

AWAKENING FROM ANDROCENTRISM: CALLS FOR MEASUREMENT OF
GENDER AND SEXUALITY IN CRIMINOLOGY

By

Hannah Corinne Gateley

Courtney A. Crittenden
Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice
(Chair)

Christina N. Policastro
Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice
(Committee Member)

Karen McGuffee
Professor of Criminal Justice
(Committee Member)

AWAKENING FROM ANDROCENTRISM: CALLS FOR MEASUREMENT OF
GENDER AND SEXUALITY IN CRIMINOLOGY

By

Hannah Corinne Gateley

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the University of
Tennessee at Chattanooga in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree
of Master of Science in Criminal Justice

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Chattanooga, Tennessee

May 2020

Copyright © 2020

By Hannah Corinne Gateley

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

In recent years, calls have been made to progress the inclusivity of criminology, a field historically dominated by males. While specialty journals, such as *Feminist Criminology*, permit and encourage inclusive and progressive conceptualizations of social constructs such as gender and sexuality, these recent calls have noted mainstream criminology's historical reluctance to such progress. The current study examined articles published in the past five years in a mainstream criminological journal and a well-respected victimization journal to examine inclusion and conceptualization of gender and sexuality. Gender and sexuality were included more in the diversity-focused victimization journal that was analyzed, compared to the mainstream criminological journal analyzed. However, conceptualizations of these constructs in both journals rarely fell outside of a binary measure, which suggests that the measurement and inclusion of gender and sexuality are still lacking, and within the field of criminology and victimology calls for inclusivity have not been fully heeded.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	7
Gender and Criminology.....	7
Sexuality and Criminology	13
Queer Criminology and the Call to Research	18
History of Victimology	20
Gender and Victimology.....	23
Sexuality and Victimology	27
Gender, Sexuality, and Victimology.....	31
III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	33
Data and Sample	34
Coding Technique.....	35
Measures	36
Outcome Variables	36
Independent Variables	37
Control Variables	37
Analysis.....	38
IV. RESULTS	39
V. DISCUSSION.....	49
VI. CONCLUSION.....	54
Implications.....	54
Limitations	55

Future Research	57
REFERENCES	58
APPENDIX	
A. CODE SHEET	65
VITA	69

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Characteristics of Sample	41
Table 2 Any Mention of Social Constructs by Journal Type.....	43
Table 3 Gender in Article Sections by Journal Type.....	44
Table 4 Sexuality in Article Sections by Journal Type.....	45
Table 5 Social Constructs as Variables by Journal Type.....	46
Table 6 Author Gender by Journal Type	47
Table 7 Inclusion of Social Constructs in Journals by Author Gender.....	48

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

IPV, Intimate Partner Violence

NCVS, National Crime Victimization Survey

UCR, Uniform Crime Report

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Both gender and sexuality are concepts that have been acknowledged as sources of social oppression and privilege. This oppression and privilege is due in part to the socially constructed nature of gender and sexuality. Historically, sex has been the determining factor of an individual's gender socialization. Sex is widely understood as the biological identification of an individual immediately after birth as male, female, or intersex (McDonald, 2017; Muehlenhard & Peterson, 2011; West & Zimmerman, 1987). However, even biological sex can be somewhat socially constructed. In some countries, including the United States, sex-classifications are limited to male or female, without acknowledging intersex as a legitimate sex. This is problematic for intersex individuals, who are born with a combination of male and female sex organs and have been encouraged by doctors to undergo surgical modification in order to conform with the dualistic view of sex (McDonald, 2017).

For years a person's sex at birth determined their gender and subsequent socialization, and the terms 'sex' and 'gender' were often conflated due to this connection. However, gender is now commonly understood as an achieved social identity (*Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines and Training Manual*, 2015; McDonald, 2017). West and Zimmerman (1987) perceive gender as "a routine, methodological, and recurring accomplishment...that cast[s] particular pursuits as expressions of masculine and feminine 'natures'" (p. 126). In other words, gender is an outward performance of an individual's identity as male, female, or gender

nonconforming. Historically, 'doing gender' began as early as birth by parents, depending on their child's sex (McDonald, 2017). For example, a biological boy would be referred to as 'handsome' and when older would be given toys reflective of his masculine identity, such as trucks or action figures. Alternatively, a biological girl would be referred to as 'beautiful' and would be given dolls and other typically-feminine toys to play with (McDonald, 2017).

However, these sex-based assumptions are not always an accurate representation of how an individual perceives their own gender today. A cis-gender individual is someone whose biological traits do match their gender socialization, while a trans-gender individual is someone whose gender socialization does not match their biological makeup (McDonald, 2017). Third gender or gender non-conforming individuals do not identify with a specific gender or may maintain multiple gender identities (McDonald, 2017). In today's society, gender identities outside of cis-gender male or female have and continue to face scrutiny socially (McDonald, 2017).

Historically, gender has only been discussed in criminology with regard to males (Cook, 2016; Franklin, 2008). Criminological theory was designed by males to explain male patterns of offending and for years excluded females from research, despite gendered findings (Belknap, 2015; Cook, 2016; Franklin, 2008). Females were not widely introduced to criminology as subjects and researchers until the second wave of the feminist movement, and any inclusion of females in criminological research before this point painted females in a derogatory and subservient light (Burgess-Proctor, 2006; Franklin, 2008). The inclusion of females and gender minorities in criminological research and theoretical explanations continues to be a slow and gradual process.

Females have long been outnumbered by males as authors of criminological journals, and literature examining any potential authorship disparities among gender minority and non-conforming criminologists is scarce if not non-existent altogether (Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015). The underrepresentation of gender and sexual minorities within criminological journals seems to work to maintain gendered editorial discrepancies. For example, in an analysis of criminological journals' editorial boards, Lowe and Fagan (2019) found that despite gradual increases in representation, females are still under-represented in editorial roles. Included in their analysis were the roles of editor-in-chief, associate editor, and editorial board member, roles which ultimately maintain authority in determining what research is to be published (Lowe & Fagan, 2019). This finding exhibits a significant, yet unsurprising, obstacle for female criminologists, who have been historically excluded from the field as both researchers and subjects (Belknap, 2015; Cook, 2016; Franklin, 2008). Their finding is especially problematic when considered in conjunction with female authors' underrepresentation in mainstream criminological journals and overrepresentation in specialty journals that focus on issues of gender and sexuality (Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015). While queer and feminist criminology introduced and expanded the study of gender and sexuality within the field, the authorship of such work primarily by females creates a barrier to the progression of research on gender and sexuality. The discussion of gender and sexuality almost exclusively in specialty journals and by female authors allows such topics to be avoided by mainstream (male) criminologists. While the creation and standing of specialty journals is progressive, it does not equate to an advance in acceptance and inclusion of gender and sexual minorities in the field of criminology (Crow & Smykla, 2015; Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015).

The avoidance of sexuality and sexual orientation by criminologists has ultimately contributed to the oppression of sexual minorities (McDonald, 2017). A person's sexual orientation, specifically, defines who an individual is sexually attracted to. Heterosexual individuals are only attracted to opposite-gender sexual partners, while homosexual individuals are only attracted to same-gender sexual partners (McDonald, 2017). Traditionally, sexuality has been viewed as a binary of either homosexual or heterosexual sexualities (Callis, 2014). Even Kinsey, Pomeroy, and Martin's (1948) early studies of sexuality, which were progressive in their view of sexuality along a spectrum, maintained this binary.

Kinsey and colleagues' (1948) scale measured sexuality but only as it ranged from heterosexual (0) to homosexual (1) with varying degrees of homosexuality in between, which inadvertently measured other sexualities.¹ However, they did include an 'X' category specifically for individuals who were celibate or did not maintain any sexual feelings toward a particular group of people (Drucker, 2012; McDonald, 2017). It should be noted, too, that Kinsey perceived a person's sexuality to be the definition of their sexual acts rather than a definition of them as people and did not credit any sexuality with more stigma than another, insisting that all sexualities were natural and evolutionary responses (Drucker, 2012). The 'X' category was expanded upon in Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, and Gebhard's (1953) later work, and their scale continually evolved over time, as researchers adapted the scale to maintain relevance.

Kinsey and colleagues' (1948; 1953) work is reflective of society's broader tendency to view non-binary sexualities as springing up between the heterosexual-homosexual binary. For example, bisexual individuals, those attracted to sexual partners of the same gender and another

¹ A (3) on the scale indicated equal parts heterosexual and homosexual in a person's sexual identity, which some would consider bisexual.

gender, and pansexual individuals, those attracted to sexual partners of any gender, are seen as a variation of the binary conceptualization of sexuality rather than a distinctive (McDonald, 2017). While ascribing to these newer sexualities can place non-binary individuals lower in the social hierarchy, due to the hegemonic nature of society's binary conceptualization of sexuality, such ascription has the benefit of contributing to the view of sexuality as occurring on a spectrum.

Non-heteronormative--particularly non-binary--sexual individuals have experienced and continue to experience backlash due to their sexual orientation (Callis, 2014; Kane, 2003; Woods, 2014). In the 19th century, sexuality was medicalized, and men who engaged in sodomy were seen as psychologically and medically defective (Ball, 2016; McDonald, 2017; Woods, 2014). This psychological stigma was present officially in the APA's Diagnostic and Statistical Manual until 1974, when a vote took place to remove homosexuality from the manual (McDonald, 2017). Until fairly recently, individuals who engaged in sodomy, even with an opposite-gender partner, were subject to criminal sanction for such behavior (Ball, 2016; McDonald, 2017; Woods, 2014). After sodomy laws were repealed, the image of sexual minorities as deviants remained, and sexual minorities still face oppression in the workplace, in the adoption process, and in society at large (Ball, 2016; McDonald, 2017; Woods, 2014).

While the victimization of sexual minorities has been documented in criminological research, preliminary findings suggest that further research is needed to fully understand the victimization of various non-heterosexual individuals (e.g., bisexual, pansexual, and others) due to differing rates of victimization among these populations (Brown & Herman, 2015). It has also been noted that victimology could benefit from including men in the historically female-focused issue of sexual victimization (Hunnicut, 2009; Katz, 2013). Pathways research and lifestyle-routine activities theory would suggest that an individual's victimization is somewhat dependent

upon gender as a demographic characteristic, and all genders should be considered in order to fully understand the circumstances surrounding victimization (Franklin, 2008; McNeeley, 2015).

The introduction of feminist and queer criminology has encouraged the inclusion of more women and gender and sexual minorities in criminological research (Cook, 2016; Renzetti, 1993). However, calls influenced by feminist and queer criminology have noted that inclusive conceptualizations of sexuality and gender still need to be included more in the literature (Belknap, 2015; Woods, 2014). More recently, Belknap (2015), in her American Society of Criminology's Presidential speech noted that while some progress has been made, criminologists still need to heighten their focus on issues of inclusivity in their research and conduct more intersectional research and more research that focuses on how social identities like gender and sexuality impact criminality, victimization patterns, and experiences within the criminal justice system. In order to examine if criminologists have begun to heed the calls of Belknap and others, in the present study, recent publications are evaluated to determine the inclusion of gender and sexuality in criminology and victimology research. Additionally, presumed author gender is also explored in order to determine its influence on likelihood of publication in mainstream criminological and victimization journals and the inclusion of sexuality and gender within the articles.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Gender and Criminology

Criminology is and has long been a male-dominated field, designed by heterosexual men to punish and treat other men (Belknap, 2015; Cook, 2016; Franklin, 2008). Despite the fact that analyses have, since the beginning of criminological research, suggested that gender discrepancies might exist, gendered patterns of offending were disregarded as concepts to be studied (Cook, 2016). Franklin (2008) argues that, historically, criminology regarded women in only three ways: not at all, with fascination at female sexuality, or to impose female gender roles. When criminology did discuss women, the fascination with female sexuality and imposition of female gender roles overlapped somewhat. These true motives were masked under the guise of concern for the morality of women, which was policed by prohibiting and punishing certain female sexual behaviors, such as engaging in promiscuous behavior and carrying venereal disease (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2004; Franklin, 2008; Rafter, 1990; Shelden, 2001). Any woman's betrayal of her socially-prescribed sexual role was historically seen as a threat to the male-dominated power structure and was punished accordingly (Franklin, 2008).

