

A Critical Race Feminist Theory Analysis of Police Responses to Intimate Partner Abuse

Hannah Meharg
Department of Ethnic Studies

Primary Thesis Advisor
Joanne Belknap, Ph.D., Ethnic Studies Department

Honors Committee Members:
Clint Carroll, Ph.D., Ethnic Studies Department
Celeste Montoya, Ph.D., Women and Gender Studies Department

University of Colorado at Boulder
April 3rd, 2017

ABSTRACT

This study explores the dynamics of police responses to intimate partner abusing very recent data and detailed police reports acquired from the Longmont police department in Colorado. Despite disagreement in the literature about the efficacy of arrest as the preferred police response for IPA, all fifty states have enacted laws that either encourage or mandate arrest in IPA cases. Since their enactment however, these pro-arrest policies have contributed to many unanticipated outcomes, including increased rates of dual arrest and increased rates of arresting women. Despite the pressing need to interrogate determinants of IPA arrest, very little research has focused on police responses to IPA in recent years. Furthermore, the research that does exist does not provide consistent findings and there is a scarcity of research comparing police responses and arrest outcomes among different races/ethnicities. Thus, this study will contribute to the recent body of literature on factors that inform IPA arrest decisions by providing an analysis of arrest determinants that reflect the influence of many years of a mandatory arrest laws being in existence. The goal of this study is not only to describe suspects, victims, cases, and case outcomes, but to determine how these variables interact, with a primary focus on whether or not case outcomes vary by ethnicity, primarily between Latinx and White suspects.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dr. Joanne Belknap

For being a more incredible mentor than I could have ever imagined. You were my absolute greatest support throughout this entire process and I certainly would not have enjoyed this experience nearly as much as I have had it not been for your unconditional encouragement and guidance. Your dedication to your students is so very remarkable and admirable and I am unbelievably grateful to have had the opportunity to work with and learn from you. I truly cannot thank you enough for inspiring me to embark on this journey and for committing so much of yourself and your time to my work. Thank you.

Dr. Clint Carroll

For graciously sharing your time to be a part of my thesis committee. Your impassioned dedication to your work as a professor, researcher, and advocate for Indigenous rights and social justice is inspirational and I am honored to have the opportunity to share my own work with you. Thank you.

Dr. Celeste Montoya

For graciously sharing your time to be a part of my thesis committee. I truly appreciate your commitment to working with me. It is an honor to have the opportunity to share my thesis with you. Thank you.

Sandra Campanella

For your enormous contribution to this thesis. Had it not been for you, I would not have had a data set with which to work. I cannot thank you enough for committing so much of your time and patience to this study by helping Joanne and I access this unbelievable data set. Thank you.

Annie Clarkin

For your unparalleled love and support. Your kindness, selflessness, and encouragement has sustained me throughout this experience and I would never have been able to maintain my tenacity had it not been for you. Thank you.

My Ethnic Studies Honors Peers

For pushing me to strive to put my best work forward. I am so grateful to have shared this experience with you all. Thank you.

Ronni Peltz and Joseph Meharg

For inspiring me and believing in me even when I do not believe in myself. Thank you for all that you have done for me. You are both uniquely wonderful people and I love you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	6
Introduction	6
Contextualizing IPA	10
<i>Defining and Documenting IPA</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Family Violence Versus Feminist Perspectives.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Recognizing Diversity Within IPA Experiences</i>	<i>17</i>
Latinx IPA Experiences	22
Criminal Justice Response to IPA	36
<i>History and Reform.....</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Consequences of Pro-Arrest Policies</i>	<i>39</i>
Theoretical Approach	42
Conclusion.....	46
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	47
Introduction	47
Police Discretion	48
Race and Ethnicity	48
Gender and LGBTQ	50
Socioeconomic Status	52
Injury/Level of Violence	53
Officer Perceptions.....	55
Miscellaneous Additional Variables	56
Dual Arrests.....	58
Conclusion.....	60
CHAPTER III: METHODS	62
Introduction	62
Data Collection	63
Sample	63
Variables	64
Data Analysis	65
Limitations	65
CHAPTER IV: Findings	69
Introduction	69
Overview of Victim and Suspect Characteristics	69
Crosstabulation of Suspect and Victim Race/Ethnicity.....	72
Comparison Between White and Latinx Suspects	74
Binary Logistic Regressions	80

Conclusion.....	82
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	83
Introduction	83
Major Findings	84
Policy Implications	95
Future Research	96
REFERENCES.....	98
APPENDIX A	111

CHAPTER I: STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Within the United States, intimate partner abuse (IPA) remains an enormously concerning public health issue. Recent data from the Bureau of Justice Statistics indicates that while IPA rates have declined overall, IPA still accounts for 21 percent of all violent crime (Truman & Morgan, 2014). Per the 1996 National Violence Against Women Survey data--the first study funded by the Violence Against Women Act-- an estimated 1.3 million women and 835,000 men were physically assaulted by an intimate partner within the United States between November 1995 and May 1996 (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a). More recently, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that 14.0% of women and 3.5% of men have been injured by intimate partner violence and that in 2010, 1,095 women and 241 men were killed by an intimate partner (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2015). The health effects of IPA, however, go far beyond direct injury and mortality due to situational exposures. For instance, asthma, circulatory conditions, migraines, cardiovascular disease, sexually transmitted infections, and a multitude of psychological health concerns have each been associated with IPA (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2015). Evidently, IPA remains a pressing social matter that demands continued attention and research, and with such devastatingly impactful health repercussions, IPA has become an incredibly pressing matter with regards to public health.

Clearly, there are multiple intersecting factors which contribute to the health of any one community. These determinants of population health can include a seemingly innumerable

variety of elements and each of these elements has the potential to affect human well-being at multiple levels. It is thus necessary that health phenomena be analyzed with incredibly scrutiny to ensure the most complete clinical picture. This type of analysis enables practitioners of public health to make informed suggestions and decisions as to how particular population health problems might best be managed. In terms of IPA, these management suggestions are quite varied and include strategies for prevention at primary, secondary, and tertiary levels. One very important aspect of IPA management revolves around the role of law enforcement. IPA is inextricably related to issues of legality, and the police play an immense role in terms of controlling and preventing this issue as they are most likely to be the first called to the crime (Hilton, 1993). Law enforcement's response to IPA has the potential to function as a secondary preventative measure by ensuring that IPA perpetrators be kept from continuing to perpetuate violence and by providing victims with avenues for protection, healing, and moving forward. However, police responses are informed by numerous factors, and in many cases, the response does not effectively mediate safety for victims of IPA due to the emphasis on offender accountability that often overshadows the need for victim safety and security (Epstein, Bell, & Goodman, 2003).

One factor that contributes to the complicated dynamics of police responses to IPA within Colorado, like elsewhere in the U.S., is the existence of a mandatory arrest policy¹ for IPA incidents. Unlike with most offenses, mandatory arrest policies take away police discretion, requiring that police arrest the suspect in question if there is probable cause to believe that IPA

¹ These policies vary somewhat across jurisdictions in terms of names and expectations. They are referred to as "mandatory" and "presumptive" arrest policies to mean primarily the same response. I will use these terms and their umbrella term "pro-arrest" policies interchangeably to mean the same police response: an expectation that there will be an arrest when responding to a domestic violence call.

has occurred (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1992; Hilton, 1993; Miller, 2005; Muftić, Bouffard, & Bouffard, 2007; Schneider, 2000; Sloan, Platt, Chepke, & Blevins, 2013). These policies began being enacted in the 1980s, largely in response to the efforts of feminist activists as well as the highly published results of Lawrence Sherman's 1984 Minneapolis experiment which asserted that arrest was the most effective means of deterring IPA (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1992; Hilton, 1993; Hirschel, Buzawa, Pattavina, & Faggiani, 2007; Miller, 2005; Muftić, Bouffard, & Bouffard, 2007; Muftić, Finn, & Marsh, 2012; Schneider, 2000; Sherman, 1992; Sloan et al., 2013). In his 1992 book, *Policing Domestic Violence: Experiments and Dilemmas*, Sherman explains that the Minneapolis experiment did not prove that arrest would be universally effective and he cites the Omaha, Charlotte, and Milwaukee replications of the experiment as evidence of contradictions to the results suggested by his own experiment.

Despite disagreement in the literature about the efficacy of arrest as the required police response for IPA (Schmidt & Sherman, 1993; Sherman, 1992; Sloan et al., 2013), all fifty states have enacted laws that not only criminalize IPA, but also encourage or even mandate arrest when there exists probable cause (Buzawa & Buzawa, 2003; Hirschel et al., 2007). Since their enactment however, these pro-arrest domestic violence policies and laws have contributed to many unanticipated outcomes, including increased rates of dual arrest (arresting both members of the couple), increased rates of women being arrested, and the coinciding increase in rates of individuals categorized as victim-offenders—individuals who have been classified as both victims and offenders of IPA (Buzawa & Hirschel, 2008; Chesney-Lind, 2002; Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002; Hirschel et al., 2007; Martin, 1997; Miller, 2005; Muftić et al., 2012). In their recent study, Lisa Muftić, Mary Finn, and Erin Marsh (2012) explain that the increase in arrest rates of individuals who have previously experienced victimization poses a very problematic

issue as many social services for IPA do not offer help to those who have a record of IPA offending. Though the enactment of mandatory and pro arrest policies was intended to improve circumstances for victims of IPA, the current policing of IPA requires a great deal of revision as it has resulted in a criminal justice climate that often punishes victims and fails to unequivocally deter IPA perpetration (Miller, 2005; Stark, 2009).

Considering that the sanctioning of pro arrest laws has coincided with unprecedented increases in arrests of women as well as former victims of IPA, it is evident that there exists a need to investigate the factors which contribute to officer decision-making in terms of IPA arrest. By examining the variables which lead to arrest decisions, a potentially more appropriate model for policing IPA might be devised. Such a model could better address the complexity of IPA scenarios so that the police response to IPA could most effectively act as a secondary measure of prevention. While a great deal of research exists regarding the significance of police responses to IPA and the complex network of factors that shape IPA arrest decision-making, only a small portion of this research has been conducted within the last 25 years (Bachman & Coker, 1995; Buzawa & Buzawa, 1992; Feder, 1996; Hart, 1993; Jones & Belknap, 1999; Lee, Zhang, & Hoover, 2013; Martin, 1997; Roark, 2016; Robinson & Chandek, 2000; Stalans & Finn, 1995; Tatum & Pence, 2015). This dearth of research on IPA arrest responses is perhaps due to the assumption that arrest always occurs as a result of pro-arrest policies. Furthermore, the handful of these more recent study findings have not been completely consistent and the dynamics of officer discretion and arrest decision making are still not entirely clear (Lee & Hoover, 2013).

To adapt police response models to more effectively protect victims of violence, we must aim to understand how arrest decisions are informed by demographic, attitudinal, and situational factors. This thesis is an attempt to investigate the dynamics of police responses to IPA using

very recent data and detailed police reports from a medium sized Western city within the United States. The data for this study are all of the 741 domestic violence cases to which Longmont, Colorado police officers responded during 2016. Using this data set, the present study will explore trends regarding suspect and victim demographic variables, variables regarding the alleged abuse/assault, and case outcome variables. Although there is a growing body of research addressing IPA in Latinx communities which will be explained in greater detail in the following chapter (Adames & Campbell, 2005; Amerson, Whittington, & Duggan, 2015; Bonomi, Anderson, Cannon, Slesnick, Rodriguez, 2009; Ingram, 2007; Kelly, 2009; Mattson & Ruiz, 2005; Medina & Vasquez, 2004; Villalón, 2010), there is a scarcity of research which addresses police responses to IPA for Latinx victims and suspects. The goal of this study is thus not only to describe the suspects, victims, cases, and case outcomes, but to determine how these variables interact, with a primary focus on variance between dynamics among Latinx and white suspects (and victims) as these two ethnicities constitute the vast majority of the Longmont, CO population. This research will contribute to the recent body of literature on factors that inform IPA arrest decisions by providing an analysis of arrest determinants which reflect the influence of many years of a mandatory arrest law being in existence.

Contextualizing IPA

Defining and Documenting IPA

Within the United states, a multitude of titles are used to refer to abuse perpetrated by a current or former intimate partner. While most jurisdictions use the term “domestic violence” to refer to the abuse that occurs between current or former intimate partners, different jurisdictions outline varied definitions of the meaning of the term “domestic violence” (Geffner, 2016).

Generally, state-by-state legal definitions of domestic violence are quite broad and are intended to encapsulate violence between intimate partners, as well as that which occurs between family members (Barocas, Emery, & Mills, 2016; World Health Organization, 2012). In contrast, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2016) uses the term intimate partner violence to describe “physical violence, sexual violence, stalking and psychological aggression (including coercive acts) by a current or former intimate partner” (para. 1), and they clarify that intimate partner violence can differ in terms of frequency and severity. The World Health Organization (2012) also uses the term intimate partner violence and defines this term as “physical, sexual, and emotional abuse and controlling behaviours by an intimate partner” (para. 1).

Robert Geffner (2016) asserts that the terms “assault” and “violence” can both be used to refer to physical, sexual, or psychological acts of aggression, but he explains that these terms differ in that abuse is more often used to connote an ongoing pattern of one or more forms of aggression. Conversely, Robert Okun (1986) contends that the term abuse is more descriptive than violence in that abuse suggests the possibility of a larger number of tactics while violence simply connotes one form of abuse. Geffner (2016) also differentiates violence and abuse by asserting that abuse is characterized by the perpetrator’s use of power and coercive control wherein one “person uses his/her superior position, privilege, or strength to impose their will on another, usually through intimidation” (Geffner, 2016, p. 924). Similarly, the term “battering” implies a perpetrator’s use of coercive control tactics, possessive behavior, and violence and threats to exert power (Miller, 2005; World Health Organization, 2012).

IPA occurs across all socioeconomic, cultural, and religious groups worldwide (World Health Organization, 2012). Though women can be abusive towards male intimate partners, the data consistently indicate that IPA is a gender-based abuse, that women experience substantially

more IPA than do men, and that men perpetrate far more IPA than women (Brownmiller, 1975; Buzawa & Buzawa, 1992; Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Dobash, Dobash, Wilson, & Daly, 1992; Geffner, 2016; Henning et al., 2006; Hunnicutt, 2009; Johnson, 1995; Lystad, 1975; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a; World Health Organization, 2012). The 1996 National Violence Against Women survey indicates that 22.1% of women reported having been physically assaulted by a current or former intimate partner within their lifetime while only 7.4% of men had experienced such an assault (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a). Furthermore, 64.0% of women who reported having been raped, physically assaulted, or stalked were victimized by a current or former intimate partner as compared to only 16.2% of men (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a). More recently, the Bureau of Justice Statistics' 2009 findings on female victims of violence reported that the rate of intimate partner victimization among females was significantly higher than that among males, at 4.3 and 0.8 victimizations per 1,000 women and men, respectively (Catalano, Smith, Snyder, Rand, 2009).

A 2014 report of the data presented in the ongoing National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey revealed that 9.4% of women surveyed had been raped by an intimate partner in their lifetime as compared to 2.2 % of men. Furthermore, 16.9% of women had experienced sexual violence other than rape perpetrated by an intimate partner as compared to 8.0% of men (Breiding, Chen, & Black, 2014). This report also demonstrated that the lifetime prevalence of severe physical violence perpetrated by an intimate partner was 24.3% for women as compared to 13.8% for men. Similarly, the lifetime prevalence of stalking by an intimate partner was 10.7% for women as compared to 2.1% for men. Lastly, the data indicated that the proportion of female victims who had experienced more than the median number of unique sexually violent, physically violent, and psychologically aggressive behaviors by an intimate partner was greater

than the proportion of male victims who had experienced this (Breiding et al., 2014).

In terms of race and ethnicity, the data interpreted by Breiding, Chen, and Black (2014) revealed that the lifetime prevalence of rape, physical violence, or stalking perpetrated by an intimate partner was 43.7% for Black non-Latina² women and 53.8% for multiracial non-Latina women as compared to 34.6% for White non-Latina women and 19.6% for Asian or Pacific Islander non-Latina women. Data retrieved from the Bureau of Justice Statistics evidenced that rates of IPA were similar among Latina and non-Latina women at 4.1 and 4.3 victimizations per 1000, respectively (Catalano et al., 2009). These data also demonstrated that Black women were four times more likely to be murdered by a boyfriend or girlfriend as compared to white women. In terms of socioeconomic status, Breiding, Chen, and Black indicated that rates of rape, physical violence, and stalking by an intimate partner were higher among women and men who had experienced housing insecurity within the previous 12 months as compared to rates among women and men who did not experience such housing insecurity (2014).

Quite a few studies similar to the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey and the National Violence Against Women survey have been conducted in an attempt to quantify the incidence and prevalence of IPA. Quantification of IPA is quite difficult as it is severely under reported to police and sadly holds significant stigma for the victims. For example, the Bureau of Justice Statistics estimates that in 2008, only 49% of IPA committed against women was reported to police (Catalano et al., 2009). National studies of this nature are also problematic as they often use divergent definitions of abuse because IPA can involve many different

² Though many national data statistics use the racial/ethnic identifier “Hispanic” to refer to the Latinx population, the terms Latinx, Latina, and Latino will be used within this thesis. These terms will be used because they are more representative of self-definition while the term “Hispanic” is an exonym that is overall more problematic.

behaviors which makes it somewhat difficult to measure (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1990). Given the differential use of definitions, the majority of official and self-reports pertaining to the scope of IPA are generally assumed to understate the issue (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1990). These discrepancies in definitions and measurements pose problems in terms of collecting data systematically, comparing data from different sources, and monitoring data over time (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2016). Briana Barocas, Danielle Emery, and Linda Mills (2016) argue that the definitions of abuse between intimate partners need to be expanded upon to better address the complexities of IPA and encourage acknowledgement of the diversity that exists in terms of violence, intimate partnerships, life circumstances, and the unique needs of perpetrators and victims (Barocas, Emery, & Mills, 2016).

Family Violence Versus Feminist Perspectives

Between the 1960's and 1980's, two opposing theories developed regarding the occurrence of IPA. The first outlook-- the feminist perspective-- was inspired by the 1960's revival of feminism and argues that violence against women is a product of systems of patriarchy, sexism, and misogyny (Brownmiller, 1975; Buzawa & Buzawa, 1992; Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Hunnicutt, 2009; Schneider, 2000). This perspective is founded on the basis that the misogynistic institutions, laws, and structures that undergird United States society have historically enabled-- and still presently enable--IPA to occur (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1992; Coker, 2016; Miller, 2005). Evan Stark (2009a) clarifies this contention explaining:

Dramatic sex-based disadvantages remain that allow men to translate their relative privilege in the wider society into disproportionate levels of power and control in relationships.....Coercive control extends women's already diminished personhood and

decisional autonomy in families and relationships into a comprehensive form of regulating whether and how they express themselves in every arena of existence. (p. 1513)

That is, gender inequalities facilitated by the patriarchal domination of United States society function to establish patriarchal ideologies within the family structure and subsequently reinforce male domination over women within intimate partnerships (Coker, 1999; Sherman, 1992). Thus, feminist researchers and IPA victim advocates primarily understand the gendered phenomenon of violence against women within the context of the systemic subordination of women.³ These researchers contend that IPA poses an enormous threat to the lives, health, self-determination/agency, freedoms, and autonomy of women (Schneider, 2000).

The second outlook-- the family violence perspective-- maintains that intimate partner violence is a gender-neutral phenomenon that developed due to a flawed family structure (Archer, 2002; Buzawa & Buzawa, 1992; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Neidig, & Thorn, 1995; Schneider, 2000; Straus & Gelles, 1986). This sociological perspective contends that social structures inform patterns of human behavior and that the family structure must thus be flawed in such a way that it promotes gender neutral violence within families (Archer, 2002; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Neidig, & Thorn, 1995; Muftić, Finn, & Marsh, 2015; Straus & Gelles, 1986). This theory was informed by Murray Straus and Richard Gelles's (1986) classic research on family violence which yielded results that supported the claim that women are equally as violent as men within families. Additionally, Straus and Gelles claimed that factors such as childhood victimization histories and women's verbal aggression were the most impactful

³ Therefore, the term "gender-based violence" has been growing in use to include intimate partner abuse, sexual abuse, stalking and other crimes that occur disproportionately to women/girls and are disproportionately perpetrated by men/boys.

determinants of family violence (1986).

