

2021

## Dynamics of Male-on-Male Penetrative Sexual Assaults in the United States Army

Nicole Cunningham  
*Walden University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

---

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu](mailto:ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu).

# Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Nicole Cunningham

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,  
and that any and all revisions required by  
the review committee have been made.

## Review Committee

Dr. Eric Hickey, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty

Dr. Edward Keane, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty

Dr. Stephen Hampe, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost  
Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University  
2020

Abstract

Dynamics of Male-on-Male Penetrative Sexual Assaults in the United States Army

by

Nicole Cunningham

MS Criminal Justice, Tiffin University, 2011

BA Criminal Justice, BA Psychology, Columbia College, 2008

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Forensic Psychology

Walden University

February 2020

## Abstract

Male-on-male sexual assaults are a challenge for prevention and response personnel, law enforcement, and the military justice system. Limited research has been conducted on the military sex offender population, and none has been done specifically on military male-on-male assaults resulting in a gap in the research on offenders, what factors make their victims vulnerable, and the situational dynamics of the assaults. In this quantitative exploratory study, 171 cases of penetrative male-on-male sexual assaults were examined through the lens of the routine activity theory. The results of this exploration found that both victims and offenders were most likely to be 18-24 years old, active duty, combat soldiers, White, single, social acquaintances, or friends, had a relationship of at least one month, and involved alcohol use. Most victims were in the rank of E1-E3 and heterosexual, and most offenders were E4-E6 and bisexual or homosexual. Most assaults took place within the offender's home, on a Saturday, between the hours of midnight and six a.m., involved a con method of approach, and involved offender to victim fellatio. Law enforcement notification was made through victim reporting and 58% of reports were within one week of the assault. In 71.9% of the cases, the offender consented to an interview resulting in confessions in 55.6% of the cases. In 81.9% of the cases, at least one type of evidence was available. Offenders were punished in 78.9% cases, with a conviction in a court-martial for their sexual crime being the most common case outcome. As a result of this research, prevention and response programs could be better tailored to male victims and enhanced investigative and prosecution methods could be developed leading to positive social change.

Dynamics of Male-on-Male Penetrative Sexual Assaults in the United States Army

by

Nicole Cunningham

MS Criminal Justice, Tiffin University, 2011

BA Criminal Justice, BA Psychology, Columbia College, 2008

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Forensic Psychology

Walden University

February 2020

## Dedication

First and foremost, this work is dedicated to the male victims of sexual violence. I hope by bringing light to your experiences, you can be content in the knowledge that someone does care, someone does support you, and you are important.

Second, I would like to dedicate this to the men and women of the US Army CID community and those who educate them. Your work and dedication to the truth and finding justice is amazing. I hope that this information brings you more tools for your toolbox. Remember- understanding behavior does not excuse behavior, but I hope you now have a little more understanding.

And finally, I dedicate this work to my children. You four are my inspiration and drive behind so much that I do. Scott, Ty, Brock, and Ashley, I love you all...now go forth and do great things!

## Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge my family, friends and co-workers who put up with me bouncing ideas and theories off them, and my ever flowing “hey, what do you think about this?” line of questioning. Thank you all for keeping me sane.

To my boss and friend, Donna. Thank you so much for being my support, my rock, my encouragement, and my sounding board. And thank you for believing in me.

Finally, to my chair, Dr. Hickey. Thank you for welcoming me to the Darkside.

