

**INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE IN THE MILITARY: AN ANALYSIS OF
POLICE REPORTING BEHAVIORS**

by

Patricia Becker

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the University of Delaware in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Criminology

Spring 2017

© 2017 Patricia Becker
All Rights Reserved

**INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE IN THE MILITARY: AN ANALYSIS OF
POLICE REPORTING BEHAVIORS**

by

Patricia Becker

Approved: _____
Ronet Bachman, Ph.D.
Professor in charge of thesis on behalf of the Advisory Committee

Approved: _____
Karen F. Parker, Ph.D.
Chair of the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice

Approved: _____
George H. Watson, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

Approved: _____
Ann Ardis, Ph.D.
Senior Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Education

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Ronet Bachman, the chair of my thesis committee, for her invaluable support throughout this project. Ronet thank you for your guidance, advice, and hugs when needed. Thank you to my committee members Dr. Susan Miller and Dr. Ben Fleury-Steiner who shared their knowledge and unique viewpoints with me throughout this process. Susan, thank you for pushing me to think critically and for being a constant source of support and guidance. Thank you to the entire Sociology and Criminology graduate program, particularly Isaiah T., Talisa C., Ashley M., Brandie P., and my entire cohort.

Most importantly, thank you to my family especially my parents, Mary and Joseph Becker, for sacrificing so much to make this possible for me. Mom, thank you for calming me down through all the mini crises. I am sure there will be many more to come. Thank you to my siblings, Johnny and Mary, for not making fun of my love for school too much. Lastly, thank you to my love and best friend Derrick for your constant support, love, and numerous food shopping trips.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vi
Chapter	
1 INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE IN THE MILITARY: AN ANALYSIS OF POLICE REPORTING BEHAVIORS	1
Introduction	1
Literature Review	2
Police Reporting	2
Police Reporting for IPV	5
IPV in the Military.....	10
Methods	13
Data.....	13
Independent Variables	14
Dependent Variable	17
Analytical Strategy	17
Results	18
Bivariate Statistics	18
Multivariate Analyses.....	19
Discussion.....	20
TABLES	26
REFERENCES	31

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Descriptive Statistics for Intimate Partner Violence and Robbery Victimizations, (NCVS 1992-2014).....	26
Table 2	Bivariate Examining Relationship Between Independent Variables and Reporting Likelihood for IPV and Robbery (NCVS 1992-2014).	28
Table 3	Logistic Regression Results Examining the Predictors of Reporting IPV to Police (NCVS 1992-2014).....	29
Table 4	Logistic Regression Results Examining the Predictors of Reporting Robbery to Police (NCVS 1992-2014).....	30

ABSTRACT

Although awareness of intimate partner violence (IPV) has increased in society, acknowledging that American military members and their families are particularly vulnerable to these forms of violence has been relatively recent. The 2011 Department of Defense Health Related Behaviors Survey of Active Duty Military Personnel concluded that 21.7% of women who joined the military reported unwanted sexual contact by someone in the military. While scholars have shown that victims of IPV are unlikely to report their victimizations to the police (Venema, 2016), virtually no attempts have been made to explore police reporting behavior by those in the military and/or victimized by someone in the military. In this paper, the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS): Concatenated files, 1992-2014 were used to examine whether intimate partner violence were less likely to be reported by the victim if either the victim and/or offender were active duty military personnel. To ascertain whether military status affected reporting behaviors for other violent crimes, models predicting the probability of police reporting behavior for robbery victimizations were also examined. This counterfactual comparison was utilized to provide further evidence that the military culture differentially silences IPV victims compared to victims of other violent crime.

Chapter 1

INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE IN THE MILITARY: AN ANALYSIS OF POLICE REPORTING BEHAVIORS

Introduction

Intimate partner violence (IPV) is an important global public health concern that significantly affects the lives of individuals. In the United States in particular, the Center for Disease Control (CDC) (2014) reported that, on average, 22.3 percent of women experience severe IPV in their lifetime. These types of violence can have devastating and long-lasting consequences for the victims. IPV is related to numerous negative physical and psychological health concerns, including death (Marshall, Panuzio, & Taft, 2005). Despite the progress our society has made in acknowledging these victimizations as social problems, victims of IPV are still unlikely to report their victimizations to the police (Venema, 2016). Moreover, we have only recently begun to address the high rates of IPV that exist across different institutions in the United States, including the people serving in the armed forces where data indicate women face greater risk of victimization compared to those in the civilian population (Jones, 2012; Rentz et al., 2006). Anecdotal evidence suggests that women in the military are even more reluctant to report their victimizations to authorities compared to their civilian counterparts (House of Representatives Hearings, 2009). While scholars have revealed many different connections between intimate partner violence (IPV) and reporting victimizations to the police (see: Felson et al., 2002; Kaukinen, 2004), we

know very little about the factors that affect the likelihood that victims connected to the military will report their victimizations to police.

This paper attempts to fill this gap by examining whether there is a difference in reporting behaviors for victims of IPV when the victim and/or offender are in the military compared to victims not currently in the military. Data from the NCVS is utilized to compare the police reporting differences that may exist between victims and offenders in the military compared to the civilian population. Specifically, this research will compare the probability of police reporting for two violent crimes: IPV and robbery. Robbery is very often considered a violent crime (BJS, 2016); therefore, examining if the factors of reporting IPV are different from reporting robbery, it can be determined that there are unique characteristics with IPV and victim experiences that would elucidate why differences may exist. Furthermore, examining these violent crimes separately explicates whether the military culture differentially silences victims. One possible explanation for why a difference might exist is the hyper-masculinity and silence that is profound in the military culture (Dunivin, 1994).

