

Characteristics of Intimate Partner Violence: Implications for Prevalence Rates

By

Jennifer M. Johnson

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Masters of Science

in the

Criminal Justice

Program

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

December, 2016

Characteristics of Intimate Partner Violence: Implications for Prevalence Rates

Jennifer Johnson

I hereby release this thesis to the public. I understand that this thesis will be made available from the OhioLINK ETD Center and the Maag Library Circulation Desk for public access. I also authorize the University or other individuals to make copies of this thesis as needed for scholarly research.

Signature:

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Jennifer M. Johnson*, Student

Date

Approvals:

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Richard L. Rogers*, Thesis Advisor

Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Patricia B. Wagner*, Committee Member

Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Gordon G. Frissora*, Committee Member

Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Salvatore A. Sanders, Dean of Graduate Studies

Date

## Abstract

Studies have shown that intimate partner violence rates are declining faster among Whites than minorities, and the rate for African Americans has not changed since the year 2003. This research looks at the victimization rates and the prevalence rates of intimate partner violence, using all forms of intimate partner violence as identified in the concatenated file of the National Crime Victimization Survey for the years 1992 to 2014. The NCVS samples about 90,000 households comprising nearly 160,000 people ages 12 and up. I hypothesis that when controls for social disintegration, measured by income, education, and never married, are added, the African American prevalence rate is equal or almost equal to that of Whites.

The results show that when social disintegration is considered, racial and ethnic differences in intimate partner violence disappear, and the likelihood of experiencing intimate partner violence decreases as income increases. Those who finished high school are 1.5X more likely to experience intimate partner violence than those without a high school diploma. The results however, do not address the original question about changes in prevalence rates by race over time. Recently, African Americans have been hit twice as hard as Whites by the recovering economy, and if social disintegration accounted for the changing prevalence rates, some evidence should have appeared in this analysis.

A possible next step could be to look at African American marriages. Recent studies have shown that black marriages are not working; African American women are half as likely as white women to be married, and more than three times as likely as white women never to marry.

## Acknowledgements

This project would not have been possible without the support of many people. I would first like to thank my thesis chairman Dr. Richard Rogers for his patience, insight, and expertise. The door to Prof. Rogers's office was always open whenever I ran into a trouble spot or had a question about my research or writing. I am immensely grateful for the constructive criticism, friendly advice, and vast support.

I would next like to thank my committee, Dr. Gordon Frissora and Attorney Patricia Wagner. Without their passionate participation, input, and encouragement this thesis could not have been successfully conducted.

Finally, I must express my very profound gratitude to my parents, family, and friends for providing me with unfailing support and continuous encouragement throughout my years of study and through the process of researching and writing this thesis. This accomplishment would not have been possible without them. Thank you.

Author

Jennifer Johnson

## Table of Contents

Preface.....	iii
• Abstract	
• Acknowledgement	
Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
Chapter II: Literature Review.....	4
• Definitions	
• Frequency and Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence	
• Origins of Intimate Partner Violence	
• Statement of Problem and Hypothesis	
Chapter II: Methodology.....	11
• Variables	
• Analytic Strategy	
Chapter IV: Results.....	14
• Unadjusted Models (Column 1)	
• Adjusted Models	
Chapter V: Discussion .....	17
References .....	21
Tables.....	30

## **Chapter I**

### **Introduction**

On September 4, 1972, Ruth Bunnell called San Jose Police for help because her husband, from whom she was separated, had called her to say he was coming to kill her. The police responded to the call by saying, “Wait to call until he gets there.” Over the previous year, Mrs. Bunnell had called the police at least 20 times, each time telling them about her husband's abusive behavior to not only her but to her two daughters as well, yet the police refused to respond to her complaint. This time Mrs. Bunnell never got the chance to call the police back because her husband came and stabbed her to death before she had the chance. Her estate sued the police for negligence, but state courts dismissed the case because “the police had never induced decedent's reliance on a promise, express or implied, that they would provide her with protection” (Zorza, 1992). Why? At this point in time police had regarded conflicts between intimate partners as private matters; therefore, police and courts often did not take cases of family violence seriously (Bettinger-Lopez & Brandt-Young, 2011). The Bunnell case was no exception, and given the standards of the time, the court ruled that the police had no duty to intervene.

This philosophy would soon change. In 1973, the first shelter for victims of family violence opened in Duluth, Minnesota, and more solutions for victims followed in the years to come (Saint Martha's Hall, 2016). The National Coalition against Domestic Violence formed in 1979, and the Domestic Violence Prevention and Services Act, which provided federal grants for battered women's programs, passed in the same year. By 1983 more than 700 domestic violence shelters were in existence. In 1992 the Crime Victims

Fund totaled \$221 million, and by 2012 the deposits had reached \$2.79 billion (Mandall, 2013)

Advocacy was supplemented by policies encouraging mandatory arrests and no-drop prosecution in family violence cases (Champagne, 2015; Cramer, 2005; Morao, 2006). In 1984 the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment was the first controlled field research to provide evidence that mandatory arrests of perpetrators could deter further violence between partners (Sherman & Cohen, 1989). Although subsequent research qualified the conditions under which mandatory polices are effective (Berk, Klap, Campbell, & Western, 1992; Frye, Haviland, & Rajah, 2007; Kruttschnitt, 2008; Maxwell, Garner, & Fagan, 2001, Sherman, Schmidt, Rogan, et al., 1992), many still regard their use in some form as central to combatting family violence or the starting point for developing improved strategies (Champaigne, 2015; Morao, 2006; Nichols, 2014; White, Goldkamp, & Campbell, 2005; Zelcer, 2014).