Women have historically been penalized for behaving in a manner that falls outside of female gender expectations (Franklin, 2008). Following the chivalry hypothesis, women are seen as weak and passive and the criminal justice system, as a patriarchal institution, shows females leniency as a way to protect them (Franklin, 2008). However, women who do not express

feminine traits or who do not fall into a traditional female role are treated more harshly (Belknap, 2001; Franklin, 2008; Rafter, 1990). Further, women who are convicted of more stereotypically masculine offenses receive harsher punishment than women convicted of stereotypically feminine offenses, a phenomenon described as the *evil woman thesis* (Albonetti, 1988; Franklin, 2008; Koons-Witt, 2002; Kruttschnitt, 1984). The evil woman thesis, originally proposed by Nagel and Hagan (1983), proposes that women generally receive chivalry or preferential treatment, but this chivalry is reserved for more typically feminine crimes (i.e. fraud) and is denied in the case of female offenders with more violent, ‘masculine’ crimes such as armed robbery or assault--the latter fall into the ‘evil woman category,’ at which point, chivalry ceases due to the belief that such ‘evil women’ are unworthy of male protection (Spohn & Spears, 1997).

When women lacked ‘morality’ or acted in an aggressive (i.e. masculine) way, they were sentenced to incarceration in women’s reformatories, implemented in the 19th and 20th centuries (Belknap, 2001; Franklin, 2008; Rafter, 1990). These reformatories, run by ‘matrons,’ were maintained as a way to correct female ‘criminality.’ Matrons acted as role models, leading the women in cleaning, sewing, and cooking in an effort to mold the women to fit society’s expectations for females (Crittenden, Koons-Witt, & Kaminski, 2018; Franklin, 2008; Rafter, 1990). However, women of color were often not afforded the luxury of reformatories and were relegated to work alongside incarcerated men in roles such as mining, operating machinery, and sometimes working on chain gangs, a sanction practically foreign to white women (Crittenden et al., 2018).

Females in the juvenile system received similar treatment to white women in rescue homes and girls’ reformatories. In these facilities, girls were taught domestic skills, morality, and

religion, were provided with infant care, and were quarantined in cases of sexual promiscuity and disease (Knupfer, 2001; Pasko, 2008). Juvenile reformatories were the result of the Child Savers Movement, a movement which, in order to “patrol the puritanical boundaries of sexuality” among juveniles, influenced the court system to hold a disproportionate number of female offenders for crimes like ‘immorality’ and ‘waywardness,’ offenses responsible for nearly all female juveniles’ appearances in court (Franklin, 2008; Pasko, 2008, p. 828). Juvenile courts originally considered juvenile delinquency to be any violation of the law by someone under the age of sixteen, but when applied to girls, this definition was broadened to include “‘incorrigibility (beyond parental control), associations with lascivious or immoral persons, vagrancy, frequent attendance at pool halls or saloons, immoral conduct, and use of indecent language’” (Knupfer, 2001; Pasko, 2008, p. 828). In a study of girls referred to court in 1929 and 1930, over half were charged with ‘immorality’--a charge that carried an implication of sexual intercourse (Chesney-Lind & Pasko, 2004; Pasko, 2008). Historically, girls were more likely to be formally processed and put into custody than boys (Shelden, 2001), and more current research suggests that girls are still treated more severely than boys in the juvenile justice system (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2004; Franklin, 2008; MacDonald & Chesney-Lind, 2001). In the case of status offenses, such treatment might be especially unwarranted, as research has noted the potential for status offenses--such as running away--to be a defense mechanism against abuse (Belknap, 2001; Chesney-Lind & Pasko, 2004; Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2004; Franklin, 2008; Gilfus, 2006).

Not only are women held to certain standards of femininity, they are also held liable for their offspring. Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) argued that one of the strongest predictors of crime was having a single-parent family, noting that single parents are typically females who are

less able to control criminal behavior in their offspring (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). Sutherland and Cressey (1974), too, dismissed gender as the greatest statistically significant indicator of crime, explaining away gender differences as the result of probable parental supervision and socialization differences (Cook, 2016). Sampson and Laub (1993) also ignored gender as a contributing factor in violence against women, instead attributing IPV to a male's excessive consumption of alcohol, long after the "drunken-bum" theory of violence against women had been disproven (Cook, 2016; Kantor & Straus, 1987).

Despite gendered findings appearing time and time again, criminological theory was not designed with the intent to explain gendered patterns of offending (Franklin, 2008). Even more contemporary control theories and life course theories fail to explore nuances in acknowledged gender discrepancies, and until the 21st century, critical criminology avoided analyzing gender-based power dynamics (Cook, 2016). Mainstream criminology reflects this disinterest in gendered analyses, often limiting the study of gender to a control variable (Sharp & Hefley, 2007). Instead of investigating gender differences, criminologists have consistently and typically incorrectly asserted that research on predominately-male or all-male subjects can be broadly applied to females as well (Cook, 2016). Research on male-only subjects is often overgeneralized to apply to females without concern for whether or not the implications will hold true for females, and what little research exists on female-only subjects narrowly limits the generalizability of their findings (Cook, 2016; Hannon & Dufour, 1998).

Knowing that gender differences have historically been ignored by criminologists and that criminology has long been a male-dominated field, it is unsurprising that women are more often the authors of empirical studies on gender differences (Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015). This is a primary reason why the exclusion of females from the field, not only as subjects but as

scholars, demands attention. Women dominate feminist criminological journals yet make up a disproportionately small percentage of authors in mainstream journals (Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015). This is notable considering the fact that more females than males are currently entering the field of criminal justice after earning their doctoral degrees (Crow & Smykla, 2015). Renzetti (1993) expressed surprise that women are interested in entering the field at all given the “rampant sexism” that pervades the history of criminology (p. 226). However, it is also noted that “one cannot expect that the first generation of new scholars will be confident or sure-footed after centuries of exclusion from the academy” (Burgess-Proctor, 2006; Daly & Chesney-Lind, 1988, p. 506). Female criminologists may be slow to enter the field, testing the waters to determine whether or not they are welcome and in what subfields.

This historical exclusion is one of the main reasons why female criminologists sought to charter a distinct subfield of criminology with the introduction of feminist criminology. Feminist criminology is a theoretical perspective that originated in the 1960s and 1970s with the second wave of feminism (Burgess-Proctor, 2006). During this time, feminist scholars fought back against their exclusion from criminological research, which studied almost exclusively male populations (Burgess-Proctor, 2006). The third wave of feminism, beginning in the 1980s and 1990s, emphasized the experiences of intersecting statuses, particularly intersecting minority statuses--a population that had been ignored by the predominately heterosexual, white, middle- to upper-class feminists in the field (Burgess-Proctor, 2006). The intersectional approach “recognizes that systems of power such as race, class, and gender do not act alone to shape our experiences but rather, are multiplicative, inextricably linked, and simultaneously experienced” (Burgess-Proctor, 2006, p. 31). This approach would, for example, emphasize how white women and black men experience oppression differently based on the compounding factors of race and

gender. More relevant to the current study, another example of intersectional feminism would be how homosexual men and heterosexual women experience social oppression or privilege differently.

There are five major feminist perspectives that influence criminology: liberal feminism, radical feminism, Marxist feminism, socialist feminism, and postmodern feminism. Liberal feminism cites women's oppression as the result of gender role socialization, while radical feminism lays the blame for female oppression at the feet of patriarchy, the male power structure (Burgess-Proctor, 2006). Marxist feminism regards the subordinate class status of women in capitalist societies as the source of their oppression, and socialist feminism combines the perspectives of radical and Marxist feminism, ultimately blaming structural inequalities based on sex and class (Burgess-Proctor, 2006). Lastly, postmodern feminism is a departure from any one fixed source of oppression, focusing more on "multiple truths" (Burgess-Proctor, 2006, p. 29). Postmodern feminism may best be illustrated through the words of Cook (2016) who noted, "all voices are - or at least can be - authentic" (p. 341). Despite the differences between feminist perspectives, five commonalities serve as the basis for all feminist work: 1) emphasizing gender as a major social feature, 2) social relations are shaped by power, 3) social context shapes relations, 4) there are processes in which social reality is constructed, and 5) emphasizing the importance of empowering people to bring about systemic change (Renzetti, 1993).

These concepts of feminism can be seen within the criminological literature today but were and are still much slower to build in the field of criminology than in other social science fields, especially regarding research and curriculum (Goodstein, 1992; Renzetti, 1993). In the past, researchers and activists seeking to expand the scholarship on these issues have created new and specialized areas in the field to highlight the importance of studying these topics that have

long been ignored by mainstream criminology (Woods, 2014). While their progress cannot be understated, it is limited, as seen through the continuous denial of progressive issues by mainstream criminology. Some blame this lack of progressive change on the field's ever-enduring 'tough-on-crime' stance, which emphasizes the inherently masculine nature of the patriarchal society that feminist literature blames to begin with (Garrison, McClelland, Dambrot, & Casey, 1992; Renzetti, 1993). Still others have criticized that feminism is only beneficial for women, to which Renzetti (1993) contests that benefitting half of the population is well worth it, and certainly researchers have not historically been discouraged from only including the male half of the population. Daly and Chesney-Lind (1988), contend that all realms of society are women's issues and are therefore privy to feminist perspective. Matthews and Young (1992) suggest that, "there can be little doubt that the impact of feminists on criminological thinking has been one of the most productive and progressive inputs into the subject over the last decade or so" (p. 14). Ultimately, the goal of feminism is not to take men down but to bring women up and into the conversations being had within and regarding criminological research (Renzetti, 1993). Gendered criminological issues deserve the attention of researchers of all genders.

Sexuality and Criminology

The inclusion of sexuality in criminology and criminal justice has seemingly been much more gradual than the inclusion of women into the field. In the later part of the twentieth century, gender and sexual non-conforming behaviors became more public with the growth of industrialization, urbanization, and overall diversity (Woods, 2014). Because the government could not directly intervene into the sexual lives of citizens to mandate puritanical standards, society turned to medical fields to resolve what were primarily moral issues (Woods, 2014).

Sexologists emerged as the experts in homosexuality, a term used to describe any and all acts outside of heterosexual and gender conforming behavior (Woods, 2014). Some medical experts believed that ‘homosexuality’ was biologically ingrained in certain individuals, in whom those traits were present from birth, while others believed that homosexual tendencies were natural for all people (Drucker, 2012; McDonald, 2017; Woods, 2014). Still, some saw heterosexuality as the standard from which any deviation would classify an individual as a “biological degenerate” (Makari, 2008; McDonald, 2017; Woods, 2014).

Around the same time that sexologists were speculating on the origin and cause of homosexuality, Cesare Lombroso was formulating biological theories of crime, which classified various types of criminals based on biological traits. With these theories, Lombroso attached stigma to homosexual men, whom he referred to as “pederasts.” This label was earned from an individual’s nonconforming behaviors, appearance, and clothing, and in Lombroso’s later theories, he classified pederasts as a type of “insane criminal” (Lombroso, 2006).

Lombroso’s classification of homosexuals as criminal served as the foundation for widely-held stigmatization of gender and sexual nonconforming behaviors and implementation of sodomy and sexual psychopath laws, which were standard in every state prior to 1961 (Kane, 2003; Woods, 2014). Sodomy laws criminalize certain sexual acts, such as oral and anal sex, between consenting adults (Eskridge Jr., 1999; Kane, 2003). While these laws were always applied to homosexual sexual partners, they were inconsistently applied to heterosexual sexual partners, contributing to the criminalization of non-heterosexual individuals (Kane, 2003). Historically, sodomy laws have been used to discriminate against and deny the rights of non-heterosexual individuals with both formal and informal penalties, such as parental custody denial as a result of criminal status prescribed by violation of sodomy laws (Cain, 2000; Clendinen &

Nagourney, 1999; Kane, 2003). According to the homosexual deviancy thesis, this deviance-centered element suggests that criminologists discussed sexual minorities only in regard to their ‘deviance’ (Ball, 2016; Woods, 2014). The invisibility element of Woods’ (2014) homosexual deviancy thesis applies to criminology’s inclusion of sexuality following the 1970s, when these laws were widely repealed and unenforced. Rather than replacing the social image of sexual minorities as deviants, the field remained silent, maintaining an informal association between ‘homosexuality’ and deviance (Ball, 2016; Woods, 2014).

Since the 1970s, criminological research on sexual minorities has been sparse. There is little to no data on sexual minority offenders, and what data does exist is focused on their experiences of victimization, such as intimate partner violence and “bias crime” (Woods, 2014). Outside of criminology, sexuality has also been researched in the context of the prevalence of substance abuse among sexual minorities. Additionally, sexuality and gender identity are rarely used as key variables in data collection, especially in self-report surveys and surveys used to officially measure crime statistics (Woods, 2014). One of the main statistical informants of criminal justice policy in the United States, the Uniform Crime Report (UCR), contains measures for race, age, and sex but fails to include any measure for sexuality or gender identity (which would be necessary in keeping with the distinction between gender identity and biological sex) except in its measure of hate crimes (Woods, 2014). The only inclusion of sexuality and gender is in a separate hate crime dataset, which includes crimes reported by officers who believe certain offenses were motivated by bias (*Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines and Training Manual*, 2015).