Literature Review

Police Reporting

A great deal of research that has investigated the factors that affect police reporting behavior by victims of violence. A few of these studies have utilized longitudinal data and have focused on the effects of a victim's past experiences with police on future police reporting behavior. For example, Xie, Pogarsky, Lynch, and McDowall (2006) used the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) from 1998-2000 to explore the reporting behaviors of all victims, regardless of crime type. They

found that greater police effort following the respondent's most recent victimization was positively related to whether the respondent reported later personal and household victimizations. Surprisingly, they also concluded that whether the police made an arrest was not significant when predicting the likelihood of reporting later victimizations. In addition to police effort, they explained that both multiple contacts with the police and the total number of prior victimizations were consistent predictors of reporting. Consistent with other research, they reported that both injuries to the victim and property loss greater than 300 dollars also increased the likelihood of reporting.

Baumer and Lauritsen (2010) utilized the National Crime Survey (NCS) from 1973-1993 and the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) from 1992-2005 to examine the likelihood of police notification for both violent and property crime incidents. The authors found that crimes where the victim knew the offender experienced an increase in police notification since the mid-1980s. These crimes include IPV, other family violence, and acquaintance violence. They concluded that there was an upward trend in police notification of violent crimes.

Other researchers have examined the factors related to police reporting behavior using the NCVS in a cross-sectional manner. For example, Felson, Messner and Hoskin (1999) drew upon the NCVS from 1992-1994 to examine the effect of the victim-offender relationship and reporting one-on-one assaults to the police. Classifying reporting to police into a trichotomy, which included whether the victim reported, a third party reported, or no one reported, they found that victims were more likely to call the police when the offender was an ex-spouse compared to spouse, romantic partner, other family, friend, other well-known person, acquaintance, and

strangers. In addition, they concluded that victims were more likely to call the police when either the victim or the offender was female.

Bosick, Gover, and Dodge (2012) used more recent NCVS data from 1992-2010 to investigate the relationship between reporting of all nonfatal violent victimizations, which included rapes, robberies, and assaults. They concluded that there was substantial variation in the rate of reporting by both the age of the victim and crime type. For instance, they determined that as a victim's age increased, so did the likelihood of reporting violence to the police. In addition to age, gender of the victim also surfaced as a significant predictor for certain circumstances; female victims under 50 were more likely than their male counterparts to report victimizations. However, gender proved to be an insignificant predictor of reporting if the victim was 50 years old or older.

Other victimization surveys have been used to explore and the factors related to reporting violence to the police. Goudriaan, Lynch, and Nieuwbeerta (2004) used the International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS) from 1992, 1996 and 2000 to look at the relationship between crime seriousness and reporting victimizations to the police. They looked at four western industrial countries: Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States. After examining both property crimes (i.e., theft and burglary) and contact crimes (i.e., robbery, assaults, and threats) they concluded that the main reason for not reporting both of these types of crimes was that the crime was perceived to be "not serious enough."

In addition to utilizing surveys, scholars have investigated the factors related to police reporting through more intensive interviews with victims. Neville and Pugh (1997), for example, examined the general and culture-specific factors that influence

the likelihood of reporting among African American women (Neville & Pugh, 1997). After completing a survey and semi-structured interviews with 29 African American women, the authors concluded that women rate police concerns, fear of negative consequences, and culture-specific concerns as contributing moderately to their decisions in not reporting victimizations. In addition, the authors found that perceptions of distrust in the police deterred African American women from reporting crimes to the police.

In sum, the unique characteristics that influence victims of intimate partner violence to report in particular are less prevalent, especially military assaults. Understanding the unique predictors that affect victims of IPV to report is paramount to investigating whether or not military context influences a victim of IPV to report.

Police Reporting for IPV

Few studies have investigated the factors that affect reporting behaviors for victims of intimate partner violence specifically. Some scholars have utilized nationally representative data to explore these factors. For instance, Felson et al. (2002) used the NCVS from 1992-1998 to explore the factors related to police reporting behavior for lone victims who had been attacked or threatened with an attack by a lone offender. The authors explored a number of motives for reporting or not reporting violence: self-protection, trivial matter, private matter, protect offender, and police wouldn't think it was important. They reported that victims were more likely to report to police when they knew the offender because they wanted protection from future attacks. In addition, victims were more likely to report to the police when they suffered from injuries and when a weapon was used. Female victims were more likely to report their victimization to police compared to their male counterparts. Compared

to victims attacked by other offenders, victims attacked by their intimate partners were more likely to state that they did not report their victimizations to the police because of privacy concerns, they wanted to protect their partner, or they were fearful of retaliation.

Kaukinen (2004) used data from the Violence Against Women and Men Survey (NVAWS) to investigate the affect that demographic characteristics had on general help seeking behaviors for victims of IPV and sexual assault. Kaukinen found that only a small number of victims engaged in formal help seeking behaviors (i.e., calling the police, seeking social support from family and friends, seeking care from a psychiatrist, and seeking help from social service agencies). Specifically, only 20 percent of victims engaged in this formal help seeking, and of that, 20 percent only 40 percent of victims called the police. Additionally, results indicated that compared to women of color, white women were more likely to engage in all help seeking behaviors, while minority women often engaged in withdrawal behaviors (meaning that they withdrew from contacting any formal help seeking organizations/services).

Akers and Kaukinen (2009) investigated the relationship between demographic characteristics and help seeking behaviors by female victims of IPV using the Canadian General Social Survey (CGSS) for 1999. They concluded that married women were less likely to contact the police, women with children in the home were more likely to contact the police, and when children witnessed the violence, women were significantly more likely to contact the police.

In addition to using nationally representative samples, research has investigated the factors related to reporting behaviors for victims of IPV using surveys based on nonprobability samples. For example, Ruiz-Perez, Mata-Pariente, and

Plazaola-Castano (2006) used a cross-sectional survey conducted in Spain, which was a self-administered anonymous questionnaire completed by 400 women. All women ages 18-65 that attended a primary healthcare center in Granada, Spain for any reason were included in the study. They discovered that young, single or separated women abused by an intimate partner were more likely to resolve their situation by contacting the police. Furthermore, only 15 percent of the female victims in this study reported the violence to the police; the majority (68.4) of victims tried to resolve their situation themselves.