The change in philosophy also influenced how the courts viewed family violence. In a landmark ruling in 1985, Tracy Thurman was awarded \$2.3 million by a jury when the Torrington, Connecticut, Police Department failed to intervene after she called about her abusive husband, who while in the presence of Officer Frederick Petrovits continued to abuse her (Goodmark, 2011). In 1992, Evelyn Humphrey of Fresno was originally convicted of manslaughter for the shooting her boyfriend, Albert Hampton, but the California Supreme Court overturned the conviction in 1996 on grounds that expert testimony about battered women's syndrome had been ignored in the trial phase (Duivent, 2013).

The incorporation of strategies to deter and punish family violence was accompanied by a decline in instances of such violence. For example, the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) indicates that the intimate partner victimization rates among females fell from 11.67 per 1,000 women in the 5-year period from 1993 to 1997 to 3.71 between 2009 and 2013 (See Table 1.) Concurrently, prevalence rates fell from 0.34% of women to 0.16%.

However, the decline has not been spread evenly across all racial and ethnic groups, especially in recent years. The intimate partner victimization rate across all women fell 14.97% between the periods 2003-2008 and 2009-2013 while African American women fell only 1.49%. While prevalence rates fell 3.36% across all women, prevalence among African American women actually increased over 5.18%. This thesis explores whether social disintegration can account for these recent variations by race and ethnicity.



## **Chapter II**

### **Literature Review**

What is intimate partner violence, and why does it happen? The first section of this chapter contrasts definitions of two types of family violence—domestic violence and intimate partner violence. The second section describes the frequency and consequences of intimate partner violence, and the third looks specifically at intimate partner violence and its causes. The final section lays the groundwork for the question of historical change.

#### **Definitions**

The language of family violence is confusing. Violence between family members is often labeled domestic violence while the term intimate partner violence is reserved for the subset of these offenses that occur within sexual relationships. However, some seek to equate the two. For example, the National Domestic Violence Hotline defines domestic violence as “a pattern of behavior in any relationship that is used to gain or maintain power and control over an intimate partner” (Office on Violence Against Women, 2016). The scenario most people imagine is the husband abusing the wife multiple times before she actually reports it.

This thesis utilizes the definitions of the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) as they are operationalized in the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). The mission of the BJS is as follows:

To collect, analyze, publish, and disseminate information on crime, criminal offenders, victims of crime, and the operation of justice systems at all levels of government. The data is critical to federal, state, and local policymakers in

combating crime and ensuring that justice is both efficient and evenhanded.

(Bureau of Justice Statistics, n.d.)

The BJS defines domestic violence as rape, sexual assault, robbery, and aggravated and simple assault committed by intimate partners, immediate family members, or other relatives (Truman & Morgan, 2014).

The term intimate partner violence was introduced to encompass a narrower understanding of violence in relationships (Wallace, 2016). Reports from the NCVS define an intimate partner as “a current or former spouse, boyfriend, or girlfriend” (Catalano, 2007), and as with domestic violence includes rape, sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault, and simple assault. The concept acknowledges that abuse can exist in any type of personal intimate relationship, regardless of sexual orientation, marital status, or gender. This definition challenges the myth that this problem only occurs in straight-couple relationships—intimate partner violence does not discriminate.

Statistically, intimate partner violence (and other crimes) can be measured in terms of victimization rates and prevalence rates (Lauritsen & Rezey, 2013; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000b). In the NCVS, victimization rates are defined as victimizations per 1,000 people (Truman & Morgan, 2016, p. 11). Prevalence refers to victims as a percent of the population. A single person can be the victim of multiple events when determining victimization rates but counts only once when determining prevalence.

### **Frequency and Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence**

Intimate partner violence constitutes the largest single category of violent crime in the United States (Brosius, 2015). According to the National Institute for Justice, “measuring intimate partner violence, often called domestic violence, can produce

different results depending on the instruments used, the focus of the survey (crime, safety, health) and the severity of injuries” (National Institute of Justice, 2010). Annual national estimates of intimate partner violence current come primarily from the NCVS. One-time reports from the 1995-1996 National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS) and the 2010 National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NIPSVS) supplement these numbers with more expansive views that include lifetime prevalence estimates. (See Table 2.)

The NCVS documents a substantial decline in victimization over time. The survey shows that the victimization rate of 9.8 per 1,000 people in 1993-1994 fell to 2.4 by 2014 (Catalano, 2015; Truman & Morgan, 2016). Women have higher rates of victimization than the population at large, and a special-topic report examining intimate partner violence in greater detail shows a comparable decline among women, from 16.1 in 1993-1994 to 5.9 in 2009-2010 (Catalano, 2015).

The NVAMS and NIPSVS are the sources of oft-quoted lifetime prevalence numbers and also yield estimates of 12-month prevalence rates that are higher than those seen in the NCVS. NVAMS finds that roughly 1 in 4 women (25.5%) have been victims of sexual violence (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a). NIPSVS results show that 1 in 5 (18.3%) women have experienced rape over the course of their lifetime and 44.6% have experienced some other type of sexual violence (Black, Basile, Breiding, Smith, Walters, et al., 2011). NVAMS estimated 12-month prevalence rates at 1.8% of women, while the 12-month estimates from NIPSVS for 2000 are at 1.1% for rape and 5.6% for other sexual violence. Reasons for the differences in rates between surveys have not been fully explored.

The consequences of intimate partner violence are considerable. It is the leading cause of injury to women with more incidents than car accidents, muggings, and rape combined (Brosius, 2015). Half of the victims of criminal intimate partner violence reported injuries in the NCVS, but only one in five of those injured sought medical treatment (Rennison & Planty, 2003). Women's crisis centers and battered women's shelters have been the cornerstone of programs for victims of partner violence (Campbell & Manganello, 2006). These types of programs offer individual counseling, job training and assistance in dealing with social services and legal matters. Many also provide referrals for drug and alcohol treatment. One of the most important prevention strategies to reduce conditions that threaten the life and health of large numbers of Americans is public awareness or health education campaigns aimed at the entire population or large aggregate groups.