Most of the differences between the family violence and feminist perspectives are a result of differing definitions of IPA, as well as differences in research methods (Buzawa and Buzawa, 1992). For example, the family violence theory argues that gender symmetry is present within all types of IPA perpetration (Archer, 2002; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Neidig, & Thorn, 1995; Muftić, Finn, & Marsh, 2015; Straus & Gelles, 1986). One of the primary criticisms of this family violence approach is that it does not consider the differences in motives for perpetrating violence (e.g., Muftić, Finn, & Marsh, 2015). Contrarily, research investigating the validity of the feminist perspective engages the idea of motives for violence and proclaims that women most often utilize violence in self-defense (Busch & Rosenberg, 2004; Buzawa & Buzawa, 1992; Dobash, Dobash, Wilson, & Daly, 1992; Henning et al., 2006; Johnson, 1995; Lystad, 1975; Schneider, 2000). This assertion is corroborated by official crime statistics as well as the finding that the majority of women's use of violence is preceded by victimization and is directed at those who victimized them—primarily intimate male partners (Busch & Rosenberg, 2004; Buzawa & Buzawa, 1992; Henning et al., 2001; Miller, 2001; Muftić, Finn, & Marsh, 2015; Schneider, 2000). In addition to motives, the family violence perspective neglects to consider various other qualitative differences in violence perpetrated by men and women such as levels of physical aggression, use of coercive control, and histories of abuse (e.g., Henning et al., 2006).

Both the National Violence Against Women Survey and the National Crime Victimization Survey reported significant gender differences in rates of IPA. Martin Schwartz's (1987) analysis of the National Crime Survey database indicated that the great majority of victims of marital violence are women (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a, 2000b). These findings contradict the gender-neutral theory proposed by the family violence perspective and illustrate

how the feminist perspective more accurately portrays the realities of IPA (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1992). Understanding the history of IPA theory is very important as these perspectives help to shed light on the evolution of misconceptions and widely held beliefs regarding IPA as it exists today. Moreover, these theories illustrate the complexities of IPA as well as the fervent necessity to continue contributing to the available IPA research so that these complexities can be addressed appropriately through the policing of IPA.

Recognizing Diversity Within IPA Experiences

Misinformed conceptions of IPA regularly lead to the common assumption that victims' IPA experiences do not substantially differ (Coker, 2016; Mahoney, 1991; Schneider, 2000). Assumptions such as these are cultivated by widely publicized stereotypes of "helpless" IPA victims and they often go so far as to assume the identity and characteristics of the victim (Coker, 2016; Mahoney, 1991; Schneider, 2000). In truth, victims of IPA are not a uniform group and should not be essentialized. Consequently, victims' experiences of abuse, as well as their needs, reflect the distinctiveness of IPA occurrences and represent varied access to resources and unique survivor concerns (Erez & Belknap, 1998; Hilton, 1993). Unfortunately, the somewhat recent criminalization of IPA within the United States has led to a rather homogenized policy of policing IPA that does not account for the variance in abuse situations or victim preferences for effectively responding to these situations (Erez & Belknap, 1998). Thus, the criminal legal system's "one-size-fits-all" response to IPA does not always mediate safety or satisfaction for victims (Erez & Belknap, 1998; Goodman & Epstein, 2005; Mills, 1999). This was evidenced by a study conducted by Edna Erez and Joanne Belknap (1998) which asked victims to rank their levels of satisfaction for the various authorities with which they dealt while

seeking legal services. IPA survivors participating in the study ranked police the lowest of all authorities, indicating that they were upset by their lack of choice provided by the police regarding their own abusive circumstances and victimizations (Erez & Belknap, 1998). Erez and Belknap (1998) asserted that the current police response scenario “is likely to deepen the sense of powerlessness and exacerbate the frustration characteristic of those enmeshed in battering relationships” as it does not adequately address the diverse needs of IPA survivors (p. 264).

This diversity cannot be understood without considering the many ways that race and ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, immigration status, disability, sexual orientation, and other forms of marginalization intersect and impact IPA experiences. Though some studies suggest that controlling for economic deprivation results in the finding that rates and experiences of IPA do not differentiate in terms of race, these findings must be evaluated with a great deal of scrutiny as research addressing IPA and race is somewhat limited, often focuses only on differences between the IPA experiences of Black and white women, and has provided mainly inconclusive results (Amerson, Whittington, & Duggan, 2015; Nowotny & Graves, 2013; Ptacek, 1999). Despite the scant amount of available data, the impact had by the intersections of race/ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, and violence cannot be overlooked (Ptacek, 1999). In their comparison of experiences of clients seeking IPA services, Susan Grossman and Marta Lundy (2007) analyzed how IPA scenarios varied with respect to race and ethnicity. The data revealed that African American clients were the most overrepresented group of women seeking IPA services. Additionally, African American women were significantly more likely than individuals from other racial/ethnic groups to have never been married and most of these women had been abused by a current or former male friend as opposed to a spouse. These researchers also suggested that the needs of African American victims of IPA may be underestimated as

Black women are forced to bear the burden of multiple intersecting oppressions which has potentially resulted in their acting more assertive, confident, and resilient than they actually feel (see Grossman & Lundy, 2007; Potter, 2008). Similarly, Black feminist activists contend that it is exceptionally challenging to address the issue of IPA within marginalized communities that are beset by “hostility publicity” (Ptacek, 1999, p. 19).

Grossman and Lundy (2007) reported that Asian American women were relatively underrepresented as clients seeking IPA services and they theorized that this might indicate an insufficient number of IPA services within areas where a greater portion of Asian American people reside. The data also demonstrated that Asian American clients were those most likely to have been abused by current or former husbands, most likely to have been self-referred to services, least likely to have been referred to services by the police, and likely to have been referred by a friend. These statistics suggest that Asian American communities may be disproportionately isolated with regards to acquiring IPA information and that services and institutions aiming to address the needs of Asian American victims of abuse should attempt to expand within these communities to offer accessible service solutions to clients (Grossman & Lundy, 2007). Other research suggests, however, that the dominant individualistic strategies of IPA interventions do not appropriately account for differences in power dynamics within group oriented cultures which often results in a lack of culturally appropriate services for certain marginalized communities including Asian American communities (Choi, Elkins, & Disney, 2016). Furthermore, IPA services most often do not accommodate the language needs of all of their Asian American clients which also contributes to the observed lack of service utilization by Asian American victims (Choi, Elkins, & Disney, 2016).

Lastly, Grossman and Lundy’s (2017) study determined that Native American victims

represented the group seeking the greatest number of services for sexual abuse, housing assistance and shelter, and overall service needs. Zoe Hilton (1993) discusses the research on Native American victims of IPA explaining that Native American women are eight times more at risk of experiencing IPA as compared to the risk estimated for the general population. Hilton goes on to explain that IPA incidents within Native American communities are reported infrequently due to “isolation, community norms, and consequences to victims due to disclosure,” and that the increased rates of violence within the community are attributed to the repercussions of racism, colonial structures that systematically aimed to destroy Native American cultures, and the subsequent “loss of traditional hunting, fishing, and trapping roles for men” (1993, p. 91). In evaluating the history of rape and abuse, it becomes quite clear that these systems of domination were used as tools of colonial possession and control and this cannot be ignored in considering the current and exaggerated perpetration of rape and abuse against Native American women (Deer, 2015). Reflecting on the current scenario of sexual assault for Native American women, Sarah Deer explains that the use of the term “epidemic” depoliticizes the exaggerated state of gendered violence perpetrated against Native women by neglecting the settler colonial history and law that have shaped this crisis (Deer, 2015). The criminal legal system’s response to Native American victims of IPA fails remarkably to address the unique needs and experiences of these women and must be adapted to enable a more culturally sensitive response (Hilton, 1993).

Data pertaining to the intersection of socioeconomic status and IPA is a bit more consistent than data regarding race/ethnicity and IPA. An analysis of the data presented in the 1992 National Crime Victimization Survey demonstrated that women with family incomes lower than \$10,000 experienced IPA at a rate that was four times greater than the rate of IPA

experienced by women with family incomes greater than \$50,000 (Schwartz, 1987). James Ptacek (1999) explains that the increased rate of IPA among lower socioeconomic status women results from the fact that economic deprivation undermines a person's control over his or her life and safety. Additionally, patterns of IPA differ based on class because different economic scenarios provide IPA offenders with distinctively different resources for exerting control (Ptacek, 1999). This is not to deny that IPA occurs across all levels of socioeconomic status and that it occurs among some the wealthiest individuals, where, it is also gendered.

The available research on LGBTQ IPA is equally as scant as that which addresses intersections of race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and IPA. LGBTQ IPA is often regarded as less of a serious issue than IPA that occurs within heterosexual relationships (Poorman et al., 2003; Seelau & Seelau, 2005). As such, it is assumed that IPA of this nature does not require the same level of intervention as that required by heterosexual IPA (Poorman et al., 2003; Seelau & Seelau, 2005). Research findings indicate that IPA occurs within same-sex relationships quite frequently (e.g., Waldner-Haugrud, Gratch, & Magruder, 1997), but to date, very few studies have addressed the issue (Seelau & Seelau, 2005; Waldner-Haugrud, Gratch, & Magruder, 1997). This lack of concern for LGBTQ IPA research reflects the lack of concern encoded by the law. In 2005, only the states of Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, and Ohio had enacted laws that explicitly required legal protection of same-sex victims of IPA (Seelau & Seelau, 2005). Additionally, Seelau and Seelau (2005) reported that as of 2005, only 37 states utilized gender-neutral language in their IPA protections, seven states had made an active effort to ensure that same-sex victims of IPA were explicitly not protected by the law, and three states had ensured that gay victims of IPA could not be protected under the law because of laws which criminalized sodomy (Seelau & Seelau, 2005). Clearly, homophobia still plays a role in shaping how LGBTQ

victims of IPA will be legally protected. This evidences the fact that in most jurisdictions, the police response to LGBTQ IPA has not been remotely adapted to address the specific needs of these individuals.

Though several studies have illustrated the inherent diversity that exists within IPA experiences, the criminal legal system response to IPA has not yet been adapted to reflect this diversity. This has resulted in criminal legal system responses that fail to consider the varied needs of IPA victims (e.g., Potter, 2008; Worcester, 2002). To facilitate a more individualized and effective police response to IPA, policy changes need to be made to reflect those research findings which illustrate that IPA circumstances, experiences, and victim needs are divergent and cannot be addressed using a single, non-wavering law that threatens the autonomy, mental health, and security of IPA victims.

Latinx IPA Experiences

The Latinx population is the most rapidly increasing ethnic minority within the United States (Amerson, Whittington, & Duggan, 2015). This growth is reflected within the current study's data as Latinx individuals comprise the largest ethnic minority group of IPA victims within the sample from Longmont, Colorado. To effectively provide a thorough and relevant review of the literature pertaining to the specific data set and research question being analyzed within this study, this section of my thesis summarizes the extant research focused on IPA in Latinx communities and emphasizes the diverse experiences and victimizations of Latina women.

Despite the vast growth of the Latinx population in the U.S. (e.g., Amerson, Whittington, & Duggan, 2015), there is a scarcity of research regarding the experiences of IPA among Latina

victims. Furthermore, research addressing racial and ethnic differences in IPA prevalence rates has not yielded conclusive results for this group (Amerson, Whittington, & Duggan, 2015). Bonomi, Anderson, Cannon, Slesnick, and Rodriguez (2009) found that IPA victimization prevalence and incidence is high among Latina women, with a 44.6% prevalence rate and an 11.5% incidence rate. Breiding, Chen, and Black (2014) found a somewhat similar but lower lifetime/prevalence of IPA among Latina women at 37.0%. Inconsistent findings are likely the result of underrepresentation of racial minorities within national data sets, varied measures of IPA, and underreporting of IPA among undocumented immigrants for whom fear of deportation is at play (Amerson, Whittington, & Duggan, 2015). In general, factors such as language barriers, variance in cultural conceptions and definitions of abuse, stigma, fear of police, and underreporting likely contribute to conservative reports of IPA prevalence among the Latinx population (Choi, Elkins, & Disney, 2016). In terms of relative rates of IPA, the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2009) reported that Latinx and non-Latinx women experienced very similar rates of IPA in the year 2008 and this data was corroborated by Bonomi, Anderson, Cannon, Slesnick, and Rodriguez (2009) (see Catalano et al., 2009). Other research supports the related but alternative claim that rates of IPA are higher among Latinx victims as compared to non-Latinx victims when considering only the past year's victimization while these rates are reversed when comparing lifetime victimization rates (Ingram, 2007). Variance between cross study comparisons such as these is likely the result of discrepancies in the circumstances of data collection, the categorization of IPA, and the sample characteristics (Bonomi, Anderson, Cannon, Slesnick, & Rodriguez, 2009).

It is important to note that the term Latinx is problematic in that it fails to acknowledge or respect cultural differences that exist among subgroups that are categorized under the

homogenizing title (Kelly, 2009). The term is most often used as an ethnic categorization for persons from Central and South America and the Caribbean-- each of which hosts a myriad of communities with distinct cultural elements (Williams & Kasturirangan, 2003). Because the Latinx community is so incredibly diverse, providers of services for Latinx IPA survivors must consider differences in country of origin, language, cultural experiences, level of education, generational status, and length of time lived within the United States to competently serve this population (Perilla, Serrata, Weinberg, & Lippy, 2012). Williams and Kasturirangan (2003) explain that while the population of individuals grouped under the term Latinx is incredibly culturally diverse, commonalities and patterns do exist among these cultures and these similarities influence commonalities in terms of issues of acculturation. Patterns of this nature are rather generalizing, but they can also provide researchers and policy-makers with a potentially more informed understanding of the broader cultural and historical context that often impacts experiences of IPA victimization for Latina women (Perilla, Serrata, Weinberg, & Lippy, 2012; Williams & Kasturirangan, 2003). Among other aspects of identity, the intersections of culture, gender, ethnicity, race, and legal status within the United States shape individual experiences of IPA for Latina women. Thus, further research efforts which aim to investigate the associations between components of Latinx culture and the prevalence, contributing factors, and diverse manifestation of IPA for Latina women are incredibly necessary to inform future policy surrounding IPA and establish a culturally-competent response that would mediate healing and safety for Latinx victims (Choi, Elkins, & Disney, 2016).

Despite the fact that research aiming to interrogate commonalities among Latinx perceptions of IPA is lacking, that which exists has identified various common trends within Latinx conceptions of IPA. For example, two studies examining perceptions of IPA from Latinx

survivors found the participants often noted physical and verbal abuse-- sometimes in the form of humiliation-- when explaining their understandings of abuse (Adames & Campbell, 2005; Mattson & Ruiz, 2005). Adames and Campbell (2005) added that their participants did not independently consider sexual or emotional aggression to be abusive, though they did not reject the idea of sexual or emotional abuse when they were later presented with these abuse tactics. This is a potentially significant finding as it may suggest that the participants within this study viewed sexual and emotional aggression as private matters which would be consistent with the research that asserts that sexuality is commonly perceived as taboo within the Latinx community (Adames & Campbell, 2005; Silva Martinez, 2016).

Though definitions of IPA have been varied among Latinx survivors, many agree that IPA is a significant problem within their communities and that gender-based inequality is a critical component related to this issue (Adames & Campbell, 2005; Silva Martinez, 2016). Gender-based inequality is an issue that spans the majority of cultures, but this inequality manifests uniquely within different socio-cultural contexts. For instance, many cultures-- including many Latinx cultures-- uphold norms that value male dominance and control in contrast to female submissiveness and tolerance of suffering (Amerson, Whittington, & Duggan, 2015). While it is important to note that generalizing descriptions of Latinx culture of this nature are often denounced as harmful stereotypes, it is also important that these cross-cultural commonalities pertaining to gender and family not be overlooked, but rather, critically investigated with regards to their potential role in Latinx experiences of IPA (Amerson, Whittington, & Duggan, 2015; Williams & Kasturirangan, 2003).

Most research that focuses on Latinx IPA experiences recognizes the influence of the concepts of Machismo and Marianismo. Machismo is generally defined as the expectation for

men to be dominating, in control, and economic providers for families (Adames & Campbell, 2005; Amerson, Whittington, & Duggan, 2015). Machismo expectations coexist with the concept of Marianismo—the expectations for women to be passive, obedient to men, and willing to bear all for the sake of the family (Mattson and Ruiz, 2005; Perilla, Vasquez Serrata, Weinberg, Lippy, 2012; Williams & Kasturirangan, 2003). Marianismo is a value that reflects reverence for the Virgin Mary as a role model of self-sacrifice within motherhood (Choi, Elkins, & Disney, 2016). In their interviews with Latina individuals from various countries and socioeconomic backgrounds, Williams and Kasturirangan (2003) found that the majority of their participants perceived Latinas as behaving submissively, not expressing their own desires, and catering to the desires of men. These conceptions reflect the impactful influence of Marianismo on Latina women's lives and self-perceptions. Together, the concepts of Machismo and Marianismo function to normalize the dominant authority of men and the subordination of women which often serves as conventionalized justification of physical punishment perpetrated by men against their female partners (Amerson, Whittington, & Duggan, 2015; Choi, Elkins, & Disney, 2016; Mattson & Ruiz, 2005). Additionally, these concepts often teach women to remain submissive for the sake of their families, even if they are in danger (Mattson and Ruiz, 2005; Perilla, Vasquez Serrata, Weinberg, Lippy, 2012). Thus, the concepts of Machismo and Marianismo can function to normalize violence against women, which leads to socialization of IPA as commonplace and tolerable (Adames & Campbell, 2005; Raj & Silverman, 2002). This is evidenced by research that has found that many Latina women view IPA as a common or normal problem within their communities (Adames & Campbell, 2005; Silva Martinez, 2016).

At the same time, research suggests that Latina women's respect for Marianismo values is often challenged when Latinx families migrate to settings where more gender-egalitarian

values appear to predominate, and where both partners might need to contribute financially to the family due to the economic pressures of migration (Adames & Campbell, 2005; Choi, Elkins, & Disney, 2016; Raj & Silverman, 2002). In these scenarios, Latinx men may interpret these changes to economic power dynamics as threatening to their masculinity and they may be more likely to resort to abusive or violent means of asserting their authority (Adames & Campbell, 2005; Choi, Elkins, & Disney, 2016; Raj & Silverman, 2002).

Another cultural factor that may play a role within Latinx experiences of IPA is the importance of family. Many Latinx cultures center around family and the betterment of the family is often valued above individual welfare (Choi, Elkins, & Disney, 2016). This was evidenced by Williams and Kasturirangan's (2003) study which revealed that a variant category of Latinx descriptions of Latinx individuals centered around the paramount significance of family. Furthermore, Zadnik, Sabina, and Cuevas (2016) reported similar lifetime rates of IPA for undocumented Latinx individuals as compared to Latinx individuals with legal status, and these researchers hypothesized that these similar rates might be due to a protective effect had by cultures of origin that value family, respect, and the admiration of women who serve as family caretakers. This protective effect was also observed by DePrince and her colleagues (2013) who found that the greater the percentage of Latinx individuals in a community, the more social support and the less PTSD *all* IPA victims self-reported, regardless of their race (DePrince, Buckingham, & Belknap, 2013).

These values are further reinforced by Christianity which celebrates the sacrament of matrimony and considers divorce to be a sin against God (Choi, Elkins, & Disney, 2016). Choi, Elkins, and Disney (2016) maintain that Latinx communities are historically Catholic or Protestant and that their religious beliefs are often used by abusers, family, friends, or the

religious community to justify IPA, blame victims of abuse for their circumstances, or encourage women to forgive the abuser for the sake of the family. The influence of religion is often more pronounced in immigrant communities because religious institutions have gained a central role within these communities due to the fact that they often serve as a means of maintaining ethnic identity and culture for immigrants to the U.S. (Choi, Elkins, & Disney, 2016).

Stephen (2016) warns against simplistic explanations of Latinx IPA that reduce this phenomenon to an issue of individual male behavior or to an entirely cultural issue stemming from Machismo. Latinx IPA survivors often experience interpersonal violence that stems from collective violence due to structures of sexism, acculturation, racism, discrimination, and limited access to resources (Schultz et al., 2016). Thus, essentialist cultural explanations must be understood in terms of structural violence and the interface between culture and political systems must not be overlooked with regards to its impact on gendered violence (Stephen, 2016). Stephen focuses on transborder networks of criminal and state violence that span the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands and perpetuate state-sanctioned violence against Mexican women. Specifically, Stephen describes the War on Drugs and the United States supported militarization of many parts of Mexico as having produced gendered forms of violence due to the extensive use of rape, sexual assault, and threatened assault by Mexican soldiers and police against women. These structures of state-sanctioned violence are fortified by an economic system of drug exchange and corruption that spans the Borderlands and perpetuates a culture of impunity as drug-related corruption abounds (Stephen, 2016). Because of this political and economic climate, many immigrant Latina women coming to the United States are escaping trauma associated with IPA experiences that are often connected to community violence due to political issues of drug trafficking and cartels (Schultz et al., 2016). Additionally, the Mexican government promotes an

official narrative which claims that most rapes and murders of women and men are associated with organized crime groups and this narrative serves to justify state inaction by blaming victims for any violence that they experience (Stephen, 2016). This narrative framing is reflected in the treatment of IPA as a private matter in which police can not intervene and for which there is no jail time (Mattson & Ruiz, 2005; Stephen, 2016).