Leone, Lape, and Xu (2014) utilized the Chicago Women's Health Risk Study (CWHRS) from 1997-1998 to examine help seeking behaviors of low-income women. They used a subgroup of respondents from four medical centers: Chicago Women's Health Center, Roseland Health Center, Erie Family Health Center, and Cook County Hospital. A three-item partner violence measure, based on the Intimate Partner Violence Screening Tool, was used during the intake procedure of all women receiving any form of medical care. Women who answered yes to any of the three partner violence screening questions were coded as "Abused," which resulted in a subsample of 497 women. Of these women, 53.7 percent of the respondents contacted the police, a medical center, and/or a counselor/agency. The authors lacked in disaggregating the individual percentages for these formal help-seeking behaviors; therefore, the percentage of respondents who contacted the police was unknown. In addition, fear of further abuse, income, physical violence, and injuries strongly predicted decisions about formal help seeking.

Scholars have also investigated factors related to help seeking behavior for victims of IPV using meta-synthesis. Specifically, Overstreet and Quinn (2013)

completed an integrative literature review using data from three electronic databases: PsycINFO, PubMed, and Scopus to investigate the relationship between stigma and help seeking behaviors. They focused on qualitative studies that investigated the relationship between stigma barriers and help seeking behaviors for victims of IPV. They looked at three types of stigma: cultural stigma, defined as societal ideologies that delegitimize victims of IPV, stigma internalization, otherwise known as internalized stigma based on negative IPV beliefs, and anticipated stigma, which referred to the degree that victims fear or expect stigmatization. The articles examined by the authors utilized one or more of the following methodologies: focus groups, semi-structured interviews, face-to-face interviews, and naturalistic inquiry. Overstreet and Quinn (2013) concluded that these three types of stigmas pushed female victims of IPV to keep their victimization private, which in turn, prevented them from seeking help from victim agencies and the police. This finding showed the importance of perceptions when it came to help seeking behaviors such as reporting to the police.

In addition to the variety of methodologies explored above, research has also explored factors related to help seeking behaviors for victims of IPV who have made contact with the police and/or client services. For instance, Vatnar and Bjorkly (2014) used a representative sample of Norwegian women who contacted shelters, police, and/or family counseling agencies regarding an incident of IPV to investigate the factors to their help seeking behavior. The authors measured help seeking behaviors by asking the women if they went to the emergency room, the family doctor, a psychologist, police, or consumed alcohol/substances to self-medicate. They concluded that positive perceptions of police and positive prior police contact were

significant factors for victims engaging in legal help seeking behaviors. Hollenshead et al. (2006) similarly used data for a sample of female victims of intimate partner violence from a metropolitan police department and client service groups to examine the factors related to help seeking. They found that there was no statistically significant association between age groups and help-seeking behavior of these victims, but concluded that there was a strong underutilization of social services by minority groups. While findings from clinical and police reported incidents are informative, they cannot be generalized to all victims of IPV since the women from these samples have already met the threshold of seeking help for their victimizations.

Although there has been multiple studies that investigate the factors that affect a victim of IPV's decision to report their victimization to the police, these studies do not consider the unique nature of the military and how that can impact an individual's decision. To ascertain whether military status affects reporting behaviors for IPV, it is important to understand the prevalence of IPV in the military and how the military culture potentially silences victims of IPV.

As shown in the research detailed above, there are a number of consistent predictors that have been found to affect the likelihood of victim reporting incidents of IPV. For instance, gender (i.e., female victims) and incidents where a weapon was present and that resulted in injuries increase the likelihood of victim reporting. Most findings that include minority women have found that they are less likely to report their victimizations. However, there are a number of inconsistencies in the literature, as well. Some studies report that older women are more likely to report, whereas other studies found that younger women were more likely to report their victimizations.

Despite these inconsistencies, virtually all studies revealed that only a small percentage of IPV victims reported their victimizations.

IPV in the Military

There are approximately 1,400,000 men and women in active-duty in the U.S. military including in the Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, Marine Corps, and the Navy. More than 200,000 of these are women, which is about 15 percent of the total (Governing, 2013).

The Department of Defense (DOD) acknowledges that IPV is a serious problem in the military, there are no representative data sources that accurately measure the prevalence of IPV for military personnel and their partners. For instance, the United States Government Accountability Report (2010) states, “DOD continues to have long-standing problems with the reliability and completeness of data on incidents of domestic abuse and does not have visibility over the total number of these incidents that occur throughout DOD” (p. 17). The review below details what we know about IPV in the military based on data from the Department of Defense.

While exact estimates of IPV in the military are not so readily available, the United States Government Accountability Office Report (2010) conducted 52 discussion groups with service members and civilian personnel in an attempt to assess its prevalence. This report concluded that of all the domestic violence incidents reported to the Family Advocacy Program’s Central Registry, 47 percent of domestic violence victims were active-duty service members. In addition, 62 percent of abusers were active-duty service members. In sum, those incidents reported to the Family Advocacy Program’s Central Registry show that abusers are more likely to be military service members; while, victims are slightly more likely to be civilians.

Scholars have also investigated the prevalence and potential risk factors of IPV in the military. Campbell et al. (2003) utilized the Defense Enrollment Eligibility Reporting System (DEERS) database with a sample size of 616 active duty military women that were screened for abuse using a modified version of the Abuse Assessment Screen. The authors used an introductory letter that described the study to recruit participants. They found that 30 percent of women reported adult lifetime intimate partner violence. In addition, 22 percent of women reported IPV during their military service. Other scholars have concluded that the most prevalent form of IPV in the military is physical violence (Jones, 2012; Rentz et al., 2006). Rentz et al. (2006) conducted a meta-analysis of 15 studies that either explored child maltreatment, spousal abuse, or both within military families. The studies included in this meta-analysis collected data using different sources such as questionnaires, the U.S. Air Force and Army Central Registry, and the Air Force Child Advocacy Committee. This research has shown that IPV rates in military samples are higher compared to civilian samples (Rentz et al., 2006). This finding was confirmed by Marshall, Panuzio, and Taft's (2005) meta-analysis of 48 published articles from several databases that used quantitative data to investigate IPV perpetration by military servicemen or veterans. Data ranged from nationwide random samples, volunteers, convenience samples of alcohol dependent and PTSD inpatients, to the National Vietnam Veterans Readjustment Study (NVVRS). Marshall and colleagues (2005) concluded that rates of IPV perpetration among military veterans and active duty servicemen were three times higher compared to civilian samples.