According to NVAWS, the economic costs of intimate partner violence against women alone were more than \$5.8 billion in 1995 (Beyer, Wallis, & Hamberger, 2015)—direct medical and health-care costs accounted for \$4.1 billion, and \$1.8 billion was for the indirect costs of lost productivity. When the rates were looked at again in 2003, the cost of intimate partner violence had risen to \$8.3 billion.

### **Origins of Intimate Partner Violence**

The association of intimate partner violence with race and ethnicity is the principal concern of this study. African American women consistently report higher rates of lifetime and past-year intimate partner victimization when compared with White and Hispanic women (Lacey, West, Matusko, & Jackson, 2015). NIPSVS reports that 30.5% of non-Hispanic White and 29.7% of Hispanic women have experienced intimate partner

violence in their lifetimes compared to 41.2% of non-Hispanic Black women (Table 2). Rates are even higher among some smaller, hard-to-measure groups like Native Americans and mixed-race individuals.

**Social disintegration theory.** The research literature indicates that higher prevalence rates of intimate partner violence may be related to social disintegration. According to social disintegration theory, the basic support structures providing the foundation for normal social relationships are disrupted by influences such as poverty, low levels of education, and marital instability (Emmett, 2008; Heitmeyer & Anhut, 2008; Möller, 2008; Ramphele, 1991). The criminological literature has a rich tradition of applying this idea on both individual and ecological levels.

On the individual level, the focus has been on anomie and cultural deviance. Anomie is caused by the imbalance that results when cultural goals are overemphasized at the expense of institutionalized means. Merton (1938; 1949) recognized that the social structure cannot effectively deliver what the dominant value system promises because American culture places a preeminent emphasis on monetary rewards (Chamlin & Cochran, 1995). The more unequal the opportunities, the higher the strain and, in consequence, the level of criminal offending (Savolainen, 2000). Messner and Rosenfield (1994) argued that an expansion of economic opportunities can intensify culturally induced pressures to use extralegal means to acquire monetary rewards. They suggested that the effects of economic conditions on profit-related crime depend on the strength of noneconomic institutions (Chamlin & Cochran, 1995). Similarly, cultural deviance theory which assumes that cultures, not persons, are deviant, and assumes that

in living up to the demands of his own culture, the person automatically comes into conflict with the law (Akers, 1996).

With regards to ecological analysis, Shaw and McKay (1942) introduced social disorganization theory in 1942. It is said to be one of the most fundamental sociological approaches to the study of crime and delinquency from the Chicago school of social research. The theory declares that communities have more difficulty regulating local crime when they are impacted by ethnic heterogeneity, concentrated poverty, and the frequent relocation of residents (Kubrin, 2009; Sampson & Groves, 1989; Taft, Bryant-Davis, Woodward, Tillman, & Torres, 2000; Weisburd, Groff, & Yang, 2014).

**Application to intimate partner violence.** The higher prevalence rates of intimate partner violence among African American women may not be related to race but instead reflect several influences such as demographic, socioeconomic, and situational factors indicative of social disintegration (Hampton, 1991; DeJong, Pizarro, & McGarrell, 2011; Jackson, 2016; Lacey et al. 2015, Rennison, Dekeseredy, & Dragiewicz, 2013). Severe poverty and its associated stressors increase the risk for intimate partner violence; the lower the household income, the higher the reported intimate partner violence rates (Carlson & Worden, 2000). Low income women are more likely than other women to experience abuse. The potential consequences of domestic violence for women whose economic stability may already be tenuous are especially significant (Farber & Cribbs, 2014).

Social disorganization theory has been applied primarily to crimes such as burglary, robbery, and stranger assaults, and more recently it has been applied to interpersonal violence, including intimate partner violence. Previous research has

examined empirically the effects of community-level poverty and collective efficacy on intimate partner violence, and findings suggest that community-level poverty and broader measures of community disadvantage are positively associated with individual reports of intimate partner victimization and perpetration (Edwards, Mattingly, Dixon, & Banyard, 2014; Emery, Jolley, & Wu, 2011). Individuals with the same family income status in different communities demonstrate different risk for intimate partner violence. Those living in more impoverished rural communities are at greater risk for intimate partner violence than those living in less impoverished and rural communities (Lanier & Maume, 2009; Osgood & Chambers, 2000).

### **Statement of Problem and Hypothesis**

A new wrinkle has emerged in the study of intimate partnership violence: Rates are declining faster among Whites than minorities (Table 1). Of particular concern are rates among African Americans, where there has been virtually no change since 2003. My intent is to examine changes in prevalence over time with the focus on African Americans. I suggest that when controls for social disintegration are added, the African American prevalence rate is equal or almost equal to that of Whites.

## **Chapter III**

### **Methodology**

This report presents data from the NCVS, the principal source of data for annual prevalence rates of a variety of crimes including intimate partner violence. The NCVS is an ongoing self-report survey in which interviewed persons are asked about the number and characteristics of victimizations experienced during the prior 6 months. The main objective of the NCVS is to (1) develop detailed information about the victims and consequences of crime, (2) to estimate the number and types of crimes not reported to the police, (3) to provide uniform measures of selected types of crimes, and (4) to permit comparisons over time and types of areas. At this point in time, approximately 90,000 households and 160,000 people are surveyed annually (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2016b).

Although sexual crimes are underreported in official police statistics, the NCVS is regarded as an excellent source for examining these types of crimes because it includes offenses that are not reported to the police. A victim might be more likely report getting an arm broken or getting stabbed, but might be less likely to report getting scratched or pushed by an intimate partner.

This report looks at all forms of intimate partner violence using the concatenated file of the NCVS for the years 1992 to 2014 (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2016a). The data used in this study combines incident and person-level data. This special version of the file was prepared by Professor Richard Lee Rogers for his own use and use by his students, and the raw totals for offenses closely matches BJS estimates. The data reported



in this thesis is based on collection year and uses the person weight to adjust to the population. The population is delimited to women.