This narrative of justification of violence against Mexican women also manifests as racialized justifications for the exclusion of Mexican migrant women from the United states-- a narrative which serves to obscure the common occurrence of sexual and physical abuse of Mexican women by border patrol agents (Schultz et al., 2016; Stephen, 2016). Many Latinx victims of IPA have undocumented or non-permanent immigrant status which places legal restrictions on them and increases their vulnerability within the IPA context (Raj & Silverman, 2002). In March of 2013, President Obama signed the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act which has since been increasingly used to grant asylum to women victims of IPA who are not protected from this abuse in their home countries (Stephen, 2016). But asylum can only provide protection for a very small percentage of Latinx migrant women who have access to a lawyer and can navigate the complicated U.S. legal system (Stephen, 2016). Thus, in combination with the narrative of justified violence against Mexican women, immigration policies in the United states increase the risk of violence and death for Mexican women attempting to escape life threatening situations due to transborder political and economic structures that normalize misogyny and use of violence by intimate partners and thus perpetuate femicide (Stephen, 2016).

For Latinx women, IPA is not experienced in isolation from their experiences of abuse due to systematic oppression and racism (Silva Martinez, 2016). Silva Martinez (2016) explains

that the Latinx victims of IPA who participated in the 2016 study were consciously aware of experiencing racism and discrimination due to ethnicity within the U.S. and the responses of these women suggested that these oppressive experiences of prejudice impactfully shaped the ways that these women viewed help seeking as well as the ways they felt comfortable disclosing their abuse. Many immigrant Latinx victims of IPA experience increased vulnerability because they are situated within a sociopolitical context in which they are isolated and regarded as other due to their race, ethnicity, or legal status (Raj & Silverman, 2002). Undocumented status is often used by intimate partners as a means of control whereby abusers manipulate victims to remain silent with threats of having them deported or ceasing to help them to gain legal residence (Raj & Silverman, 2002; Zadnik, Sabina, & Cuevas, 2016). Another factor that increases the risk of abuse for Latinx immigrants is economic insecurity due to barriers to finding employment in the U.S., such as language barriers, lack of education, lack of necessary job skills, or racial, ethnic, and/or immigrant discrimination (Raj & Silverman, 2002).

This was supported by Cheng and Lo (2016) who reported that within Latina subsamples, IPA was associated with low income status. Economic insecurity may contribute to Latinx men turning to substance abuse or destructive behaviors which increases the risk of IPA for Latinx women (Raj & Silverman, 2002). Many studies report an association between drug and alcohol abuse and IPA victimization among Latinx women which supports the potential association between economic insecurity, substance use, and IPA among Latinx individuals (Cheng & Lo, 2016; Nowotny & Graves, 2013).

Though a great deal of research documents the association between IPA and mental health in the general population, very little research focuses on these associations specifically within communities of color (Amerson, Whittington, & Duggan, 2015; Bonomi, Anderson,

Cannon, Slesnick, & Rodriguez, 2009; Fedovskiy, Higgins, & Paranjape, 2008). This is an important area of research that requires more attention as the scant amount of research that does exist suggests that Latinx victims of IPA experience more pronounced adverse IPA related mental health issues than do non-Latinx survivors (Bonomi, Anderson, Cannon, Slesnick, & Rodriguez, 2009). Fedovskiy, Higgins, and Paranjape (2008) found that baseline rates of Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) and Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) are higher within the Latinx population as compared to the general population and that Latina women who report lifetime IPA are thus more likely than the general population to also report criteria for PTSD and MDD. Increased rates of mental health issues among Latinx survivors may be related to the adverse mental health effects that are associated with exclusion and discrimination due to race and ethnicity (Silva Martinez, 2016). Furthermore, collective trauma in the form of historical or structural trauma often compounds the trauma associated with IPA for Latinx survivors (Schultz et al., 2016). Culturally appropriate mental health services are limited for Latinx survivors due to high costs and non-bilingual healthcare providers (Perilla, Serrata, Weinberg, & Lippy, 2012). Additionally, individual therapy services are not always viewed as useful, appropriate, or acceptable options for care by Latinx survivors (Perilla, Serrata, Weinberg, & Lippy, 2012). Nowotny and Graves (2013) reported that for Latinx women, IPA victimization during early young adulthood was associated with marijuana and drug use later in life. These findings suggest that Latinx women may have different coping strategies for IPA which indicates that more culturally relevant and affordable mental health services must be developed to support the unique mental health needs of Latinx survivors (Nowotny & Graves, 2013).

Latina victims of IPA describe a wide variety of reasons for staying and leaving their abusive relationships. These reasons relate directly to intersections of gender, race/ethnicity, and

immigration status and it is incredibly important that they be understood in order to develop policies and interventions that are relevant to the realities of Latina victims' experiences (Silva Martinez, 2016). One such reason is financial dependency which is often noted by Latinx women as a reason for staying within an abusive relationship (Choi, Elkins, & Disney, 2016; Mattson & Ruiz, 2005). Many Latinx victims struggle to gain financial independence because they face a great deal of difficulty securing employment due to discrimination and racial prejudice, issues finding childcare, and issues finding reliable transportation to and from work (Medina & Vasquez, 2004; Williams & Kasturirangan, 2003). Another factor that contributes to Latinx victims' decisions to stay is fear of what others might think due to the cultural pressures to remain married to be a "good" wife and mother (Mattson & Ruiz, 2005; Medina & Vasquez, 2004; Silva Martinez, 2016; Williams & Kasturirangan, 2003). In other cases, Latinas describe their reasons for staying as simply not wanting to break up the marriage or maintaining love for their partners and hoping they would change (Medina & Vasquez, 2005; Williams & Kasturirangan, 2003). For many Latinx victims, fear of safety and safety of children is an important factor that mediates efforts to either leave or remain within abusive relationships depending on victims' interpretations of their immediate danger (Medina & Vasquez, 2004; Silva Martinez, 2016; Williams & Kasturirangan, 2003). Cheng and Lo (2016) demonstrated that Latina women became more likely to seek social support as IPA incidents increased and the victimization became more severe.

Though children's well-being can function either as an obstacle or a motivating factor for help-seeking, research indicates that the mothering role is one of the most, if not the most, impactful influences on Latinx victims' decision-making regarding disclosure and staying or leaving abuse (Amerson, Whittington, & Duggan, 2015; Kelly, 2009; Mattson & Ruiz, 2005).

For many Latinx IPA victims, reasons for staying revolve around fear that the abuser could and would take the children with him if she attempted to leave (Medina & Vasquez, 2003; Kelly, 2009). These fears are often bred by threats made by the abuser and the lacking available information about rights and laws leads many victims to believe these threats (Kelly, 2009). Additionally, many Latinx victims stay due to fear of their children being taken by Child Protection Services (Kelly, 2009; Silva Martinez, 2016). Furthermore, many Latinas explain their reasons for staying as not wanting to separate the children from their father due to the consequential emotional repercussions of such an experience (Medina & Vasquez, 2003). Kelly (2009) reported that even when Latina victims did leave their abusive relationships, they often continued limited contact with their abusers so that their children could have a father despite the emotional cost to themselves. Moreover, many Latinx victims express feelings of suffering due to their awareness of the impact that their abuse could have on their children as well as due to fear that the violence might be perpetuated generationally (Kelly, 2009; Mattson & Ruiz, 2005). In order to ensure the emotional and psychological well-being of their children, many Latinx victims have expressed a desire for IPA providers to offer emotional counseling geared towards children's wellbeing as well as for programs aimed towards educating children about healthy ways to express anger and interact with partners (Mattson & Ruiz, 2005; Perilla, Serrata, Weinberg, & Lippy, 2012; Williams & Kasturirangan, 2003).

A large majority of these reasons for staying or leaving abusive situations center around barriers to formal help seeking mechanisms and these barriers are exacerbated for immigrant Latinx victims (Medina & Vasquez, 2004). These barriers are reflected by the fact that research indicates that non-Latinx individuals access shelters more frequently than Latinx individuals and that undocumented Latinx individuals access formal services at an even lower rate than Latinx

individuals with legal residence (Ingram, 2007; Zadnik, Sabina, & Cuevas, 2016). The majority of Latinx victims of IPA have a number of unique needs and many of these women want formal help. Unfortunately, few resources are available to them due to issues such as language barriers, cultural incompetency, and discriminatory and exclusionary practices among service providers (Choi, Elkins, & Disney, 2016; Silva Martinez, 2016). For example, many immigrant Latinx victims constantly fear deportation due to threats made by their abusers and this fear can be intensified by the feeling of powerlessness due to lack of knowledge about existing services or provisions for immigrant victims of IPA (Choi, Elkins, & Disney, 2016; Medina & Vasquez, 2004; Silva Martinez, 2016).

Lacking information regarding immigrant specific services is certainly a barrier to Latina IPA victim receiving formal help, but another barrier arises when service providers themselves are not fully informed in terms of immigration laws and immigrant victims' rights (Medina & Vasquez, 2004; Villalón, 2010). Additionally, it is very difficult to get appointments with immigration lawyers and there are very limited affordable resources for initiating and navigating the process of immigration (Silva Martinez, 2016; Villalón, 2010). Thus, immigration reform and more efficient processing of documentation are needed to protect the safety and human rights of undocumented Latinx immigrants (Silva Martinez, 2016). Another barrier to formal help seeking arises due to fear of negative stereotypes and discrimination (Choi, Elkins, & Disney, 2016; Silva Martinez, 2016). These fears are not unfounded as lack of cultural sensitivity among service providers can sometimes lead to issues of discrimination and xenophobia (Medina & Vasquez, 2004; Villalón, 2010).

Furthermore, providers sometimes overlook the influence of macro-level structural factors or the dynamics of collective experiences of trauma which results in problematic and

discriminatory misunderstandings of Latinx IPA (Schultz et al., 2016; Silva Martinez, 2016). Perilla, Serrata, Weinberg, and Lippy (2012) encourage providers to refrain from focusing exclusively on the negative values associated with culturally situated gender expectations and to instead focus on affirming the positive values that are associated with culturally rooted gender roles. Even when adequate resources do exist, there is still the issue of lacking knowledge about said resources (Choi, Elkins, & Disney, 2016; Silva Martinez, 2016). This lacking knowledge is the result of poor outreach aiming to inform Latinx survivors of IPA about services available to them as well as their rights to those services (Medina & Vasquez, 2004).

One of the most significant barriers to accessing formal help services for Latinx victims of IPA is the issue of language and cultural competency. Many Latinx survivors are unable to communicate in English and they face difficulties in terms of communicating with non-bilingual service providers (Medina & Vasquez, 2004; Silva Martinez, 2016; Villalón, 2010; Williams & Kasturirangan, 2003). A survey of 92 domestic violence agencies across the U.S. revealed that 25% of agencies had no bilingual or bicultural staff, 57.1% of agencies had two bilingual or bicultural staff members or fewer, and 50% of agencies had only clients who could not read or write in English (Medina & Vasquez, 2004). In many cases, providers can understand the language, but not the cultural values or circumstances of their Latinx clients which also results in issues of communication (Choi, Elkins, & Disney, 2016; Medina & Vasquez, 2004; Silva Martinez, 2016). Sometimes, Latinx cultural values collide with the feminist domestic violence model upheld by service providers which presumes that all victims of abuse want to leave their relationships (Perilla, Serrata, Weinberg, & Lippy, 2012). In their 2012 study, Perilla, Serrata, Weinberg, and Lippy discovered that most of their Latinx participants wanted the violence to cease rather than wanting to leave their relationships and the providers' expectations that the

victims should leave their partners thus served to deter these victims from continuing with services or seeking formal help in the future. The feminist domestic violence model is also problematic as it provides services that are mostly individually-oriented, segregated, and insular and which consequently neglect to consider the important cultural role of family for Latinx survivors (Choi, Elkins, & Disney, 2016; Perilla, Serrata, Weinberg, & Lippy, 2012). Ingram (2007) argues that service providers should aim to develop interventions that target family support and provide services to all family members as this would better serve Latinx survivors who rely substantially on a family network of support.

Criminal Justice Response to IPA

History and Reform

The laws surrounding violence against women have evolved enormously throughout history. This history began in 753 BC Rome with the Laws of Chastisement which permitted a husband to use physical force to discipline his wife under various circumstances (Okun, 1986). These laws were adopted as part of Anglo-American common law and through the rights of chastisement, husbands were legally allowed to use corporal punishment upon their wives (Okun, 1986; Hilton, 1993). This right was upheld by the Doctrine of Coverture which provided that women would lose their legal rights as well as their identities through marriage (Hilton, 1993). The United States constitution failed to address issues concerning domestic relations and when an 1824 Mississippi court legalized corporal punishment of wives, the majority of states followed suit (Okun, 1986). Under these laws, violence perpetrated against wives was handled very differently from issues of stranger assault (Schneider, 2000). These laws began to be hesitantly reformed during the 1960's when feminist activists and lawyers began to raise public

awareness for the significance of the issue of wife abuse (Schneider, 2000). However, men who physically assaulted their wives were often provided immunities from prosecution as courts maintained that issues of domestic relations should continue to be handled privately to preserve the sanctity of said relations (Okun, 1986; Schneider, 2000). Though the laws had changed, normative attitudes towards abuse of wives had not adjusted which meant that police often avoided arresting husbands who had physically assaulted their wives (Dobash and Dobash 1979). This propensity to avoid arresting offenders resulted in a great deal of police criticism (Erez & Belknap, 1991).

During the 1980's, a very important movement for change formed called the Battered Women's Movement. In response to discretionary policing, battered women's advocates rallied for police to respond more effectively and punitively to the crime of domestic violence (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1992; Hilton, 1993). The few laws that addressed the issue were rarely enforced and they existed alongside other laws that protected offenders from arrest such as those that banned police from making arrests without a warrant in cases they had not directly witnessed (Hilton, 1993; Sherman, 1992). Advocates demanded that police responses be modified on the constitutional grounds that perpetrators of violence against wives should be treated in the same legal manner as perpetrators of violence against strangers (Buzawa & Buzawa. 1992). Legal attempts to protect the sanctity and privacy of the family were questioned as studies began to illustrate the need to publicly address domestic violence as a national issue (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1992). For example, Lee Bowker's 1983 study of 146 women from Milwaukee who had been free from spousal abuse for over a year evidenced the fact that a number of victims of abuse had reported negative experiences dealing with the criminal legal system such as district attorneys discouraging victims from prosecuting their abusers or lawyers who sided with abusers instead

of victims (Bowker, 1983). Lewis Okun (1986) provided evidence that the judicial response to domestic violence reflected the societally held misconception that domestic violence was non-crime and he argued that the push to hide the problem of battering from the public view had perpetuated ignorance regarding the severity of the epidemic. While Richard Gelles and Murray Straus (1988) maintained that the issue of domestic violence was actually non-gendered family violence, they provided evidence that police often responded slower to cases of domestic violence than to other public disturbances. These and other studies helped to reinforce the work of battered women's advocates in moving the issue of domestic violence from the private to the public sphere (Schneider, 2000).

In response to this push for change, the National Institute of Justice began to sponsor domestic violence centered research (Sherman & Berk, 1984). One of these research endeavors-- the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment-- provided evidence that arrest was the most effective deterrent of reoffending as compared to counseling or removing one of the parties from the home (Sherman and Berk, 1984). Despite confounding evidence regarding the validity of these findings as generalizable, many states subsequently began to enact policies that would enforce arrest within domestic violence cases (Buzawa et al., 2012). In addition to the results of the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment, other concerns such as police liability contributed to the pressure to further criminalize domestic violence and ensure arrests of offenders (Jain, 2011; Muftić, Bouffard, & Bouffard, 2007; Sherman, 1992). Lawsuits filed against police departments in New York and Connecticut during the 1970's and 1980's illustrated that the police were failing to protect victims of domestic violence because they would not make arrests in these cases (Hilton, 1993). These lawsuits demonstrated that police accountability was an important aspect to consider in terms of the criminal legal response to

domestic violence and they contributed to the push for changing police practices (Hilton, 1993). Furthermore, Nixon's War on Drugs followed by Clinton's expansion of the police force and enactment of policies such as the three strikes law as well as mandatory and minimum sentencing led to the expunction of discretionary policing and the establishment of more routine and severe arrest policies (Miller, 2005).

These political circumstances, liability concerns, and findings from the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment contributed to the massive state-by-state adoption of non-discretionary arrest policies aimed at ending domestic violence (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1992; Hilton, 1993; Miller, 2005; Muftić, Bouffard, & Bouffard, 2007; Schneider, 2000; Sloan et al., 2013). These policies reflect the actions taken by police agencies to remove domestic violence from the private sphere and respond to the issue as a crime against the state (Adler & Denmark, 1995; Sherman, 1992). While prosecuting and sentencing policies remained somewhat unchanged, arrest rates increased dramatically in response to these changes to policing (Sherman, 1992). Despite data presented by and Schmidt & Sherman (1993), Sherman (1992), and Sloan, Platt, Chepke, and Blevins (2013) that suggest that arrest may not be the most powerful domestic violence deterrent, all states have now enacted legislation that mandates or advocates for arrest within domestic violence cases when there is probable cause (Buzawa & Buzawa, Dugan, 2003; 2003; Hirschel et al., 2007). These laws are respectively called mandatory or pro-arrest policies and they drastically restrict officer discretion (Hirschel et al., 2007; Miller, 2005; Schneider, 2000). For example, mandatory and pro arrest policies require or encourage arrest even if the victim does not wish to prosecute the offender (Miller, 2005; Schneider, 2000). This lack of discretion has had many unintended repercussions. Though these policies were arguably successful in raising public awareness for the issue of IPA, they have not played out as expected

by the battered women's advocates who pushed for their enactment.

Consequences of Pro-Arrest Policies

Mandatory and pro-arrest policies were enacted for a number of reasons. Among other things, supporters of these policies argue that they better enable the state to prosecute and combat IPA, protect the victim by leaving the decision to prosecute the offender to the state, and send a message to offenders that the abuse committed is punishable by law and thus unacceptable (Schneider, 2000). Unfortunately, this reasoning neglects to consider the ways in which these policies have failed victims of IPA.

While these policies have been associated with an increase in IPA arrests overall, this increase is much more significant for women than it is for men (Buzawa & Hirschel, 2008; Chesney-Lind, 2002). Data indicate that the number of women arrested as offenders of IPA has substantially increased since the country wide adoption of mandatory and pro arrest policies (Busch and Rosenberg, 2004; Frye et al., 2007; Hirschel et al., 2007). These policies are flawed in that they encourage the determination of victims and offenders based on a single incident of abuse and this manner of policing forces officers to ignore histories of abuse which is incredibly problematic due to the fact that a great deal of evidence suggests that while women who engage in acts of violence against their partners are not a homogeneous group, the majority of these women have engaged in violence as a means of self defense (Muftić, Finn, & Marsh, 2015). Susan Miller (2005) explains that while many victims do commit an illegal act of violence, this violence is contextually situated within a long history of abuse. In their 2015 study of sex differences in IPA offending, victimization, and victim offenders--individuals who are originally determined to be offenders and determined to be victims in a future incident or visa versa--

Muftić, Finn, & Marsh found that 53.4% of female victims within their study were revictimized during the follow up period as compared to 29.6% of males. Additionally, these researchers reported that 67.6% of female offenders desisted in the follow up period as compared to only 48.2% of male offenders, and that 68.6% of female victim offenders were determined to be victims in the original IPA incident as compared to 30.8% of men. These results support the contention that women usually experience victimization prior to becoming offenders which suggests that women often use violence as a defense mechanism when they commit IPA offenses (Muftić, Finn, & Marsh, 2015). This data is very concerning as IPA offenders often cannot access services for victim support which means that victim-offenders who act violently in self-defense cannot access the support they might need as victims of ongoing abuse (Crager, Cousin, & Hardy, 2003 as cited by Muftic, Finn, & Marsh, 2015; Mills, 1999).

In addition to increased rates of arrest of women, mandatory and pro-arrest policies have contributed to increased rates of dual arrest (Frye et al., 2007; Henning et al., 2006; Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002; Hirschel et al., 2007; Martin, 1997; Miller, 2005; Muftić, Finn, & Marsh, 2015; Roark, 2016). Dual arrest occurs when both parties involved in a criminal incident are arrested for offenses committed against each other (Hirschel et al., 2007). Feder & Henning (2005) concluded that when dually arrested, women exhibited less severe violence and less serious histories of IPA compared to their dually arrested male partners. In another study conducted by Muftić, Bouffard, and Bouffard (2007), police most often indicated in dual arrest police reports that the male offender had provoked the incident and that the female offender had responded in self defense. Furthermore, female offenders arrested dually were more likely to report having used violence out of frustration, fear, or in self-defense (Muftić, Bouffard, & Bouffard, 2007). These findings substantiate the idea that violence perpetrated by men and women is qualitatively

very different and that increased rates of dual arrests reflect a problem of policy over-enforcement on the part of police officers responding to IPA (Martin, 1997).