Lastly, it is essential to understand the procedural issues with reporting options and chain of command requirements that are unique to the military. Within the

military, it is the commander's role to ensure that IPV offenders are held accountable through appropriate discipline under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) and/or administrative protocols (BWJP; DTFDV, 2003). The military commander has a range of options to correct/change an offender's behavior at the lowest level possible. Due to the large amount of discretion that commanders have and the desire to resolve complaints at the lowest level possible, DOD has direct hotlines where victims can call that overrides the military chain of command. Reports of IPV can come from multiple sources that include the victim, chaplain/religious advisor, medical personnel, civilian law enforcement, and third parties. If a victim reports IPV to the military, they have a choice between filing an Unrestricted and Restricted Report. Unrestricted Reports are given to command and/or law enforcement for investigation, whereas Restricted Reports allow victims to receive medical care and advocacy services confidentially without causing an investigation (DTFDV, 2003).

In sum, there is research to suggest that victimization is higher among those involved in the military either personally or through their romantic partnerships, and there is research demonstrating the factors that influence the reporting of violence in general; however, there is less research on reporting of IPV, especially among those involved in the military. This study addresses these gaps in the literature. This paper will examine whether the factors that predict reporting of IPV are similar among victims despite military status. This study includes a counterfactual comparison to uncover how, if at all, a military connection influences the reporting likelihood for both IPV and robbery. Because robbery victims do not suffer the same stereotypical victim-blaming that sometimes accompany assaults by intimates, victims are less reluctant to report this form of crime to authorities (BJS, 2016). Therefore, if the

military silences all forms of violent crime victims, robbery victims who are in the military should be less likely to report their victimizations compared to their civilian counterparts. In this way, this counterfactual comparison will illuminate whether the military culture differentially silences IPV victims compared to other violent crime victims.

Methods

Data

The data for this study is gathered from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS): Concatenated files, 1992-2014. This survey is contracted by the United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. The purpose of this survey is to obtain the actual prevalence of crimes that are both reported and not reported to the police along with contextual data of victimizations including whether any injuries were sustained, if medical attention was received, offender and victim characteristics, and the relationship between the victim and offender.

The NCVS accumulates data from personal and household victimizations through a continuing national survey of residential addresses. The NCVS utilizes a stratified multistage cluster sampling procedure, which produces a representative sample of households. Any individual age 12 or older living in the United States, including those living in dormitories or religious buildings are included in sampling procedures and data collection. Data is collected semi-annually, and intensive face-to-face interviews are used for the first interview followed by computer-aided telephone interviews.

For this study, only one-on-one assault victimizations perpetrated by a current or former spouse, or a current or former boyfriend/girlfriend were examined. These incidents included completed aggravated assault with injury, attempted aggravated assault with a weapon, threatened assault with a weapon, simple assault completed without injury, and verbal threat of assault. There were a total of 4,836 incidents of IPV.¹ Robberies were coded as completed or attempted robberies with and without injuries. Robberies with multiple offenders were also included. There were a total of 5,686 incidents of robbery. For each crime, both male and female victims were included.

Independent Variables

Victim or reference person in armed services. For this variable, the NCVS asks respondents if they are currently an Armed Forces member. The variable is coded 1 for those who are in the military and 0 otherwise. There were 44 IPV victims and 41 robbery victims who reported they were currently in the armed services. In addition to examining whether victims are currently in active duty, it is also important to determine whether their intimate partners may be serving in the military. Although there is no question in the NCVS that directly asks about this, it is possible to estimate this by using information about the reference person in the victim's household. The reference person is the owner and/or co-owner (or renter) of the household. The NCVS asks respondents if the reference person is currently serving in the Armed

¹ This measurement of IPV did not include all forms of violence measured by the NCVS.

Forces, and assuming that the intimate partner delineated as the offender is actually the same reference person, this can be used to indicate whether the offender is in the military. This variable is coded 1 for reference persons who are in the military and 0 otherwise. There were 61 and 54 reference persons in the armed services identified by IPV and robbery victims respectively. Another variable called *nomilitary* was created using these two military variables, which was coded 0 for those victims and/or reference persons who were in the military and 1 for those who were not in the military.

Based on previous literature, several other variables were included in multivariate models predicting police reporting behavior. Descriptive statistics for the IPV sample are shown in Table 1. The models predicting intimate partner violence included those incidents that were perpetrated by some type of intimate only. The mean age in this sample was 32 and ranged from 12 to 90. Race was transformed into a dichotomous variable: white non-Hispanic compared to all other races. From this sample, 70 percent were white non-Hispanic. Marital status was dichotomized as married (coded 1) and not married (coded 0). This sample was comprised of mostly single respondents; only 16 percent replied that they were married. Weapon present by the offender was dichotomized as yes (coded 1) for an incident that involved any type of weapon and no (coded 0). IPV in this sample occurred mostly without a weapon present, only 17 percent of respondents stated that there was a weapon present. Victimization where medical care was received were coded 1 and 0 otherwise. Only 17 percent of IPV victims required medical attention. Gender of the victim was coded

as 1 = female and 0 = male, and the majority of victims were female (85 percent)². Education level was coded as 0 = high school graduate or less and 1 = some college or more. From this sample, 44 percent achieved some college or more. Employment status was dichotomized as currently employed full or part-time (coded 1) and currently not employed (coded 0). For this sample, 59 percent of the respondents stated that they currently have a job. Lastly, majority of IPV incidents occurred in a private location (71 percent) compared to a public location.