To initially identify changes in trends by race and ethnicity over time, data was aggregated into five-year periods: 1993-1997, 1998-2002, 2003-2008, and 2009-2013. The aggregated periods rather than single years were used because of small numbers of observations in some subsets of the data. Data for the year 2014 were dropped because data collection for 2014 was not completed until 2015, so 2014 information is incomplete on the concatenated file. Data for the year 1992 was dropped because it did not fit into the five-year periods. The 2006 data was dropped due to known methodological issues with the survey and the five-year periods were adjusted accordingly.

Two sets of results in this paper are supplied from this data set. Table 1 is supplied by Professor Rogers and is based on his own estimates applying a generalized variance function to collection-year data (Couzens, Shook-Sa, Lee, & Berzofsky, 2015). This table is used with permission. Descriptive statistics and logistics regressions are calculated by the student from data subset of the data for 2003 to 2013 prepared by Professor Rogers.

### **Variables**

The dependent variable is whether a person was a victim of intimate partner violence. Intimate partner violence was defined using the NCVS incident file and attaching the results to the NCVS person file. A victimization was identified as violent if it was identified as a rape or sexual assault, aggravated assault, simple assault, or robbery, or an attempt or threat to commit one of these crimes as indicated in variable V4529. (A complete list of eligible offenses as coded in the data can be found in Appendix A.) An

intimate partner is defined as a spouse, ex-spouse, boyfriend, girlfriend, or former boyfriend or girlfriend (V4245).

Race and ethnicity were collapsed into three categories—White, African American, and Other—based on variable V3023 on the person file. The Hispanic category was created by overriding V3023 with the indicator of Hispanic origin in variable V3023A. The Other category is a residual and should not be given any substantive interpretation.

The social disintegration variables are household income, education, and never married. Income and education were based on the collapsing of categories in V2026 and V3020 respectively. Marital status was derived from V3015. Frequency distributions for all variables can be found in Table 3.

### **Analytic Strategy**

The data analysis for this project will compare the characteristics of victims of IPV across two time periods. These time periods 2003-2008 and 2009-2013 are used as the basis of comparison due to the negligible change in African American prevalence rates over this decade. The technique for multivariate analysis will be logistic regression. All data analysis was conducted using SPSS.

## Chapter IV

### Results

#### Unadjusted Models (Column 1)

Table 4 presents the results of logistic regressions predicting the likelihood of a woman experiencing intimate partner violence. The unadjusted results indicate that African Americans are 47% (OR=1.47) more likely to experience intimate partner violence. This group is the only race/ethnicity to show a statistically significant difference from Whites.

The unadjusted models also support the contention that social disintegration increases the likelihood of intimate partner violence. The likelihood of experiencing intimate partner violence decreases as income increases. Those in the 25-49K income range are 58% (OR=.42) less likely to experience intimate partner violence than those making less than 25K. The likelihood drops 74% (OR=0.26) for those making 50-74K and to 80% (OR=0.20) among those making 75K or more. Furthermore, those who are never married are 67% (OR=1.67) more likely to experience intimate partner violence than those ever married.

Education poses an exception to the model. Instead of peaking among those not finishing high school, the likelihood of experience intimate partner violence peaks among high school graduates, who are 1.5X more likely to experience intimate partner violence than those without a high school diploma. However, the rate drops dramatically among college graduates, who are 43% (OR=0.57) less likely to experience intimate partner violence than those not finishing high school.

### **Adjusted Models (Columns 2 through 4)**

The effects of race and ethnicity completely disappear when social disorganization variables are added (Column 2). However, the effects of social disorganization remain in place. The likelihood of experiencing intimate partner violence decreases as income increases. Those in the 25-49K income range are 57% (OR=.43) less likely to experience intimate partner violence than those making less than 25K. The likelihood drops 72% (OR=0.28) for those making 50-74K and to 76% (OR=0.24) among those making 75K or more. Furthermore, those who are never married are 61% (OR=1.61) more likely to experience intimate partner violence than those who are married.

The relationships seen in the adjusted model for all women used in this study remain in place when subdividing the sample by 5-year periods (Columns 3 and 4). No category of race and ethnicity is statistically significant. During the 5-year period from 2003 to 2008, the likelihood of experiencing intimate partner violence decreases as income increases (Column 3). Those in the 25-49K income range are 50% (OR=.50) less likely to experience intimate partner violence than those making less than 25K. The likelihood drops 70% (OR=0.30) for those making 50-74K and to 74% (OR=0.26) among those making 75K or more. Furthermore, those who are never married are 54% (OR=1.54) more likely to experience intimate partner violence than those ever married.

During the 5-year period from 2009 to 2013, the likelihood of experiencing intimate partner violence decreases as income increases (Column 4). Those in the 25-49K income range are 63% (OR=.37) less likely to experience intimate partner violence than those making less than 25K. The likelihood drops 74% (OR=0.26) for those making 50-

74K and to 78% (OR=0.22) among those making 75K or more. Furthermore, those who are never married are 44% (OR=1.34) more likely to experience intimate partner violence than those ever married.

## Chapter V

### Discussion

This study shows that when social disintegration is considered, racial and ethnic differences in intimate partner violence disappear. This result is important but it does not address the original question about changes in prevalence rates by race over time. What should have been seen? The slow economic recovery of recent years hit Blacks twice as hard as Whites, and if social disintegration accounted for the changing prevalence rates, some evidence should have appeared in this analysis. In addition to the results reported in this document, some direct comparisons were made of sociodemographic characteristics by race across the time periods of this study and were left unreported because they provided no additional insight to what happened.