When bias appears to be present in data reported to the UCR, it must be specified what kind of bias motivated the offense. Gender bias, gender identity bias, and sexual orientation bias

are among the various kinds of bias that can be chosen from. Gender bias is defined as “a preformed negative opinion or attitude toward a person or group of persons based on their actual or perceived gender, i.e., male or female” (*Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines and Training Manual*, 2015, p. 16). The definition of gender identity bias is “a preformed negative opinion or attitude toward a person or group of persons based on their actual or perceived gender identity, e.g., bias against transgender or gender nonconforming individuals” (*Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines and Training Manual*, 2015, p. 16). The UCR’s definition for sexual orientation (followed in the categorization of sexual orientation bias) is “the term for a person’s physical, romantic, and/or emotional attraction to members of the same and/or opposite sex, including lesbian, gay, bisexual, and heterosexual (straight) individuals” (*Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines and Training Manual*, 2015, p. 21). This measurement of sexual orientation, while more inclusive than previous measures, still lacks labels to describe pansexual, asexual, and intersex sexual minorities. These more progressive measures in official crime statistics are also still limited to the UCR’s specialized subset of hate crime data and are not considered outside the context of victimization relative to a person’s status as a sexual or gender minority. They only measure the offender’s bias and therefore the perceived (and not actual) sexual or gender minority status of individuals and potential offenders. This perception of sexual or gender minority status is that of the police officer, which in the best case is an inconsistent measure, and in the worst case could be the result of biases maintained by that officer or lack of proper training (*Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines and Training Manual*, 2015; Woods, 2014).

The National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), the leading measurement of self-reported crime in the United States, began including demographic characteristics of gender

identity and sexual orientation in 2016 as well as considering sexual orientation and gender identity in the context of crimes motivated by gender identity and sexual orientation bias (*National Crime Victimization Survey, 2016: Technical Documentation, 2017*). Because such scant current research exists about the relationship between sexual and gender nonconforming individuals and crime, application of and inclusion in criminological theory is extremely limited. While there are evidence-based expectations for a whole host of other offender characteristics, such as age, sex, and race, no such expectations truly exist for sexuality or gender (apart from sex). Crime rates peak in late adolescence and decrease rapidly before leveling off. Males commit more crime, and their offenses are more violent than those of female offenders. Racial minorities make up a disproportionate number of criminal offenders. However, the expectations of sexual minority offenders remains unknown, as research has yet to provide a baseline expectation of criminality for this population (Woods, 2014).

Aside from the more obvious need to maintain social relevance, the field of criminology must take into consideration matters of sexuality because criminological research can have the power to influence policy (Woods, 2014). Without statistical backing, there is no evidence to affect policy and no reason to provide funding to such aspects of the criminal justice system. Essentially, without updated research on sexuality in the field of criminology, it can be expected that the system will continue to operate on antiquated assumptions about sexuality. One reason for the exclusion of sexuality and gender variables in criminological research is the difficulty of operationalizing and measuring nuanced variables such as these. While careful consideration in the measurement and operationalization of these variables is wise and should take place, this cannot be the sole reason for decades of exclusion from analyses, as researchers have had to overcome similar obstacles in the measurement of race and ethnicity (Woods, 2014).

An entire subset of criminologists is working to push past this stagnancy with the relatively new field of queer criminology. Queer criminology focuses primarily on sexual and gender nonconforming individuals and their experiences with the criminal justice system (Ball, 2016). Just as feminist criminology has helped to bring light to female interactions with the criminal justice system, the hope is that queer criminology will shed light on the lives of sexual and gender minorities and how they interact with the criminal justice system. Historically, major schools of criminological ideology focused solely on heterosexual men, ignoring women and sexual minorities (Woods, 2014). Queer and feminist criminology were introduced as a way to compensate for this gap in research.

Queer Criminology and the Call to Research

Queer and feminist criminology's recent emergence as specialty fields is due in large part as a response to calls that have been made over the years to include these marginalized populations in criminological research (Cook, 2016; Renzetti, 1993). In Belknap's 2014 (2015) *Presidential Address to the American Society of Criminology*, she emphasized the need for activist criminology as a response to the marginalization that minorities have experienced at the very hands of the criminal justice system. Defining activist criminology as "criminologists engaging in social and/or legal justice at individual, organizational, and/or policy levels, which goes beyond typical research, teaching, and service," Belknap (2015) notes the "heightened responsibility" that criminologists have in dealing with marginalized populations, due to advantages in privilege, knowledge, and ultimately, power (pp. 4-5). Belknap (2015) suggests that of all fields that can and are discussing gender and sexuality progressively, criminology

should be at the forefront, as criminologists are largely financially capable and well-informed university faculty members, quite familiar with the shortcomings of the justice system.

While activism can be seen as a hindrance to truly empirical work, Belknap (2015) argues that without it, social and legal justice issues will be worsened by the climate of academia, which does not prioritize “outrageous acts and everyday rebellions” (p. 4; Steinem, 1983). Belknap (2015) acknowledges that such activism can take place on a volunteer basis but also can be done from within the ivory tower of academia, through acts such as whistleblowing, inclusive research, and messages conveyed in the classroom. Drawing on the work of Woods (2014), Belknap (2015) emphasized, among other needs, the need to redefine the damaging perceptions of sexual and gender minorities as deviants--a label attached by criminologists many years ago—both in the classroom and in criminological scholarship. Repairs must be made from a fresh and unbiased perspective that mirrors the work of critical criminology in advancing concepts of race, ethnicity, and class (Belknap, 2015).

Woods (2014) states directly in his work, “This chapter makes a call to ‘queer’ criminology. In so doing, I advocate for greater inclusion of LGBTQ perspectives, concepts, and theories in the field” (p. 16). Queer criminology, as a field that seeks to address criminal and social injustices suffered by sexual and gender minorities, is in of itself a field of activists (Ball, 2016). Belknap (2015) emphasized the need for this kind of activism in all areas of mainstream criminology, not just the specialized fields of queer, feminist, and critical criminology. Belknap (2015) also voiced concern over the omission of gender from criminological literature--a concern expressed by numerous criminologists for decades. In 1988, Daly and Chesney-Lind began examining feminist theories and applying them to criminology. Reiterating that the field was “a product of white, economically privileged men’s experiences,” Daly and Chesney-Lind (1988)

sought to follow international criminologists whose work on gendered patterns of crime “signaled an awakening of criminology from its androcentric slumber” (pp. 506-507). In 1992, Matthews and Young directly acknowledged feminist criticism of criminological research, stating “there can be little doubt that the impact of feminists on criminological thinking has been one of the most productive and progressive inputs into the subject over the last decade or so” (p. 14). In *On the margins of malestream (or, they still don't get it, do they?)*, Renzetti (1993) reviewed recent scholarship for feminist content, noting the general reluctance of researchers to incorporate such issues. Renzetti (1993) concludes this review by stating, “My task, as I stated at the outset, was to develop an argument for greater emphasis on feminist analyses in criminal justice curricula. But as I completed this article, I found myself asking ‘Why should I have to make this case *again?*’” emphasizing the redundant nature of these calls for inclusion and activism (p. 232). Moreover, Britton (2000) and Flavin (2001) note the contradiction that exists due to the lack of inquiry on gender and masculinity in relation to crime, given that men and boys are overrepresented as victims and offenders and gender is such a strong predictor of crime (Blumstein, Cohen, Roth, & Visher, 1986; Burgess-Proctor, 2006; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996). This gender gap in criminological research has led to an “epistemological blind spot” in criminological theory (Cook, 2016, p. 342; Flavin, 2001).

History of Victimology

The importance of gender has also been highlighted in the criminological subfield of victimology, the study of victims, offenders, and society, as females were historically thought to be weaker and therefore more likely to be victimized (Wallace & Roberson, 2011). Victimology first emerged in the 1940s and 1950s, as a departure from archaic victim reparation methods such

as blood feuds and outright revenge (Wallace & Roberson, 2011). One of the main researchers of victim-offender interactions during the emergence of victimology was Benjamin Mendelsohn. Mendelsohn was a practicing attorney and is the originator of the term ‘victimology.’ Following his studies of victims, defendants, and witnesses in preparation for trial, he proposed a theory to explain the relationship between victims and offenders (Mendelsohn, 1963). With his theory, victims fell into one of six categories: the completely innocent victim, the victim with minor guilt, the victim who is as guilty as the offender, the victim more guilty than the offender, the most guilty victim, and the imaginary victim (Mendelsohn, 1963; Wallace & Roberson, 2011). Mendelsohn’s (1963) focus on the victim’s contribution to their victimization was a focus never before taken in criminology, and while he was a one of the main researchers of early victimology, he was not alone (Wallace & Roberson, 2011).

In 1941, Hans von Hentig published an article about these victim-offender interactions, and in 1948, von Hentig published his own theory of victimization (Wallace & Roberson, 2011). Von Hentig’s (1948) victim typology was based on social, biological and psychological risk factors, and included three categories of victims: the general classes of victims, the psychological types of victims, and the activating sufferer. The activating sufferer described an individual who allowed consequences of their victimization (i.e. loss of self-confidence) to lead them to offending (Hentig, 1948; Wallace & Roberson, 2011). Psychological Types of Victims included the depressed, the acquisitive (“excessive desire for gain”), the wanton, and the lonesome and heartbroken (Wallace & Roberson, 2011, p. 10). Within von Hentig’s General Classes of Victims were the young, the female, the old, the mentally defective, and immigrants, minorities, and ‘dull normals’ (Wallace & Roberson, 2011). Immigrants, minorities, and ‘dull normals’ were seen as helpless, inexperienced, poor, and/or ‘dull,’ which could lead to their being taken advantage of

(i.e. victimization). The mentally defective victim was someone who was ‘feeble-minded,’ insane, and addicted to alcohol or drugs. The old, the female, and the young were all seen as weak in one way or another, which led to their victimization. The old were thought to be in danger because of their acquired wealth and physical and mental degrade. On the contrary, youth was thought to be in of itself a weakness as the most vulnerable time in an individual’s life (Hentig, 1948; Wallace & Roberson, 2011). The females were said to have a legally recognized weakness, due to the numerous laws that present males as the stronger sex and females as the weaker sex. While both von Hentig and Mendelsohn’s theories were later disproven, the remnants of gendered views of victimization have still been evident throughout victimology’s history (Wallace & Roberson, 2011).

It was not until the 1960s that victimology research was formally implemented. During this time, the first victimization survey was undertaken, the first textbooks about victims were penned, Congress began hearing issues of crime victims, California became the first state to implement victim compensation, and in 1967, the government formally acknowledged the need for the study of victims within criminology (Karmen, 2013). Following this call, the National Crime Victimization Survey was initiated in 1972 (Karmen, 2013). The subfield of victimology, with its emphasis on gender differences, blossomed within the context of the larger feminist movement happening in the United States at that time. In the 1970s, several feminist publications such as Brownmiller’s (1975) *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*, Griffin’s (1971) “Rape: The All-American Crime,” and Millett’s (1972) *Sexual Politics*, acknowledged the sexual victimization of women in the context of workplace harassment and domestic violence—not just street crime (Wallace & Roberson, 2011).

In that same decade, the first rape crisis centers and sex crime divisions appeared, victim-witness assistance programs were formed, and the World Society of Victimology was founded (Karmen, 2013). In 1976, *Victimology—An International Journal* was the first specialty journal in victimology to be published, and in this same year, police departments began instructing their officers specifically how to interact with victims (Karmen, 2013). In the 1980s, the victims' movement and the field of victimology gained momentum the United States, with President Reagan's proclamation of Victims' Rights Week (Karmen, 2013; Wallace & Roberson, 2011). Over the next 30 years, multiple laws were created in the effort of victim advocacy, including the Victims of Crime Act in 1984, the Victims' Rights and Restitution Act in 1990, the Violence Against Women Act in 1994, and the Crime Victims' Rights Act in 2004 (Karmen, 2013).

Due to the growing nature of the victims' movement even still, it is critical that criminologists and criminal justice officials understand the nuances of victimology (Wallace & Roberson, 2011). Today, victimologists look for patterns and trends among victims to implement strategies that reduce risk and victimization-prevention strategies (Karmen, 2013). Specifically, by uncovering victims' vulnerabilities, they seek to understand why certain individuals are victimized and others are not (Karmen, 2013).