Descriptive statistics for the robbery sample are also shown in Table 1. The models predicting robberies included those incidents that had multiple perpetrators and both known and stranger perpetrators. The models predicting reporting for robbery revealed that 57 percent of robberies were committed by a stranger and 43 percent involved more than one perpetrator. Robberies that included both stranger and known offenders were coded as stranger. The mean age in this sample was 33 and the ages ranged from 12 to 90. From this sample, 56 percent were white non-Hispanic Hispanic any race. This sample was comprised of mostly single respondents; only 22 percent replied that they were married. Almost half, or 47 percent, of robberies in this sample occurred with a weapon present. Only 17 percent of robbery victims required medical attention. Gender of the victim is coded as 1 = female and 0 = male, and the majority of victims were male (62 percent). From this sample, 38 percent achieved some college or more and 51 percent of the respondents stated that they are currently employed. Lastly, the majority of robbery incidents occurred in the public (79 percent).

² The gender of the offender could not be included in models because it was highly correlated with the gender of the victim.

Dependent Variable

Reported to the police. To determine if the victimization was reported to the police, respondents are asked “Were the police informed or did they find out about this incident in any way?” This variable is coded as 1 = yes, 2 = no, and 3 = don’t know. The variable is transformed and dichotomized as 1 = yes and 0 = no or don’t know. A total of 56 percent of intimate partner violence victimizations were reported to the police. A total of 59 percent of robberies were reported to the police.

Analytical Strategy

Chi square analyses were utilized to determine the relationship between each independent variable and reporting behaviors for both IPV and robbery. Next, crime-specific logistic regressions were conducted to see the effect that each independent variable had on the dependent variable, net of all other factors. The NCVS utilizes a stratified, multistage cluster sample design, which prevents researchers from assuming that the observations in the sample are independent from one another (Baumer, 2002). This is problematic because regression analyses make the assumption that observations are independent. Therefore, in order to adjust for the sampling procedures, an incident weight was applied prior to conducting analyses. The incident weight recognizes that personal incidents are separate from victimizations (Pugh, 2014). The incident weight controls for the sampling design by counting each incident once. All analyses were performed using Stata, version 13.

Results

Bivariate Statistics

The relationships between all of the independent variables and the dependent variable: reported to the police were examined utilizing chi-square tests (see Table 2 for bivariate results). For the bivariate results examining reporting IPV to police, victimizations where either the perpetrator or the victim were in the military were significantly less likely to be reported to police compared to those that involved no military connection.

At the bivariate level, several victim characteristics were also related to IPV reporting behaviors. Incidents involving Non-Hispanic white victims were significantly more likely to be reported compared to their counterparts. Victimization that involved a female victim were also significantly more likely to be reported compared to victimizations that involved a male victim. Education level was significantly related to reporting likelihood, indicating that those who completed some college or more were less likely to report compared to those with high school or less education. Two contextual characteristics: weapon present and medical attention were significantly related to reporting likelihood. Those incidents of IPV that involved a weapon and where medical care was received were significantly less likely to be reported. IPV incidents that occurred in a private location were significantly more likely to be reported compared to those incidents that occurred in the public.

For the bivariate results examining reporting robbery to police, when either the victim or offender were in the military was not statistically significant to reporting likelihood. This provides preliminary evidence that the military culture does not affect reporting robberies. However, a number of contextual and victim characteristics were

related to reporting behaviors. Incidents involving multiple offenders and where medical attention was needed were significantly less likely to be reported compared to those involving lone offenders and no medical attention. Lastly, victimizations where a weapon was present were significantly more likely to be reported to police. Victimization that involved a female victim and a victim who was married were also significantly less likely to be reported. Employment status and education level were also significantly related to reporting likelihood. Victims who were employed were more likely to report robbery victimizations, whereas victims who achieved some college or more were less likely to report robbery victimizations. Robbery incidents were more likely to be reported when they occurred in a private location compared to a public location.

Multivariate Analyses

Logistic regression models were examined to determine the effect that each predictor variable, separately, has on police reporting behaviors of IPV and robbery victims (see Tables 3 and 4). Because the military variables were collinear, separate logistic regression analyses were examined to determine the effect of either the reference person in armed services, the victim in armed services, or neither in armed services had on reporting IPV and robbery to police. Results of the models predicting the likelihood of reporting IPV to police revealed that when the offender was in the armed services the odds that the victimization was reported decreased by 57 percent ($p < .05$). Results of the models predicting the likelihood of reporting IPV to police revealed that when the victim was in the armed services the odds that the victimization was reported decreased by 50 percent ($p < .05$). Furthermore, when neither the victim nor the offender were in the military the odds that the victimization was reported

increased my 80 percent ($p < .05$). The odds of IPV being reported increased significantly when a weapon was present and when the victim required medical attention. Multiple victim characteristics were significantly associated with the odds of reporting. The odds of IPV victimizations being reported decreased significantly for victims who were white non-Hispanic, compared to their counterparts. In addition, age and location significantly associated with reporting. For every one year increase in the victim's age, the odds of IPV being reported increased by 2 percent. The odds of IPV victimizations being reported increased significantly when the incident occurred in a private location.

Consistent with the bivariate analyses, none of the three military independent variables affected the likelihood of robbery being reported to the police. However, five incident characteristics were significantly associated with the odds of reporting robbery to the police. The odds of a robbery being reported increased significantly when a weapon was present, when the victim required medical attention, when the incident occurred in a private location, and when there were multiple offenders. Multiple victim characteristics were significantly associated with the odds of reporting. Gender, age and employment status were significantly associated with reporting. Specifically, the odds that robbery victimizations were reported to the police increased significantly with older, female, and employed individuals.