It is possible that the effects of social disintegration are more complicated than the simple dynamics explored in this thesis. Specifically, an alternative explanation in line with the social disintegration thesis suggests there may be a complicated interaction between race and income among African American women that is not tested here. Studies show that black marriages are not working, and that black women are the least likely to get married. In the book *Is Marriage for White People?* Ralph Richard Banks (2011) speaks about how the decline of African American marriages affects not just African American, but everyone. Banks sought to explain why African American women are half as likely as white women to be married, and more than three times as likely as white women never to marry. His results showed that the African American poor are majority male; therefore, the benefits of marriage don't accrue as readily for African Americans as for other groups precisely because of their economic instability. The rates of divorce and

reported dissatisfaction among married black couples are higher than those among married white couples. When it comes to picking a mate Banks notes that black women aren't picky like they're said to be; in fact, they are more likely than women of other groups to marry men who are less successful than they are, educationally or occupationally (Perry, 2011). When Banks was asked why he narrowed his research to African Americans, he replied "Because this is a demographic that has traditionally been overlooked by demographers. When scholars study marriage, they usually focus on white people, yet when they focus on African Americans, they usually study the lower classes" (Kaufman, 2011).

For this reason, a next step in my research could be to look deeper into black marriages. An example of what needs to happen are studies like the one conducted by Johnson and Loscocco (2014), who looked at the pathological side of the marital patterns of African American. Their study showed that African American women are seen as too independent, too smart, and too strong; their strengths often are seen as a negative and damaging to African American male egos. The authors even showed that the problems go as far back as slavery when women were seen as the wife and mother who took care of the house. Nowadays the African American church and media promote the notion that African American woman should be financially independent and more educated than the African American men, which is a situation that could create a marital relationship leaving both parties dissatisfied (Larson, 2015). I think researching African American marriages could help further my research.

Another possible next step could be looking at surveys that only look at ages 18 and up. The NCVS surveys individuals ages 12 and up, which makes the BJS the only

major researcher on intimate partner violence including underage individuals (Table 2). It is possible that the inclusion of minors distorts how social disintegration works among adults.

This study has several limitations. A significant issue is the omission of populations in which intimate partner prevalence rates are suspected to be high. The NCVS interviews are conducted among ordinary households, and those living in homeless or domestic violence shelters or living on military bases are not counted in the results. In other words, those victims who escaped their violent situations aren't being counted nor are military women who experience high rates of victimization (Dichter & Wagner, 2015).

There are several other issues with the NCVS related to problems in getting responses about intimate partner violence. The NCVS obviously excludes victims of murder. Many victims of intimate partner violence have been killed by their partner; this causes a problem for those who try to help prevent or minimize the occurrence of murders related to intimate partner violence. Underreporting of domestic crimes may be another issue. Victims might not report their crime if they feel they have no way out, or that their attacker will make things worse on them. Another common limitation in research on intimate partner violence is derived from the fact that women who are accompanied by their partner at the time of the interview or questionnaire are systematically excluded from samples (Ruiz, Castano & Vives, 2007).

The methodology of the survey itself creates a final set of problems. The methodology of the survey changes over time, which could affect longitudinal estimates. In addition, in any given year, estimates of the prevalence of an individual crime are built



on small sample sizes, which can lead to the exaggeration of the change effects. The five-year categories used in this quasi-longitudinal study were an attempt to mitigate this problem.

## References

- Akers, R. L. (1996). Is differential association/social learning cultural deviance theory? *Criminology*, *34*(2), 229-247.
- Banks, R. R. (2011). Is marriage for white people? How the African American marriage decline affects everyone. *New York, NY: Dutton*.
- Berk, R. A., Klap, R., Campbell, A., & Western, B. (1992). The deterrent effect of arrest in incidence of domestic violence: A Bayesian analysis of four field experiments. *American Sociological Review*, *57*(5), 698-708.
- Bettinger-Lopez, C., & Brandt-Young, C. (2011, April 18). *Domestic violence in the United States*. Retrieved October 30, 2016, from [http://www.reproductiverights.org/sites/crr.civicactions.net/files/newsletter/DV in the US\\_Br Paper to SR on VAW.pdf](http://www.reproductiverights.org/sites/crr.civicactions.net/files/newsletter/DV%20in%20the%20US_Br%20Paper%20to%20SR%20on%20VAW.pdf)
- Beyer, K., Wallis, A. B., & Hamberger, L. K. (2015). Neighborhood environment and intimate partner violence: A systematic review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *16*(1), 16-47.
- Black, M. C., Basile, K. C., Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Walters, M. L., et al. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey: 2010 summary report*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Brosius, A. D. (2015). Review an Iowa law in need of imminent change: Redefining the temporal proximity of force to account for victims of intimate partner violence who kill in non-confrontational self-defense. *Iowa Law Review*, *100*(2), 775-802.

- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (n.d.). About us. Retrieved November 14, 2016, from <http://www.bjs.gov/>
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (2016a). *National Crime Victimization Survey, concatenated file, 1992-2014* [ICPSR 36143]. Ann Arbor, MI: Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (2016b). *National Crime Victimization Survey, concatenated file, 1992-2014: Codebook* [ICPSR 36143]. Ann Arbor, MI: Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research.
- Campbell, J. C., & Manganello, J. (2006). Changing public attitudes as a prevention strategy to reduce intimate partner violence. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 13*(3/4), 13-39.
- Carlson, B. E., & Worden, A. P. (2000). *Violence against women: Synthesis of research for service providers: Final report to the National Institute of Justice*. [NCJ 199578]. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice,
- Catalano, S. (2015). *Intimate partner violence, 1993-2011* (Revised). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Catalano, S. (2007, December 29). Intimate partner violence in the United States. Retrieved November 14, 2016, from <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ipvus.pdf>
- Chamlin, M. B., & Cochran, J. K. (1995). Assessing Messner and Rosenfeld's institutional anomie theory: A partial test. *Criminology, 33*(3), 411-429.