## Table of Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| List of Tables .....                               | v  |
| Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....          | 1  |
| Background.....                                    | 2  |
| Problem Statement.....                             | 7  |
| Purpose of the Study .....                         | 8  |
| Research Questions.....                            | 9  |
| Theoretical Foundation .....                       | 10 |
| Nature of the Study .....                          | 12 |
| Definitions.....                                   | 14 |
| Assumptions.....                                   | 16 |
| Scope and Delimitations .....                      | 17 |
| Limitations .....                                  | 18 |
| Significance of the Study .....                    | 19 |
| Significance to Theory .....                       | 19 |
| Significance to Practice.....                      | 19 |
| Significance to Social Change .....                | 20 |
| Summary and Transition.....                        | 21 |
| Chapter 2: Literature Review.....                  | 22 |
| Literature Search Strategy.....                    | 23 |
| Theoretical Foundation .....                       | 25 |
| Literature Review: Key Variables and Concepts..... | 28 |



|  |    |
|--|----|
| Military Offender Demographics.....  | 28 |
| Offender Personality and Development.....                                  | 31 |
| Male Victims and Military Culture.....                                     | 33 |
| Male Rape Myths, Biases, and the Impact on Victims and Case Outcomes ..... | 36 |
| Victim Vulnerability Factors .....   | 39 |
| Known Data on Military Sexual Assault Situational Characteristics .....    | 41 |
| Victim Selection Patterns and Motivational Factors .....                   | 45 |
| Information Needed for Proper Investigation and Interviewing.....          | 49 |
| Gaps in Literature .....   | 51 |
| Summary and Conclusions .....  | 51 |
| Chapter 3: Research Method.....  | 53 |
| Research Design and Rationale .....  | 54 |
| Methodology.....   | 58 |
| Population .....   | 58 |
| Sampling and Sampling Procedures .....                                     | 58 |
| Archival Data.....   | 59 |
| Instrumentation and Operationalization of Constructs .....                 | 60 |
| Variable Definitions and Sources .....                                     | 61 |
| Data Analysis Plan.....  | 65 |
| Research Questions.....  | 66 |
| Threats to Validity .....  | 66 |
| Ethical Procedures .....   | 68 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Summary .....  | 69  |
| Chapter 4: Results .....                               | 71  |
| Data Collection .....                                  | 72  |
| Study Results .....                                    | 74  |
| Offender and Victim Dynamics .....                     | 74  |
| Assault Situational Dynamics .....                     | 78  |
| Law Enforcement Response and Evidence Identified ..... | 85  |
| Case Outcomes.....                                     | 88  |
| Summary .....  | 88  |
| Chapter 5: Discussion .....                            | 90  |
| Interpretation of Findings .....                       | 91  |
| Motivated Offenders and Suitable Victims.....          | 91  |
| Levels of Violence and Cognitive Distortions.....      | 92  |
| Victim Selection and Cognitive Distortions .....       | 94  |
| Victim Reactions and Cognitive Distortions .....       | 95  |
| Criminal Behavior.....                                 | 98  |
| Paraphilic Behavior and Fantasy .....                  | 100 |
| Effects of Don't Ask, Don't Tell .....                 | 101 |
| Lack of Guardianship.....                              | 102 |
| Limitations of the Study.....                          | 103 |
| Recommendations.....                                   | 104 |
| Implications.....                                      | 107 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Implications for Social Change.....                 | 107 |
| Implications for Practice .....                     | 108 |
| Conclusions.....                                    | 109 |
| References.....                                     | 110 |
| Appendix A: Military Occupational Specialties ..... | 127 |
| Appendix B: Variable Coding .....                   | 131 |

## List of Tables

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Table 1_ Research Question 1, Variable and Levels of Measurement .....       | 56 |
| Table 2_ Research Question 2, Variables and Levels of Measurements .....     | 56 |
| Table 3_ Research Question 3, Variables and Levels of Measurements .....     | 57 |
| Table 4_ Victim and Offender Demographics .....                              | 73 |
| Table 5_ Age Ranges of Victims and Offenders.....                            | 75 |
| Table 6_ Race of Victims and Offenders .....                                 | 75 |
| Table 7_ Relationship Status of Victims and Offenders .....                  | 75 |
| Table 8_ Military Occupational Specialties of Victims and Offenders .....    | 76 |
| Table 9_ Identified Sexual Orientation of Victims and Offenders .....        | 77 |
| Table 10_ Rank of Victims and Offenders.....                                 | 77 |
| Table 11_ Type and Length of Relationship Between Victims and Offenders..... | 78 |
| Table 12_ Assault Location, Time, and Date.....                              | 79 |
| Table 13_ Alcohol and/or Drug Use by Victims and Offenders.....              | 81 |
| Table 14_ Offender's Control of The Victim During Assault .....              | 82 |
| Table 15_ Offender's Control of the Victim Based on Sexual Orientation ..... | 83 |
| Table 16_ Victim Response During Assault .....                               | 84 |
| Table 17_ Sexual Act(s) Committed During Assault.....                        | 85 |
| Table 18_ Time to Disclosure to Law Enforcement .....                        | 86 |
| Table 19_ Initial Law Enforcement Notification Method.....                   | 86 |
| Table 20_ Victim Participation in Investigation and Prosecution.....         | 87 |

## Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Male-on-male sexual assaults have garnered very little attention from researchers outside of correctional or homosexual populations (Greathouse et al., 2015). However, in nationwide surveys it has been shown that as many as one out of 33, or 2.78 million men, have been a victim of a rape or attempted rape within their lifetime, highlighting that this is a problem that should be addressed (RAINN.org, 2019). The lack of research is especially true regarding male victims who serve in the United States military. Each year, approximately 13% of the male military population are subject to some form of sexual violence ranging from abusive sexual contacts to rape, often by another male (Ferdinando, 2019; Greathouse et al., 2015; United States Department of Defense, 2018). This is a large segment of the civilian and military population that has undergone sexual trauma about which very little is known. Those who offend against this population are even less researched (O'Toole et al., 2014). In an effort to contribute to the advancement of knowledge within the sexual assault field, promote the development of proper prevention and response programs, investigative techniques, and, potentially, sex offender treatment programs, this research was conducted to explore the offender characteristics, victim characteristics, and offense dynamics, to better understand male-on-male sexual assaults.

This chapter considers the background of this issue and how research on male-on-male sexual assaults is still in its infancy. The problem and purpose statement, the research questions that were explored, the conceptual framework, and the nature of the

study, are also discussed. Additionally, it defines the limitations, assumptions, and the population sample scope for the research completed.

### **Background**

In 1991, the United States Navy “Tailhook” scandal hit the news media and began to shine the light on the depth of the problem of sexual violence within the United States military (Lee, 2014; Street et al., 2018; Warner & Armstrong, 2020). However, little was done to halt the incidents of assaults that continued to overwhelm the military system including the 1996 incidents at Aberdeen Proving Grounds and the U.S. Air Force Academy cases in the early 2000s (Lee, 2014). It was at this time that the public began to push Congress to change the military’s response to sexual violence within its ranks (Lee, 2014; Warner & Armstrong, 2020). In 2004 and 2005, the military reformed how they responded to sexual assaults by standing up the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program (SAPR) which changed the way that the services responded to victims (Lee, 2014). Victims were offered the option of reporting their assaults using restricted or unrestricted options, and victim advocacy services were begun to assist survivors of assaults throughout the process, including providing mental health and medical services (Lee, 2014).

Further advancing these programs in 2013 was the implementation of the Special Victims Counsel (SVC) position among the Judge Advocate Corps (Lee, 2014). SVCs provide an imperative service to victims of sexual assault by serving as their personal attorney, assisting them in navigating the criminal justice system, as well as advising them on negative outcomes of reporting such as collateral misconduct charges for crimes

such as adultery or underage drinking (Brady, 2016; Lee, 2014). This was an important step in the process of encouraging victims to come forward by removing barriers to reporting due to fear of the victim being charged themselves for any actions during the incident (Matthews et al., 2018; O'Toole et al., 2014; Warner & Armstrong, 2020).