Pro-arrest policies are meant to decrease IPA recidivism by increasing offender accountability which is an important part of supporting the wellbeing of victims (DePrince, Belknap, Labus, Buckingham, & Gover, 2012). However, these policies appear to focus more on outcomes for offenders rather than on those for victims (Goodman & Epstein, 2005). The rigid structure of the police response system has led police to devote far more attention to the punishment of IPA offenders than to supporting victims of IPA which comes at the cost of forgoing the intended woman-centered focus of the criminalization of IPA (Epstein, Bell, & Goodman, 2003). Additionally, these laws deny victims the opportunity to make decisions regarding the violence in their lives which functions to disempower women and perpetuate the problematic assertion that victims of IPA cannot make their own rational decisions (Schneider, 2000). Because victims of IPA do not have a choice in whether the offender will be prosecuted, they may be less likely to call the police when in danger because of distrust for the criminal legal system (Schneider, 2000). This is supported by Dugan (2003) who determined that police are less likely to discover incidents of IPA in mandatory arrest states than in pro-arrest states. The evidence that police did not respond as often to incidents of IPA in mandatory arrest jurisdictions suggests that mandatory arrest laws deter people from reaching out to the police in cases of IPA (Dugan, 2003). These policy repercussions should not be taken lightly as they evidence the fact that IPA victims are suffering more as a result of mandatory and pro-arrest laws.

Theoretical Approach: Critical Race Feminist Theory (CRFT)

In discussing Alice Walker, Balfour (2016) explains that an analysis of contemporary

violence and oppression must not overlook the continued presence of past injustices within the current reality. Over time, various modalities of oppression have transformed from overt practice to more covert, systematic, and institutionalized mechanisms. Nonetheless, oppression and marginalization have persisted and institutionalized persecution continues to produce political and social vulnerability that manifests as socially constructed facets of identity such as race or gender (Sheth, 2016). Sheth (2016) asserts that throughout United States history, marginalized groups have been violated by the repeated, politically or economically motivated, systematic government efforts to incite community-specific political vulnerability while simultaneously promoting a narrative of blame for the affected population. In this context, Sheth uses political vulnerability to refer to a population's susceptibility to exploitation or persecution due to the establishment of political structures having the power to strip communities of political standing, which subsequently contributes to the process of vilifying and criminalizing entire populations (2016). These processes of establishing political vulnerability have fortified heteronormative, white, male, privilege while concurrently criminalizing, excluding, and suppressing individuals and communities having alternative identities.

Identity, however, is not singular. As humans, we experience multiple aspects of identity simultaneously. These various aspects of identity are not experienced in isolation, but rather, as intersecting components of self. Consequently, discrimination based on components of identity can be experienced in multiple ways due to the intersectional nature of our diverse axes of identity (Henne & Troshynski, 2013). This concept of intersectionality, was developed by Kimberly Crenshaw, who identified three unique forms of intersectionality--structural, political, and representational (Few-Demo, 2014; Henne & Troshynski, 2013). Structural intersectionality

refers to the connection between societal systems of subordination and their differing effects in terms of experiences of privilege for people (Few-Demo, 2014; Henne & Troshynski, 2013).

Political intersectionality represents the ways in which traditional feminist and antiracist politics have played a part in perpetuating the marginalization of women of color due to their not respecting these women as unique (Few-Demo, 2014; Henne & Troshynski, 2013).

Representational intersectionality refers to the interaction between the imaginary and symbolic practices that shape narratives and inform the level of visibility for marginalized individuals with multiple identities (Few-Demo, 2014; Henne & Troshynski, 2013).

Few-Demo (2014) conceives of intersectionality as a theoretical framework that can be used to guide racialized and gendered analyses and interpretations. In this way, the concept of intersectionality functions as a fundamental aspect of racial or ethnic feminisms and critical race theories (Few-Demo, 2014). One such theory is Critical Race Feminist Theory (CRFT) which was developed in the 1980's through the 1990's. Critical Race Feminist theorists recognized the salience of unique, intersectional discrimination and experiences of oppression and they emphasized the potential in using the legal system to establish progressive social reform within limits (Fogg Davis, 2016). Legal liberalism maintains a universalistic worldview which reflects idealized notions of equality and results in quite consistent legal denial of the potential for unique experiences of discrimination rooted in intersectional identities (Marchetti, 2008). While the critical legal studies movement maintained that law could not be used to bring about change because it would only perpetuate inequalities due to the fact that it was an institution of liberal capitalism, proponents of CRFT recognized the significant power of law in deconstructing racialized criminalization (Fogg Davis, 2016). Not surprisingly, the originator of

intersectionality, Professor Kimberly Crenshaw, most powerfully describes that Critical Race Feminist theorists recognized:

...the transformative dimension of African-Americans re-imagining themselves as full, rights-bearing citizens within the American political imagination. They acknowledged and applauded the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 60s for producing important legal victories, even as they acknowledged and criticized cyclical periods of political retrenchment when civil rights gains have been eroded by conservative jurisprudence and lack of political enforcement. (Crenshaw et al., 1995, p. xxiv as cited in Fogg Davis, 2016, p. 99)

CRFT attempts to supplement discriminatory, formal, single identity policies-- which deny the multiplicity of identity-- with personal narratives, storytelling, cultural criticism, and psychoanalytic theory, each of which contributes to the strength of the CRFT argument for the validation of intersecting identities within law (Fogg Davis, 2016).

CRFT is fundamental to the analysis of the nature of crime and punishment. Crime itself has an intersectional nature in that the axes of our identities are intertwined and reflected in terms of the ways in which we conceive of crime and the ways in which patterns of crime occur across populations (Henne & Troshynski, 2013). Nevertheless, the intersectional dynamics of crime can not always be considered explanatory in terms of populational differences in crime because racial and cultural differences are often mischaracterized and this can lead to the formulation of racist conclusions (Henne & Troshynski, 2013). Furthermore, overemphasis of racial or ethnic differences can serve to mask the ever-changing nature of identity, conceptions of constructed meaning, and within group diversity (Few-Demo, 2014; Henne & Troshynski, 2013; Sheth,

2016). At the same time, intersectional analyses rooted in CRFT must consider the contextually shared histories of discrimination for a marginalized group of people as data should be interpreted with consideration of specific socio-historical contexts of structural inequality (Few-Demo, 2014). For example, race and ethnicity often inform the ways by which women and girls are reified as criminal offenders and it is these socio-historical racial constructs that engender racial/ethnic differences in rates of criminality (Henne & Troshynski, 2013). In this way, CRFT enables researchers to interrogate and visualize how various spheres of inequality intersect to construct diverse conceptions and patterns of crime (Henne & Troshynski, 2013).

The current study will contextualize its analysis in terms of CRFT because this research aims to examine the intersections between law, gender, crime, class, race, and ethnicity regarding the dynamics of the policing of IPA. CRFT provides an essential framework for analysis of this nature as this theory holds that investigation of the functionality of the law requires interpreters of data to recognize and critically interrogate the historically rooted and contemporarily existing structures of subordination and violence that influence the diverse lived experiences of marginalized communities. Additionally, use of a CRFT framework will help to structure this study's analyses in terms of the intersectionality of oppression. In this way, the analytical structure of the study aims to simultaneously illuminate and combat the dominant discourses that overlook, misrepresent, and harm individuals who identify themselves plurally and experience discrimination uniquely (Henne & Troshynski, 2013). Marchetti (2008) asserts that structures of law will not change in terms of inclusivity until legal institutions begin to recognize and respect intersectionality as a concept. As follows, intersectionality must also guide processes of research because the products of such research will inform any legal reform that is to occur. With

considerations of intersectionality and law at the center of its analysis, CRFT has the potential to frame this research in meaningful ways.

Conclusion

This chapter served to contextualize the problem of IPA within the United states as well as to provide an overview of the history and reform of criminal legal responses to IPA.

Additionally, this chapter provided an in-depth discussion of Latinx experienced of IPA in order to present background information that is most relevant to the data set being utilized within this study. Finally, this chapter concluded with a brief discussion of Critical Race Feminist theory--the theoretical framework that guides the nature of analysis of this study. The following chapter will present a review of the existing literature regarding the dynamics of IPA arrest outcomes.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The previous chapter served to contextualize the problem of IPA and to review the history of reforms that have dramatically routinized police responses to IPA. The chapter focused on the unintended consequences that have resulted from mandatory and pro arrest policies and considered how these policies have negatively affected victims of IPA. This chapter provides a review of the available literature on the current state of police discretion in a pro-arrest nation, as well as the data on legal and extra-legal factors considered to be determinants of arrest in incidents of IPA. While general criminal justice research evidences how arrest decision making is influenced by organizational factors, incident factors, and factors related to community setting, research regarding IPA arrest decision making is less extensive and the determinants of arrest decisions are not entirely understood (Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011). The present study will investigate incident level factors that influence the dynamics of arrest decision making. Incident factors can include situational legal factors such as level and type of violence, presence of injury, use of weapons, witnesses, and suspect's presence, or they can include extra-legal factors that are not legally relevant such as demographics of the victim, offender, or responding officer, victim offender relationship, or location and time of the incident (Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011; Lee, Xhang, & Hoover, 2013). It is important to note that the research on arrest decision making in cases of IPA has not drawn consistent findings and the findings that have been established are only suggestive of commonalities within police practices and they thus do not definitively characterize the behaviors of all police responding to IPA

incidents (Visher, 1983).

Police Discretion

Because mandatory and pro-arrest policies mandate or encourage arrest in IPA cases, these policies drastically limit police discretion in terms of IPA response options. Nonetheless, IPA arrest decision making continues to be informed by police discretion (Li et al., 2014). Arrest decisions are context dependent and they are thus heavily influenced by cultural forces and societally held beliefs that shape the extra-legal factors that impact arrest decision-making (Lee, Xhang, & Hoover, 2013; Li et al., 2014). Roark (2016) posits that IPA law enforcement is guided by external factors such as departmental policies in addition to internal factors related to police discretion. Thus, arrest decisions can only be standardized to a certain extent as extralegal factors such as officers' length of work experience, demographic characteristics of offenders, victims, and officers, location and timing of incidents, presence of offenders, officer attitudes towards offenders and victims, and incident severity impactfully affect officer evaluations of IPA incidents and subsequently drive arrest decision processes (Balenovich et al., 2008; Roark, 2016). Though pro-arrest policies do constrain police decisions regarding official responses to IPA (Phillips and Gillham, 2010), discretion persists within the policing of IPA because police maintain a great deal of control over the arrest decision-making process (Ferraro, 1989; Sun, 2007).

Race and Ethnicity

Robinson and Chandek (2000) explain that studies on demographic factors associated with arrest decisions have not drawn consistent findings and their own study determined that demographic factors were not incredibly predictive determinants of arrest. Other studies have

found a significant association between IPA arrest decisions and various demographic variables, one of which is race and ethnicity. The literature regarding the correlation between race and ethnicity and arrest within IPA cases has not drawn consistent or very extensive findings (Kane, 1999). Furthermore, a great deal of the literature concentrates on differences between arrest dynamics for white individuals as compared to Black individuals rather than investigating these dynamics across multiple races/ethnicities.

Much of this research contends that arrest is more likely for Black IPA offenders than it is for white IPA offenders regardless of whether they are male or female (Avakame & Fyfe, 2001; Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011; Visher, 1983). Visher (1983) suggests that Black women are more likely to be arrested than their white counterparts because they are more likely to differ from the traditional, middle class gender norms characterized by passivity and exhibited by older, white, middle class women. These restrictive, binary gender roles for men and women are often not characteristic of Black family cultural patterns and this leads officers to interpret the behavior of Black women as non-conformative which results in Black women not receiving the chivalrous or preferential treatment that is normally extended to white women who are involved in IPA incidents (Visher, 1983). Additionally, a great deal of research has found that female victims are more likely to have an arrest made on their behalf if they are white, older than 40, and wealthy while they are less likely to have an arrest made on their behalf if they are younger, Black, and poor (Avakame & Fyfe, 2001; Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011). These findings illustrate the association between race/ethnicity and arrest as well as the intersectionality between race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and arrest. Lee, Xhang, and Hoover (2013) also demonstrated this intersectionality when they reported that arrest was more likely to occur within IPA incidents that took place in census tracts with high levels of economic

disadvantage and immigration concentration as compared to those that occurred in census tracts with lower levels of economic disadvantage and immigration.

Contrary to the aforementioned research, Lee, Xhang, and Hoover (2013) found that arrest was a more likely outcome for IPA incidents that involved white and Latinx matches of victims and offenders as compared to those that involved Black matches. A potential reason for this finding may be that police considered cases involving Black matches to be less serious as a result of their being regarded as less unusual because Black matches were overrepresented within the sample (Lee, Xhang, & Hoover, 2013). Other research has disagreed altogether with the previously discussed associations between race or ethnicity and arrest. This contrary research has found no association between the race or ethnicity of the victim or offender and arrest outcomes which implies that there is no observed racial bias that affects the arrest decisions of officers responding to IPA cases (Kane, 1999; Tatum & Pence, 2015).

Gender and LGBTQ

Gender has been shown to affect arrest decision making processes in a number of ways, some of which will be discussed in greater detail within the Dual Arrests subsection that is to follow. Conversely, research regarding arrest decisions and LGBTQ identities is tremendously insufficient and the vast majority of IPA arrest research focuses on IPA among heterosexual couples. To begin, some studies have determined that arrest is more likely for IPA cases involving a male suspect and female complainant as compared to IPA cases involving alternative gender matches (Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011; Lee, Xhang, & Hoover, 2013). As previously discussed, gender, race or ethnicity, socioeconomic status and arrest outcomes exhibit intersectionality and a substantial amount of research asserts that female victims are more likely

to have an arrest made on their behalf if they are white, older than 40, and wealthy while they are less likely to have an arrest made on their behalf if they are younger, Black, and poor (Avakame & Fyfe, 2001; Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011). These data are reflective of the association between gender expectations and arrest decisions. Societal stereotypes and gendered expectations of behavior infiltrate and influence all social institutions including the criminal legal system and these stereotypes impact the ways that police view and treat women who act violently (Gilbert, 2002; Miller, 2005). Gendered conceptions of good victims idealize victims who are women, weak, fearful, passive, and delicate and victims who do not fit neatly within these definitions are viewed as less feminine and therefore deviant (Gilbert, 2002; Miller, 2001; Visher, 1983). The behavior of female victims who use violence as a mechanism of self-defense is often viewed as deviant and masculine which leads to misinformed analyses of self-defensive violence and increased rates of arrest for women who use such violence (Gilbert, 2002; Miller, 2001). Thus, women are at increased risk of arrest when they are perceived as deviating from expected gender roles (Miller, 2001).

In addition to gender role expectations, police attitudes reflective of victim blaming have been shown to influence arrest decisions. These attitudes are influenced by the normative sexist attitudes of wider society (Hilton, 1993). For instance, Hilton (1993) reveals that few police officers believe arrest to be the best option in cases of IPA and she explains that this is likely because police do not view offenders as entirely responsible for their actions. Though victims of IPA need increased advocacy and protection, they often do not receive these protections due to the impact of sexist, victim-blaming attitudes on the part of police (Hart, 1993). Attitudes of this nature were examined in Saunders and Size's 1986 study which compared police, victim advocate, and victim views regarding the criminality of wife assault. Each group reportedly

viewed IPA violence as unjustified with the exception of police of whom a majority reportedly viewed IPA violence as justified in cases of infidelity and attributed greater responsibility to the victim as compared to victim advocates and victims (Saunders & Size, 1986). These findings were substantiated by Saunders' 1995 study which found that when officers had full discretion, an officer's propensity to arrest an IPA offender was correlated with the officer's justification of IPA as well as with stereotypes regarding why victims stay.

Further research suggests that victim-blaming attitudes on the part of police have not changed enormously since 1986 despite the substantial changes that have been made in terms of the criminal legal system's systemic response to IPA (Erez & Belknap, 1998). For instance, Belknap and Hartman (2000) revealed that according to IPA victim advocates, the most commonly reported issue regarding the police response to IPA was the police statement, "there is nothing we can do" which suggests a systemic tendency for police to doubt the legitimacy of a victim's reported abuse or perhaps a tendency to minimize the severity of IPA (p. 163). This problem was noted alongside reports of police not believing the victim and subsequently delaying response time and refusing to arrest the offender in one fifth of cases which supports the assertion that sexist and victim-blaming police attitudes persist as determinants of IPA arrest (Belknap & Hartman, 2000).

Socioeconomic Status

Very little is known about whether socioeconomic status has an impact on arrest decision-making in cases of IPA (Cattaneo, 2010). Some studies indicate that offenders of lower socioeconomic status are more likely to be arrested than offenders of higher socioeconomic status (Bachman & Coker, 1995; Smith & Klein, 1984). This finding is supported by Lee,

Xhang, and Hoover's 2013 study which demonstrated that arrest was more likely in IPA cases that occurred in census tracts having high levels of social and economic disadvantage. Similarly, research indicates that police are more likely to make an arrest on behalf of a victim who is wealthy, white and older as compared to the likelihood of an arrest being made on behalf of a victim who is poor, Black, and younger (Avakame & Fyfe, 2001). Though IPA literature often asserts that victims of lower socioeconomic status have more negative experiences dealing with the police, very little evidence exists to provide information as to how or why this is the case (Cattaneo, 2010). Cattaneo (2010) investigated this topic and determined that income and employment did not significantly impact victim's interactions with police though it was hypothesized that socioeconomic status would likely have had an apparent influence on victim-police interactions had it been measured at the neighborhood level rather than at the individual level. Overall, the research on the correlation between socioeconomic status and arrest decisions is not at all substantial and this topic demands further interrogation.

Injury/Level of Violence

The association between evidence of violence and increased potential for offender arrest is well documented within IPA research. Some research asserts that the driving factor behind an officer's arrest decision is the officer's perception of potential risk to the victim (Kane, 1999; Kane, 2000). To assess this risk, police may rely on proxies that indicate severity of physical endangerment as they do not directly witness the violence themselves (Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011). This mechanism of risk evaluation is evidenced by the fact that arrest is highly correlated to indicators of IPA severity such as injuries and use of weapons.

A number of incident variables related to severity of IPA violence have been shown to

predict increased likelihood of offender arrest. First, an offender's use of a weapon is directly correlated to increased likelihood of offender arrest (Avakame & Fyfe, 2001; Bachman & Coker, 1995; Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011; Ferraro, 1989; Lee & Hoover, 2013; Smith, 1987). Research conducted by Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, and Rhodes (2011) suggests that the likelihood of arrest increases for women when a weapon other than a gun or the woman's body is used or when a gun is used and use of alcohol is noted. In contrast, the likelihood of arrest for men increases with the use of any weapon including the body. These researchers presume that this data may imply that police do not consider the use of a woman's body as a weapon to be as harmful as a man's body (Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011).

Another incident variable that has consistently been linked to increased likelihood of offender arrest is the seriousness of the IPA offense. Most research has found that the likelihood of arrest is significantly increased in the case of a felony as compared to a misdemeanor act (Black, 1971; Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011; Ferraro, 1989; Lee, Xhang, & Hoover, 2013; Smith, 1987; Tatum and Pence, 2015). Surprisingly, one study found that the likelihood of arrest *decreased* in IPA incidents that involve sexual assault (Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011). Additionally, some research found that the likelihood of arrest for a woman is decreased when the offense is intimidation though this offense has no impact on arrest outcomes for a man (Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011). This may be due to police assumptions that female intimidation is not harmful for men, or perhaps due to police assumptions that accusations of intimidation are not truthful (Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011).

A third incident variable that appears to be a reliable determinant of arrest is victim injuries. IPA research on determinants of arrest consistently validates the finding that the

presence of victim injuries substantially increases the likelihood of offender arrest (Avakame & Fyfe, 2001; Bachman & Coker, 1995; Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011; Feder, 1996; Ferraro, 1989; Tatum and Pence, 2015). While Smith (1987) and Tatum and Pence (2015) provided evidence to substantiate the claim that repeat incidents of IPA increase the likelihood of offender arrest, Bachman and Coker (1995) argued that first time offenders are actually more likely to be arrested than offenders who have been arrested repeatedly for IPA.

Most of these findings support the assertion that police are more likely to make an arrest when they perceive the potential risk to be higher for the victim. Additionally, Kane (1999) demonstrated that police tended to consider many other factors beyond risk to the victim in cases that did not involve explicit risk measures such as use of a weapon or victim injuries. This finding authenticates the notion that decreased evidence of victim risk increases the potential for police to utilize more discretionary options when making arrest decisions (Kane, 1999).

Officer Perceptions

Attitudinal determinants of arrest refer to patterns in police attitudes that appear to inform officer decision making regarding IPA arrests (Robinson & Chandek, 2000). Though Feder (1996), Robinson and Chandek (2000), and Stalans and Finn (1995) assert that situational incident variables are more predictive of arrest outcomes than variables related to officer attitudes, a significant amount of research maintains that various factors related to officer attitudes and perceptions are in fact valid determinants of arrest. To begin, several early studies reported that victim preference for arrest was correlated with increased chances of offender arrest (Black, 1971; Feder, 1996; Smith, 1987; Visher, 1983). This finding implies that officers may perceive the offender to be more culpable when the victim views the offender as culpable.

Alternatively, Kane (1999) reported that victim preference for arrest was not significantly associated with arrest outcomes.