Gender and Victimology

In addition to pinpointing what predisposes an individual to victimization and how that predisposition may differ for males and females, research suggests that pathways to offending are different for males versus females and may overlap with their victimization (Franklin, 2008; Gottfredson, 1981; Jennings, Higgins, Tewksbury, Gover, & Piquero, 2010; Lauritsen, Sampson,

& Laub, 1991; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2000). Contrary to popular belief, victims and offenders are often not polar opposites (Karmen, 2013). The offender in one situation can easily become the victim in another situation, and vice versa (Karmen, 2013; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2000). For example, an individual who is perpetually victimized might retaliate, becoming the offender, such as when battered wives kill their husbands (Karmen, 2013). This overlap exists for both violent and non-violent minor offenses and appears to be more pronounced in adolescents (Jennings et al., 2010; Lauritsen et al., 1991).

This victim-offender overlap is clearly seen within the context of women's pathways to offending. Female offenders of all ages report high levels of victimization, particularly at the hands of males, either as intimate partners or relatives (Franklin, 2008). In a study of 20 female inmates, Gilfus (2006) found that 65% had experienced childhood sexual abuse, 50% were neglected, and thirteen had run away to escape such problems. These women turned to prostitution as a source of income and self-medicated with illegal drugs to overcome their compounded trauma, essentially letting their victimization guide their pathway to offending (Franklin, 2008; Gilfus, 2006). In a study of incarcerated young girls, 75% had experienced being burned, beaten, kicked, hit, bitten, and otherwise abused, and over 25% had experienced sexual assault (Franklin, 2008; Ryder, 2007). The effects of such victimizations can, and often do, result in mental health problems that may be treated with illicit drugs (Franklin, 2008; Ryder, 2007). Abused women may also turn to prostitution or hustling to support illicit drug addiction, solidifying their position as 'offenders' within the criminal justice system (Franklin, 2008). Women who are introduced to the system are further limited by domestic violence shelters' bans on convicted felons, which create and contribute to this damaging cycle (Franklin, 2008). Chesney-Lind and Shelden (2004) deem the criminal justice system responsible for criminalizing

these survival mechanisms of women experiencing abuse when the alternative (fighting back, killing their abusers, or running away [in the case of adolescent girls]) also carries a severe criminal sanction (Busch & Rosenberg, 2004; Franklin, 2008).

The patriarchal society that acts as the foundation for the exclusion of women from academia and the differential processing of women in the criminal justice system is also partially responsible for this cyclical victimization of females as a way to affirm male-dominance. Just as females were long excluded as subjects in criminological research, the majority of previous research on violence against women has dismissed men from serious criminological consideration (Hunnicut, 2009). However, within this patriarchal society lies an even more defined hierarchal structure of males, and it is those most disadvantaged males who are responsible for the majority of violence against women (Hunnicut, 2009; Messerschmidt, 1993). In this hierarchal structure, the only threat that the 'weakest' males face are females. Within this hierarchy, females are expected to experience the most abuse, but 'weaker, less masculine' males may also experience abuse from 'superior, masculine' males since they are situated above them within the hierarchy (Hunnicut, 2009).

This coincides with Jackson Katz's (2013) work, arguing that violence against women is a women's issue, but it is first and foremost a men's issue. Because women are the more obvious victims of 'violence against women,' males are often dismissed from discussions on their role as perpetrators in violence against women, which Katz (2013) notes--in a TEDTalk--is a critical feature of dominance. "The dominant group," Katz says, "is rarely challenged to even think about its dominance." Violence against women appears to occur in a vacuum, without serious consideration given to the violent perpetrator. Instead of questioning males as the perpetrators,

victims are held responsible for their own victimization, a concept referred to as ‘victim blaming’ (Katz, 2013).

While victimology has brought light to domestic and sexual abuse of females, the same acts, when used to victimize males, are even more unthinkable, and their frequency is, therefore, significantly underestimated (Karmen, 2013; Tewksbury, 2009; Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2001). Despite the overlap of acts committed against males and females, and the ability for males to be both victims and offenders if positioned mid-rank in the social hierarchy, the body of extant research on male victimization is quite different in nature than that on female victimization, commonly referred to in the field of criminology as “violence against women.” Despite the field of criminology historically revolving around men, research on male victimization (particularly violent victimization) has been limited by males’ willingness to report their victimization and the consequences of it (Stanko & Hobdell, 1993). Women’s willingness to report their victimization and its array of negative effects has led to the field of violence against women. While an entire subfield of research is dedicated to the nuance of female victimization (rightly so), a similar body of research focusing on the nuance of male victimization cannot compare, especially regarding male sexual victimization (Stanko & Hobdell, 1993).

Sexual victimization of males is a serious problem, which has only more recently garnered attention from researchers (Karmen, 2013). While the molestation of boys is an issue that has been acknowledged and addressed, the rape of men has been virtually ignored. From 1973 to 1982, roughly 125,000 males were estimated to be victims of rape (Karmen, 2013; Klaus, DeBerry, & Timrots, 1985), and because male rape victims are very unlikely to report their victimization (if they even acknowledge the incident as ‘rape’), these numbers could be grossly underestimated (Karmen, 2013). Further preventing the reporting of such incidents,

males may face the backlash of gendered society, which, contrary to female victims who are perceived as weak, expects male victims to be ‘real men’ and fight back against any attackers (Karmen, 2013). They also may be disparagingly labeled ‘gay’ due to an assault by another male and typically have fewer places available to obtain treatment and solace (Karmen, 2013; Tewksbury, 2009).

Sexuality and Victimology

What research of non-heterosexual sexual assaults on males that does exist is limited but suggests that sexuality is less of an indicator of victimization than is gender in combination with sexuality (Wallace & Roberson, 2011). Katz-Wise and Hyde (2012) found that both heterosexual and non-heterosexual females experienced similar rates of sexual and physical assault, but a much more significant difference existed in the rates of victimization between heterosexual and non-heterosexual males, with non-heterosexual males experiencing greater rates of assault. Among other possible explanations, these preliminary findings could be the result of a patriarchal subculture that promotes hyper-masculinity and more rigid gender roles in males (Katz-Wise & Hyde, 2012; Way et al., 2014). Non-conforming males that appear “gay or girly” in societies maintaining standards of hyper-masculinity fall closer to the bottom of the social hierarchy in comparison to conforming, heteronormative males (Pascoe, 2005; Way et al., 2014). As previously stated, males at the bottom of this social hierarchy are targets of victimization perpetrated by those more powerfully-situated males (Hunnicut, 2009; Katz, 2013; Messerschmidt, 1993).

While more attention has been drawn generally to the victimization of non-heterosexual individuals in recent years with research like that of Katz-Wise and Hyde (2012)--which

analyzed victimization experiences of a variety of non-heterosexual individuals--research and policy have been slow to keep up. This is problematic given the extent of such victimization, especially when considering underreported crimes such as intimate partner violence among non-heterosexual individuals, just one aspect of the victimization experienced by sexual minorities (Brown & Herman, 2015; Wallace & Roberson, 2011). Rates of IPV among non-heterosexual partners are as high as, if not higher than, rates of IPV in among heterosexual partners, and extant research suggests that rates might differ even more among non-heterosexual individuals (Brown & Herman, 2015). For example, homosexual females report higher rates of lifetime IPV than heterosexual women, but bisexual women report even higher rates of lifetime IPV than homosexual females (Brown & Herman, 2015).

These preliminary findings suggest that further research should be conducted on sexual minorities not only as a whole but also as individuals belonging to distinct, non-heterosexual sexualities (Brown & Herman, 2015). The victimization experienced by various sexual minority individuals could be the result of a hierarchical power structure similar to that of the gendered hierarchical structure, in which the 'least powerful' men are victimized by more powerful men and exclusively victimize women, since those are the only individuals less powerful than themselves (Katz, 2013). It is possible that due to the long-standing sexual binary (homosexual or heterosexual sexual identities, exclusively), sexual identities outside of this binary, such as bisexual, pansexual, and asexual sexual identities, maintain less powerful positions in the social hierarchy, due to their only more recent social acceptance (Callis, 2014). However, more research is necessary to support this or any explanation for the victimization discrepancies of various sexual minority individuals.

Aside from the outright abuse experienced by sexual minorities, systemic and social barriers exist which hinder the resolution of these issues. An example of a uniquely problematic circumstance for sexual minorities is the risk of being ‘outed,’ either by reporting IPV to law enforcement or by an abusive partner as a form of retaliation (Brown & Herman, 2015; Wallace & Roberson, 2011). A certain amount of stigma still remains in society today, and in some environments a non-heterosexual label can induce further victimization societally. Even if a victim is out, their abuser may exploit their fears of being perceived by a homophobic society (Brown & Herman, 2015). This fear may be even greater for individuals with AIDS and those who are HIV positive (Brown & Herman, 2015). Because AIDS and HIV still carry a great amount of stigma in society, that fear of social ramifications can be used by an abusive partner against a victim with AIDS or HIV.

Reporting victimization can also lead to further discrimination by more traditional criminal justice actors (i.e. police officers, judges, and attorneys), if these authorities choose to acknowledge the victimization at all, contributing to sexual minority individuals’ reluctance to report their victimization (Brown & Herman, 2015; Wallace & Roberson, 2011). The system’s historical failure to acknowledge that the same harm inflicted among heterosexual couples is present among non-heterosexual couples—for example, laws that do not identify IPV among same-sex partners as domestic violence (Brown & Herman, 2015)—works to the advantage of the abuser (Wallace & Roberson, 2011). The abuser may also claim to be the victim—a barrier for responding law enforcement officers who have traditionally seen the larger, more masculine partner as the aggressor (Wallace & Roberson, 2011). This is not always the case in heterosexual couples, but responding to instances of same-sex abuse can further officer confusion because it is not immediately apparent which partner the officer should assume is responsible for the abuse

(Wallace & Roberson, 2011). Even when sexual minority individuals report IPV, their legal options may be limited by definitions of abuse that innately exclude any non-heterosexual victims. Additionally, victims of non-heterosexual IPV may be unaware of available resources even if they are able to overcome the aforementioned obstacles (Brown & Herman, 2015).

In addition to confusion about the roles in same-sex partnerships, one primary reason for the silence regarding the victimization of sexual minorities is the public's general discomfort in the discussion of such issues (Wallace & Roberson, 2011). However, to fully understand the victimization of this population, the circumstances unique to their lifestyle must be examined and discussed. As evident in the UCR and NCVS's measurements of hate crime, victimization of sexual minorities is a pressing issue, particularly for criminologists. Not only does criminological attention need to be paid to the victimization of sexual minorities in the population at large, but particularly within corrections, considering sexual minorities are at a higher risk of experiencing sexual abuse while incarcerated (Meyer et al., 2017; Wilson et al., 2017). To keep track of victimization, the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute annually reports levels of violence among homosexual individuals (Wallace & Roberson, 2011). These statistics found that in sexual minority incidents involving assault, 3% of attacks were fatal, 17% required hospital admission, 16% required outpatient medical care, 28% resulted in minor injuries, and only 37% resulted in no injury (Wallace & Roberson, 2011, p. 197). Further, research suggests that crimes against homosexual individuals have a higher number of offenders per offense than other hate crimes, which could easily cause more harm if the victim is unable to fight back (Wallace & Roberson, 2011).

Gender, Sexuality, and Victimology

The victimization of gender and sexual minorities due to their inferior position in the social hierarchy follows the premise of the opportunity model of victimization. The opportunity model, part of the larger model of Lifestyle Routine Activities Theory (Cohen, Kluegel, & Land, 1981), posits that victimization is the result of social inequality experienced by marginalized individuals (Wallace & Roberson, 2011). These marginalized gender and sexual minorities face increased victimization risk due to their daily routines as members of a lower social class, affecting their likelihood of encountering a situation in which crime is more likely to occur (McNeeley, 2015). This idea comes from Hindelang, Gottfredson, and Garofalo's (1978) lifestyle-exposure theory, which maintained that any difference in victimization was the result of demographic traits which determined a person's social role. This social role would be acted upon in such a way to conform to the gender roles dictated by society, determining acceptable ways in which to act within their environment (McNeeley, 2015).

Tewksbury and Mustaine (2001) elaborate on such victimization (specifically among males) with an explanation of Routine Activities Theory as "products and consequences of lifestyles," which "carr[y] an individual through settings, contexts, and interactions that may either increase or decrease the possibility of victimization" (p. 157). Interestingly, this study noted that men are more apt than women to engage in unwanted sexual activities due to peer pressure and an aim to be popular. Tewksbury and Mustaine (2001) further suggest that women's victimization can be explained in part by social acceptance of young men's use of force and coercion in sexual encounters. These beliefs suggest that common gender role expectations (of men as dominant and entitled to sex and of women as submissive, vulnerable, and sexualized) contribute to the perception of women as suitable targets of victimization. Societal expectations

further contribute to victimization of women due to the frequent lack of punishment males receive for victimizing women (Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1999). This essentially constitutes lack of guardianship, a primary tenet of Routine Activities Theory, as the criminal justice system (influenced by the larger society) fails to guard against such victimization (Cohen et al., 1981).