Military sexual offenses have been the subject of research since the outcry of the military's handling of these cases as far back as 1991 (Greathouse et al., 2015). However, much is left to be explored on this topic, specifically when it comes to male victims (Castro et al., 2015; Greathouse et al., 2015; Miller et al., 2018; O'Brien et al., 2015). As a response to the rate of sexual assaults within the United States military, the United States Army has begun a robust campaign to improve identification and tracking of male victims of sexual assaults as well as improve its investigation and prosecution policies (United States Department of Defense, 2018). An annual report is provided to the United States Congress regarding what steps have been taken, how each military branch is addressing the cases which are reported, as well as the statistical data for the prior fiscal year (United States Department of Defense, 2018). Unfortunately, the reports provided simply show basic demographic data and do not address the offender's psychosocial and behavioral dynamic factors which may have implications for prevention and investigation techniques (United States Department of Defense, 2018).

Many civilian researchers have also reported on the topic of sexual assault within the military. For instance, Miller et al. (2018) conducted a systematic case review of sexual assault reports and court-martial records from the United States Air Force during 2012 and 2013. Specifically, the authors attempted to explore the offender demographics,

characteristics, and behaviors, the victim-offender relationship, victimology, and the settings of these assaults (Miller et al., 2018). Unfortunately, the authors did not focus on cases of male-on-male assaults, and those dynamics were only briefly mentioned due to the low numbers reported of assaults on males (Miller et al., 2018). This is an ongoing issue with research conducted within the civilian and military systems, especially when gathering information on male-on-male penetrative assaults (O'Brien et al., 2015; O'Toole et al., 2014; Warner & Armstrong, 2020).

Male-on-male offenders have also been the subject of other limited research in the past, but none has been done specifically on military offenders of male-on-male sexual assault beyond basic demographic reporting (Greathouse et al., 2015; O'Toole et al., 2014). One of the biggest hurdles in exploring male-on-male sexual assault in the military is the aftereffects caused by the military's history of barring homosexuals as well as the implementation and subsequent repeal in 2011 of Don't Ask, Don't Tell (DADT; Department of Defense Directive 1304.26, 1993; O'Brien et al., 2015). This unique barrier in the military environment may have had an impact on the number of male victims willing to come forward out of fear they would be labeled a homosexual and therefore separated from the service (Castro et al., 2015; Greathouse et al., 2015; O'Brien et al., 2015; Warner & Armstrong, 2020).

Castro et al. (2015), O'Brien et al., (2015), and Warner and Armstrong (2020), expanded this in their research to state that male rape myths, as well as the military environment and culture itself, may lead to assaults. Further noted, is that due to the lack of information regarding male victimization and those who offend against them within



the military system, the prevention and response systems are not set up to deal with this population, and may impact sentencing decisions (Castro et al., 2015; O'Brien et al., 2015; Warner & Armstrong, 2020).

Victimology and the offender's perceived victim roles in criminal narratives are "particularly important in our understanding of violent and sexual crimes" (Canter & Youngs, 2009, p 135). These roles can play heavily into the investigative interviews of the offenders as well as the development of prevention programs in the military. Understanding how the victim is perceived by the offender and gathering victim characteristics is a first step in conducting effective investigations. It has also been recommended that future research should be pursued regarding how military culture can affect the development of the military offender population, how this culture influences the behavior of male-on-male sexual offenders and their sentencing outcomes, and the specific male victim dynamics which may have not been explored due to military perceptions of homosexuals and male victims' fear of being separated from the service (Castro et al., 2015; Miller et al., 2018; Schaffer & Zarilla, 2018; Warner & Armstrong, 2020).

Additionally, one issue that has developed since the focus on military sexual assaults started, is that there has been a perceived erosion of the due process rights of those who have been accused of sexual violence (Brady, 2016). This has been noted specifically in cases which involve alcohol use by the victim and the misinterpretation of the laws by the general service member population, in particular, that those who were under the influence of alcohol could not consent to sexual conduct (Brady, 2016; Miller

et al., 2018; Warner & Armstrong, 2020). This is an important factor in male-on-male sexual assaults which have reported that the rates of male victims who are under the influence of alcohol or drugs are significantly higher in these assaults (Greathouse et al., 2015; Ioannou et al., 2017). It would be appropriate for future research to explore whether alcohol is truly a factor in the adjudication outcomes of these cases to better educate those who may serve as panel members as a way to protect both victims and offenders (Brady, 2016; Greathouse et al., 2015; Miller et al., 2018; Warner & Armstrong, 2020).