Discussion

The current research examined whether there was a difference in reporting behaviors for victims of IPV when the victim and/or offender were in the military compared to victims not currently in the military. This study utilized a contemporary, nationally representative sample from the National Crime Victimization Survey. This

research contributes to the current literature by providing one of the first analyses using a large national sample to examine whether a military connection influences the likelihood of reporting IPV to the police. To determine whether the effect of military status differentially predicted police reporting of IPV victimizations compared to other forms of violent crime, robbery victimizations were also examined to provide this counterfactual comparison.

Initial bivariate analyses revealed that a military connection significantly decreases the likelihood of IPV being reported compared to the civilian population, however, military status had no effect on the likelihood of robbery victimizations being reported. Multiple logistic regression results indicated that even after controlling for the effects of other important victim and incident characteristics, when the victim was in the military, the odds that IPV victimizations were reported remained significantly decreased. Furthermore, when neither the victim nor the offender was in the military, the odds that IPV victimizations remained significantly increased. These findings reveal that the military culture differentially silences IPV victims compared to victims of other violent crime.

It is essential to understand the military culture and how it may contribute to the silencing of IPV victims. Within military culture, the factors that dictate the informal norms and processes of service members are masculinity and professionalism (Wilson, 2007). One explanation for how the military culture differentially silences IPV victims is through hegemonic masculinity. Hegemonic masculinity is a pattern of practice or a process that perpetuates men's dominance over women (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Scholars have researched the presence of hegemonic masculinity in different organizations and workplaces (Connell & Messerschmidt,

2005). In particular, specific patterns of hegemonic masculinity have surfaced in the military, which is undoubtedly problematic as it relates to the likelihood that victims of IPV will seek help from authorities. Hegemonic masculinity promotes a culture of solidarity and secrecy within the military. This culture affects supervisors and disciplinary bodies within the military structure. In turn, appears to affect an individual's decision to report their victimizations (Hale, 2012). Furthermore, the hyper-masculine nature of the military culture easily produces outsiders (i.e. females), who often face hostile relations with other service members. The military culture embodies an "Us vs. Them" mentality in which "separatist attitudes" are created (Dunivin, 1994). These attitudes surface when outsiders (i.e. females) defy the hyper-masculine culture and traditional gender roles. In turn, this outsider perspective can affect an individual's decision to report their victimization. Despite the increasing number of women in the military, it remains a male-dominated institution. As such, females are already considered outsiders, and to avoid hostile interactions with their male counterparts, they may decide to keep their IPV victimizations private (Dunivin, 1994).

Other facets of the military could impact non-reporting. For example, the military culture also can have unique collateral consequences for military families. For instance, if active duty military IPV offenders are charged they may be forced to relinquish their weapons. This could be grounds for a dishonorable discharge, which could impact non-reporting. Secondly, the two types of reports that victims are allowed to file (Restricted reports versus Unrestricted reports). Restricted Reports allow victims to receive medical care and advocacy services confidentially without causing an investigation (DTFDV, 2003). This style of reporting would affect IPV

reports to law enforcement personnel, which could explain the small number of IPV incidents measured by the NCVS that involve a military connection.

Other findings in this research are consistent with previous research. Incidents that involved female victims, a weapon, and required medical attention were more likely to be reported. This study also found victims who were white non-Hispanic were significantly less likely to report their victimizations, compared to their counterparts. This finding is particularly important because it contradicts previous research that minority victims are less likely to report IPV to the police (Kaukinen, 2004; Hollenshead et al., 2006).

The findings of this research offer clear policy implications. Similar to the surveys implemented by the DOD to monitor the prevalence of rape and sexual assault victimizations, the prevalence of IPV needs to be more accurately monitored using survey methodology. Policies need to be in place to ensure that victims feel safe to report IPV to the police. Without these policies that attempt to change the culture of silence, victims will remain disconnected from support services because several of these services rely on police referrals. Furthermore, nonreporting limits the deterrent aspect of the criminal justice system, which is one of its major functions (Skogan, 1984). Finally, the DOD needs a better system of reporting their findings surrounding IPV to the public. A recurring issue throughout the research process for this study was that many links to studies on the DOD's website led to errors and "page not found" results. The first step to accountability is maintaining a level of transparency regarding the problems of IPV in the military with the public. Lastly, this research shows that both women who are in the military and those who are victimized by an intimate in the military are less likely to report their IPV victimizations. This finding highlights the

need to combat the stigma associated with IPV. In sum, combating this stigma can impact reporting of IPV across all institutions, not just within the military.

No study is without limitations, and this study is no exception. The primary limitation is that the NCVS was not intended to measure the IPV in the military so there was a very small number of victims who were in the military themselves or were victimized by an intimate in the military. Because of this limitation, the findings should not be generalized to the larger military population. Despite this, however, the NCVS provided a unique opportunity to examine whether the military silences victims of IPV. These results underscore the need for more research to investigate the factors that affect help seeking behavior of IPV victims serving in the military. Another limitation is the assumption that the reference person as measured by the NCVS is the offender in IPV incidents. This assumption needs to be tested with surveys that more directly measure the characteristics of offenders. Another limitation is that victims were not specifically asked about the specific law enforcement agency that was notified. Because victims in the military also have the option of reporting their victimizations to their superiors, who would then notify military law enforcement, it is not clear whether the generic question asked by the NCVS includes this reporting mechanism. Importantly, however, active duty victims of IPV can report to both civilian and military jurisdictions according to DOD guidelines (DTFDV, 2003).