While a substantial body of literature explains the relationship between gender and victimization in the context of Routine Activities and Lifestyle Routine Activities Theories, a similar body of research concerning sexuality pales in comparison. Only recently has sexuality begun to be explored generally in victimology (primarily as victims of IPV), and while, according to these theories, logic would suggest that the same marginalization of gender minorities exists for sexual minorities, empirical evidence cannot yet provide a definitive answer. This lack of research reaffirms the calls for the incorporation of sexuality into criminology and criminological theory.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The review of literature demonstrates and demands further study of both gender and sexuality. Criminological research has maintained gender discrepancies for many years, and even the more specialized field of victimology fails to fully acknowledge issues of gender and sexuality. The purpose of this study is to investigate the extant literature in regard to the inclusion of gender and sexuality. Further, given the historical exclusion of women from academia, and the primarily female work of specialized research addressing issues of gender and sexuality, this study also explores the presumed gender of authors and whether or not relationships exist between author gender and authors' choice to include and discuss the topics of gender and sexuality. Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following questions:

- 1) To what extent are gender and sexuality included in criminological and victimization articles?
- 2) How are gender and sexuality operationalized in criminological articles and victimization articles, and are there major differences across the disciplines?
- 3) What, if any, relationship exists between presumed gender of the author(s) and the inclusion of gender and sexuality?

Data and Sample

In order to answer these questions, the current study employed a content analysis, examining the current state of the field of criminology while taking into consideration the nuance of a wide variety of publications. Content analysis is known for its ability to unobtrusively measure the “identification, organization, description, and quantification of text” in a systematic way (Berg, 2004; Garland, Branch, & Grimes, 2016, p. 54; Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006; Kraska & Neuman, 2011). Using content analysis as the research method met the current study’s objective of analyzing the field as it stands, with the ability to report quantitative frequencies as well as unquantifiable, qualitative measures, such as the operationalization of variables (Berg, 1995; Gray & Densten, 1998; Weber, 1985). In order to adequately understand current conceptualizations of gender and sexuality within criminology, content analysis was necessary, as it allows for a certain richness of detail that would otherwise not be possible (Gray & Densten, 1998).

The content analysis performed in this study analyzed two preeminent journals in the field of victimology and criminology: *Journal of Interpersonal Violence (JIV)* and *Criminology*. Specifically, content analysis was employed to adequately measure the inclusion of gender and sexuality in articles published between 2015-2019 in *Criminology* and *JIV*. *JIV* is a major interdisciplinary journal with an impact factor of 3.06. It is also the first scholarly journal requiring the inclusion of diversity, evident as a component of *JIV*’s reviewer form (SAGE, 2020). *JIV*’s submission guidelines specifically require “a discussion of diversity as it applies to the reviewed research,” and its website defines diversity as “human differences such as socioeconomic status, race, ethnicity, language, nationality, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, geography, ability, age, and culture” (SAGE, 2020). *Criminology* is a

mainstream and well-respected journal within the field of criminology with an impact factor of 3.842. While all articles published in *Criminology* between 2015-2019 were analyzed (n= 139), a random sample of articles were selected for analysis from the *JIV* to match the number of pieces published in *Criminology* during that same period of time.

In order to better match publication rates among the years, a stratified random sampling technique was designed to select articles from *JIV*. For *JIV*, strata were created for each year from 2015-2019. Within the strata, all *JIV* articles from the specified year were listed in order of publication and assigned numbers. For each stratum, a random number generator was used to select an equal number of *JIV* articles as were published that year in *Criminology*. The random numbers coordinated with those assigned in the *JIV* sampling frame, indicating which articles were to be included in this analysis. Thirty articles were analyzed from 2015, 25 from 2016, 32 from 2017, 26 from 2018, and 26 from 2019. Across all five years, 139 articles were analyzed from both the *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* and *Criminology*, for a total of 278 articles analyzed.

Coding Technique

Both *Criminology* and *JIV* were coded by trained coders, with one coder responsible for *Criminology* and another coder responsible for *JIV*. Prior to data collection, coders discussed the themes being analyzed in order to gain a common understanding of the task of content analysis. Both coders followed a code sheet designed to analyze each section of a journal article separately and facilitate the analysis of each article as a whole (See Appendix A). The majority of this analysis required manifest coding, or the analysis of “immediately apparent,” observable data by counting concepts, words, and phrases (Gray & Densten, 1998; Payne, Berg, & Sun, 2005, p.

34). Specifically, researchers searched the text for words indicative of gender and sexuality being discussed (i.e. “male,” “girl,” “LGB,” “queer,” etc.). All attributes were measured as yes/no indicators of whether or not gender and sexuality were included in the various sections of the articles or as variables. Some latent coding was required, primarily to determine whether or not gender and sexuality could be considered themes of the literature review or discussion/conclusion or if they were simply mentioned.

Latent coding differs from manifest coding in that it is the unobservable, deeper meaning that is conveyed and derived from the use of certain terms, phrases, and statements (Berg, 1995; Gray & Densten, 1998; Holsti, 1969; Payne et al., 2005). In order to be considered a theme in either the literature review or the discussion/conclusion, concepts had to be included as a heading/subheading or had to be discussed throughout a substantial portion of the literature review or discussion/conclusion, as determined by the coder. In order to heighten reliability, both coders discussed and came to a consensus about what constituted a theme as far as concepts being discussed throughout a section of an article. When questions arose about a specific case, both coders would examine the article and come to a unanimous decision.

Measures

Outcome Variables

The variables of interest in this study are sexuality and gender, therefore each article was examined for inclusion of these concepts, each with its own section in the code sheet. Both of these sections asked whether the constructs of gender and sexuality were included in the article’s title, abstract, keywords, literature review (as a theme or simply mentioned), methods, analysis

and findings, and discussion and conclusion (as a theme or simply mentioned). If gender or sexuality were measured as variables, the coder was prompted on the code sheet to describe the operationalization of that variable. Each section also included a measure to determine whether the designated construct had been studied as a variable with the other construct and if so, as what kind of variable.

Independent Variables

The two primary independent variables in this study were journal type (criminological or victimology) and author gender. When measuring author gender, to avoid presumptions about traditionally masculine and feminine names being indicative of gender, gender was determined by the use of gendered pronouns in author biographies at the end of each article. Pronouns such as “she” and “her” were used to code female authors, and pronouns such as “his” or “he” were coded as male. Authors who were referenced without gendered pronouns or with formal names instead of pronouns were coded as gender ‘not specified.’ After each author’s gender was coded, author gender was analyzed as (all) male author(s), (all) female author(s), male and female authors, or not (all) specified. In other words, author gender was deemed undeterminable if gender could not be assumed for all authors of a piece. If the gender was known for all but one author, that article was still coded as undeterminable author gender. While this is still a limited measurement of author gender, it avoids the more presumptuous method of using first names to assume gender.

Control Variables

As part of the content analysis, each piece was coded for publication information, such as the year of publication, volume, number, and title, in addition to the independent variable, journal type. Coders also determined whether or not the article was empirical or if it was another type of publication (i.e. speeches, book reviews, and essays.) Lastly, there was a section for additional comments at the end of every code sheet, which allowed coders to note nuance in measurements and any other relevant information.

Analysis

Once all articles in the sample had been coded, data were entered into SPSS, and all analyses were completed using SPSS. Initially, a univariate analysis was conducted to ascertain descriptive statistics of all variables. A bivariate analysis was also conducted using chi-square to determine the relationship between the independent variable, journal type, and dependent variables, author gender, inclusion of sexuality and gender in each section of an article, inclusion of gender and sexuality as variables, and the operationalization of such variables. Chi-square is a nonparametric test used in the analysis of categorical variables in order to determine the relationship those variables share (Gau, 2019). Due to the categorical nature of the variables used in this study, chi-square is the most appropriate analytic method (Gau, 2019). The results of these analyses are presented in Tables 1-6 and are discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Table 1 contains the results of a univariate analysis, which describes all variables individually. As intended, there were an even number of *Criminology* (139) and *JIV* (139) articles analyzed, for a total of 278 articles analyzed. The majority of articles included in the analysis were empirical (91.7%), but a small percentage (8.3%) of speeches, book reviews, and essays were also included in the analysis, as a result of the sampling method utilized. In regard to author gender, 55 articles (19.8%) were authored by all-male teams, 71 articles (25.5%) were authored by all-female teams, 118 articles (42.4%) were authored by mixed-gender teams, and in 34 articles (12.2%) not all authors' genders could be determined.

On average, gender was included in 3.78 (SD = 2.04) article sections (title, abstract, keyword, literature review, methods, analysis/results, and/or discussion/conclusion) and was included in a majority (93.2%) of articles in some capacity. Sixty-eight (24.5%) articles included gender in the title, 121 (43.5%) included gender in the abstract, and 40 (14.4%) articles included gender as a keyword. Gender was included in the literature review of most articles in some capacity, being mentioned in 36.7% of articles and included as a theme in an additional 40.3% of articles, for a total of 213 articles. It was also included in the majority of methods (80.9%) and analysis/results (73.0%) sections. Gender was included as frequently in the discussion/conclusion sections of articles, being mentioned in 25.5% of articles and included as a theme in an additional 38.8%, 179 articles total. Gender was included as a variable in 63.3% (176) of articles

and was included as more than one kind of variable in some articles. It was used as a control variable (43.9%) more frequently than it was used as an independent variable (20.9%) or dependent variable (3.6%). Gender was only operationalized outside of a binary in 1.1% (3) of all articles. A binary measure would include operationalizations such as male/female, man/woman, male/non-male, and female/non-female. The non-binary measures of gender were male/female/transgender female, female/male/male and female/other/“it depends”/neither female nor male, and masculine (male)/feminine (female)/gender non-conformity. It should be noted that there was at least one other operationalization (transgender men/transgender women) that, while indicative of greater inclusivity than the traditional gender binary, was still technically a binary measure.

Sexuality was included, on average much less than gender, in 0.34 (SD = 0.95) article sections (title, abstract, keyword, literature review, methods, analysis/results, and/or discussion/conclusion) and was only included in any capacity in 1 in 5 articles. In other words, on average, sexuality was included (in any capacity) less than one time per article. As a title and in keywords, sexuality was only included in three (1.1%) articles and was only included in 2.9% (8) of abstracts. Sexuality was mentioned in 6.8% of literature reviews, and only used as a literature review theme in an additional 2.9% of articles, 27 articles total. It was rarely included in methods (6.5%) and analysis/results (4.0%) sections. In the discussion/conclusion sections of articles, sexuality was mentioned 6.8% of the time and was included as a theme in an additional 1.8%, a total of 24 articles. Sexuality was included as a variable in 4.3% (12) of articles and was included as more than one kind of variable in one article. Similar to gender, it was used as a control variable (2.5%) more frequently than it was used as an independent variable (1.1%) or dependent variable (1.1%). Sexuality was operationalized outside of a binary in 1.1% (3) of all

articles. Binary measures of sexuality included heterosexual/non-heterosexual, heterosexual/other, heterosexual/sexual minority, and percentage not exclusively attracted to men. Non-binary measures found were heterosexual (straight)/homosexual (gay or lesbian)/bisexual/not sure, heterosexual/lesbian or gay/bisexual, and homosexual/transgender/heterosexual/bisexual/other.

While sexuality was included less than gender in every other capacity, each was operationalized outside of a binary measure in three articles. Further, gender and sexuality were studied as parallel variables in 2.5% of articles. That is to say, in seven articles in which sexuality was included as a variable, gender was also studied as a variable. However, in terms of percentage of gender and sexuality variables that were non-binary, a greater percentage of sexuality variables (25%) were non-binary than gender variables (1.7%). Of the articles that measured gender as a variable (176), only 3 operationalizations measured gender outside of a binary. Of the articles that measured sexuality as a variable (12), only 3 operationalizations measured sexuality outside of a binary (see Table 5).