In a 2019 report, the United States Department of Defense (2019b) stated that to combat sexual assaults within the military, a comprehensive approach is needed including research incorporating the, "...factors that contribute to sexual assault and its prevention" (p. 6). This would include exploring risk and protective factors for potential victims and a greater understanding of the offender and military cultural influences on these crimes, which my study intends to address (United States Department of Defense, 2019b).

Since the crime of male-on-male sexual assault in the military is understudied, further research surrounding the offender characteristics of those who commit these assaults, male victim characteristics, and the differences between male and female sexual violence should be explored for specific similarities and differences in order to inform those who encounter these cases (Miller et al., 2018). Victimology and the offender's perceived victim roles in criminal narratives are "particularly important in our understanding of violent and sexual crimes" (Canter & Youngs, 2009, p 135). These roles can play heavily into the investigative interviews of the offenders as well as the

development of prevention programs in the military. Assessing how the victim is perceived by the offender and gathering victim variables is a first step in understanding patterns in male-on-male sexual assault in the military.

An understanding of this crime could help to advise and educate those in the criminal justice system on some of the misconceptions surrounding male sexual victimization and correctly inform policy and law on sexual violence in the military. By using a quantitative approach employing the tenets of the routine activity theory (RAT), the theory to policy gap could be overcome, resulting in enhanced investigations, prevention, and response abilities of those entities that serve this victim population (Pratt & Turanovic, 2016).

### **Problem Statement**

Male-on-male sexual assaults are one of the most underreported and understudied areas of sexual crime investigations (Ioannou et al., 2017; Lowe & Rogers, 2017; O'Brien et al., 2015; Warner & Armstrong, 2020). Although there is a budding growth in the research of adult male victimization, very few studies have attempted to address the offender dynamics of these crimes outside of a prison and institutional environments (Greathouse et al., 2015; Ioannou et al., 2017). Noteworthy myths surrounding the offenders and male victims in these crimes abound, leaving a dearth of information on these offenders and limiting our understanding (Ioannou et al., 2017; Javid, 2018; Lowe & Rogers, 2017; Turchik et al., 2015).

Additionally, many studies that have reported on offender dynamics, have relied upon the victim reporting these details which leaves the information potentially

questionable and likely incomplete (Duchesne et al., 2018; Ioannou et al., 2017; Javid, 2018). Furthermore, there is a gap in the research regarding the relationship between offender behaviors and characteristics which could assist law enforcement with interview and investigation strategies (Beauregard et al., 2017; Lin & Simon, 2016; Lundrigan & Mueller-Johnson, 2013).

Although limited research has been conducted on the military population, there is a gap in the research on male-on-male offenders. Specifically, who the victims are, what factors make them vulnerable, and the situational dynamics of the assaults. These areas have been overlooked and understudied, particularly when it comes to more violent and penetrative assaults (Castro et al., 2015; Miller et al., 2018).

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this exploratory quantitative research study was to investigate and explore the dynamics of male-on-male penetrative sexual assaults in the United States Army. Since military law enforcement is required to fully investigate all sexual assaults reported to them thoroughly, these cases provided a plethora of data for research about offender, victim, and situational dynamics of male-on-male assaults.

The variables examined included victim-offender relationship, length of the relationship, the specific sexual crime committed, nonsexual crimes discovered through the investigation, alcohol or drug use by either victim or offender during the incident, the evidence identified such as medical, electronic, or forensic evidence, demographics of the victim and offender including age, rank, military occupational specialty (MOS), deployment history of the offender, and the identified sexual orientation of those

involved. Additionally, location, time, and circumstances of the assault were explored including the presence of paraphilia, fantasy reenactment, the use of weapons or physical force, violence involvement, and grooming or stalking behaviors identified, were determined through the data collection.