- Champagne, F. (2015). Prosecuting domestic violence cases. *Criminal Litigation*, 16(1), 2-6.
- Couzens, G. L., Shook-Sa, B., Lee, P., & Berzofsky, M. (2015). *Users' guide to the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) generalized variance functions*. Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International. Retrieved November 18, 2106, from [https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/GVF\\_Users\\_Guide.pdf](https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/GVF_Users_Guide.pdf)
- Cramer, E. P. (2005). Unintended consequences of constructing criminal justice as a dominant paradigm in understanding and intervening in intimate partner violence. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 33(1/2), 272-289.
- DeJong, C., Pizarro, J., & McGarrell, E. (2011). Can situational and structural factors differentiate between intimate partner and 'other' homicide? *Journal of Family Violence*, 26(5), 365-376.
- Dichter, M. E., Wagner, C., & True, G. (2015). Timing of intimate partner violence in relationship to military service among women veterans. *Military Medicine*, 180(11), 1124-1127.
- Duivent, S. (2013). Battered women and the full benefit of self-defense laws. *Berkeley Journal of Gender, Law & Justice*, 12(1), 1-10.
- Edwards, K., Mattingly, M., Dixon, K., & Banyard, V. (2014). Community matters: Intimate partner violence among rural young adults. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 53(1/2), 198-207.
- Emery, C., Jolley, J., & Wu, S. (2011). Desistance from intimate partner violence: the role of legal cynicism, collective efficacy, and social disorganization in Chicago neighborhoods. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 48(3/4), 373-383.

- Emmett, T. (2000). Addressing the underlying causes of crime and violence in South Africa. In T. Emmett & A. Butchart (Eds.), *Behind the mask: Getting to grips with crime and violence in South Africa* (pp. 273-332). Pretoria. South Africa: HSRC Publishers.
- Farber, N., & Miller-Cribbs, J. (2014). Violence in the lives of rural, southern, and poor white women. *Violence Against Women, 20*(5), 517-538.
- Frye, V., Haviland, M., & Rajah, V. (2007). Dual arrest and other unintended consequences of mandatory arrest in New York City: A brief report. *Journal of Family Violence, 22*(6), 397-405.
- Goodmark, L. (2011). Mandatory interventions. A troubled marriage domestic violence and the legal system, 106-135
- Hampton, R. L. (1991). *Black family violence: Current research and theory*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Heitmeyer, W., & Anhut, R. 2008. Disintegration, recognition, and violence: A theoretical perspective. *New Directions for Youth Development, 119*, 25-37.
- Jackson, A. L. (2016). The combined effect of women's neighborhood resources and collective efficacy on IPV. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 78*(4), 890-907.
- Johnson, K. R., & Loscocco, K. (2014). Black marriage through the prism of gender, race, and class. *Journal of Black Studies, 46*(2), 142-171.
- Kaufman, D. (2011, August). Is marriage for white people? *TIME.com*. Retrieved November 26, 2016, from <http://healthland.time.com/2011/08/31/is-marriage-for-white-people/>

- Kruttschnitt, C. (2008). The effect of “no-drop” prosecution policies on perpetrators of intimate partner violence. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 7(4), 629-632.
- Kubrin, C. E. (2009). Social disorganization theory: Then, now, and in the future. *In Handbook on crime and deviance* (pp. 225-236). Springer.
- Lacey, K. K., West, C. M., Matusko, N., & Jackson, J. S. (2015). Prevalence and factors associated with severe physical intimate partner violence among U.S. Black women: A comparison of African American and Caribbean Blacks. *Violence against Women*, 22(6), 651-670.
- Lanier, C., & Maume, M. O. (2009). Intimate partner violence and social isolation across the rural/urban divide. *Violence against Women*, 15(11), 1311-1330.
- Larson, V. (2015, January). Rethinking the “problems with black marriage” Retrieved November 26, 2016, from [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/vicki-larson/rethinking-the-problems-w\\_b\\_6469762.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/vicki-larson/rethinking-the-problems-w_b_6469762.html)
- Lauritsen, J., & Rezey, M. (2013, September). *Measuring the prevalence of crime with the National Crime Victimization Survey: Technical Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Mandell, M. (2013). *2013 NCVRW resource guide*. Retrieved November 12, 2016, from [https://www.ncjrs.gov/ovc\\_archives/ncvrw/2013/index.html](https://www.ncjrs.gov/ovc_archives/ncvrw/2013/index.html)
- Maxwell, C. D., Garner, J. H., & Fagan, J. A. (2001). *The effects of arrest on intimate partner violence: New evidence from the spouse assault replication program*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

- Merton, R. K. (1938). Social structure and anomie. *American Sociological Review*, 3(5), 672-682.
- Merton, R. K. (1949). *Social theory and social structure: Toward the codification of theory and research*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Messner, S. F., & Rosenfeld, R. 1994. *Crime and the American dream*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Möller, K. (2008). The role of social work in the context of social disintegration and violence. *New Directions in Youth Development*, 119, 185-205.
- Morao, K. (2006). Domestic violence and the state. *Georgetown Law Review*, 7(3), 787-817.
- National Institute of Justice. (2010). Measuring intimate partner (domestic) violence. Retrieved September 17, 2016, from <http://www.nij.gov/topics/crime/intimate-partner-violence/pages/measuring.aspx>
- Nichols, A. J. (2014). No-drop prosecution in domestic violence cases: Survivor-defined and social change approaches to victim advocacy. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(11), 2114-2142.
- Office on Violence against Women. (2016). Areas of focus. Retrieved November 16, 2016, from <https://www.justice.gov/ovw>
- Osgood, D. W., & Chambers, J. M. (2000). Social disorganization outside the metropolis: An analysis of rural youth violence. *Criminology*, 38(1), 81-116.
- Perry, I. (2011). Blacks, whites and the wedding gap. Retrieved November 26, 2016, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/18/books/review/is-marriage-for-white-people-by-ralph-richard-banks-book-review.html>