Table 1 Characteristics of Sample

Variable	% Yes (n)/ Mean	Description
Journal		Journal article was published in
Criminology	50.0 (139)	
JIV	50.0 (139)	
	(n = 278)	
Gender of Authors		Presumed gender of authors
Male	19.8 (55)	Author(s) was male
Female	25.5 (71)	Author(s) was female
Both	42.4 (118)	Both male and female authors
Undeterminable	12.2 (34)	Could not determine gender of all authors
Type of Article		
Empirical	91.7 (255)	Empirical data was collected
Other	8.3 (23)	Literature review/book review/essay/other

Gender	3.78 (2.04)	Range: 0-7
Any	93.2 (260)	Gender mentioned in the article anywhere
Title	24.5 (68)	
Abstract	43.5 (121)	
Keyword	14.4 (40)	
Variable	63.3 (176)	
Control variable	43.9 (122)	
Independent variable	20.9 (58)	
Dependent Variable	3.6 (10)	
Non-binary operationalization	1.1 (3)	
Literature Review	76.6 (213)	
Theme	40.3 (112)	
Mention	36.7 (102)	
Methods	80.9 (225)	
Analysis/results	73.0 (203)	
Discussion/conclusion	64.4 (179)	
Theme	38.8 (108)	
Mention	25.5 (71)	
Sexuality	0.34 (0.95)	Range: 0-7
Any	20.8 (58)	Sexuality mentioned in the article anywhere
Title	1.1 (3)	
Abstract	2.9 (8)	
Keyword	1.1 (3)	
Variable	4.3 (12)	
Control variable	2.5 (7)	
Independent variable	1.1 (3)	
Dependent Variable	1.1 (3)	
Non-binary operationalization	1.1 (3)	
Literature Review	9.7 (27)	
Theme	2.9 (8)	
Mention	6.8 (19)	
Methods	6.5 (18)	
Analysis/results	4.0 (11)	
Discussion/conclusion	8.6 (24)	
Theme	1.8 (5)	
Mention	6.8 (19)	
Sexuality & Gender	2.5 (7)	Sexuality studied with gender as a variable

Table 2 depicts the crosstab results of a bivariate analysis of the inclusion of gender and sexuality by journal. Both gender ($X^2 = 15.207, p < .001$) and sexuality ($X^2 = 19.608, p < .001$) were found to be significantly associated with journal type. Specifically, a significantly greater

percentage of *JIV* articles mentioned gender (99.3%) compared to *Criminology* articles (87.8%), and a significantly greater percentage of *JIV* articles also mentioned sexuality (31.7%) compared to *Criminology* articles (10.1%).

Table 2 Any Mention of Social Constructs by Journal Type

	Criminology	JIV	X ²
Gender	87.8% (122)	99.3% (138)	15.207***
Sexuality	10.1% (14)	31.7% (44)	19.608***

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 3 depicts the crosstab results of bivariate analysis of journal type and gender inclusion in each section of an article. Several significant relationships were found among article sections and journal titles. A significant association was found between article title and journal ($X^2 = 22.505, p < .001$), abstract and journal ($X^2 = 61.828, p < .001$), and keywords and journal ($X^2 = 5.724, p < .05$). Specifically, *JIV* included gender significantly more in titles (36.7%), abstracts (66.9%), and keywords (19.4%), as compared to *Criminology* (12.2%, 20.1%, and 9.4%, respectively). A statistically significant relationship was also found between journal type and the inclusion of gender in the literature review, both overall and also as both themes and mentions. The relationship with gender inclusion in the literature review overall was significant with a chi-square of 19.296 ($p < .001$). Specifically, 87.8% of *JIV* articles included gender in the literature review, compared to 65.5% of *Criminology* articles. Journal type was associated with gender (as a theme), with a chi-square of 61.246 ($p < .001$). The mention of gender in the literature review by journal type was significant as well, with a chi-square of 17.902 ($p < .001$). A statistically significant relationship was also found between journal type and both methods ($X^2 = 8.416, p < .01$) and analysis/results ($X^2 = 8.052, p < .01$). Specifically, a significantly greater

percentage of *JIV* articles included gender in both the methods (87.8%) and analysis/results sections (80.6%), as compared to *Criminology* articles (74.1% and 65.5%, respectively).

Statistically significant relationships were also found for gender inclusion in the discussion and conclusion section overall ($X^2 = 31.767, p < .001$), as themes ($X^2 = 62.020, p < .001$), and as mentions ($X^2 = 6.828, p < .01$). Specifically, *JIV* had a greater percentage of articles that included gender in the conclusion overall (80.6%), as compared to *Criminology* (48.2%).

Table 3 Gender in Article Sections by Journal Type

	Criminology % Yes (n)	JIV % Yes (n)	X ²
Title	12.2% (17)	36.7% (51)	22.505***
Abstract	20.1% (28)	66.9% (93)	61.828***
Keyword	9.4% (13)	19.4% (27)	5.724*
Literature Review	65.5% (91)	87.8% (122)	19.296***
Theme	17.3% (24)	63.3% (88)	61.246***
Mentioned	48.9% (68)	24.5% (34)	17.902***
Methods	74.1% (103)	87.8% (122)	8.416**
Analysis/Results	65.5% (91)	80.6% (112)	8.052**
Conclusion	48.2% (67)	80.6% (112)	31.767***
Theme	15.8% (22)	61.9% (86)	62.020***
Mentioned	32.4% (45)	18.7% (26)	6.828**

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 4 depicts the crosstab results of bivariate analysis of journal type and sexuality inclusion in each section of an article. No significant associations were found for journal type and inclusion of sexuality in the title, abstract, keywords, literature review (overall, as themes, or as mentions), or the analysis and results section. However, a statistically significant relationship was found between journal type and inclusion of sexuality in the methods section ($X^2 = 11.643, p < .01$). *JIV* had a significantly larger percentage of articles that included gender in the methods section (11.5%) and discussion/conclusion section overall (13.7%), as compared to *Criminology*

(1.4% and 3.6%, respectively). The relationship between journal type and the inclusion of sexuality in the conclusion overall was also statistically significant ($X^2 = 8.938, p < .01$), as was the relationship between journal type and the inclusion of sexuality mentioned in the conclusion ($X^2 = 6.836, p < .01$). No significant association was found between journal type and sexuality being included in the discussion/conclusion as a theme.

Table 4 Sexuality in Article Sections by Journal Type

	Criminology % Yes (n)	JIV % Yes (n)	X^2
Title	0.7% (1)	1.4% (2)	.337
Abstract	1.4% (2)	4.3% (6)	2.059
Keyword	0.7% (1)	1.4% (2)	.337
Literature Review	7.9% (11)	11.5% (16)	1.026
Theme	2.2% (3)	3.6% (5)	0.515
Mentioned	5.8% (8)	7.9% (11)	0.508
Methods	1.4% (2)	11.5% (16)	11.643**
Analysis/Results	2.2% (3)	5.8% (8)	2.366
Conclusion	3.6% (5)	13.7% (19)	8.938**
Theme	0.7% (1)	2.9% (4)	1.833
Mention	2.9% (4)	10.8% (15)	6.836**

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

With regard to the inclusion of gender and sexuality as variables, several statistically significant associations were found, as shown in Table 5. For gender, the association between journal type and control variable ($X^2 = 5.843, p < .05$) and the association between journal type and independent variable ($X^2 = 10.545, p < .01$) were both significant. Specifically, a greater percentage of *Criminology* articles included gender as a control variable (51.1%) than *JIV* articles (36.7%). However, a significantly larger amount of *JIV* articles included gender as an independent variable (28.8%) as compared to *Criminology* (12.9%). The relationship between journal type and the inclusion of sexuality as any kind of variable was also statistically

significant ($X^2 = 5.574, p < .05$), with *JIV* including sexuality as a variable at a higher percentage (7.2%) than *Criminology* (1.4%). A statistically significant relationship was also found between journal type and the non-binary operationalization of sexuality ($X^2 = 9.574, p < .01$).

Specifically, a higher percentage of *Criminology* articles operationalized sexuality outside of a binary (1.4%), as compared to *JIV* (0.7%). There was no statistically significant relationship found between journal type and gender as any variable, gender as a dependent variable, a non-binary operationalization of gender, or sexuality as a control, independent, or dependent variable.

Table 5 Social Constructs as Variables by Journal Type

	Criminology	JIV	X^2
Gender	61.2% (85)	65.5% (91)	0.557
Control Variable	51.1% (71)	36.7% (51)	5.843*
Independent Variable	12.9% (18)	28.8% (40)	10.545**
Dependent Variable	1.4% (2)	5.8% (8)	3.734
Non-binary operationalization	0.7% (1)	1.4% (2)	0.669
Sexuality	1.4% (2)	7.2% (10)	5.574*
Control Variable	0.7% (1)	4.3% (6)	3.664
Independent Variable	0.7% (1)	1.4% (2)	.337
Dependent Variable	0.0% (0)	2.2% (3)	3.033
Non-binary operationalization	1.4% (2)	0.7% (1)	9.574**

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Bivariate analysis also revealed a statistically significant relationship between journal type and assumed author gender ($X^2 = 44.669, p < .001$; see Table 6). More articles with all-male (33.8%) and mixed-gender (43.2%) author teams were published by *Criminology*, while more articles with all-female (33.8%) and undeterminable (18.7%) author teams were published by *JIV*. *Criminology* (43.2%) and *JIV* (41.7%) both published more mixed-gender authored articles than any other kind. Alternatively, the fewest number of *JIV* articles were authored by all-male

teams (5.8%) and the fewest number of *Criminology* articles were published by gender-undeterminable author teams (5.8%).

Table 6 Author Gender by Journal Type

	Criminology	JIV
All male	33.8% (47)	5.8% (8)
All female	17.3% (24)	33.8% (47)
Both	43.2% (60)	41.7% (58)
Undeterminable	5.8% (8)	18.7% (26)
$X^2 = 44.669^{***}$		

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

A bivariate analysis of the inclusion of gender and sexuality by gender composition of author team was also conducted, layered by journal type, as depicted in Table 7. Specifically, chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant relationship ($X^2 = 8.992, p < .05$) between author gender and the mention of gender at any point in *Criminology* articles. While that relationship was the only statistically significant one found with bivariate analysis, the frequencies revealed through univariate analysis were telling. Within *Criminology*, all-male author teams included gender in 78.7% of articles, but only mentioned sexuality in 8.5% of articles, compared to all-female author teams, who included gender in 100.0% of articles and sexuality in 16.7% of articles. Mixed-gender author teams, or teams that included at least one female and one male, included gender in 91.7% of articles but sexuality in only 8.3% of *Criminology* articles. Within *JIV*, 100.0% of articles authored by all-male author teams, 100.0% of articles authored by all-female teams, and 98.3% of articles authored by mixed-gender author teams included the construct gender at some point. With regard to the inclusion of sexuality in *JIV*, all authors (all-male, all-female, and mixed-gender) included sexuality a greater percentage

of the time than in *Criminology*. Specifically, all-male teams included sexuality in 37.5% of articles, all-female teams included sexuality in 31.9% of articles, and mixed-gender teams included sexuality in 29.3% of articles.

Table 7 Inclusion of Social Constructs in Journal by Author Gender

	All Male	All Female	Mixed Gender	X ²
Criminology				
Gender Included	78.7% (37)	100.0% (24)	91.7% (55)	8.992*
Sexuality Included	8.5% (4)	16.7% (4)	8.3% (5)	1.531
JIV				
Gender Included	100.0% (8)	100.0% (47)	98.3% (57)	1.407
Sexuality Included	37.5% (3)	31.9% (15)	29.3% (17)	0.381

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The primary purpose of this study was to analyze the inclusion of gender and sexuality in extant *Criminology* and *JIV* articles. This study was founded upon a series of historic calls for greater inclusion of gender and sexual minorities, namely Belknap's (2015) call for inclusion and activism within the field of criminology. Responding to that call, this study examined the inclusion of gender and sexuality in criminological literature from both a mainstream and diversity-focused, interdisciplinary journal in the years following Belknap's (2015) call to the present. Findings of this study bring to light some notable takeaways.

Overall, gender was included significantly more in *JIV* articles than in *Criminology* articles, and the disparity between *JIV* and *Criminology* in regard to the inclusion of sexuality was even more pronounced. While it could be as vague as a single mention at one point in an article (such as the word 'boy' in the literature review) or as significant as inclusion of gender or sexuality as a theme of the article, a significantly greater percentage of *JIV* articles included sexuality. When looking at themes found within the literature reviews of articles, *JIV* included sexuality in only 2 more articles than *Criminology* did, but counts for both were low; sexuality was only a theme in five *JIV* articles and three *Criminology* articles. Significantly, over three times as many *JIV* articles included gender as a theme, compared to *Criminology* articles. This is surprising because, when looking at gender and sexuality as variables—arguably the most telling measure of inclusion—gender was included as a variable (most often a control variable) in a

majority of both *JIV* and *Criminology* articles and, therefore, did not have a significant relationship with journal type. However, and despite limited counts for both journals, a significant relationship was found between journal type and the inclusion of sexuality as a variable. Specifically, *JIV*, a diversity-focused, interdisciplinary journal, included sexuality as a variable nearly 6% more than *Criminology*, a mainstream journal.