Other early studies completed prior to the implementation of mandatory arrest policies found that officers were less likely to make arrests when they viewed victims as uncooperative or likely to drop charges (Berk & Loseke, 1981; Ferraro, 1989; Smith, 1987). More recent research supports this assertion and indicates that the likelihood of arrest decreases when victims are perceived as less cooperative by responding officers (Lee, Xhang, & Hoover, 2013). When police arrive at the scene of the incident, women may still be experiencing emotional trauma which might be interpreted by police as combative and less credible behavior (Miller, 2001). Miller (2001) explains that interpretations of trauma such as these are very problematic as they are likely to play a role in decreasing the likelihood of an arrest being made on behalf of victims experiencing trauma as these victims may be perceived as less cooperative. Robinson and Chandek (2000) reported that officer perceptions of cooperativeness were influenced by victims' use of drugs or alcohol as well as by officer perceptions of the likelihood of prosecution. Similarly, Stalans and Finn (1995) reported that officers tended to perceive women as less truthful or more dangerous when they appeared to be abusing alcohol. Alternatively, Kane (2000) argues that the most impactful determinant of arrest decision-making is officer perception of the risk of future IPA which is described in greater detail in the previous section. Overall, research indicates that police perceptions of victims' cooperativeness and risk of future IPA continue to play a role in terms of the dynamics of IPA arrest decision-making. However, some research suggests that attitudinal variables are not very telling determinants of arrest.

Miscellaneous Additional Variables

Though difficult to categorize, many additional variables have been included in models on the determinants of IPA arrests. One such variable is age gap. Lee, Xhang, and Hoover (2013) determined that the likelihood of arrest increased when the difference in age between the suspect and complainant increased. This study also indicated that arrest likelihood increased for IPA incidents occurring late at night, at a residence, or on weekends. Other research suggests that incident location and time do not affect arrest decision making (Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011; Tatum & Pence, 2015). Additionally, Robinson and Chandek (2000) found that incident timing was associated with arrest outcomes only when the incident took place an hour prior to the responding officer's shift being over which decreased the likelihood of arrest being made on behalf of the victim.

Another variable that appears to increase the likelihood of arrest is the use of drugs or alcohol. Research shows that police are more likely to arrest an offender if he or she appears to be under the influence of drugs or alcohol (Avakame & Fyfe, 2001; Berk & Loseke, 1981; Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011; Jones & Belknap, 1999). Research also indicates that the likelihood of arrest is increased when a child is present at the incident which suggests that officers are more inclined to take action in order to protect a child (Tatum & Pence, 2015). As one might assume, suspect presence at the scene of the incident is considered to be one of the strongest predictors of arrest (Feder, 1996; Hirschel et al., 2007; Robinson & Chandek, 2000; Tatum and Pence, 2015). Moreover, the likelihood of arrest is significantly decreased when the suspect is not present at the scene of the incident (Feder, 1996).

Some research confirms that the likelihood of arrest is increased when suspects and complainants are cohabitating (Kane, 1999; Robinson & Chandek, 2000). This assertion is related to research regarding the association between suspect and complainant relationship status

and likelihood of arrest. While Black (1971) and Bachman and Coker (1995) determined that unmarried women experienced an increased likelihood of arrest being made on their behalf, Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, and Rhodes (2011) argued that compared to current spouses, ex-spouses were half as likely to be arrested. Kane (1999) asserted that marital status was not a significant determinant of arrest. Data collected within Boulder County by Jones and Belknap (1999) indicated that marital status was not significantly related to police decisions to jail offenders, but that it was related to police action as police were less likely to take any action when the victim and offender had once been married. This study also determined that the likelihood of arrest was increased for offenders who were intimately involved as a couple with their partners at the time of the incident. Jones and Belknap (1999) suggested that these findings might imply that some police continue to view marriage as deserving or requiring less police intervention or that police are more concerned for the safety of the victim who is still in a relationship with her abuser. Other research presents findings that suggest that offender arrest is even more likely for partners who are married at the time of the incident than it is for partners who are dating or divorced at the time of the incident (Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011).

The present study cannot investigate the impact of factors related to agency organization as the data are only representative of the structure and policies of one criminal legal system organization-- the Longmont Police Department. Nonetheless, variance in agency policies and resources significantly influences many police decisions including the decision to arrest within IPA cases (Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011; Tatum & Pence, 2015). Research shows that generally speaking, the likelihood of domestic violence arrest increased among smaller agencies with fewer female officers and smaller budgets (Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes,

2011). Robinson and Chandek (2000) found that women officers tend to make fewer IPA arrests compared to their male counterparts, and they hypothesized that this is likely the result of female officers responding more frequently than male officers to victim preferences (Robinson & Chandek, 2000). Additionally, some evidence suggests that arrest rates are greater for trained, novice officers as compared to those for untrained, novice officers as well as experienced, older officers (Stalans & Finn, 1995).

Dual Arrests

To effectively evaluate the dynamics of arrest decision-making within IPA cases, the variables that contribute to dual arrest outcomes must be considered. Though research suggests that the likelihood of arrest is increased for cases in which only the man is identified as the offender as compared to cases in which both partners are identified as the offenders, Roark (2016) indicates that women are more likely to be dually arrested than solely arrested (as cited by Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011). The increased rate of dual arrest for women is impacted by who contacts the police. Roark (2016) found that women who contacted the police themselves were 500% more likely than their male partners to be dually arrested.

Some research contends that IPA incidents which result in dual arrest are often less violent than incidents that result in a single arrest (Martin, 1997). This claim is supported by Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, and Rhodes (2011) who discovered that cases involving aggravated assaults were six times more likely to result in dual arrest while cases involving simple assault were 11 times more likely to result in dual arrest. Additionally, these researchers determined that incidents involving charges of intimidation were five times more likely than incidents not involving intimidation to result in dual arrest and they suggested that this finding could be the

result of police having insufficient physical evidence to determine a primary aggressor (Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011). The use of a weapon within the incident may also impact the ability of officers to determine the primary aggressor. That is, when police are called to respond to an incident due to the involvement of a weapon, the likelihood of dual arrest is increased (Belknap & Hartman, 2000; Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, and Rhodes, 2011). Belknap and Hartman (2000) propose that this association may be related to the fact the use of a weapon sometimes indicates that the victim is trying to defend herself which could impair police ability to determine a primary aggressor. This data substantiates the conviction that police inability or unwillingness to distinguish between primary aggression and self-defense is a pressing issue that contributes to increased rates of arrest for women due to increased likelihood of dual arrest outcomes (Miller, 2001).

A substantial body of research demonstrates that IPA incidents which involve alcohol or drugs are more likely to result in dual arrests (Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011; Martin, 1997; Muftić, Bouffard, and Bouffard, 2007; Roark, 2016). Roark (2016) found that when both parties used alcohol or drugs, the man's likelihood of dual arrest increased by 126% which suggests that police have greater difficulty determining a primary aggressor when both parties are intoxicated. In contrast, women's odds of dual arrest increased by 142% when only her partner was under the influence of drugs or alcohol which may indicate that police perceive women to be more culpable than men when fighting with an intoxicated partner (Roark, 2016).

Though data presented by Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, and Rhodes (2011) demonstrated that dual arrest was less likely in predominantly white communities, other research asserts that dual arrest is a more likely outcome for women and men who are white (Martin, 1997; Roark,

2016). Research also points to increased likelihood of dual arrest for young couples (Martin, 1997; Roark, 2016). Another variable that is considered to be a determinant of dual arrest is relationship status. Martin (1997) found that the majority of couples who were dually arrested were co-habiting and unmarried. This finding was contradicted by Roark (2016) who discovered that the likelihood of dual arrest decreased for couples who were not in a relationship or were separated at the time of the incident. This negative correlation may be because police can more easily distinguish a primary aggressor when couples are not in a relationship (Roark, 2016).

Conclusion

This chapter provided an overview of the available research regarding arrest dynamics. As the chapter demonstrates, an enormous host of factors have been shown to be associated with various arrest decision outcomes. Research on this topic is not entirely consistent and continued arrest dynamics research is thus necessary in order to inform a more complete understanding of the workings of the criminal justice system's response to IPA. The following chapters will discuss the current study and its role in terms of contributing to the literature on IPA arrest decision-making.

CHAPTER III: METHODS

Introduction

The previous chapter was preceded by an overview of trends in IPA, the history of IPA and institutional IPA responses within the United states, and the diversity of IPA experiences. This chapter was followed by a review of the existing literature pertaining to factors which are associated with arrest decisions in IPA cases within the United states. These chapters provided a great deal of context regarding IPA arrest decision-making dynamics. The three chapters that are to follow will build on the research that has been presented by contributing to the data on IPA arrest decision-making.

The current chapter will outline the methodological mechanisms used to analyze the data that was interpreted within this study. This data set was graciously supplied by the Longmont Police Department of Colorado with the enormously appreciated aid of Sandy Campanella. The data contained represent all of the Longmont Police Department police reports for cases of IPA that occurred during 2016. Though a number of studies have been conducted with the intention of investigating variables that influence arrest decisions in IPA cases, very few of these studies have analyzed recent data that potentially reflects the impact of over twenty years of a mandatory arrest policy being in place. Because the majority of research asserts that mandatory and pro-arrest policies have significantly increased the number of dual arrests as well as women arrested for IPA, it is imperative that studies aim to determine exactly why these arrest rates have increased. This type of determination requires an analysis of IPA incident and demographic variables that appear to be associated with arrest decisions. This study revolves around such an

analysis and will be one of the first to analyze the Longmont Police Department DARC data set. Furthermore, the racial/ethnic makeup of the sample lends itself to an analysis that focuses on variance and similarity in arrest decision-making processes for IPA cases involving Latinx individuals as compared to those involving white individuals. This is an important area of research as the majority of research on IPA arrest and race/ethnicity has been inconclusive and has emphasized differences between Black and white individuals rather than individuals of all races/ethnicities.

Data Collection

The Longmont Police Department DARC data set has been compiled by the LEVI Committee and it has been used as a record of police responses to IPA incidents within Longmont, Colorado. The data set includes information regarding a number of incident variables and responding officers are responsible for categorically inputting the data that pertain to the IPA incidents to which they have responded. Each year, new variables are added to the data set in order to establish a more comprehensive history of IPA police records for the region. For instance, data on victim and suspect race and ethnicity were not included until the year 2016. This data was reported within written police records, but it was not electronically entered until it was needed by the present study. Just as with the majority of variables listed as part of the police reports, race and ethnicity data were police-reported and thus dependent on officer perceptions. Exceptions to police perception data include victim and suspect names and ages as well as offending history of suspects.

Sample

According to the most recent United States Census Bureau Data from 2010, 50.7% of

Longmont, CO residents are women, 69.3% are white (not Hispanic or Latinx), 24.6% are Latinx, 0.9% are Black, 1.0% are American Indian or Alaska Native, 3.2% are Asian/Asian American, 0.1% are Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and 2.9% are two or more races/ethnicities. Regarding SES, median household income is \$62,208 and 14.1% of individuals are considered to be under the poverty line. Lastly, 87.3% of individuals over age 25 have a high school degree or higher, and 22.4% of residents over five years of age speak a language other than English at home (United States Census Bureau, 2010). These demographics represent the potential demographics of the sample as the sample is representative of the population of Longmont, Colorado. While the sample size was 741 cases, some race/ethnicity data were missing which resulted in a sample size of 734 for analyses including race/ethnicity as a variable of interest. The ages of individuals included within this sample ranged from 16 to 86 for victims and 14-73 for offenders. No gender data was missing within the 2016 DARC data.

Variables

The 2016 DARC data set categorized suspect/victim race/ethnicity as either white, Latinx, Black, Asian American/Pacific Islander, or Native American. Data regarding arrest dynamics included the five dichotomous outcomes of whether there was an arrest, a felony charge, a misdemeanor charge, a deferred sentence, and whether the charges were dismissed. After coding for missing data, new variables were created to organize the information regarding the nature of IPA crimes and the number of crimes reported for each case. Additionally, new variables were created to determine the percentage of intraracial couples, the percentage of same-sex couples, the percentages of six different relationship types, and the percentage of individuals who were repeat victims, offenders, or victim-offenders within the year 2016 only. The data set

included a variable for repeat offenders from all years since the department had started collecting the data (about 4 years). Bivariate analyses and multivariate logistic regression models were used to analyze each of the aforementioned variables. Overall, this study maintained a distinct focus on determining the relationships between race/ethnicity, gender, incident characteristics, and arrest outcomes within IPA cases.

Data Analysis

The data analysis was performed using the program SPSS. After cleaning the 2016 DARC data set and computing the aforementioned variables, initial frequencies were determined for suspect and victim race/ethnicity, gender, age, relationship status, and repeat offenders. These frequencies are presented in Tables 1 and 2. Bivariate chi-square analyses were then used to analyze nominal data pertaining to suspect/victim race ethnicity matches. The results of these analyses are presented within Table 3. Bivariate chi-square analyses were also used to analyze nominal and ratio level data pertaining to only Latinx and white suspects and victims (given that the cell sizes were too small to conduct meaningful analyses on other races/ethnicities). The results of these analyses are not presented within tables but they are discussed in great detail in the findings chapter. Lastly, binary logistic regressions were used to analyze the association between ten independent variables and four distinct arrest outcome variables. Prior to performing these logistic regressions, analyses were performed to check for multicollinearity between the ten independent variables. For all analyses, significance was determined at the $p \leq 0.05$, 0.01, or 0.001 levels.

Limitations

All though this data set provided a substantial amount of information from which

significant and important conclusions could be drawn, the study was not without limitations. To begin, the race/ethnicity data was reported by police based on their assumptions of suspect and victim race/ethnicity. Though this information is important to consider due to the fact that this study's analysis focuses on the ways in which officer perceptions and evaluations affect arrest decision-making, race and ethnicity data that is assumed by police is very likely to be misinformed and the accuracy of the racial/ethnic demographics of the sample cannot be assessed. Additionally, these data represent IPA cases involving mainly Latinx and white individuals. As a result, the majority of analyses emphasized comparisons between Latinx and white persons because other racial/ethnic comparisons could not yield significant results due to very small Black, Asian American/Pacific Islander, and Native American sample sizes. While this Latinx-specific research is important as it has largely been neglected within the literature on determinants of IPA arrest, analyses of a sample with greater racial/ethnic diversity would enable broader, more diversified findings in terms of race and ethnicity. Furthermore, the racial/ethnic distinctions included within the data are very limited and there is no recognition of bi- or multi-racial/ethnic identities. These data would be beneficial as they would enable more comprehensive analysis of the associations between race/ethnicity and arrest decision-making within IPA cases.

Another limitation of the study is that the data sample was almost entirely comprised of heterosexual couples (99.95%) which could mean that same-sex IPA is less likely to be taken seriously by police or perhaps less likely to be reported to the police by victims or other witnesses. IPA data on same-sex couples is limited at the outset and data on the dynamics of arrest within same-sex IPA cases is limited to an even greater extent. This study would provide imperative contributions regarding this research if same-sex couples were included within the

data, but unfortunately, this was not the case. Similarly, the data set did not include any information on victim or suspect socioeconomic status (SES). Research on the correlation between factors related to SES and arrest decision-making has yielded rather inconsistent results and inclusion of SES factors within this study's analysis would not only have contributed to the literature, but also strengthened the analysis of other associations.

This study is further limited by the fact that the data set does not include any records of dual arrest or incident injuries. These are incredibly important aspects of IPA arrests and IPA arrest decision-making and exclusion of these variables from the study's analysis limits the breadth of possible results. Additionally, these data would have been an important component of the analysis regarding IPA arrest dynamics variability among different races/ethnicities. Similarly, data on use of weapons, crime types, and factors relating to the involvement of children were underreported which may have impacted the validity of the associations determined by the study. These data are also important to consider in terms of arrest dynamics and underreporting within the data may have skewed the results of data analyses. Also, more information is reported for variables related to suspects than to victims. Understanding factors associated with police determination of victims is another critical aspect of analysis regarding arrest dynamics that would have helped to substantiate the findings presented within this study.

Though the data set is large enough to yield significant statistical findings, an even larger sample size may have enabled more extensive findings. A larger sample size could have been assessed if DARC data from years prior to 2016 could be analyzed. Unfortunately, however, categories of data have been added to each year's reports which makes cross comparisons between years very difficult. For example, race and ethnicity data were only added to the DARC data set in the year 2016 and racial/ethnic comparisons of yearly reports would thus not be

possible. Moreover, analysis of this data set does not allow for investigation of organizational factors that may influence arrest decisions as this data set only reflects the policies and resources of a single police department. Despite these limitations, the data provide ample information on many IPA variables. If time permitted however, more multivariate analyses would be conducted in order to more reliably confirm findings.

CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS

Introduction

This study aims to contribute to the literature on predictors of arrest dynamics to help establish a more thorough understanding of how and why individual and populational experiences of arrest may differ. The previous chapter provided an explanation of the 2016 DARC data set being utilized in this study as well as an overview of the mechanisms of analysis that were used to understand this data. This chapter will report the findings of those statistical analyses.

Overview of Victim and Suspect Characteristics

Selected descriptive statistics for the sample of analysis are presented in Table 1. Though these characteristics data were not analyzed to determine statistical significance, they provide information regarding the composition of the sample. In total, the sample size amounted to 741 cases. As would be predicted by feminist IPA theorists, the majority of victims were women (77.7%) while the majority of suspects were men (77.1%). Unlike gender characteristics, suspect and victim age ranges were quite similar with suspects' ages ranging from 14 to 73 years ($\mu = 34.4$) and victims' ages ranging from 16 to 86 years ($\mu = 33.4$). Age data were reported for 735 out of 741 total cases which indicated that this data was only missing for a very small percentage of cases. As Table 1 illustrates, suspects and victims were divided into four age categories to determine the most common age ranges of suspects and victims, respectively. The 25 to 34 year age range was most common for both victims (37.3%) and suspects (32.7%). The second most

common age range was 35 to 44 years which included 23.1% of victims and 26.4% of suspects. 22.4% of victims and 21.6% of suspects fell into the 24 and younger age range while 17.2% of victims and 19.3% of suspects fell within the 45 and older age range.

The race/ethnicity characteristics of the sample guided the direction of analysis for the remainder of the study. As evidenced by the data presented within Table 1, Latinx and white victims and suspects comprised the great majority of the sample. Specifically, white and Latinx victims respectively constituted 63.6% and 33.5% of the total 736 victims for whom race/ethnicity data were reported. Similarly, white and Latinx suspects respectively constituted 56.4% and 37.4% of the total 737 suspects for whom race/ethnicity data were reported. While the sample did not include any Native American victims, Black and Asian American/Pacific Islander victims amounted to 1.3% and 0.9% of total victims, respectively. Compared to Black victims, Black suspects made up a slightly greater percentage of total suspects (4.6%), but suspects identified as Asian American/Pacific Islander and Native American only comprised 0.7% and 0.4% of the total suspect sample, respectively. Due to the overwhelmingly white and Latinx racial/ethnic composition of the sample, the data analyses that followed mainly concentrated on comparisons between Latinx and white suspects and victims.

Two measures were used to determine the prevalence of repeat offenders and victims within the sample. The first of these measures was a simple determination of repeat offender frequency based on the reported DARC data for repeat offenders. This data was based on the entire DARC data set rather than just the DARC data for the year 2016. These frequency measures thus enabled consideration of the significance and effects of having ever been categorized as a repeat offender. Frequency measurements based on these data indicated that 53% of offenders within the 2016 sample were repeat offenders while 47% of offenders were

first time offenders. These measurements were very valuable in terms of further analysis, however, they did not provide any information regarding repeat victims. To determine the number of victims and offenders who had been involved in more than one incident of IPA either as repeat victims or offenders or as victim-offenders, the data were thoroughly inspected and ordered in such a way that individuals who appeared in more than one case were revealed. This frequency measurement confirmed that 57% of individuals within the sample had not repeatedly engaged with the police due to IPA within the past year while 43% of individuals within the sample had been repeatedly reported as victims, offenders, or victim-offenders within the past year. Thus, over two-fifths of the victims and suspects in the 2016 data set had previous domestic violence encounters with the police as either victims and/or suspects.

Table 1 concludes by presenting relationship status data on a case by case basis. Unlike the aforementioned characteristics, relationship status data was not reported separately for victims and suspects as it pertains to both the victim and the suspect within each case. As with age data, relationship status data was reported for 735 cases total. The data set initially included seven relationship categories but two of these categories-- co-habiting and living together-- were combined into a single category as these relationship types were assumed to be too similar to be considered separately. Suspects and victims who were co-habiting or living together (23.26%), dating (20.41%), married (18.10%), or ex-girlfriends or boyfriends (23.84%) represented the most common relationship types. Suspects and victims who were separated (7.76%) or divorced (6.53) were least common. It is important to note that only four cases involved same-sex couples meaning that if the suspect was male in 77.1% of cases, the victim was female in 99.995% of those cases and if the suspect was female in 22.9% of cases, the victim was male in 99.995% of those cases.

