16.03	1.08	1.10
Male-to-Female	1.47***	0.099	5.76	1.29	1.68
Male-to-Male	1.31	0.252	1.39	0.90	1.91
Female-to-Female	1.77***	0.296	3.42	1.28	2.46
Ethnicity	1.00	0.056	-0.03	0.90	1.11
Age	0.98***	0.003	-8.55	0.97	0.98
Constant	0.29***	0.031	-11.51	0.24	0.36

\*\*\* p < .001

Table 19

*Logistic Regression of SDI on DVSI-R Item 11: Whether Abuse has Escalated in Past 6 Months*

	OR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
SDI	1.72***	0.043	21.68	1.54	1.80
Male-to-Female	1.27***	0.079	5.40	1.22	1.53
Male-to-Male	1.43*	0.254	2.02	1.01	2.03
Female-to-Female	0.89	0.143	-0.74	0.65	1.22
Ethnicity	1.13*	0.060	2.48	1.03	1.26
Age	1.00	0.002	-1.43	0.99	1.00
Constant	0.51***	0.047	-7.24	0.43	0.62

\*\*\* p &lt; .001

\* p &lt; .05

Table 20

*Logistic Regression of SDI on Recommended Jail Time for Initial Incident Arrest*

	OR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
SDI	1.35***	0.038	10.73	1.28	1.43
Male-to-Female	5.96***	0.839	12.69	4.53	7.86
Male-to-Male	4.03***	1.14	4.93	2.32	7.01
Female-to-Female	2.09*	0.666	2.31	1.11	3.90
Ethnicity	0.72***	0.056	-4.24	0.62	0.84
Age	1.00	0.003	-1.36	0.99	1.00
Constant	0.03***	0.006	-19.51	0.02	0.05

\*\*\* p &lt; .001

\* p &lt; .05

Table 21

*Logistic Regression of SDI on Whether Perpetrator Was Incarcerated at Initial Incident Arrest*

	OR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
SDI	1.39***	0.035	13.61	1.33	1.46
Male-to-Female	4.79***	0.473	145.81	3.94	5.80
Male-to-Male	2.76***	0.641	4.36	1.75	4.35
Female-to-Female	1.60	0.395	1.89	0.98	2.59
Ethnicity	0.64***	0.042	-6.87	9.57	0.73
Age	1.00	0.003	-1.43	0.99	1.00
Constant	0.08	0.010	-19.62	0.06	0.10

\*\*\* p &lt; .001

Table 22

*Logistic Regression of DVSI-R and SDI on Whether Perpetrator Was Charged with a Felony for Initial Incident Arrest*

	OR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
SDI	1.41***	0.031	15.36	1.35	1.47
Male-to-Female	1.98***	0.125	10.78	1.75	2.24
Male-to-Male	1.83***	0.329	3.39	1.29	2.60
Female-to-Female	1.27	0.214	1.43	0.91	1.77
Ethnicity	0.92	0.049	-1.60	0.83	1.02
Age	0.98***	0.002	-6.52	0.98	0.99
Constant	0.44***	0.042	-8.61	0.37	0.53

\*\*\* p &lt; .001

Table 23

*Logistic Regression of DVSI-R and Sexual Orientation by Gender on IPV Recidivism, with Interaction Terms DVSI-R\*Sexual Orientation by Gender*

	OR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
DVSI-R	1.10***	0.013	8.93	1.08	1.13
Male-to-Female	1.83***	0.253	4.35	1.39	2.40
Male-to-Male	1.48	0.643	0.91	0.63	3.47
Female-to-Female	2.49**	0.809	2.82	1.32	4.71
DVSI-R*Male-to-Female	0.98	0.013	-1.80	0.95	1.00
DVSI-R*Male-to-Male	0.98	0.035	-0.42	0.92	1.06
DVSI-R*Female-to-Female	0.96	0.031	-1.21	0.90	1.02
Ethnicity	0.99	0.060	-0.13	0.89	1.10
Age	0.98***	0.003	-8.54	0.97	0.98
Constant	0.25***	0.035	-9.97	0.19	0.32