This finding fits the extant research which suggests that topics surrounding gender and sexual minorities are reserved for journals with a particular focus on inclusivity (Crow & Smykla, 2015; Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015). The dismissal of such topics by mainstream criminology journals was an unintended result of feminist and queer criminology's creation of academic journals uniquely designed to broach subjects of gender and sexuality (Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015). While specialty journals have done well, mainstream journals see their existence as excusing the otherwise necessary discussion of gender and sexuality in mainstream criminology, reflected in these findings.

Notably, the majority of variables measuring gender and sexuality were dichotomized or measured within a binary. Binary measures tend to be indicative of a limited conceptualization of the constructs of gender and sexuality, which are often currently conceptualized as spectrum-type measures by society. To limit gender and sexuality to binary measures such as male/female and heterosexual/non-heterosexual conceptualizations not only fails to keep up with society's modern perspective, but it fails to account for a significant demographic of individuals. Further, the conceptualization of sexuality as "heterosexual/other" or "heterosexual/non-heterosexual" shows how pervasive heteronormative beliefs are, even among social scientists. According to heteronormativity, heterosexuality is seen as the norm from which any other sexual orientation is a deviation (Jackson, 2006). Any individuals who do not identify as heterosexual are lumped

together and do not receive acknowledgment of the nuance of different non-heterosexual sexual orientations.

Despite recognition of the problematic nature inherent in the dichotomy of gender and sexuality (Callis, 2014; Collins, 1990), in the articles examined here, gender was only measured outside of a binary in three of 175 articles that included gender as a variable, and sexuality was only measured outside of a binary in three out of 12 articles that measured sexuality as a variable. Compared to gender, sexuality was measured outside of a binary at a significantly higher rate when it was included as a variable. However, there were limitations even in non-binary conceptualizations of these constructs. For example, one article operationalized sexuality as ‘homosexual,’ ‘transgender,’ ‘heterosexual,’ ‘bisexual,’ and ‘other.’ While the effort to incorporate a variety of sexualities can be commended, the inclusion of ‘transgender’ as a sexual orientation indicates a misunderstanding of the difference between gender and sexuality. It is likely that this misunderstanding was influenced by the inclusion of ‘T’ in the ‘LGBT’ acronym. While the evolution of the acronym to incorporate the identities of a variety of gender and sexual minorities provides a sense of identity to many marginalized individuals, it becomes problematic in research, when a distinction between gender and sexuality as unique and distinct constructs is paramount. To overcome the misuse of the acronym in research, some have made a distinction between ‘LGB’ and ‘LGBT,’ using the former for research that is specific to sexual minorities (Willis, Maegusuku-Hewett, Raithby, & Miles, 2014). However, others have advocated for the dismissal of the acronym within research, as it groups together various sexualities that are deserving of individual study (Herek, Norton, Allen, & Sims, 2010)

Determining a difference in which journals operationalized sexuality in a more inclusive (i.e. non-binary) way was difficult due to the scant number of articles in each journal that

included sexuality as a variable at all. While it sounds impressive to say that two times as many *Criminology* articles measured sexuality outside of a binary, the reality is that only three articles had non-binary sexuality measures (*Criminology* = 2; *JIV* = 1). Conversely, only two *JIV* articles and one *Criminology* article measured gender outside of a binary.

As stated in the findings, the relationship between mention of gender in *Criminology* articles by author gender was found to be significant. All-male and mixed-gender author teams (teams which included at least one male) were the only author teams of *Criminology* articles not to mention gender at all. However, it should be noted that this was only the case in nine articles, some of which focused on topics not directly relevant to the measurement of gender, such as criminal hot spots. Every all-female author team of criminological articles mentioned gender at some point in their publication, and all-female author teams mentioned sexuality in a greater number of Criminological articles than all-male or mixed-gender teams. Similarly, among *JIV* articles analyzed, every article authored by an all-female author team mentioned gender, as did every article authored by all-male author teams. Notably, when compared to *Criminology*, *JIV* had a greater percentage of articles that mentioned gender and sexuality at any point, for authors teams of all gender compositions.

These findings fit the context of the larger literature suggesting that females are not as commonly accepted into national journals and are, therefore, relegated to journals that are more inclusive of gender and sexual minority issues (Crow & Smykla, 2015; Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015). Eigenberg & Whalley (2015) note that indeed female authors, relegated to feminist criminology journals are those discussing gender and sexuality in the literature. The current study's finding that *Criminology* publications had almost twice as many all-male author teams as all-female author teams, while *JIV* had just over six times as many all-female teams to all-male

teams, supports the previous finding that females are not as commonly accepted into mainstream criminology journals and are instead relegated to journals that can be easily ignored by mainstream criminologists. There remains a serious need for mainstream criminological journals to embrace the inclusivity demonstrated by diversity-focused journals in order to enhance female authorship and more inclusive literature on gender and sexual minorities.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Among the significant findings of this study, a single conclusion stands out: the calls for inclusivity and activism have not been met, at least not entirely. While progress has been made, it is slow, and there is still a noticeable gap between the inclusion of gender and sexual minorities in mainstream and diversity-focused, interdisciplinary journals, with mainstream criminological journals failing to heed the call to criminology as activism. This failure is particularly stark with the inclusion of sexuality, which rarely has been allowed to grace the pages of criminological publications, regardless of mainstream/specialty distinction. Even the more inclusive publications of diversity-focused journals have yet to match the nuance observed in the conceptualization of gender and sexuality among society at large, a concerning realization for a field rooted in sociology and the study of individual behavior.

Implications

Given the apparent gender gap which these extant findings suggest is still present, a productive first step would be to work towards gender parity in the authorship and editorial positions of mainstream criminology. Women, who are often those discussing gender and sexuality, are still pushed into specialized journals, which are easily ignored by mainstream criminologists (Crow & Smykla, 2015; Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015). When women are given

more opportunity to publish within mainstream journals, the inclusion of gender and sexuality will follow.

In addition to simply mentioning sexuality more often in criminology scholarship, criminologists, as social scientists, should conceptualize sexualities in accordance with those that are socially recognized (such as bisexual, pansexual, and asexual). Such endeavors could shed light on the effects of nuance in sexuality and lead to a never before realized connection between sexuality and the criminal justice system. While gender is included in a majority of publications, researchers should prioritize an inclusive conceptualization of gender (to at least include transgender and gender non-conforming identities), not only for the empirical advantage mentioned for the inclusion of sexuality but also to encourage gender and sexual minorities to engage with the field of criminology as activists and researchers. While there has been progress, the field of criminology still has room to grow in terms of the conceptualization of gender and sexuality as non-binary measures. It is this progress that, when accomplished by a variety of individuals with different sexualities and gender identities, will lead to growth in the field of criminology--growth that will finally heed the calls.

Limitations

While there are some clear takeaways, there are also a few noteworthy limitations to this study. Perhaps the most notable limitation is the narrow scope used in terms of journals. While *Criminology* is a mainstream criminological journal and *JIV* is a diversity-focused, interdisciplinary journal, they are only one of the many academic journals in publication today. Therefore, while they are reflective of a portion of publications, the findings ascertained herein cannot be fairly generalized to make assumptions of *all* criminology journals.

Further, while both coders in this study were trained and worked collaboratively to resolve questions and concerns of coding, the reliability of the research method could have been strengthened by requiring multiple coders for each article, particularly in the analysis of latent content. If any discrepancies arose, particularly with latent coding, they could be resolved by an unbiased third party to further reliability coding, especially that involving the judgment of the coder.

The measurement of gender as an assumption based on gendered pronouns is also somewhat limited, especially for authors who did not use gendered pronouns in their biographies (either incidentally or by choice). The researchers in this study could have contacted authors directly to inquire as to what their preferred gender identity is or, after assuming authors' gender identity based on pronouns, researchers could have contacted those authors to confirm that the gendered pronouns used in their biographies are indicative of their gender identity. Any authors that were deemed to be of 'undeterminable' gender based on the lack of gendered pronoun use in their biography could have been contacted directly in order to ascertain their gender identity.

Lastly, the analyses run in this study did not lend themselves to causal findings. It cannot definitively be said whether or not, for example, female authors include sexuality in a greater percentage of articles due to their gender. Analyses were further limited for sexuality in particular due to the small number of articles in the sample that included sexuality as a variable. We were not able to procure enough non-binary measurements to determine the results of a chi-square analysis on the relationship between author gender, journal type, and non-binary operationalization of variables.

Future Research

In an effort to resolve some of the limitations of this study, future research should include the analysis of a number of articles from other criminological journals to determine if similar results are found. Researchers should also take a partner approach to coding in order to ensure that judgment on the inclusion of these constructs is consistent. As stated previously, this work could also be strengthened by objectively determining author gender, which would also allow future studies to eliminate the ‘undeterminable’ gender category (a significant percentage of author teams) altogether. Additionally, if author gender is determined by self-identification by the authors, gender conceptualization should expand as appropriate to include transgender and gender non-conforming gender identities. Representative and relevant research can only be published when researchers are willing to approach research in such an open and earnest manner.

REFERENCES

- Albonetti, C. (1988). The role of gender and departures in the sentencing of defendants convicted of a white-collar offense under the federal sentencing guidelines. *Sociology of Crime, Law, and Deviance, 1*, 3-48.
- Ball, M. (2016). Queer criminology as activism. *Critical Criminology, 24*(4), 473-487.
- Belknap, J. (2001). *The invisible woman: Gender, crime, and justice* (2 ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson.
- Belknap, J. (2015). Activist criminology: Criminologists' responsibility to advocate for social and legal justice. *Criminology, 53*(1), 1-22.
- Berg, B. L. (1995). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (2 ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Berg, B. L. (2004). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (Vol. 5). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Blumstein, A., Cohen, J., Roth, J. A., & Visher, C. (1986). Introduction: Studying criminal careers. In A. Blumstein, Cohen, J., Roth, J. A., & Visher, C. (Ed.), *Criminal careers and "career criminals"* (pp. 12-30). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Britton, D. (2000). Feminism in criminology: Engendering the outlaw. *Annals of the American Academy of Social Science, 571*, 57-76.
- Brown, T., & Herman, J. (2015). *Intimate partner violence and sexual abuse among LGBT people*. Los Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute.
- Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against our will: Men, women, and rape*. New York, NY: Fawcett Books.
- Burgess-Proctor, A. (2006). Intersections of race, class, gender, and crime: Future directions for feminist criminology. *Feminist Criminology, 1*(1), 27-47.
- Busch, A. L., & Rosenberg, M. S. (2004). Comparing women and men arrested for domestic violence: A preliminary report. *Journal of Family Violence, 19*, 49-57.
- Cain, P. A. (2000). *Rainbow rights: The role of lawyers and courts in the lesbian and gay civil rights movement*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Callis, A. S. (2014). Bisexual, pansexual, queer: Non-binary identities and the sexual borderlands. *Sexualities, 17*(1-2), 63-80.
- Chesney-Lind, M., & Pasko, L. (2004). *The female offender: Girls, women, and crime* (2 ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. .
- Chesney-Lind, M., & Shelden, R. (2004). *Girls, delinquency, and juvenile justice*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.
- Clendinen, D., & Nagourney, A. (1999). *Out for good: The struggle to build a gay rights movement in America*. New York, NY: Simon & Shuster Paperbacks.
- Cohen, L. E., Kluegel, J. R., & Land, K. C. (1981). Social inequality and predatory criminal victimization: An exposition and test of a formal theory. *American Sociological Review, 46*, 505-524.
- Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black feminist thought*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cook, K. J. (2016). Has criminology awakened from its “androcentric slumber”? *Feminist Criminology, 11*(4), 334-353.
- Crittenden, C. A., Koons-Witt, B. A., & Kaminski, R. J. (2018). Being assigned work in prison: Do gender and race matter? . *Feminist Criminology, 13*(4), 359-381.
- Crow, M. S., & Smykla, J. O. (2015). An examination of author characteristics in national and regional criminology and criminal justice journals, 2008-2010: Are female scholars changing the nature of publishing in criminology and criminal justice? . *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 40*(2), 441-455.
- Daly, K., & Chesney-Lind, M. (1988). Feminism and criminology. *Justice Quarterly, 5*(4), 497-538.
- Drucker, D. J. (2012). Marking sexuality from 0-6: The Kinsey scale in online culture. *Sexuality & Culture, 16*, 241-262.
- Eigenberg, H. M., & Whalley, E. (2015). Gender and publication patterns: Female authorship is increasing, but is there gender parity? . *Women & Criminal Justice, 25*(1-2), 130-144.
- Eskridge Jr., W. N. (1999). *Gaylaw: Challenging the apartheid of the closet*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Flavin, J. (2001). Feminism for the mainstream criminologist: An invitation. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 29*, 271-285.
- Franklin, C. A. (2008). Women offenders, disparate treatment, and criminal justice: A theoretical, historical, and contemporary overview. *Criminal Justice Studies, 21*(4), 341-360.