Future research should extend analyses of police reporting behavior by military personal beyond IPV to include incidents of rape and sexual assault. Unfortunately, there were too few rape incidents reported in the NCVS that involved active duty military personal to include those victimizations in the analyses. As illustrated in a growing body of literature, a number of sexual assault scandals in the military have

been exposed (DOD, 2014; House of Representatives Serial No. 111-4, 2009; House of Representatives Serial No. 111-17, 2009). In addition to examining reporting behaviors, it is crucial that future research explores the barriers associated with reporting these victimizations within the military. For instance, The Department of Defense Annual Report on Sexual Assault in the Military (2014) reveals an 11 percent increase in the number of military sexual assault victims who reported their victimizations to authorities, though the actual percentage of victimizations decreased in 2014 (4.3%) compared to the estimates in 2012 (6.1%). Although this report shows some positive advancements made by the Armed Forces to combat sexual assault and an increase in victims' willingness to make reports to authorities, the survey revealed that respondents still experienced negative outcomes from reporting their sexual assaults. For instance, 62 percent of active duty sexual assault victims who reported their victimizations also reported experiencing some form of retaliation and/or punishment professionally, socially, and/or administratively. In sum, there needs to be better data to examine this issue both quantitatively and qualitatively.

TABLES

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics for Intimate Partner Violence and Robbery Victimizations, (NCVS 1992-2014)

	N	IPV Mean	SD	N	Robbery Mean	SD
<u>Dependent Variables</u>						
Reported to Police	4836	.56	.50	5686	.59	.49
<u>Independent Variables</u>						
<i>Military</i>						
Reference Person	4836	.01	.11	5686	.01	.10
Victim	4836	.01	.10	5686	.01	.08
No Military	4836	.99	.12	5686	.99	.10
<u>Control Variables</u>						
<i>Contextual Characteristics</i>						
Weapon Present	4556	.18	.38	5686	.47	.50
Medical Attention	4706	.17	.38	5686	.17	.38
Private Location	4836	.71	.45	5686	.21	.41
Multiple Offender				5533	.43	.49
Stranger				5686	.57	.49
<i>Victim Characteristics</i>						
Non-Hispanic White	4836	.70	.46	5686	.56	.49
Female	4836	.85	.36	5686	.38	.50
Marital Status	4810	.16	.37	5663	.22	.41
Age	4836	32	10.98	5686	33	15.95

Employment	4836	.59	.49	5686	.51	.50
Education	4836	.44	.50	5601	.38	.49

BIVARIATE STATISTICS

Table 2 Bivariate Examining Relationship Between Independent Variables and Reporting Likelihood for IPV and Robbery (NCVS 1992-2014).

	Dependent Variables	
	Reported IPV	Reported Robbery
<u>Independent Variables</u>		
<i>Military Variable</i>		
Military Connection	1%*	1%
No Military Connection	99%*	99%
<u>Control Variables</u>		
<i>Contextual Characteristics</i>		
Weapon Present	19.7%***	52.4%***
Weapon Not Present	80.3%***	47.6%***
Medical Attention Received	22.9%***	22.6%***
No Medical Attention Received	77.1%***	77.4%***
Public Location	27.4%*	25.1%***
Private Location	72.6%*	74.9%***
Multiple Offenders		45.4%***
Single Offender		54.6%***
Stranger		57.4%
Known		42.7%
<i>Victim Characteristics</i>		
Non-Hispanic White	66.8%***	56.7%
Non-white	33.2%***	43.3%
Female	85.9%*	43.2%***
Male	14.1%*	56.8%***
Married	16.2%	25.4%***
Not Married	83.8%	74.6%***
Employed	58.8%	55%***
Not Employed	41.2%	45%***
Some College or More	41.2%***	40.8%***
High School or Less	58.8%***	59.3%***

Note. ***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05

LOGISTIC REGRESSION: MODEL 1

Table 3 Logistic Regression Results Examining the Predictors of Reporting IPV to Police (NCVS 1992-2014).

Independent variables	Odds Ratio (SE)		
	Reference	Victim	No Military
<i>Military Variables</i>	.57 (.17)*	.50 (.18)*	1.80 (.48)*
<u>Control Variables</u>			
<i>Contextual Characteristics</i>			
Weapon Present	1.45 (.13)***	1.45 (.13)***	1.44 (.13)***
Medical Attention	2.43 (.22)***	2.43 (.22)***	2.43 (.22)***
Private Location	1.15 (.08)**	1.15 (.08)*	1.15 (.08)*
<i>Victim Characteristics</i>			
Non-Hispanic White	.72 (.05)***	.72 (.05)***	.72 (.05)***
Female	1.28 (.12)**	1.28(.12)**	1.28 (.12)**
Age	1.01 (.003)***	1.01 (.003)***	1.01 (.003)***
Marital Status	1.00 (.01)	.99 (.09)	1.00 (.09)
Employment	1.08 (.07)	1.09 (.07)	1.09 (.07)
Education	.99 (.002)	.99 (.002)	.99 (.002)

Note. N=4810.

***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05

Prob > F = .000***

LOGISTIC REGRESSION: MODEL 2

Table 4 Logistic Regression Results Examining the Predictors of Reporting Robbery to Police (NCVS 1992-2014).

Independent Variables	Odds Ratio (SE)		
	Reference	Victim	No Military
<i>Military Variables</i>	.96 (.29)	1.04 (.35)	1.10 (.30)
Control Variables			
<i>Contextual Characteristics</i>			
Weapon Present	1.66 (.12)***	1.66 (.11)***	1.66 (.12)***
Medical Attention	2.87 (.29)***	2.87 (.30)***	2.87 (.30)***
Private Location	1.75 (.17)***	1.75 (.17)***	1.75 (.17)***
Multiple Offenders	1.50 (.10)***	1.50(.10)***	1.50 (.10)***
Stranger	1.004 (.08)	1.004 (.08)	1.003 (.08)
<i>Victim Characteristics</i>			
Non-Hispanic White	.98 (.07)	.98 (.07)	.98 (.07)
Female	1.86 (.13)***	1.86 (.13)***	1.86 (.13)***
Age	1.02 (.002)***	1.02 (.002)***	1.02 (.002)***
Marital Status	1.21 (.10)*	1.21 (.10)*	1.21 (.10)*
Employment	1.32 (.09)***	1.32 (.09)***	1.32 (.09)***
Education	1.08 (.08)	1.08 (.08)	1.08 (.08)

Note. N=5441.