Crosstabulation of Suspect and Victim Race/Ethnicity

A more in depth investigation of sample characteristics related to race/ethnicity is presented within Tables 2 and 3. Table 2 compares the percentages of each distinct racial/ethnic victim/suspect match within the sample. The crosstabulation of victim race/ethnicity with suspect race/ethnicity across all sample races/ethnicities was statistically significant with a χ^2 value of 861.265 at the $p \leq 0.001$ level. This significance indicates that there is a statistically confirmed association between suspect race/ethnicity and victim race/ethnicity which is evidenced by the fact that the majority of racial/ethnic matches of victims and suspects reported in the table are intraracial. As previously stated, white suspects made up the majority of suspects (56.68%) and 88.7% of these white suspects were involved in cases of IPA with white victims. Latinx suspects were the second largest group of suspects (37.60%) and 75% of these suspects were involved in IPA cases with Latinx victims. Though Asian American/Pacific Islander suspects only constituted 0.68% of the total suspect sample, 100% of Asian American/Pacific Islander suspects perpetrated IPA against Asian American/Pacific Islander victims.

Though a significant pattern of intraracial IPA appeared within this analysis, there were some exceptions to this trend. First, Black victims only made up 1.4% of total victims while Black suspects amounted to 4.63% of total suspects. These percentages reveal that the majority of this sample's Black suspects could not have been involved in intraracial cases of IPA. Black intraracial cases only constituted 5.88% of IPA incidents involving Black offenders while cases involving Black suspects and white victims comprised 85.3% of these such cases. Similarly, no Native American victims were included within the sample, but 100% of the three cases involving Native American offenders were interracial incidents involving white victims. The proportions of

Black and Native American individuals within this sample are far too small to yield significant results, however, the trend that is exhibited regarding victim race/ethnicity matches among the small sample of Black and Native American suspects may reflect important racial/ethnic distinctions regarding officer determination of IPA suspects. This interpretation will be discussed in greater detail within the following chapter.

Overall, the data reported within Table 2 indicate the significant prevalence of white and Latinx intraracial matches of suspects and victims as well as the significance of interracial matches involving white and Latinx individuals or white and Black individuals. Table 3 investigates these findings more intensively by analyzing the relationship between variance in inter- and intraracial couples and suspect gender. Among white intraracial couples, 26.6% of suspects were women while 73.4% of suspects were men. In comparison, 19.8% of suspects were women and 80.19% of suspects were men among Latinx intraracial couples. Black, Asian American/Pacific Islander, and Native American dyads are not included in this table because the sample sizes are either very small or nonexistent.

The dyads that include interracial couples also exhibit some variance. Among couples of white suspects and Latinx victims (5.18%), 26.6% of suspects were women and 73.7% were men. Conversely, among couples of Latinx suspects and white victims (9.26%), 19.1% of suspects were women while 80.9% were men. Suspect gender percentages exhibited even more divergence among white and Black interracial couples. For couples of white suspects and Black victims (0.95%), 42.9% of suspects were women and 57.1% of suspects were men. Among couples of Black suspects and white victims (3.95%) however, 10.3% of suspects were women while 89.7% of suspects were men. Though these sample sizes are incredibly small, these data perhaps suggest that gender-based differences in the likelihood of being labeled by police as the

offender may be associated with differences in victim and suspect race/ethnicity. This concept will be further interrogated within the following chapter as well. It is important to note that the percentages presented within Tables 2 and 3 differ very slightly from those reported within Table 1. This variance is due to the fact that Table 1 presents data on victim and suspect race/ethnicity separately while Tables 2 and 3 report victim race/ethnicity as it relates to suspect race/ethnicity. These different analyses led to a marginally different distribution of missing race/ethnicity data within Tables 2 and 3 which resulted in the slight variance that is exhibited in these percentages as compared to those reported within Table 1.

Comparisons Between White and Latinx Suspects

Though not reported within any tables, the results of analyses of possible correlations between suspect gender, suspect race/ethnicity, and various incident characteristics revealed a number of important findings. For these analyses, only Latinx and white suspects were compared for reasons previously explained. Additionally, the unit of analysis for this study was the domestic violence case responded to by the police--- not the victim and offender. Thus, each incident characteristic was analyzed individually to determine its potential association to suspect race/ethnicity and suspect gender.

The first of these chi-square analyses compared the statistical significance of the association between intraracial couples and suspect gender among Latinx and white suspects. Though these associations were not statistically significant ($p = 0.975$ for white suspects and $p = 0.707$ for Latinx suspects), the data indicate that for both Latinx and white suspects, the majority of female and male suspects were suspects within intraracial relationships.

The analysis then focused on associations between relationship status and suspect gender

among white and Latinx suspects. Among cases involving white suspects, the majority of both female and male suspects were co-habiting/living together or ex-boy/girlfriends. White male suspects were represented slightly more within the ex-boy/girlfriend category while white female suspects were represented slightly more within the co-habiting/living together category. Chi-square tests revealed that the distribution of relationship types among white male suspects as compared to that among white female suspects was not statistically different. In terms of Latinx versus white comparisons of representation, both racial/ethnic groups of combined male and female suspects were heavily represented within the ex-boy/girlfriend category, however, white suspects were much more heavily represented within the co-habiting/living together category while Latinx suspects were much more heavily represented within the dating category. The chi square test for couples involving Latinx suspects revealed that the distribution of relationship types among Latinx male suspects as compared to that among Latinx female suspects was statistically different ($\chi^2 = 11.614$, $p = 0.04$). This is evidenced by the fact that among cases involving Latinx suspects, the majority of female suspects were married (34.7%) while only 16.4% of male suspects were married. Additionally, the majority of Latinx male suspects were represented within the ex-boy/girlfriend category (25.1%) while only 16.3% of Latinx female suspects were represented within this category.

A number of the analyses investigating the relationships between suspect gender and many incident-specific variables among cases involving Latinx or white suspects did not yield any significant results or any results that were very close to being statistically significant. These analyses included the following incident variables: suspect alcohol or drug use, repeat victim or offender, repeat offender within all DARC data, charges dismissed in lieu of plea, charges included assault, only assault charged, use of weapons reported, child present, child witness, and

child abuse charged. Though the chi square tests analyzing weapon use, charges included assault, and only assault charged were not statistically significant, these findings should be interpreted with a great deal of caution as these data were not reported for a substantial number of cases. Frequencies regarding weapon use, charges included assault, only assault charged, number of crimes charged, and more than one crime charged were all determined based on the the same reported data for 352 white suspects and 235 Latinx suspects meaning that for each of these variables, data were only collected for 84.21% of cases involving white suspects and 84.84% of cases involving Latinx suspects. Furthermore, the prevalence of weapon use within these already under-reported weapons data is abnormally low at 0.6% and 3.4% for cases involving white and Latinx suspects, respectively.

Though the analysis of the association between suspect gender and more than one crime charged suggested a relationship between these factors that was almost significant among Latinx suspects ($p = 0.06$), this could also be the result of the aforementioned missing data which would indicate either that this relationship is actually stronger than reported, or on the contrary, that the relative significance of this relationship is over estimated. While these data are not statistically significant, they do exhibit discernible differences in percentages of more than one crime charged for cases involving Latinx versus white suspects. Over one-fifth (22.7%) of cases involving white female suspects and 31.8% of cases involving white male suspects resulted in suspects being charged with more than one crime. Conversely, 35.6% of cases involving Latinx female suspects and 51.1% of cases involving Latinx male suspects resulted in suspects being charged with more than one crime. The racial/ethnic variance within these percentages is also exhibited within the data on the association between number of crimes charged and suspect gender. Specifically, the percentage of Latinx female suspects charged with 2 crimes is more

than double that for white female suspects charged with 2 crimes and the percentage of Latinx male suspects charged with 3 or 4 crimes is more than double that for white male suspects charged with 3 or 4 crimes. Additionally, while the analysis of the association between number of crimes charged and suspect gender determined a statistically significant relationship between these variables for cases involving Latinx suspects ($p = 0.007$). This significance as well as the lack of significance among cases involving white suspects should be considered cautiously due to the missing data.

Though the data regarding child presence, child witness, and child abuse charged was reported for almost all of the cases involving white and Latinx suspects, none of the analyses of these variables yielded significant results which implies that the proportional prevalence of each of these factors is not significantly different for cases involving white and Latinx female versus male suspects. The percentage of cases for which child presence was reported was similar for cases involving white suspects (17%) as compared to those involving Latinx suspects (21.6%). However, the percentage of cases for which a child witness was reported was vastly greater for cases involving Latinx suspects (22.4%) as compared to those involving white suspects (9.5%). This pattern was repeated regarding the different percentages of child abuse charged for cases involving Latinx suspects (16.7%) as compared to those involving white suspects (7%).

Though a number of these chi-square analyses were not statistically significant, there were also many analyses that did yield statistically significant results. First, victim's use of alcohol or drugs was significantly associated with suspect gender for cases involving Latinx suspects ($\chi^2 = 9.396$, $p = 0.002$). For cases with Latinx female suspects, 22.4% of victims were reported to have been using alcohol or drugs as compared to only 7.7% of victims for cases with Latinx male suspects. Additionally, though no significant differences were determined with

regards to the percentage of victims who used alcohol or drugs in cases involving white female versus male suspects, the percentage of victims who used alcohol or drugs in cases involving white female suspects (9.3%), white male suspects (9.5%), and Latinx male suspects (7.7%) was less than half of that for cases involving Latinx female suspects.

Gendered comparisons of strangulation reports revealed a significant correlation between suspect gender and reports of strangulation among cases involving white suspects ($\chi^2 = 9.825$, $p = 0.002$). Strangulation was noted in 8.5% of cases with white male suspects and in no (0.0%) cases with white female suspects. This association was not statistically significant among Latinx suspects, but it approached significance ($p = 0.063$). Strangulation was reported in 10.4% of cases with Latinx male suspects and only 2.0% of cases with Latinx female suspects indicating that Latinx and white percentages were roughly equivalent. Thus, though strangulation was associated with suspect gender, it did not appear to be associated with suspect race/ethnicity.

Analyses of the relationship between suspect gender and whether or not second degree assault was charged revealed a statistically significant association among cases involving both Latinx ($\chi^2 = 5.574$, $p = 0.018$) and white suspects ($\chi^2 = 4.133$, $p = 0.042$). When the percentages of Latinx versus white male and female suspects charged with second degree assault are compared, there is very little difference between these percentages among female suspects, but among male suspects, the percentage of Latinx suspects charged with second degree assault (10.4%) is almost double that of white suspects (5.6%). Similarly, analyses of the association between suspect gender and whether an arrest was made revealed that the percentages of both male and female suspects arrested were slightly higher among Latinx suspects as compared to those among white suspects. A significant association between these variables was only found for Latinx suspects ($\chi^2 = 4.500$, $p = 0.034$). Interestingly, the percentages of female suspects who

were arrested were higher than those of male suspects who were arrested among both white and Latinx suspects.

Just as with analyses of gender and arrest, chi-square tests used to determine the relationship between suspect gender and dismissal of charges, as well as between suspect gender and a deferred sentence, indicated that these relationships were only significant among Latinx suspects. The deferred sentence outcome was significantly associated with Latinx suspect gender ($\chi^2 = 30.891$, $p = 0.000$) and the charges dismissed outcome was significantly related to Latinx suspect gender ($\chi^2 = 4.676$, $p = 0.031$). Almost three-tenths (28.6%) of Latinx female suspects received deferred sentences, while only 4.1% of Latinx male suspects, 16.7% of white female suspects, and 9.8% of white male suspects received deferred sentences. This higher percentage among Latinx female suspects was also reflected in the charges dismissed data. Charges were dismissed for 10.2% of Latinx female suspects, while they were only dismissed for 3.2% of Latinx male suspects, 8.3% of white female suspects, and 6.9% of white male suspects. These findings suggest that Latinas may be arrested with less evidence compared to other gender-race/ethnicity groups.

Felony and misdemeanor charges were the final variables explored within these bivariate analyses. Regarding analyses of the relationships between suspect gender and felony charge and suspect gender and misdemeanor charge, statistical significance was shown for both Latinx and white suspects. Felony charge was significantly associated with white suspect gender at the ($\chi^2 = 9.089$, $p = 0.003$) and it was significantly associated with Latinx suspect gender ($\chi^2 = 11.883$, $p = 0.001$). Less than one-tenth (7.4%) of white female suspects and (6.1%) Latinx female suspects were charged with felony, while 20.0% of white male suspects and 29.9% of Latinx male suspects received felony charges. Misdemeanor charge was significantly associated with both

white ($\chi^2 = 4.103$, $p = 0.43$) and Latinx suspect gender ($\chi^2 = 16.308$, $p = 0.000$). More specifically, 60.2% of white female suspects and 73.5% of Latinx female suspects were charged with misdemeanors, while 48.9% of white male suspects and 41.6% of Latinx male suspects received misdemeanour charges.

Binary Logistic Regressions

Tables 4 through 7 report the results of the 4 binary logistic regressions that were used to evaluate the proportional effect of 10 predictor variables on each of the 4 possible criminal legal system outcomes: arrest (Table 4), felony charge (Table 5), misdemeanor charge (Table 6), and deferred sentence (Table 7). The predictor (independent) variables included suspect gender, suspect race/ethnicity, ever married, strangulation reported, repeat offender from DARC data, intraracial couple, child abuse charged, age difference (suspect age minus victim age), suspect using alcohol or drugs (SAOD), and victim using alcohol or drugs (VAOD). As was the case for the previous bivariate analyses, only Latinx and white comparisons were made within these analyses. Suspect gender and race/ethnicity were equal to 1 when the suspect was female and Latinx and equal to 0 when the suspect was male and white, respectively. Child abuse charged was equal to 0 when child abuse was charged and equal to 1 when it was not charged. The binary variables ever married, strangulation reported, repeat offender from DARC data, intraracial couple, suspect using alcohol or drugs, and victim using alcohol or drugs were equal to 1 when they were present within the case and equal to 0 when they were absent. Age difference (suspect-victim) was equal to 1 when the value was greater or less than 0 years (suspect was either older or younger than victim) and equal to 0 when the value was equal to 0 (no difference in age between suspect and victim). 361 cases (52.9% of total) were included in the analysis for each

outcome variable.

Regarding the dependent variable arrest made, the Omnibus Test of Model Coefficients indicated that the model was predictive of arrest likelihood at an alpha level of $p \leq 0.001$. Suspect using alcohol or drugs ($\beta = 1.522$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 4.580$) and repeat offender from DARC data ($\beta = 0.842$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 2.321$) were both significantly associated with increased likelihood of arrest ($p \leq 0.001$). The variable suspect using alcohol or drugs was predicted to most substantially increase the likelihood of arrest as compared to all other variables that exhibited significant associations. Suspect race/ethnicity ($\beta = 0.694$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 2.001$), and intraracial couple ($\beta = 0.852$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 2.343$) also showed strong significant associations with increased likelihood of arrest at an alpha level of $p \leq 0.05$. In terms of decreased likelihood, the variable ever married ($\beta = -0.723$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 0.485$) was significantly associated with decreased likelihood of arrest ($p \leq 0.05$).

The Omnibus Test of Model Coefficients indicated that the model used for the analysis of felony outcome was predictive of this outcome ($p \leq 0.05$). The odds of a felony charge were only significantly associated with the variable strangulation reported ($\beta = 2.041$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 7.698$). Strangulation reported was shown to significantly increase the likelihood of a felony outcome by over 600% ($p \leq 0.005$). The variables suspect gender ($\beta = -0.520$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 0.595$) and victim using alcohol or drugs ($\beta = -0.529$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 0.589$) were not significantly related to the felony charge outcome but they did appear to be associated with a decreased likelihood of a felony charge.

The Omnibus Test of Model Coefficients indicated that the model used for the analysis of misdemeanor outcome was predictive of this outcome ($p \leq 0.001$). Suspect gender ($\beta = 0.540$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 1.715$), child abuse not being charged ($\beta = 1.756$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 5.787$), and suspect using alcohol or drugs ($\beta = 0.662$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 1.938$) were each significantly associated with an

increased likelihood of a misdemeanor charge ($p \leq 0.05$). The analysis revealed that when child abuse was not charged, this would result in the greatest increase in the likelihood of a misdemeanor outcome. Suspect using alcohol or drugs and suspect gender were shown to comparatively increase the likelihood of misdemeanor charge. The analysis illustrated that the variables ever married ($\beta = -0.561$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 0.571$) and strangulation reported ($\beta = -1.712$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 0.180$) were significantly associated with decreased likelihood of misdemeanor charge ($p \leq 0.05$). Ever married was predicted to increase the likelihood of misdemeanor charge by three times the increase in likelihood predicted for strangulation reported.

The Omnibus Test of Model Coefficients indicated that the model used for the analysis of deferred sentence outcome was predictive of this outcome ($p \leq 0.001$). Only two independent variables were significantly associated with deferred sentence outcome. Suspect using alcohol or drugs ($\beta = 1.187$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 3.227$) was shown to significantly increase the likelihood of deferred sentence ($p \leq 0.005$). On the other hand, being a repeat offender from DARC data ($\beta = -2.612$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 0.073$) was shown to significantly decrease the likelihood of deferred sentence ($p \leq 0.001$).

Conclusion

This chapter presented the findings yielded by the various statistical analyses performed in order to interpret the 2016 DARC dataset. The following chapter will discuss the significance and meaning of these findings as well as whether or not these results corroborate or negate the current literature. This chapter will close with suggestions for policy implications and future research based on the findings presented within this study.

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

Despite the drastic reform of the criminal legal system's response to IPA that occurred in the 1980's, IPA continues to be an enormous issue within the United States. Since the implementation of mandatory and pro-arrest laws, many studies have demonstrated that the number of women arrested for IPA and the number of IPA dual arrests have both substantially increased (e.g., Martin, 1997; Miller, 2001, 2005). The current study findings indicate that the criminal legal system's reformation is likely to have contributed to these striking changes in the arrest dynamics of IPA.

Victim advocates had not hoped for increased arrests of women when pushing for the increased criminalization of IPA between the 1960's and 1980's. Evidently, the current criminal justice response to IPA must be interrogated in order to establish a system that could more effectively mediate safety for IPA victims and discourage IPA offending by addressing the institutional policies and practices that contribute to the perpetuation of IPA. This type of system analysis requires that we aim to better understand the dynamics of IPA arrest decision-making as these dynamics are what effectuate helpful police responses for some victims while creating distinct problems of re-victimization and criminalization for others. In order to contribute to this research on arrest dynamics, this study focused on analyzing a number of factors that may or may not contribute to the likelihood of various arrest outcomes. Due to the overwhelmingly white and Latinx racial/ethnic composition of the sample, this study's data analyses concentrated on comparisons between Latinx and white suspects and victims. Given how little quantitative

data addresses IPA in the Latinx community, this study provides an important contribution. Moreover, as noted in the review of the literature, there has been a dearth of IPA police-response research that has been conducted in the last two decades. Thus, the current study helps to fill this troubling gap in the literature whereby Latinx IPA cases have largely been overlooked.

Major Findings

This study's data analysis produced a number of notable findings with important implications regarding police responses to IPA. To begin, a greater percentage of women were victims rather than offenders as compared to men across all racial/ethnic categories. Thus, despite longstanding mandatory arrest policies that have been shown to have increased the number of women arrested for IPA, this study confirms that women are still more likely than men to be victims of IPA rather than offenders which substantiates a great deal of previous IPA research (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000b).

Though some IPA arrest dynamics research has found no association between victim or offender race/ethnicity and arrest dynamics (Kane, 1999; Tatum & Pence, 2015), the data presented in tables 2 and 3 reveal a second important finding which is that police were more likely to label people of color as suspects within IPA cases as compared to white people. Data analyses indicated that among interracial couples, matches of Latinx suspects and white victims were more prevalent than matches of white suspects and Latinx victims. Furthermore, matches of Black suspects and white victims were more prevalent than matches of white suspects and Black victims. Additionally, though only three Native American individuals were included in the sample, all three of these individuals were determined to be the suspects and their white partners determined to be the victims within the IPA incidents in which they were involved. The greatest

percentage of suspects within this sample were white individuals. While this is certainly a reflection of the demographic makeup of the community of Longmont, it also indicates that people of color are not disproportionately represented as IPA suspects within this population. Thus, these results are certainly not indicative of people of color being more violent within intimate relationships than white people. Rather, these data suggest that responding officers may be more likely to perceive and thus label Latinx, Black, or Native American individuals involved in incidents of IPA as offenders. The proportions of Black and Native American individuals within this sample are far too small to yield significant results and the proportions of the aforementioned interracial couples were also concerningly small as compared to the total sample. Nonetheless, the trend that is exhibited regarding victim race/ethnicity matches among these small sample sizes may reflect important racial/ethnic distinctions regarding officer determination of IPA suspects and this trend should be examined further within future research.