- Ramphele, M. (1991). Social disintegration in the Black community: Implications for transformation. Paper delivered for a Joint Enrichment workshop. Retrieved November 20, 2016, from <https://www.nelsonmandela.org/omalley/index.php/site/q/03lv01538/04lv01584/05lv01585.htm>
- Rennison, C., & Planty, M. (2003). Nonlethal intimate partner Violence: Examining race, gender, and income patterns. *Violence and Victims, 18*(4), 433-443.
- Rennison, C. M., Dekeseredy, W. S., & Dragiewicz, M. (2013). Intimate relationship status variations in violence against women: Urban, suburban, and rural differences. *Violence Against Women, 19*(11), 1312-1330.
- Ruiz-Pérez, I., Plazaola-Castaño, J., & Vives-Cases, C. (2007). Methodological issues in the study of violence against women. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 61*(Suppl. 2), ii26–ii31.
- Saint Martha's Hall. (n.d.). History of battered women's movement. Retrieved October 23, 2016, from <http://saintmarthas.org/resources/history-of-battered-womens-movement>.
- Sampson, R. J., & Groves, W. B. (1989). Community structure and crime: Testing social-disorganization theory. *American Journal of Sociology, 94*(4), 774-802.
- Savolainen, J. (2000). Inequality, welfare state, and homicide: Further support for the institutional anomie theory. *Criminology, 38*(4), 1021-1042.
- Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1942). *Juvenile delinquency in urban areas*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.



- Sherman, L., & Cohn, E. (1989). The impact of research on legal policy: The Minneapolis domestic violence experiment. *Law & Society Review*, 23(1), 117-144.
- Sherman, L., Schmidt, J., Rogan, D., Smith, D., Gartin, P., Cohn, E., & Bacich, A. (1992). The variable effects of arrest on criminal careers: The Milwaukee domestic violence experiment. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 83(1), 137-169.
- Taft, C. T., Bryant-Davis, T., Woodward, H. E., Tillman, S., & Torres, S. E. (2009). Intimate partner violence against African American Women: An examination of the socio-cultural context. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 14(1), 50-58.
- Tjaden, P. & Thoennes, N. (2000a, July). *Extent, nature, and consequences of intimate partner violence: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000b, November). *Full report of the prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Research report: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.
- Truman, J., & Morgan, R. (2014, April). *Nonfatal domestic violence, 2003–2012*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Truman, J., & Morgan, R. (2016). *Criminal victimization, 2015*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

- Wallace, R. (2016). Domestic violence and intimate partner violence: What's the difference? Retrieved September 17, 2016, from <http://inpublicsafety.com/2015/10/domestic-violence-and-intimate-partner-violence-whats-the-difference/>
- Weisburd, D., Groff, E. R., & Yang, S. M. (2014). The importance of both opportunity and social disorganization theory in a future research agenda to advance criminological theory and crime prevention at places. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 51(4), 499-508.
- White, M. D., Goldkamp, J. S., & Campbell, S. P. (2005). Beyond mandatory arrest: Developing a comprehensive response to domestic violence. *Police Practice & Research*, 6(3), 261-278.
- Zelcer, A. M. (2014). Battling domestic violence: Replacing mandatory arrest laws with a trifecta of preferential arrest, officer education, and batterer treatment programs. *American Criminal Law Review*, 51(2), 541-461.
- Zorza, J. (1992). The criminal law of misdemeanor domestic violence, 1970-1990. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 83(1), 46.

Table 1

*Incidence of Intimate Partner Violence among Women Ages 12 and Over, 1993-2013*

	1993 to 1997	1998 to 2002	2003 to 2008*	2009 to 2013	Change to 2009-2013**		
					1993 to 1997	1998 to 2002	2003 to 2008*
<b>NUMBER OF VICTIMIZATIONS</b>							
White	4,695,851	2,653,356	2,514,412	1,590,137	-66.14%	-22.64%	-19.68%
Black	1,033,151	465,109	372,341	389,320	-62.32%	-7.34%	1.64%
Hispanic	676,432	400,086	318,103	303,707	-55.10%	-14.25%	-2.13%
Other***	77,990	89,567	231,221	170,356	118.43%	103.59%	-78.04%
Total	6,483,424	3,608,117	3,436,077	2,453,520	-62.16%	-17.81%	-15.15%
<b>VICTIMIZATION RATE (per 1,000 people)</b>							
White	11.23	6.23	5.74	3.61	-67.83%	-23.27%	-18.93%
Black	14.97	6.23	4.484	4.61	-69.19%	-10.78%	-1.49%
Hispanic	13.80	6.59	3.98	3.19	-76.91%	-24.66%	-5.72%
Other***	3.98	3.81	6.55	4.01	0.74%	4.95%	-63.88%
Total	11.67	6.17	5.45	3.71	-68.25%	-21.11%	-14.97%
<b>PREVALENCE RATE (% of population)</b>							
White	0.32%	0.24%	0.16%	0.14%	-55.39%	-30.54%	-7.13%
Black	0.52%	0.27%	0.21%	0.24%	-54.25%	-6.54%	5.18%
Hispanic	0.34%	0.24%	0.16%	0.17%	-50.90%	-23.29%	0.21%
Other***	0.15%	0.13%	0.16%	0.16%	4.12%	17.33%	-0.70%
Total	0.34%	0.24%	0.17%	0.16%	-53.18%	-23.84%	-3.36%

*Notes:* Table provided by Professor Richard Lee Rogers and used with permission. \*2006 excluded due to methodological issues.

\*\*defined as  $(t_2-t_1)/t_1 \times 100$ . \*\*\*Other is a residual category and its change rates should not be used for comparative purposes.