- Garland, T. S., Branch, K. A., & Grimes, M. (2016). Blurring the lines: Reinforcing rape myths in comic books. *Feminist Criminology, 11*(1), 48-68.
- Garrison, C. G., McClelland, A., Dambrot, F., & Casey, K. A. (1992). Gender balancing the criminal justice curriculum and classroom. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 3*(2), 203-222.
- Gau, J. M. (2019). *Statistics for Criminology and Criminal Justice* (3 ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. .
- Gilfus, M. E. (2006). From victims to survivors to offenders: Women's routes of entry and immersion into street crime. In L. F. C. Alarid, P. (Ed.), *In her own words: Women offenders' views on crime and victimization* (pp. 5-14). Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.
- Goodstein, L. (1992). Feminist perspectives and the criminal justice curriculum. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 3*(2), 165-181.
- Gottfredson, M. R. (1981). "On the Etiology of Criminal Victimization". *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 72*(2), 714-726.
- Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gray, J. H., & Densten, I. L. (1998). Integrating quantitative and qualitative analysis using latent and manifest variables. *Quality & Quantity, 32*, 419-431.
- Griffin, S. (1971). Rape: The all-American crime. *Ramparts Magazine, 10*, 26-35.
- Hannon, L., & Dufour, L. R. (1998). Still just the study of men and crime? A content analysis. *Sex Roles, 38*, 63-71.
- Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines and Training Manual*. (2015).
- Hentig, H. V. (1948). *The criminal and his victim*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Herek, G. M., Norton, A. T., Allen, T. J., & Sims, C. L. (2010). Demographic, Psychological, and Social Characteristics of Self-Identified Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Adults in a US Probability Sample. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy, 7*, 176-200.
- Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Leavy, P. (2006). *Emergent methods in social research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Hindelang, M., Gottfredson, M., & Garofalo, J. (1978). *Victims of personal crime: An empirical foundation for a theory of personal victimization*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing.
- Holsti, O. R. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Hunnicut, G. (2009). Varieties of patriarchy and violence against women: Resurrecting “patriarchy” as a theoretical tool. *Violence Against Women, 15*(5), 553-573.
- Jackson, S. (2006). Gender, sexuality and heterosexuality: The complexity (and limits) of heteronormativity. *Feminist Theory, 7*(1), 1464-7001.
- Jennings, W. G., Higgins, G. E., Tewksbury, R., Gover, A. R., & Piquero, A. R. (2010). A longitudinal assessment of the victim-offender overlap. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(12), 2147-2174.
- Kane, M. (2003). Social movement policy success: Decriminalizing state sodomy laws, 1969-1998. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly, 8*(3), 313-334.
- Kantor, G. K., & Straus, M. (1987). The “drunken bum” theory of wife beating. *Social Problems, 34*, 213-230.
- Karmen, A. (2013). *Crime victims: An introduction to victimology* (8 ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Katz, J. (2013). Violence against women—it’s a men’s issue. *TEDxFiDiWomen*. ted.com: TED.
- Katz-Wise, S. L., & Hyde, J. S. (2012). Victimization experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Sex Research 49*(2-3), 142-167.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., Martin, C. E., & Gebhard, P. H. (1953). *Sexual behavior in the human female*. Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders.
- Klaus, P. A., DeBerry, M., & Timrots, A. (1985). The crime of rape. In B. o. J. S. US Department of Justice (Ed.). Washington, D.C. .
- Knupfer, A. (2001). *Reform and resistance: Gender, delinquency, and America’s first juvenile court*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Koons-Witt, B. (2002). The effect of gender on the decision to incarcerate before and after the introduction of sentencing guidelines. *Criminology, 40*, 297-327.
- Kraska, P. B., & Neuman, W. L. (2011). *Criminal justice and criminological research methods*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Kruttschnitt, C. (1984). Sex and criminal court dispositions: The unresolved controversy. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 21*, 213-232.
- Lauritsen, J. L., Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1991). The link between offending and victimization among adolescents. *Criminology 29*.
- Lombroso, C. (2006). *Criminal man*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Lowe, C. C., & Fagan, A. A. (2019). Gender composition of editors and editorial boards in seven top criminal justice and criminology journals from 1985 to 2017. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 30(3), 424-443.
- MacDonald, J., & Chesney-Lind, M. (2001). Gender bias and juvenile justice revisited: A multiyear analysis. *Crime & Delinquency*, 47, 173-195.
- Makari, G. (2008). *Revolution in mind: The creation of psychoanalysis*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers Inc.
- Matthews, R., & Young, J. (1992). Reflections on realism. In J. Y. R. Matthews (Ed.), *Rethinking criminology: The realist debate* (pp. 1-23). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.
- McDonald, D. (2017). Defining sex and gender. In D. McDonald (Ed.), *Race, gender, class, and criminal justice: Examining barriers to justice* (pp. 27-43). Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press, LLC.
- McNeeley, S. (2015). Lifestyle-routine activities and crime events. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 31(1), 30-52.
- Mendelsohn, B. (1963). The origin and doctrine of victimology. *Excerpta Criminologica*, 239-244.
- Messerschmidt, J. W. (1993). *Masculinities and crime: Critique and reconceptualizations of theory*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Meyer, I. H., Flores, A. R., Stemple, L., Romero, A. P., Wilson, B. D., & Herman, J. L. (2017). Incarceration rates and traits of sexual minorities in the United States: National Inmate Survey, 2011-2012. *American Journal of Public Health*, 107(2), 267-273.
- Millett, K. (1972). *Sexual politics*. London: Abacus.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Peterson, Z. D. (2011). Distinguishing between sex and gender: History, current conceptualizations, and implications. *Sex Roles*, 64(11-12), 791-803.
- Mustaine, E., & Tewksbury, R. (1999). A Routine Activity Theory Explanation for Women's Stalking Victimization. *Violence Against Women*, 5(1), 43-62.
- Mustaine, E. E., & Tewksbury, R. (2000). Comparing the Lifestyles of Victims, Offenders, and Victim-Offenders: A Routine Activity Theory Assessment of Similarities and Differences for Criminal Incident Participants. *Sociological Focus*, 33(3), 339-362.
- Nagel, I. H., & Hagan, J. (1983). Gender and crime: Offense patterns and criminal court sanctions. *Crime and Justice*, 4, 91-144.
- National Crime Victimization Survey, 2016: Technical Documentation*. (2017).

- Pascoe, C. J. (2005). "Dude, you're a fag": Adolescent masculinity and the fag discourse. *Sexualities*, 8, 329-346.
- Pasko, L. (2008). The wayward girl revisited: Understanding the gendered nature of juvenile justice and delinquency. *Sociology Compass*, 2(3), 821-836.
- Payne, B. K., Berg, B. L., & Sun, I. Y. (2005). Policing in small town America: Dogs, drunks, disorder, and dysfunction. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33, 31-41.
- Rafter, N. (1990). *Partial justice: Women, prisons, and social control* (2 ed.). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Renzetti, C. M. (1993). On the margins of the malestream (or, they still don't get it, do they?): Feminist analyses in criminal justice education. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 4(2), 219-234.
- Ryder, J. A. (2007). 'I wasn't really bonded with my family': Attachment, loss, and violence among adolescent female offenders. *Critical Criminology*, 15, 19-40.
- SAGE. (2020). Journal of Interpersonal Violence. Retrieved from <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/journal-of-interpersonal-violence/journal200855#submission-guidelines>
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1993). *Crime in the making: Pathways and turning points through life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sharp, S. F., & Hefley, K. (2007). This is a man's world... or at least that's how it looks in the journals. *Critical Criminology*, 15(1), 3-18.
- Shelden, R. (2001). *Controlling the dangerous classes: A critical introduction to the history of criminal justice*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Spohn, C. C., & Spears, J. W. (1997). Gender and case processing decisions: A comparison of case outcomes for male and female defendants charged with violent felonies. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 8(3), 29-59.
- Stanko, E. A., & Hobdell, K. (1993). Assault on men: Masculinity and male victimization. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 33(3), 400-415.
- Steffensmeier, D., & Allan, E. (1996). Gender and crime: Toward a gendered theory of female offending. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22, 459-487.
- Steinem, G. (1983). *Outrageous acts and everyday rebellions*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Sutherland, E. H., & Cressey, D. R. (1974). *Criminology* (9 ed.). New York, NY: J. B. Lippincott.

- Tewksbury, R. (2009). Male rape. In J. Wilson (Ed.), *The Praeger handbook of victimology* (pp. 161-163). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Tewksbury, R., & Mustaine, E. E. (2001). Lifestyle Factors Associated with the Sexual Assault of Men: A Routine Activity Theory Analysis. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 9(2), 153-182.
- Wallace, H., & Roberson, C. (2011). *Victimology: Legal, psychological, and social perspectives* (3 ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Way, N., Cressen, J., Bodian, S., Preston, J., Nelson, J., & Hughes, D. (2014). "It might be nice to be a girl...then you wouldn't have to be emotionless": Boys' resistance to norms of masculinity during adolescence. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 15(3), 241-252.
- Weber, R. P. (1985). *Basic content analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA Sage Productions.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, 1(2), 125-151.
- Willis, P., Maegusuku-Hewett, T., Raithby, M., & Miles, P. (2014). Swimming upstream: The provision of inclusive care to older lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) adults in residential and nursing environments in Wales. *Ageing & Society*, 36, 282-306.
- Wilson, B. D., Jordan, S. P., Meyer, I. H., Flores, A. R., Stemple, L., & Herman, J. L. (2017). Disproportionality and disparities among sexual minority youth in custody. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 46(7), 1547-1561.
- Woods, J. B. (2014). "Queering criminology": Overview of the state of the field. In D. P. V. R. Panfil (Ed.), *Handbook of LGBT communities, crime, and justice* (pp. 15-41). New York, NY: Springer.

APPENDIX A
CODE SHEET

Variable	Description
Journal Name	
Volume Number	
Issue Number	
Title	
Author 1 Name	
Presumed Gender	
Author 2 Name	
Presumed Gender	
Author 3 Name	
Presumed Gender	
Author 4 Name	
Presumed Gender	

Variable	Article Component	YES	NO
Gender	Mentioned in the title		
	Mentioned in the abstract		
	Mentioned in key words		
	Used as a control variable		
	Used as a dependent variable		
	Used as an independent variable		
	Operationalization:		
	Discussed in literature review as a theme/subheading		

	Mentioned in literature review but not a theme/subheading		
	Mentioned in the methods section		
	Mentioned in the analysis/results		
	Discussed in discussion/conclusion as a theme		
	Mentioned in discussion/conclusion but not a theme		
	Studied with sexuality as any type of variable? <i>Variable type:</i>		
Sexuality	Mentioned in the title		
	Mentioned in the abstract		
	Mentioned in key words		
	Used as a control variable		
	Used as a dependent variable		
	Used as an independent variable		
	Operationalization:		
	Discussed in literature review as a theme/subheading		
	Mentioned in literature review but not a theme/subheading		
	Mentioned in the methods section		
	Mentioned in the analysis/results		
	Discussed in discussion/conclusion as a theme		
	Mentioned in discussion/conclusion but not a theme		
	Studied with gender as any type of variable?		

	<i>Variable type:</i>		
EMPIRICAL	Is the article empirical (was data collected/analyzed)?		
	Was it a speech?		
	Was it a literature review/essay?		
	Was it a book review?		
	Was it something else? If so, explain below:		
Further Explanation/Notes:			

VITA

Hannah Gateley is an East Tennessee native. Following her graduation from Clinton High School, she decided to attend the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga to pursue a degree in legal assistant studies and criminal justice. During her time at the University of Tennessee in Chattanooga, Hannah was involved in a wide variety of extracurriculars. In addition to her work with the Criminal Justice Club and membership in multiple honor societies, she volunteered with the Chattanooga Food Bank and worked as a file clerk at two different law firms. Through her coursework, Hannah realized she had a passion for helping disadvantaged communities. Whenever given the opportunity, she focused her studies on social justice and became interested in working in underserved communities. After attaining her bachelor's degree in Psychology and Criminal Justice in May of 2018, she worked as a camp counselor with the Chattanooga Boys and Girls Club. As she began classes for her Master's of Science in Criminal Justice at the University of Tennessee Chattanooga, she was eager to continue working with young people and accepted a position with GEAR UP, teaching and mentoring kids in urban middle schools. Working as a graduate assistant, Hannah has had the opportunity to participate in a wide variety of research and present at several regional and national conferences. Her assistantship has also allowed her to teach multiple classes at the collegiate level and introduced her to her current employer, The Next Door of Chattanooga. While Hannah's post-graduate plans are not set in stone, she hopes to continue working to better her community, making connections in service to those around her.