The data presented within Tables 2 and 3 also suggest that gender-based differences in the likelihood of being determined to be the primary suspect may be associated with differences in victim and suspect race/ethnicity. Among Latinx intraracial couples, a greater percentage of suspects were men as compared to the percentage of male suspects among white intraracial couples. Similarly, a greater percentage of suspects were men among couples of Latinx suspects and white victims as compared to couples of white suspects and Latinx victims. Suspect gender percentages exhibited even more divergence among white and Black interracial couples. That is, a much greater percentage of suspects were men among couples of Black suspects and white victims as compared to the percentage of male suspects among couples of white suspects and Black victims. This variance could indicate a number of phenomena. For instance, these differing percentages of male suspects could reflect differing socioculturally influenced behavioral

patterns of aggression among white, Latinx, and Black women or among white, Latinx, and Black men, which seems unlikely. Another potential and seemingly more likely explanation for this variance could be that police officers may perceive Latinx and Black men in relationships with white women to be more culpable for their actions as compared to white men in relationships with Latinx or Black women. This hypothesis would also imply that police may perceive Latinx and Black women in relationships with white men to be less in need of police protection from IPA as compared to white women in relationships with Latinx or Black men. This contention is supported by previous research which has found that female victims are more likely to have an arrest made on their behalf if they are white rather than Black (Avakame & Fyfe, 2001; Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011). If this is the case, these data reflect racialized biases and stereotyping within police determination of primary offenders.

In terms of racialized differences among female suspects, the findings suggest an opposing trend. As illustrated in Table 3, a greater percentage of white women in relationships with Latinx or Black men were determined to be suspects as compared to the percentages of Latinx and Black women in relationships with white men who were determined to be suspects. While these data may suggest that white women are more likely to engage in IPA than Latinx or Black women, this assertion is not supported by previous IPA research. A more likely interpretation might be that police determination of the primary suspect involves a certain degree of shaming of white women who choose to be in relationships with Latinx or Black men. While these results raise pressing questions regarding the biases that may undergird the systematic police processes of suspect determination, it is important to keep in mind that the data on interracial couples was not very substantial and these results could very well be coincidental due to small sample size comparisons.

The results of the chi-square analyses of incident variables and suspect gender for cases involving white and Latinx suspects illustrated that both white and Latinx suspects were most likely to have engaged in IPA with an ex girl/boyfriend. This finding may reflect victims being less willing to live with or independently deal with abuse when they are no longer in a relationship with the abuser. Though this finding does not directly confer any information regarding suspect's likelihood of arrest, this data would suggest that individuals who engage in IPA with former dating partners are potentially at increased likelihood of being arrested due to the fact that police most often respond to incidents that have occurred between ex girl/boyfriends. However, a more likely explanation of this finding is probably that ex girl/boyfriend relationship status elicits more IPA than other relationship types.

Representation within relationship groupings was quite consistent for male and female Latinx and white suspects. However, the one outlier in terms of relationship status was that Latinx women were most significantly represented within the category of marriage while white men and women and Latinx men were not substantially represented within this category. One important question that these results raise is why Latinx female suspects are more likely than white female suspects or Latinx male suspects to engage in IPA within married relationships. Previous research maintains that Latinx women remain in abusive relationships for many reasons including abusers' threats of deportation or ceasing to help victims gain legal residence (Raj & Silverman, 2002; Zadnik, Sabina, & Cuevas, 2016), financial dependency (Choi, Elkins, & Disney, 2016; Mattson & Ruiz, 2005), fear of outsider opinions due to the cultural pressures to stay married in order to be a good wife and mother (Mattson & Ruiz, 2005; Medina & Vasquez, 2004; Silva Martinez, 2016; Williams & Kasturirangan, 2003), and fear that abusers might take away their children (Medina & Vasquez, 2003; Kelly, 2009). These findings suggest that Latinx

women may be more likely to get married despite experiencing IPA due to socioculturally specific pressures. Furthermore, some research asserts that Latinx women are less likely to call the police for help due to fears such as having their children taken away (Kelly, 2009; Silva Martinez, 2016). These data suggest that the reason why Latina women are more likely to be suspects within married relationships is because their options for dealing with their abuse are rather limited and they may be forced to act in defense. This would indicate that married Latinx women may be more likely to face arrest for IPA than Latinx women in other relationships.

Another important finding that was gleaned from this data was that child abuse was charged twice as often for cases involving Latinx suspects than for those involving white suspects though no gender differences were associated with this outcome. The results of analyses investigating the variables child presence, child witness, and child abuse charged revealed that rates of child presence reports were similar among Latinx and white suspects of both genders, however, the rates of child witness reports and child abuse being charged were more than two times greater for Latinx suspects as compared to white suspects. Because the percentage of child presence was very similar between these groups, these results demonstrate that police may be more likely to perceive and report child presence as child witnessing and child abuse in cases involving Latinx suspects as compared to those involving white suspects. This proposed interpretation indicates that police may perceive Latinx suspects to be more culpable of child endangerment as compared to white suspects.

In terms of use of alcohol and drugs (AOD), this study found that that an individual is at increased risk of being determined to be the primary offender when he or she has been using AOD regardless of race/ethnicity or gender. This finding could be due to police perceiving AOD users to be more culpable or it could be because use of AOD is believed to elicit more abuse,

violence, and aggression. Similar percentages of white female suspects, white male suspects, and Latinx male suspects were reported to have used AOD themselves, but half as many of these suspects were reported to have been with victims who had used AOD. In contrast, the percentage of Latinx suspects who used AOD was similar to the percentage of white female and male and Latinx male suspects, but unlike these three groups of suspects, the percentage of Latinx suspects who were with victims who used AOD was approximately the same as the percentage of suspects who used AOD themselves. It is not entirely clear what these findings suggest, however, this study proposes two speculations. First, these results may indicate that Latinx women are forced to defend themselves from abuse more when their partners are using AOD. This would imply that police are not considering differential uses of violence within IPA when determining primary aggressors. The second theory is that police may perceive Latinx women who engage in IPA with partners using AOD to be more culpable for their actions than white men, white women, or Latinx men who do the same.

One of the most striking findings of this study is that regardless of race/ethnicity, police were more likely to arrest female suspects than male suspects and female suspects were arrested for less criminally serious offenses. For cases involving Latinx or white suspects, a greater percentage of female suspects were arrested for IPA as compared to male suspects. Considering the fact that strangulation reported, weapons reported, second degree assault, and felony charges were all substantially increased among male suspects as compared to female suspects, these arrest results indicate that police were more likely to arrest female offenders for less criminally serious offenses as compared to male offenders. This finding is probably representative of the increased pressure on police to determine a primary aggressor and carry out an arrest due to mandatory arrest laws in Colorado. This contention is supported by the fact that, overall, both

Latinx and white women showed greater percentages of deferred sentences and cases dismissed as compared to Latinx and white male suspects which suggests that the majority of these female arrests were likely due to police following protocol in determining a single offender rather than considering the context or severity of abuse as these women were more likely than men to later be absolved of their crimes. Alternatively, these results may simply indicate that police showed more leniency towards male suspects in terms of arrest. This could potentially be due to sexist or victim blaming attitudes or greater police receptiveness to victim desires as the majority of victims in the study were women. Overall, low arrest percentages reflect the fact that mandatory arrest policies are not being strictly adhered to within this organization.

This finding is also applicable in terms of race/ethnicity. Specifically, the results revealed that Latina female suspects were more likely to be arrested than white female suspects and that the percentage of Latina female suspects charged with 2 crimes was more than double that of white female suspects charged with 2 crimes. This could be because Latina female suspects are more likely to have committed more serious and more numerous crimes within a single IPA incident, but the data suggest that it is more likely that the Latina female suspects in this study were more likely than white female suspects to be charged with and arrested for multiple crimes rather than to have actually committed multiple and more serious crimes. This is supported by the fact that the percentages of Latina female suspects who received deferred sentences and dismissed cases were substantially greater than the percentages of white female suspects, white male suspects, and Latinx male suspects who received these arrest outcomes. Had the crimes committed by Latina female suspects been more severe than those committed by white female suspects, we would not expect to see increased likelihood of deferred sentencing and dismissal of charges for Latina female suspects. Though a slightly greater percentage of white female

suspects received felony charges as compared to Latina female suspects, we must consider these differences in charges among female suspects with respect to the arrest data. That is, despite the slightly increased frequency of felony charges among white female suspects, a lesser percentage of these suspects were arrested as compared to the percentage of Latina female suspects who were arrested.

The increased risk of Latina female suspects being arrested indicates that their crimes were perceived by police to be overall more serious despite the fact that these arrest outcomes were later overturned in more of these cases than in cases involving white female suspects. These findings indicate that for whatever reason, police were arresting Latina women more frequently than white women despite the fact that these women appear to have been committing less serious crimes. This finding could potentially be the result of institutionalized racism, increased police perceptions of lack of cooperation among Latinx suspects due to language barriers, or perhaps Latina women being at increased risk of not being able to make a strong case for themselves due to language barriers.

In terms of race/ethnicity and male suspects, Latinx male suspects received harsher arrest outcomes and were arrested more often than white male suspects. This finding was informed by the fact that among male suspects, the percentage of Latinx suspects charged with second degree assault was almost double that of white suspects. additionally, Latinx male suspects were slightly more likely to receive a felony charge as compared to white male suspects. Furthermore, a greater percentage of Latinx male suspects were charged with more than one crime as compared to white male suspects and the percentage of Latinx male suspects charged with 3 or 4 crimes was more than double that for white male suspects. This could indicate that Latinx men are more likely than white men to commit 3-4 IPA crimes in a single incident, but it could very well also

demonstrate that Latinx men are more likely than white men to be charged with multiple crimes which reflects the proposed harsher arrest dynamics for Latinx suspects. Moreover, a slightly greater percentage of Latinx male suspects faced arrest as compared to white male suspects. Thus overall, Latinx male suspects were more likely than white male suspects to be arrested and to receive harsher charges.

The results of the binomial logistics regressions also indicated a number of paramount findings regarding the dynamics of arrest outcomes. First, when controlling for all other independent variables analyzed within the regression, suspect use of AOD, suspect being a repeat offender from DARC data, suspect being Latinx, and if the couple was intraracial, all showed strong significant and causal associations with increased the likelihood of arrest. Most likely, the variable intraracial couple was significantly associated with arrest due to the fact that the crosstabulation of victim race/ethnicity with suspect race/ethnicity across all sample races/ethnicities confirmed that the majority of racial/ethnic matches of victims and suspects reported in the sample were intraracial. Thus, most suspects who experienced arrest were involved in intraracial couples because the majority of couples were intraracial. The correlation between suspect being Latinx and increased likelihood of arrest was also demonstrated within the simple linear regressions data. This finding helps to expand the scope of other racially focused IPA arrest dynamics research as much of this research contends that arrest is more likely for Black IPA offenders than it is for white IPA offenders regardless of whether they are male or female and this research reveals that the same can be said of Latinx IPA offenders as compared to white IPA offenders (Avakame & Fyfe, 2001; Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011; Visher, 1983). Additionally, the finding that a repeat offender suspect is more likely to be arrested supports research conducted by Smith (1987) and Tatum and Pence (2015) which

claimed that repeat incidents of IPA increase the likelihood of offender arrest. This finding contradicts research conducted by Bachman and Coker (1995) which argued that first time offenders are more likely to be arrested for IPA than repeat IPA offenders. Overall, the variable suspect using AOD was predicted to most substantially increase the likelihood of arrest as compared to all variables that exhibited significant correlation. This finding corroborates a great deal of research which has demonstrated that likelihood of arrest increases for individuals who appear to be under the influence of AOD (Avakame & Fyfe, 2001; Berk & Loseke, 1981; Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011; Jones & Belknap, 1999).

In terms of decreased likelihood of arrest, suspect having ever been married was significantly associated with decreased likelihood of arrest, but it was predicted to decrease likelihood of arrest by a lesser percent than that of the variables that were predicted to increase the likelihood of arrest. Jones and Belknap (1999) suggested that marital status was not significantly related to police decisions to jail offenders, but that it was related to police action as police were less likely to take any action when the victim and offender had ever been married. This study supports this assertion however it also reveals that for the sample in question, arrest was in fact less likely for suspects who had ever been married.

Conversely, the variable strangulation reported was shown to significantly increase the likelihood of a felony outcome by over 600% when controlling for all other independent variables. This finding fits within the context of other IPA arrest outcome research which contends that presence of victim injuries increases the likelihood of offender arrest as police are more likely to make an arrest when they perceive the potential risk to be higher for the victim (Avakame & Fyfe, 2001; Bachman & Coker, 1995; Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011; Feder, 1996; Ferraro, 1989; Tatum and Pence, 2015). Though this study did not confirm that

strangulation reported was associated with increased likelihood of arrest, it did demonstrate that strangulation reported significantly increased the likelihood of felony charges and this finding supports the assertion that police are likely to rely on physical signs of violence to guide their arrest decision processes.

Suspect having ever been married was shown to significantly decrease the likelihood of a misdemeanor charge by three times the decrease in likelihood predicted for when strangulation was reported. This supports the previous finding that strangulation reported was associated with enormously increased likelihood of a felony charge meaning that it is sensible that this variable would be associated with a decreased likelihood of misdemeanor charge. Contrarily, suspect being female and suspect use of AOD were each significantly correlated with an increased likelihood of misdemeanor charge. The analysis revealed that child abuse not being charged would result in the greatest increase in the likelihood of misdemeanor outcome. This finding supports other research which suggests that the likelihood of arrest is increased when a child is present (Tatum & Pence, 2015) and that the likelihood of arrest is significantly increased in the case of a felony as compared to a misdemeanor outcome (Black, 1971; Dichter, Marcus, Morabito, & Rhodes, 2011; Ferraro, 1989; Lee & Hoover, 2013; Smith, 1987; Tatum and Pence, 2015). Though the analyses of felony and arrest outcomes did not directly reveal associations with child abuse charged, the results of the analysis of misdemeanor outcome indirectly support the assertion that child abuse charged is more likely associated with felony and thus with arrest than with misdemeanor outcome.

Interestingly, suspect use of AOD was shown to significantly increase the likelihood of a deferred sentence while suspect being a repeat offender was shown to significantly decrease the likelihood of a deferred sentence. This finding suggests that while suspects who use AOD may

be at increased risk of being arrested, they are more likely than suspects who do not use AOD to receive deferred sentences. Moreover, the data indicate that a suspect who is a repeat offender is more likely than a first time offender to be arrested for IPA and also less likely than a first time offender to receive a deferred sentence.

Policy Implications

These findings indicate that women are being arrested more often than men for less severe domestic violence police interventions. Furthermore, this study reveals that Latinx female suspects are arrested more often and receive more severe charges for potentially less criminally severe crimes as compared to their white female counterparts. Finally, these findings suggest that IPA crimes and incident variables are being interpreted differently based on suspect race/ethnicity and gender. These findings reflect the need for policy modifications that would reform procedural police responses to IPA in a manner that would establish broader police acknowledgement of differential uses of violence as well as barriers that some victims face in advocating for their needs, innocence, and rights.

At the same time, these findings suggest that police protocol for determining a primary offender may need to be standardized in a manner that could more effectively mitigate the perceivable biases that exist in terms of the dynamics of arrest decision-making. This study also demonstrates that criminal justice policy needs to be continuously scrutinized with respect to current research in order to initiate training models that will mitigate any potential police misunderstandings of trends in IPA scenarios as these misunderstandings may be contributing to the unnecessary and harmful arrests of victims who require increased advocacy and protection from police rather than increased risk of punishment. Within Colorado specifically, these

findings imply that mandatory arrest policy should be changed to pro-arrest policy as this might decrease the pressure on police to determine and arrest a single offender which could in turn lead to a decrease in unsubstantiated arrests that eventually result in dismissed cases.

Future Research

Though this data set was an unbelievable source of information pertaining to arrest dynamics within IPA cases, some key variables were missing from the data and these variables would have enabled a more nuanced analysis of IPA arrest decision-making dynamics. Most importantly, SES data, dual arrest frequencies, injury reports, and more accurately reported data for weapons use are each important factors to consider in terms of arrest determinants and future studies should aim to include these variables within their analyses. While this study demonstrated that officer determination of IPA suspects appears to be influenced by both suspect and victim race/ethnicity and gender, this trend should be examined further within future research as interracial and non-Latinx or white sample sizes were too small from which to draw definitive conclusions. This data set allowed novel comparisons to be made between Latinx and white IPA suspects in terms of associations between various incident variables, suspect gender, and multiple arrest outcomes, but future studies would be benefited by conducting research that investigates arrest dynamics for other races/ethnicities that are neglected within IPA research. Similarly, future studies should aim to analyze more interracial cases of IPA as very little is known about the arrest dynamics of these cases.

This study revealed some very interesting findings that need to be investigated within other police districts in order to confirm the results established by this research. Firstly, arrest percentages reflect the fact that mandatory arrest policies are not being strictly adhered to within

this organization. Because this research was only conducted with respect to this organization, it is unclear whether or not this is the case among other police organizations. Future studies could explore this topic either by comparing arrest rates among various police organizations or by looking at arrest rate changes over a number of years within a single organization. Additionally, this study found that female suspects are being arrested more often than male suspects and this contention needs to be assessed within other regions in order to confirm whether or not this pattern exists for other police organizations.

REFERENCES

- Adames, S. B., & Campbell, R. (2005). Immigrant Latinas' conceptualizations of intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women, 11*(10), 1341-1364.
- Adler, L.L., Denmark, F.L. (1995). *Violence and the prevention of violence*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Amerson, R., Whittington, R., Duggan, L. (2015). Intimate partner violence affecting Latina women and their children. *Journal of Emergency Nursing, 40*(6), 531-536.
- Archer, J. (2002). Sex differences in physically aggressive acts between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 7*(4), 313-351.
- Avakame, E. F., & Fyfe, J. J. (2001). Differential police treatment of male-on-female spousal violence: Additional evidence on the leniency thesis. *Violence Against Women, 7*(1), 22-45.
- Bachman, R., & Coker, A. L. (1995). Police involvement in domestic violence: The interactive effects of victim injury, offender's history of violence, and race. *Violence and Victims, 10*(2), 91-106.
- Balenovich, J., Grossi, E., & Hughes, T. (2008). Toward a balanced approach: Defining police roles in responding to domestic violence. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 33*(1), 19-31.
- Balfour, L. (2016). Feminist reconstructions, critical race interventions: The presence of the past and the future of political theories of race and gender. *Contemporary Political Theory, 15*(1), 80-86.
- Barocas, B., Emery, D., & Mills, L. G. (2016). Changing the domestic violence narrative:

- Aligning definitions and standards. *Journal of Family Violence*, 31(8), 941-947.
- Belknap, J., Hartman J. (2000). Police responses to woman battering: Victim advocates' reports. *International Review of Victimology*, 7(1-3),159-177.
- Berk, S. F., & Loseke, D. R. (1981). "handling" family violence: Situational determinants of police arrest in domestic disturbances. *Law & Society Review*, 15(2), 317-334.
- Black, D. J. (1971). The social organization of arrest. *Stanford Law Review*, 23(6), 1087-1111.
- Bonomi, A.E., Anderson, M. L., Cannon, E.A., Slesnick, N., Rodriguez, M.A. (2009). Intimate partner violence in Latina and Non-Latina women. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 36(1), 43-48.
- Bowker, L.H. (1983). Battered wives, lawyers, and district Attorneys: An examination of law in action. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 11, 403-412.
- Breiding, M.J., Chen J., & Black, M.C. (2014). *Intimate partner violence in the United States — 2010*. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/cdc_nisvs_ipv_report_2013_v17_single_a.pdf
- Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against our will: Men, women and rape*. New York: Fawcett Columbine.
- Busch, A. L., & Rosenberg, M. S. (2004). Comparing women and men arrested for domestic violence: A preliminary report. *Journal of Family Violence*, 19(1), 49-57.
- Buzawa, E.S., Buzawa, C.G. (1990). *Domestic violence: The criminal justice response (Studies in crime, law, and criminal justice)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Buzawa, E.S., Buzawa C.G. (Eds.). (1992). *Domestic violence: The changing criminal justice response*. Westport, CT: Auburn House.

- Buzawa, E. S., & Hirschel, D. (2008). Domestic violence: The beginning, continuation, or final act in a criminal career? *Victims & Offenders*, 3(4), 391-411.
- Catalano, S., Smith, E., Snyder, H., Rand, M. (2009). *Bureau of justice statistics selected findings: Female victims of violence*. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/fvv.pdf>
- Cattaneo, L. B. (2010). The role of socioeconomic status in interactions with police among a national sample of women experiencing intimate partner violence. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 45(3), 247-258.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2015). *Intimate Partner Violence: Consequences*. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/consequences.html>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2016). *Intimate partner violence: Definitions*. Retrieved from: <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/definitions.html>
- Cheng, T.C., Lo, C.C. (2016). Racial disparities in intimate partner violence examined through the multiple disadvantage model. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 31(11), 2026-2051.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (2002). criminalizing victimization: The unintended consequences of pro-arrest policies for girls and women. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 2(1), 81-90.
- Choi, Y.J., Elkins, J., Disney, L. (2016). A literature review of intimate partner violence among immigrant populations: Engaging the faith community. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 29, 1-9.
- Coker, D. (1999). Enhancing autonomy for battered women: Lessons from Navajo peacemaking. *UCLA Law Review*, 47(1), 1-111.