Subsequent analysis of these variables provided insight into the phenomenon of male-on-male assaults and allowed for relationship patterns and themes to emerge. It further allowed for the identification of outliers and anomalies and an exploration of hypothesis development for future research.

### **Research Questions**

Quantitative Research Question 1: What are the characteristics of offenders in male-on-male sexual assaults in the United States Army?

Quantitative Research Question 2: What are the characteristics of victims in male-on-male sexual assaults in the United States Army?

Quantitative Research Question 3: What situational factors characterize male-on-male sexual assaults in the United States Army?

Male-on-male offenders were explored through analysis of their age, race, relationship status at the time of the assault, identified sexual orientation, rank, military occupational specialty, deployment history, service component, and known prior criminal offenses. Characteristics of victims of these assaults were explored through analysis of their age, race, relationship status at the time of the assault, identified sexual orientation, rank, military occupational specialty, and service component.

Since little is known about the situational dynamics of the assaults, this area encompassed the largest number of variables including:

- Length and type of relationship between victim and offender
- Alcohol or drug use of either the victim or offender at the time of the assault
- Case year, day, time, and location specifics of the assault
- Victim or offender injuries found
- Evidence recovered or removed from the scene
- Harassment, threats, force and/or violence used both during and after the assault
- Crimes committed during the assault
- Offender's actions before, during, and after the assault
- Law enforcement notification and response
- Case outcome

### **Theoretical Foundation**

For this study, the offender dynamics and behaviors, victim dynamics and behaviors, as well as the crime scene dynamics, were explored through the lens of the routine activity theory (RAT; Cohen & Felson, 1979). This theory proposes that there are three components that must converge for a crime to take place (Cohen & Felson, 1979). The first is the motivated offender, which is an individual who has both the inclinations as well as the ability to carry out a criminal act (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Second, a suitable target is defined as a person, a location, or an item that is considered by the offender to be vulnerable in some way (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Finally, there must be a

lack of a capable guardian in place to deter the offender from committing a crime (Cohen & Felson, 1979). This can a person, such as a law enforcement officer, or a system put in place to prevent the crime, such as a surveillance system (Cohen & Felson, 1979). The theory states that if one of the three components are missing, then the crime cannot take place (Cohen & Felson, 1979).

The foundational basis of the RAT is that “social structure produces this convergence, hence allowing illegal activities to feed upon the legal activities of everyday life” (Cohen & Felson, 1979, p 588). These activities are recurrent and everyday activities that people engage in and can occur while an individual is in their own home, when they are at their job, or in other routine activities away from home such as shopping or going out for an evening dinner (Cohen & Felson, 1979).

This theory has been noted as exceptionally appropriate for studies of sexual violence and has been used as a framework for researching male-to-female violence, female-to-male violence, and same-gender violence (Turchik et al., 2015). The RAT does not require that gender be identified for the perpetrator, nor the victim, since all that is required is a motivated offender, a suitable target (victim), and the lack of a capable guardian (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Turchik et al., 2015).

This theory also enables exploration into the target selection methods and patterns of offenders by assessing victim and situational characteristics that allow for offending to take place by exploring not the “why”, but the “how” of sexual offense crimes (Beauregard et al., 2010). Since offenders perpetrate their crimes within the context of situational factors, linking the RAT to sexual offenses in a more concrete way can

educate investigators on interviewing and interrogation techniques, and improved prevention and response methods (Beauregard et al., 2017; Farmer et al., 2016).

Use of the RAT ensured proper alignment with the purpose statement, as well as the research questions because this study was designed to explore these dynamics in an effort to provide prevention, intervention, and investigation techniques that were informed through a better understanding of the victim, offender, and crime itself. Further explanation of the RAT will be conducted in Chapter 2.

### **Nature of the Study**

This quantitative study explored the three research questions to identify patterns, develop an emergent theory of the data discovered, and spark possible hypotheses for further study. It also explored how the relationship between male offenders, male victims, and crime scene dynamics in male-on-male sexual assaults, may have affected the legal outcomes of the case (Darke et al., 1998; Eisenhardt, 1989; Kohlbacher, 2006; Shareia, 2016; Zainal, 2007).