***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05

Prob > F = .000***

REFERENCES

- Akers, C., & Kaukinen, C. (2009). The police reporting behavior of intimate partner violence victims. *Journal of Family Violence, 24*, 159-171.
- Battered Women's Justice Project (BWJP) (n.d.). Military & veteran IPV. Web.
<http://www.bwjp.org/our-work/topics/military-ipv.html>
- Baumer, E P. (2002). Neighborhood disadvantage and police notification by victims of violence. *Criminology, 40*(3), 579-616.
- Baumer, E. P. & Lauritsen, J. L. (2010). Reporting crime to the police, 1973-2005: A multivariate analysis of long-term trends in the national crime survey (NCS) and national crime victimization survey (NCVS). *Criminology, 48*(1), 131-185.
- Bosick, S. J., Rennison, C. M., Gover, A. R., & Dodge, M. (2012). Reporting violence to the police: Predictors through the life course. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 40*(6), 441-451.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2016). Criminal victimization, 2015. *Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1-24*.
- Campbell, J. C., Garza, M. A., Gielen, A. C., O'Campo, P., Kub, J., Dienemann, J., Jones, A. S., & Jafar, E. (2003). Intimate partner violence and abuse among active duty military women. *Violence Against Women, 9*(9), 1072-1092.

- Center for Disease Control. 2014. Prevalence and characteristics of sexual violence, stalking, and intimate partner violence victimization – National intimate partner and sexual violence survey, United States, 2011. *CDC, 1-18*.
- Connell, R. W. and Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender and Society, 19*(6), 829-859.
- Defense Task Force on Domestic Violence (DTFDV). (2003). Defense task force on domestic violence: Third year report. *DTFDV, 1-211*.
- Department of Defense. (2014). Annual report on sexual assault in the military. *DOD, 1-61*.
- Department of Defense. (2013). 2011 health related behaviors survey of active duty military personnel. *DOD, 1-464*.
- Dunivin, K. O. (1994). Military culture: Change and continuity. *Armed Forces & Society, 20*(4), 531-547.
- Felson, R. B., Messner, S. F. & Hoskin, A. (1999). The victim-offender relationship and calling the police in assaults. *Criminology, 37*(4), 931-948.
- Felson, R. B., Messner, S. F., Hoskin, A. W., & Deane, G. (2002). Reasons for reporting and not reporting domestic violence to the police. *Criminology, 40*(3), 617-648.
- Goudriaan, H., Lynch, J. P., & Nieuwbeerta, P. (2004). Reporting to the police in western nations: A theoretical Analysis of the effects of social context. *Justice Quarterly, 21*, 933–969.
- Governing. (2013). Military Active Duty Personnel, Civilians by State. Web.

<http://www.governing.com/gov-data/military-civilian-active-duty-employee-workforce-numbers-by-state.html>.

Hale, H. C. (2012). The role of practice in the development of military masculinities.

Gender, Work and Organization, 19(6), 699-722.

Hollenshead, J., Dai, Y., Ragsdale, M., Massey, E., & Scott, R. (2006). Relationship between two types of help seeking behavior in domestic violence victims.

Journal of Family Violence, 21(4), 271-279.

Jones, A. D. (2012). Intimate partner violence in military couples: A review of the

literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17, 147-157.

Kaukinen, C. (2004). The direct and conditional effects of race and the victim offender

relationship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19, 967-990.

Leone, J. M., Lape, M. E., & Xu, Y. (2014). Women's decisions to not seek formal

help for partner violence: A comparison of intimate terrorism and situational couple violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(10), 1850-1876.

Marshall, A. D., Panuzio, J., & Taft, C. T. (2005). Intimate partner violence among

military veterans and active duty servicemen. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 25, 862-876.

Neville, H. A., & Pugh, A. O. (1997). General and culture-specific factors influencing

african american women's reporting patterns and perceived social support following sexual assault: An exploratory investigation. *Violence Against Women*, 3(4), 361-381.

- Overstreet, N. M., & Quinn, D. M. (2013). The intimate partner violence stigmatization model and barriers to help seeking. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology, 35*(1), 109-122.
- Pugh, B. (2014). *Reporting rape by victims and third parties: Evidence from the National Crime Victimization Survey (1992-2012)*.
- Rentz, E. D., Martin, S. L., Gibbs, D. A., Clinton-Sherrod, M., Hardison, J., & Marshall, S. W. (2006). Family violence in the military: A review of the literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 7*(2), 93-108.
- Ruiz-Perez, I., Mata-Pariente, N., & Plazaola-Castano, J. (2006). Women's response to intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21*, 1156-1168.
- Sexual assault in the military: Prevention: Hearing before the Military Personnel Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, 111th Cong. (Serial No. 111-17). (2009). Retrieved from GPO's Federal Digital System: <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG111hhr52186/pdf/CHRG111hhr52186.pdf>
- Sexual assault in the military: Victim support and advocacy: Hearing before the Military Personnel Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, 111th Cong. (Serial No. 111-4). (2009). Retrieved from GPO's Federal Digital System: <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-111hhr49634/pdf/CHRG-111hhr49634.pdf>
- Skogan, W. G. (1984). Reporting crimes to the police: The status of world research. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 21*, 113-137.

United States Government Accountability Office. (2010). Sustained leadership and oversight needed to improve DOD's prevention and treatment of domestic abuse. *GOA*, 1-47.

Vatnar, S. B., & Bjorkly, S. (2014). An interactional perspective on coping with intimate partner violence: Counterattack, call for help, or give in and obey him? *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 23(9), 881-900.

Venema, R. M. (2016). Police officer schema of sexual assault reports: Real rape, ambiguous cases, and false reports. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 31(5), 872-899.

Wilson, P. H. (2007). Defining military culture. *Journal of Military History*, 72(1), 11-41.

Xie, M., Pogarsky, G., Lynch, J. P., & McDowall, D. (2006). Prior police contact and subsequent victim reporting: Results from the NCVS. *JQ: Justice Quarterly*, 23(4), 481-501.