- Coker, D. (2016). Domestic violence and social justice. *Violence Against Women*, 22(12), 426-437.
- Deer, Sarah. 2015. *The beginning and end of rape: Confronting sexual violence in Native America*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- DePrince, A.P., Belknap, J., Labus, J., Buckingham, S., Gover, A. (2012). The Impact of Community-Based Outreach on Psychological Distress and Victim Safety in Women Exposed to Intimate Partner Abuse. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 80, 211-221.
- Dichter, M. E., Marcus, S. C., Morabito, M. S., & Rhodes, K. V. (2011). Explaining the IPV arrest decision: Incident, agency, and community factors. *Criminal Justice Review*, 36(1), 22-39.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1979). *Violence against wives*. New York: Free Press
- Dobash, R. P., Dobash, R. E., Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1992). The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. *Social Problems*, 39(1), 71-91.
- Dugan, L. (2003). Domestic violence legislation: Exploring its impact on the likelihood of domestic violence, police involvement, and arrest. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 2(2), 283-312.
- Epstein, D., Bell, M. E., & Goodman, L. A. (2003). Transforming aggressive prosecution policies: Prioritizing victims' long-term safety in the prosecution of domestic violence cases. *American University Journal of Gender, Social Policy, and the Law*, 11(2), 465-479.
- Erez, E., & Belknap, J. (1998). In Their Own Words: Battered Women's Assessment of the Criminal Processing System's Responses. *Violence & Victims*, 13(3), 251-268.

- Feder, L., & Henning, K. (2005). A comparison of male and female dually arrested domestic violence offenders. *Violence and Victims*, 20(2), 153-171.
- Feder, L. (1996). Police handling of domestic calls: The importance of offender's presence in the arrest decision. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24(6), 481-490.
- Fedovskiy, K., Higgins, S., & Paranjape, A. (2008;2007;). Intimate partner violence: How does it impact major depressive disorder and post-traumatic stress disorder among immigrant Latinas? *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, 10(1), 45-51.
- Ferraro, K. J. (1989). Policing woman battering. *Social Problems*, 36(1), 61-74.
- Few- Demo, A. L. (2014). Intersectionality as the “new” critical approach in feminist family studies: Evolving Racial/Ethnic feminisms and critical race theories. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 6(2), 169-183.
- Fogg Davis, H. An argument for reviving the pragmatism of early critical race feminist theory. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 15(1), 98-105.
- Frye, V., Haviland, M., & Rajah, V. (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.
- Geffner, R. (2016). Partner aggression versus partner abuse terminology: Moving the field forward and resolving controversies. *Journal of Family Violence*, 31(8), 923-925.
- Gelles, R.J., & Straus, M.A. (1988). *Intimate violence: The causes and consequences of abuse in the American family*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Inc.
- Gilbert, P.R. (2002). Discourses of female violence and societal gender stereotypes. *Violence Against Women*, 8(11), 1271-1300.
- Goodman, L., & Epstein, D. (2005). Refocusing on women: A new direction for policy and

- research on intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(4), 479-487.
- Grossman, S. F., & Lundy, M. (2007). Domestic violence across race and ethnicity: Implications for social work practice and policy. *Violence Against Women*, 13(10), 1029-1052.
- Hart, B. (1993). Battered Women and the Criminal Justice System. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 36(5), 624-638.
- Henne, K., & Troshynski, E. (2013). Mapping the margins of intersectionality: Criminological possibilities in a transnational world. *Theoretical Criminology*, 17(4), 455-473.
- Henning, K., Renauer, B., & Holdford, R. (2006). Victim or offender? Heterogeneity among women arrested for intimate partner violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 21(6), 351-368.
- Hilton, N.Z. (Ed.). (1993). *Legal Responses to Wife Assault: Current trends and evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hirschel, D., Buzawa, E., Pattavina, A., & Faggiani, D. (2007). Domestic violence and mandatory arrest laws: To what extent do they influence police arrest decisions? *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, (1973-), 98(1), 255-298.
- Hirschel, D., & Buzawa, E. (2002). Understanding the context of dual arrest with directions for future research. *Violence Against Women*, 8(12), 1449-1473.
- Hunnicut, G. (2009). Resurrecting “patriarchy” as a theoretical tool. *Violence Against Women*, 15(5), 553-573.
- Ingram, E. M. (2007). A comparison of help seeking between Latino and non-Latino victims of intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women*, 13(2), 159-171.
- Jain, N. (2011). Engendering fairness in domestic violence arrests: Improving police accountability through the equal protection clause. *Emory Law Journal*, 60(4), 1011.

- Johnson, M. P. (2011). Gender and types of intimate partner violence: A response to an anti-feminist literature review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 16*(4), 289-296.
- Johnson, M. P., & Ferraro, K. J. (2000). Research on domestic violence in the 1990s: Making distinctions. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 62*(4), 948-963.
- Johnson, M. P. (1995). Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: Two forms of violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57*, 283-294.
- Jones, D. A., & Belknap, J. (1999). Police responses to battering in a progressive pro-arrest jurisdiction. *Justice Quarterly, 16*(2), 249-273.
- Kane, R. (1999). Patterns of arrest in domestic violence encounters: Identifying a police decision-making model. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 27*(1), 65-79.
- Kane, R. J. (2000). Police responses to restraining orders in domestic violence incidents: Identifying the custody-threshold thesis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 27*(5), 561-580.
- Kelly, U. A. (2009). "I'm a mother first": The influence of mothering in the decision-making processes of battered immigrant Latina women. *Research in Nursing & Health, 32*(3), 286-297.
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Neidig, P., & Thorn, G. (1995). Violent marriages: Gender differences in levels of current violence and past abuse. *Journal of Family Violence, 10*(2), 159-176.
- Lavoie, F., Jacob, M., Hardy, J., & Martin, G. (1989). Police attitudes in assigning responsibility for wife abuse. *Journal of Family Violence, 4*(4), 369-388.
- Lee, J., Zhang, Y., Hoover, L.T. (2013). Police response to domestic violence: Multilevel factors of arrest decision. *Policing: An international journal of police strategies & management, 36*(1), 157-174.

- Li, S., Levick, A., Eichman, A., & Chang, J. C. (2015). Women's perspectives on the context of violence and role of police in their intimate partner violence arrest experiences. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 30*(3), 400-419.
- Lystad, M. H. (1975). Violence at home: A review of the literature. *The American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 45*(3), 328-345.
- Mahoney, M. (1991). Legal images of battered women: Redefining the issue of separation. *Michigan Law Review, 90*, 1-94.
- Marchetti, E. (2008). Intersectional race and gender analyses: Why legal processes just don't get it. *Social & Legal Studies, 17*(2), 155-174.
- Martin, M. E. (1997). Double your trouble: Dual arrest in family violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 12*(2), 139-157.
- Mattson, S., & Ruiz, E. (2005). Intimate partner violence in the Latino community and its effect on children. *Health Care for Women International, 26*(6), 523-529.
- Medina, A.M., Vasquez, J.F. (2004). *Developing linguistically and culturally responsive materials for Latina survivors of domestic violence*. Retrieved from http://onlineresources.wnyc.net/pb/orcdocs/LARC_Resources/LEPTopics/DV/LEP_Latinas_Domestic%20Violencer_devlinguistic.pdf
- Miller, S. (2005). *Victims as offenders: The paradox of women's violence in relationships*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Miller, S. L. (2001). The paradox of women arrested for domestic violence: Criminal justice professionals and service providers respond. *Violence Against Women, 7*(12), 1339-1376.
- Mills, L. G. (1999). Killing her softly: Intimate abuse and the violence of state intervention. *Harvard Law Review, 113*(2), 550-613.

- Muftić, L. R., Bouffard, J. A., & Bouffard, L. A. (2007). An exploratory study of women arrested for intimate partner violence: Violent women or violent resistance? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(6), 753-774.
- Muftić, L., Finn, M., & Marsh, E. (2015). The Victim-Offender Overlap, Intimate Partner Violence, and Sex: Assessing Differences Among Victims, Offenders, and Victim-Offenders. *Crime & Delinquency*, 61(7), 899–926.
- Nowotny, K. M., & Graves, J. L. (2013). Substance use and intimate partner violence victimization among white, African American, and Latina women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(17), 3301-3318.
- Okun, L. (1986). *Woman abuse: Facts replacing myths*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Perilla, J.L., Serrata, J.V., Weinberg, J., Lippy, C.A. (2012). Integrating women's voices and theory: A comprehensive domestic violence intervention for Latinas. *Women & Therapy*, 35(1-2), 93-105,
- Phillips, S. W., & Gillham, J. (2010). Policing domestic violence: The significance of charging in the post-arrest decision making of police officers. *Partner Abuse*, 1(2), 200-219.
- Poorman, P. B., Seelau, E. P., & Seelau, S. M. (2003). Perceptions of domestic abuse in same-sex relationships and implications for criminal justice and mental health responses. *Violence and Victims*, 18(6), 659-669.
- Potter, Hillary. 2008. *Battle Cries: Black Women and Intimate Partner Abuse*. New York University Press.
- Ptacek, J. (1999). *Battered women in the courtroom: The power of judicial responses*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

- Raj, A., & Silverman, J. (2002). Violence against immigrant women: The roles of culture, context, and legal immigrant status on intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women*, 8(3), 367-398.
- Roark, J. (2016). Predictors of dual arrest for offenders involved in heterosexual domestic violence arrests. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 39(1), 52–63.
- Robinson, L., Chandek, M.S. (2000) The Domestic violence arrest decision: Examining demographic, attitudinal, and situational variables. *Crime & Delinquency*, 46(1),18-37.
- Russell, B., Ragatz, L., & Kraus, S. (2009). Does Ambivalent Sexism Influence Verdicts for Heterosexual and Homosexual Defendants in a Self-Defense Case? *Springer Science*, 24, 145–157.
- Saunders, D. G., & Size, P. B. (1986). Attitudes about woman abuse among police officers, victims, and victim advocates. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1(1), 25-42.
- Saunders, D.G. (1995) The Tendency to Arrest Victims of Domestic Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 10(2), 147-158.
- Schmidt, J. D., & Sherman, L. W. (1993). Does arrest deter domestic violence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 36(5), 601-609.
- Schneider, E.M. (2000). *Battered Women & Feminist Lawmaking*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Schultz, K., Sabina, C., Jackson, S., Cattaneo, L.B., Brunner, L., Serrata, J.V. (2016). Key roles of community connectedness in healing from trauma. *Psychology of Violence*, 6(1), 42-48.
- Schwartz, M. D. (1987). Gender and injury in spousal assault. *Sociological Focus*, 20(1), 61-75.

- Seelau, S. M., & Seelau, E. P. (2005). Gender-role stereotypes and perceptions of heterosexual, gay and lesbian domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 20(6), 363-371.
- Sherman, L.W. (1992). *Policing Domestic Violence: Experiments and dilemmas*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Sherman, L. W., & Berk, R. A. (1984). The specific deterrent effects of arrest for domestic assault. *American Sociological Review*, 49(2), 261-272.
- Sheth, F.A. (2016). If the present looks like the past, what does the future look like? Feminist and critical race scholarship in political theory. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 15(1), 87-96.
- Silva Martinez, E. (2016). "El Silencio": Conceptualizations of Latina immigrant survivors of intimate partner violence in the midwest of the United States. *Violence Against Women*, 22(5), 523-544.
- Sloan, F. A., Platt, A. C., Chepke, L. M., & Blevins, C. E. (2013). Deterring domestic violence: Do criminal sanctions reduce repeat offenses? *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 46(1), 51-80.
- Smith, D. A. (1987). Police response to interpersonal violence: Defining the parameters of legal control. *Social Forces*, 65(3), 767-782.
- Smith, D. A., & Klein, J. R. (1984). Police control of interpersonal disputes. *Social Problems*, 31(4), 468-481.
- Stalans, L. J., & Finn, M. A. (1995). How novice and experienced officers interpret wife assaults: Normative and efficiency frames. *Law & Society Review*, 29(2), 287-321.
- Stark, E. (2009a). Rethinking coercive control. *Violence Against Women*, 15(12), 1509-1525.
- Stark, E. (2009b). *Coercive control: How men entrap women in personal life*. New York, NY:

Oxford University Press.

Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). Women and violence: Victims and perpetrators. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 34(3), 334-350.

Stephen, L. (2016). Gendered transborder violence in the expanded United States-Mexico borderlands. *Human Organization*, 75(2), 159-167.

Straus, M., & Gelles, R. (1986). Societal change and change in family violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 48(3), 465-479.

Sun, I. Y. (2007). Policing domestic violence: Does officer gender matter? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35(6), 581-595.

Tatum, K.M., & Pence, R. (2015). Factors that affect the arrest decision in domestic violence cases. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 38, 56-70.

Tjaden, P., Thoennes, N. (2000a). *Full report of the prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the national violence against women survey*.

Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/183781.pdf>

Tjaden, P., Thoennes, N. (2000b). Prevalence and consequences of male-to-female and female-to-male intimate partner violence as measured by the national violence against women survey. *Violence Against Women*, 6(2), 142-161.

Truman, J. L., & Morgan, R. E. (2014). *Nonfatal domestic violence: 2003-2012*. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ndv0312.pdf>

United States Census Bureau. QuickFacts: Longmont City, Colorado. Retrieved From <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045215/0845970>

Villalón, Roberta. 2010. *Violence against Latina immigrants: Citizenship, inequality, and*

- community*. New York: New York University Press.
- Visher, C. A. (1983). Gender, police arrest decisions, and notions of chivalry. *Criminology*, 21(1), 5-28.
- Waldner-Haugrud, L. K., Gratch, L. V., & Magruder, B. (1997). Victimization and perpetration rates of violence in gay and lesbian relationships: Gender issues explored. *Violence and Victims*, 12(2), 173-184.
- Williams, E. N., & Kasturirangan, A. (2003). Counseling Latina battered women: A qualitative study of the Latina perspective. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 31(3), 162-178.
- Worcester, N. (2002). Women's use of force: Complexities and challenges of taking the issue seriously. *Violence Against Women*, 8(11), 1390-1415.
- World Health Organization. (2012). *Understanding and addressing violence against women*. Retrieved from http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/77432/1/WHO_RHR_12.36_eng.pdf
- Zadnik, E., Sabina, C., Cuevas, C.A. (2016). Violence against Latinas: The effects of undocumented status on rates of victimization and help seeking. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 31(6), 1141-1153.

APPENDIX A: FINDINGS TABLES

Table 1: Victim and Offender Characteristics (N = 741)

Characteristic	Victim			Suspect		
	N	%	n	N	%	n
Gender^a	741			741		
Woman		77.7	576		22.9	170
Man		22.3	165		77.1	571
<u>Age^b</u>	735			735		
24 and Younger		22.4	166		21.6	159
25-34		37.3	276		32.7	240
35-44		23.1	171		26.4	194
45+		17.2	126		19.3	142
<u>Ethnicity/Race</u>	736			737		
White		63.6	471		56.4	418
Latinx		33.5	248		37.4	277
African American		1.3	10		4.6	34
Asian American		0.9	7.0		0.7	5.0
Native American		0.0	0.0		0.4	3.0
<u>Relationship Status</u>	N	%	n			
Co-Habiting/Living Together	735	23.26	171			
Dating		20.41	150			
Married		18.10	133			
Ex Girl/Boyfriend		23.94	176			
Separated		7.76	57			
Divorced		6.53	48			

^aIn this sample, only 4 (0.05%) of the 741 cases were same-sex couples.

^bThe suspects' ages ranged from 14 to 73, with $\mu = 34.4$. The victims' ages ranged from 16 to 86, with $\mu = 33.4$

Table 2: Suspect x Victim Race/Ethnicity (N = 734)*

	Suspect Race/Ethnicity											
	White		Latinx		African American		AA/PA		Native American		Total Sample	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
<hr/>												
Victim Race/Ethnicity												
White	88.7%	369	24.6%	68	85.3%	29	0.0%	0	100.0%	3	63.9%	469
Latinx	9.1%	38	75.0%	207	8.82%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	33.8%	248
African American	1.7%	7	0.4%	1	5.88%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.4%	10
Asian. Am./Pacif. Is.	0.5%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	5	0.0%	0	1.0%	7
Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Total Sample	56.68%	416	37.60%	276	4.63%	34	0.68%	5	0.41%	3	100.0%	734

*Crosstabulations of victim race by suspect race across all races included in the sample were significant at the $p \leq 0.001$ level ($\chi^2 = 861.265$)

Table 3:
Inter- and Intra-Racial x Victim-Suspect Gender Dyads^{a,b} (N = 718)

	Suspect Gender		Total
	Woman % (n)	Man % (n)	
<u>Intraracial Couples</u>			
White Suspect/White Victim	26.6% (98)	73.4% (271)	51.4% (369)
Latinx Suspect/Latinx Victim	19.8% (41)	80.2% (166)	28.8% (207)
<u>Interracial Couples</u>			
White Suspect/Latinx Victim	26.3% (10)	37.2% (28)	5.3% (38)
Latinx Suspect/White Victim	19.1% (13)	80.9% (55)	9.5% (68)
White Suspect/Black Victim	42.9% (3)	57.1% (4)	0.0% (7)
Black Suspect/White Victim	10.3% (3)	89.7% (26)	4.0% (29)

^aSome dyads are not in the chart because the n's are very small or 0. The data included only 2 cases of Black suspect and Black victim, 5 of Asian American/Pacific Islander suspect and Asian American/Pacific Islander victim, 0 Native American suspect and Native American victim.

^bOnly 4 out of the total 741 cases were same sex couples so if the suspect was male in 77.1% of cases, the victim was female in 99.5% of cases. If the suspect was female in 22.9% of cases, the victim was male in 99.5% of cases.

Table 4: Binary Logistic Regression for Arrest Outcome (N = 361)

Independent Variables	β	(SE)	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Suspect Gender (female)	.391	.276	1.665	1	.147	1.478
Suspect Race/ethnicity (Latinx)	.696	.279	6.191	1	.011*	2.005
Ever Married	-.710	.266	7.416	1	.007**	.492
Strangulation Reported	-.368	.723	.311	1	.661	.692
Repeat Offender	.823	.244	11.863	1	.001***	2.277
Intraracial Couple	.694	.339	6.323	1	.035**	2.002
Child Abuse Charged	20.707	9347.225	.000	1	.998	983394904.3
Age Difference (Suspect-Victim)	-.022	.017	1.745	1	.172	.978
Suspect Using Alcohol/Drugs	1.514	.384	15.693	1	.000***	4.454
Victim Using Alcohol/Drugs	-.176	3.316	3.398	1	.720	1.192

Table 5: Binary Logistic Regression for Felony Charge Outcome (N = 326)

Independent Variables	β	(SE)	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Suspect Gender (female)	-.444	.430	1.065	1	.302	.642
Suspect Race/ethnicity (Latinx)	.398	.356	1.252	1	.263	1.286
Ever Married	.180	.369	.236	1	.135	1.197
Strangulation Reported	2.080	.662	9.858	1	.002**	8.003
Repeat Offender	.467	.343	1.858	1	.173	1.595
Intraracial Couple	.723	.591	1.497	1	.221	2.061
Child Abuse Charged	-.097	.801	.015	1	.903	.907
Age Difference (Suspect-Victim)	-.007	.024	.085	1	.770	.993
Suspect Using Alcohol/Drugs	.601	.402	2.239	1	.432	1.824
Victim Using Alcohol/Drugs	-.528	.672	.618	1	.303	.590

Table 6: Binary Logistic Regression for Misdemeanor Charge Outcome (N = 361)

Independent Variables	β	(SE)	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Suspect Gender (female)	.540	.261	4.283	1	.038*	1.715
Suspect Race/ethnicity (Latinx)	.174	.248	.488	1	.485	1.190
Ever Married	-.561	.248	5.104	1	.024*	.571

Strangulation Reported	-1.712	.720	5.663	1	.017*	.180
Repeat Offender	.243	.225	1.167	1	.280	1.275
Intraracial Couple	.435	.317	1.878	1	.171	1.545
Child Abuse Charged	1.756	.787	4.871	1	.026*	5.787
Age Difference (Suspect-Victim)	-.017	.015	1.222	1	.269	.983
Suspect Using Alcohol/Drugs	.662	.308	4.601	1	.032*	1.938
Victim Using Alcohol/Drugs	.070	.433	.026	1	.871	1.073

—

Table 7: Binary Logistic Regression for Deferred Sentence Outcome (N = 320)

Independent Variables	β	(SE)	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Suspect Gender (female)	.205	.421	.237	1	.626	1.283
Suspect Race/ethnicity (Latinx)	-.667	.478	2.004	1	.157	.513
Ever Married	-.797	.471	2.863	1	.091	.451
Strangulation Reported	-.614	.968	.402	1	.526	.541
Repeat Offender	-2.612	.631	17.138	1	.000***	.073
Intraracial Couple	.249	.565	.195	1	.659	1.283
Child Abuse Charged	1.102	.842	1.712	1	.191	3.009
Age Difference (Suspect-Victim)	-.027	.030	.782	1	.377	.974
Suspect Using Alcohol/Drugs	1.187	.422	7.908	1	.005**	3.227
Victim Using Alcohol/Drugs	.561	.550	1.047	1	.306	1.755

—