The variables included the type of relationship, length of the relationship, the specific sexual crime(s) committed, nonsexual crimes discovered through the investigation, alcohol or drug use by either victim or offender during the incident, the evidence identified such as medical, electronic, or forensic evidence, demographics of the victim and subject including age, rank, MOS, deployment history of the offender, and the identified sexual orientation of those involved. The location, time, and circumstances of the assault were recorded including paraphilia or fantasy enactments, weapons, force, or



violence involvement, grooming or stalking behaviors identified, and case outcomes were included.

Properly interpreting and evaluating these findings is important for those using the research for possible social change and future policy and program formations (Barr et al., 2013). The intended results of this study were translations of this research into practice such as evidence-based interventions and prevention methods, policy alignment, and enhanced investigation and prosecution techniques (Burkholder et al., 2016). Furthermore, the results allowed the opportunity to educate individuals on a better response to male victims and improved operational readiness within the United States Army (Burkholder et al., 2016).

Collection of this data was based on a modified version of the IC-SOS: Phase 2 Presentence Investigation Report (PIR) Data Codebook, which was developed for use by the Federal Bureau of Investigations Behavioral Analysis Unit, the Federal Bureau of Investigations Internet and Cyber Crime Unit, the United States District Court, and Florida's Center for Applied Criminal Cases Analysis for research conducted on United States Indian Reservations (Jones et al., 2015). The developers used this instrument to gather both qualitative and quantitative data of violent offenders and their crimes through exploratory research (Jones et al., 2015). However, since this instrument was used for a specific population of Native American offenders, some variables did not apply to the military population under research.

Additionally, specific military factors were explored that were not included in Jones et al.'s measurement instrument. Factors such as the rank of the individuals, the

inherent trust between military members, male-dominated career fields, collateral misconduct crimes, close living, and work environments, and being in a deployed location, can influence reporting, investigations, and prosecution decisions (Miller et al., 2018; Warner & Armstrong, 2020). For those variables, research and coding themes from Miller et al. (2018) were added. Finally, Hazelwood and Burgess' (2009) research and identification of specific offender traits were also included to provide a thorough picture of offender actions that afforded a better understanding of their motivations and behaviors during the commission of the crime.

### **Definitions**

The following list of definitions are terms that are used throughout this study. Further definitions will be included in Chapter 3 for additional clarification of variables.

*Aggravated sexual contact*: an act which causes sexual contact upon or by another person if doing that act would have violated Article 120(a), Rape, had the sexual contact been a sexual act (Article 120(c), United States Government, 2019, p. IV-84).

*Force*: the use of a weapon, or the use of such physical strength or violence sufficient to overcome, restrain, or injure a person, or inflicting harm sufficient enough to compel a person to relent or submit to the act (United States Government, 2019, p. IV-84).

*Military sexual trauma (MST)*: includes acts of sexual assault, rape, aggravated sexual contact, abusive sexual contact, attempts to commit these acts, or repeated threatening sexual harassment that is experienced during military service (Schry et al., 2015).

*Rape*: a sexual act upon another person by using unlawful force, causing or likely to cause death or grievous bodily harm, threatening or placing the person in fear that they may be subject to death, grievous bodily harm, or kidnapping, rendering the person unconscious or by administering to a person by force or threat of force, or without the knowledge or consent of that person, a drug or intoxicant which substantially impairs that person's ability to appraise or control conduct (Article 120(a), United States Government, 2019, p. IV-83).

*Restricted report*: a military reporting option that does not initiate a law enforcement investigation. However, it gives the victim access to mental health services, victim advocacy, and medical services. To maintain a restricted report, the victim may only disclose to a sexual assault response coordinator, a victim advocate, or a healthcare provider (United States Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response, 2019a).