\*\*\* p < .001

\*\* p < .01

Table 24

*Logistic Regression of SDI and Sexual Orientation by Gender on DVSI-R Item 11 "Escalation of Abuse," with Interaction Terms SDI\*Sexual Orientation by Gender*

	OR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
SDI	1.63***	0.085	9.33	1.47	1.80
Male-to-Female	1.30***	0.097	3.55	1.13	1.51
Male-to-Male	1.22	0.300	0.81	0.75	1.98
Female-to-Female	0.80	0.176	-1.01	0.52	1.23
SDI*Male-to-Female	1.07	0.063	1.08	0.95	1.20
SDI*Male-to-Male	1.20	0.221	0.99	0.84	1.72
SDI*Female-to-Female	1.13	0.187	0.75	0.82	1.56
Ethnicity	1.14*	0.059	2.48	1.03	1.26
Age	1.00	0.002	-1.46	0.99	1.00
Constant	0.54***	0.052	-6.36	0.44	0.65

\*\*\* p < .001

\*p < .05

Table 25

*Logistic Regression of SDI and Sexual Orientation by Gender on Recommended Jail Time at Initial Incident Arrest, with Interaction Terms SDI\*Sexual Orientation by Gender*

	OR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
SDI	1.35**	0.145	2.84	1.10	1.67
Male-to-Female	5.98***	1.120	9.54	4.14	8.63
Male-to-Male	3.24**	1.372	2.79	1.42	7.43
Female-to-Female	2.88*	1.20	2.53	1.27	6.54
SDI*Male-to-Female	1.00	0.111	-0.02	0.80	1.24
SDI*Male-to-Male	1.15	0.238	0.67	0.77	1.72
SDI*Female-to-Female	0.74	0.212	-1.04	0.42	1.30
Ethnicity	0.72***	0.056	-4.27	0.62	0.84
Age	1.00	0.003	-1.32	0.99	1.00
Constant	0.03***	0.007	-16.33	0.02	0.05

\*\*\* p < .001

\*\* p < .01

\* p < .05

Table 26

*Logistic Regression of SDI and Sexual Orientation by Gender on Whether Perpetrator Was Incarcerated at Initial Incident Arrest, with Interaction Terms SDI\*Sexual Orientation by Gender*

	OR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
SDI	1.34***	0.012	3.84	1.15	1.56
Male-to-Female	4.55***	0.594	11.60	3.52	5.88
Male-to-Male	2.06**	0.722	2.07	1.04	4.10
Female-to-Female	2.12*	0.688	2.32	1.12	4.01
SDI*Male-to-Female	1.05	0.085	0.56	0.89	1.23
SDI*Male-to-Male	1.23	0.218	1.17	0.87	1.74
SDI*Female-to-Female	0.77	0.170	-1.18	0.50	1.19
Ethnicity	0.64***	0.041	-6.91	0.56	0.73
Age	1.00	0.003	-1.40	0.99	1.00
Constant	0.08***	0.012	-16.72	0.06	0.11

\*\*\* p < .001

\*\* p < .01

\* p < .05

Table 27

*Logistic Regression of SDI and Sexual Orientation by Gender on Whether Perpetrator Was Charged with a Felony for Initial Incident Arrest, with Interaction Terms SDI\*Sexual Orientation by Gender*

	OR	SE	z	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Limit	Upper Limit
SDI	1.44**	0.073	7.24	1.31	1.59
Male-to-Female	2.04***	0.169	8.61	1.73	2.40
Male-to-Male	1.85*	0.460	2.47	1.13	3.01
Female-to-Female	1.22	0.279	0.86	0.78	1.91
SDI*Male-to-Female	0.97	0.054	-0.57	0.87	1.08
SDI*Male-to-Male	0.99	0.148	-0.08	0.74	1.32
SDI*Female-to-Female	1.04	0.159	0.26	0.77	1.41
Ethnicity	0.92	0.059	-1.59	0.83	1.02
Age	0.98***	0.002	-6.52	0.98	0.99
Constant	0.43***	0.045	-8.08	0.35	0.53

\*\*\* p < .001

\*\* p < .01

\* p < .05