Table 2  
*Estimates of Prevalence of Intimate Partner Violence among Women*

Survey	Conducted	Age	All Women	By Race/Ethnicity	Sources
National Crime Victimization Survey	2010	12 years of age and older	12-Month: 0.16%	White: 0.14% Black: 0.24% Hispanic: 0.17% Other: 0.16%	Table 1
National Violence Against Women Survey	1995-1996	18 years of age and older	Lifetime: 25.5% 12-Month: 1.8%	Lifetime rates only White: 24.8% African American: 29.1% Asian/Pacific Islander: 15.0% Nat. Amer./Alaskan: 37.5% Mixed Race: 30.2%	Tjaden & Thoennes (2000a)
National Intimate Partner & Sexual Violence Survey	2010		12-month rates Rape: 1.1% Other: 5.6%	White: 30.5% Black 41.2% Hispanic: 29.7% Asian/Pac. Islldr: 15.3% Nat. Amer/Alaska: 51.7%	Black, Basile, Breiding, Smith, Walters, et al., 2011

Table 3  
*Frequency Distributions*

	Unweighted		Weighted	
	N	%	N	%
Intimate Partner Violence	976,234	100%	779,722	100%
Yes	1,191	1%	1,272	1%
No	975,043	99%	778,450	99%
Race/Ethnicity	976,234	100%	779,722	100%
White	670,378	69%	529,746	68%
Black	116,303	12%	97,319	13%
Hispanic	129,574	13%	105,709	14%
Other	59,979	6%	46,948	6%
Income	651,189	100%	530,777	100%
<25K	162,294	25%	162,294	26%
25K-49K	154,689	24%	154,689	24%
50K-74K	126,565	19%	126,565	19%
75K or more	207,641	32%	207,641	32%
Education	944,466	100%	762,820	100%
<HS	217,801	23%	175,027	23%
HS Grad	513,470	54%	404,496	53%
College Grad	213,195	23%	183,096	24%
Marital Status	965,884	100%	772,984	100%
Never Married	288,004	30%	234,682	30%
Ever Married	667,880	70%	538,302	70%
Period	976,234	100%	779,722	100%
2003-2008	382,612	39%	380,148	49%
2009-2013	593,622	61%	399,574	51%

Table 4  
*Results for Logistic Regression*

	Unadjusted (1)	Adjusted (2)	Adjusted 2003-2008 (3)	Adjusted 2009-2013 (4)
<b>Race/Ethnicity (ref=White)</b>				
Black	1.47 (1.24-1.73)*	1.01 (0.82-1.25)	1.02 (0.76-1.38)	1.00 (0.75-1.34)
Hispanic	1.08 (0.91-1.29)	0.83 (0.66-1.04)	0.77 (0.56-1.08)	0.88 (0.64-1.20)
Other	1.05 (0.81-1.36)	0.84 (0.60-1.17)	0.64 (0.37-1.11)	1.02 (0.67-1.56)
<b>Household Income (ref=&lt;25K)</b>				
25K-49K	0.42 (0.35-0.50)***	0.43 (0.36-0.52)**	0.50 (0.38-0.64)***	0.37 (0.28-0.48)***
50K-74K	0.26 (0.20-0.33)***	0.28 (0.22-0.36)***	0.30 (0.21-0.43)***	0.26 (0.18-0.37)***
75K or more	0.20 (0.16-0.25)***	0.24 (0.19-0.30)***	0.26 (0.19-.36)***	0.22 (0.16-0.31)***
<b>Education (ref=&lt;HS)</b>				
HS graduate	1.50 (1.29-1.76)***	1.93 (1.58-2.36)***	1.63 (1.24-2.16)**	2.32 (1.73-3.10)***
College graduate	0.57 (0.46-0.71)***	0.99 (0.75-1.31)	0.90 (0.60-1.34)	1.11 (0.74-1.64)
Never married	1.67 (1.48-1.88)***	1.61 (1.37-1.88)***	1.54 (1.23-1.94)***	1.66 (1.34-2.07)***
Period	0.93 (0.83-1.05)	1.00 (0.87-1.15)		

*Note:* \* p< .05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001



Appendix A  
*NCVS Violent Crimes (V4529)*

---

V4539	Description
01	Completed rape
02	Attempted rape
03	Sexual attack with serious assault
04	Sexual attack with minor assault
05	Completed robbery with injury from serious assault
06	Completed robbery with injury from minor assault
07	Completed robbery without injury from minor assault
08	Attempted robbery with injury from serious assault
09	Attempted robbery with injury from minor assault
10	Attempted robbery without injury
11	Completed aggravated assault with injury
12	Attempted aggravated assault with weapon
13	Threatened assault with weapon
14	Simple assault completed with injury
15	Sexual assault without injury
16	Unwanted sexual contact without force
17	Assault without weapon without injury
18	Verbal threat of rape
19	Verbal threat of sexual assault
20	Verbal threat of assault

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics (2016)

---



November 11, 2016

Dr. Richard Lee Rogers, Principal Investigator  
Ms. Jennifer Johnson, Co-investigator  
Department of Criminal Justice & Forensic Sciences  
UNIVERSITY

RE: HSRC Protocol Number: 056-2017  
Title: Characteristics of Intimate Partner Violence: Implications on Victimization and  
Prevalence Rates

Dear Dr. Rogers and Ms. Johnson:

The Institutional Review Board has reviewed the abovementioned protocol and determined that it is exempt from full committee review based on a DHHS Category 4 exemption.

Any changes in your research activity should be promptly reported to the Institutional Review Board and may not be initiated without IRB approval except where necessary to eliminate hazard to human subjects. Any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects should also be promptly reported to the IRB.

The IRB would like to extend its best wishes to you in the conduct of this study.

Sincerely,

Mr. Michael A. Hripko  
Associate Vice President for Research  
Authorized Institutional Official

MAH:cc

c: Attorney Patricia Wagner, Chair  
Department of Criminal Justice & Forensic Sciences