*Sexual act*: the penetration, however slight, of the penis into the vulva, anus, or mouth or the penetration, however slight, of the vulva, mouth, or anus of another by any part of the body or any object, with intent to abuse, humiliate, harass, or degrade that person, or to gratify the sexual desire of any person (United States Government, 2019, p. IV-84).

*Sexual assault*: a sexual act upon another person by threatening or placing that other person in fear, making a fraudulent representation that the act serves a professional purpose, inducing the belief that the person is another person or commits the act on the person without consent, when the person is asleep, unconscious, or otherwise unaware

that the act is occurring, or when the individual cannot consent due to impairment through alcohol or drug use or a mental disease or defect (Article 120(b), United States Government, 2019, p. IV-84)

*Unrestricted report*: a military reporting option that initiates a law enforcement investigation into the incident (United States Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response, 2019b).

### **Assumptions**

The main assumption of this work was that the case files which were reviewed were complete and accurate based upon the presentation of the evidence gathered throughout the investigation. It was believed that these case files were more complete than what is observed within the civilian law enforcement populations because regulations within the military system require all cases of sexual violence to be taken seriously and thoroughly investigated. Agents are taught to approach their investigations with an open mind and with an attitude that they are to seek the truth based upon the evidence given. Additionally, agents are required to be thorough and timely with their investigations, and their case files are subject to Inspector General audits at any time.

Although thoroughness cannot be guaranteed, agents do not have the ability to screen out cases that they do not believe have “merit” based upon the demographics of the victim or offender or the difficulty of the case. The requirements of multiple levels of review and approval for each of these cases provide some level of security that the information contained therein is accurate and complete.

### **Scope and Delimitations**

Limited research has been conducted on cases involving adult male-on-male sexual assault, but as noted, this problem is one that the military faces in bringing sexual assault perpetrators to justice. However, without the research on this population, the crime of male-on-male sexual assault, investigations, prevention, and response programs are at a distinct disadvantage.

As part of its prevention and response efforts, the United States Department of Defense states that in order to appropriately address the extent of this crime within the military, a greater understanding of the magnitude and scope of the problem is needed (United States Department of Defense, 2019b). Yet, as to date, they have relied upon prevalence surveys and incident reports which only give a cursory account of the problem the military is facing (O'Toole et al., 2014; United States Department of Defense, 2019b; Warner & Armstrong, 2020). At present, there has been no drill-down conducted of the data to determine and understand with granularity what factors are common to the cases underlying the prevalence and incident reports.

The target population for this research study were victims and offenders involved in male-on-male sexual crimes. The sample population was drawn from investigative case files of the United States Army Criminal Investigative Division (CID). These files included only cases that were reported to Army CID investigators and found to contain enough evidence about the crime to refer the case to a court-martial. Cases that involved female victims or offenders, or any individuals under the age of 18, were excluded. Case files that included male-on-male penetrative sexual assaults (oral, anal, or made to

penetrate assaults) or aggravated sexual contacts, where the case has been referred for charges were reviewed. Data included the fiscal years 2009-2019 to gather a significant sample size to explore.

Due to its exploratory nature, the findings of this study are generalizable only to other male-on-male sexual assaults within similar contexts such as other military and paramilitary organizations. However, due to the limited amount of cases for review, caution should be used when applying to other populations.

### **Limitations**

Permission and access to the investigation files were granted by the appropriate entities within the United States Army, Command CID. A limitation of this research was that the data gathered is restricted to what was included in the case files. However, this was mitigated to some extent by only including cases that were referred for charges and therefore, contain enough case information to determine probable cause that a crime was committed.

Another limitation included the lack of cases that met the criteria for study inclusion. Male-on-male sexual assault is one of the most underreported crimes and this study relied upon those who have come forward and made an unrestricted report to law enforcement. To combat this, the strategy used for this sample collection was a total-population sample over multiple fiscal years. Nonprobability sampling can run a higher risk of bias within the results (Center for Innovation in Research and Teaching, n.d.), and although this sampling design is not ideal, there are very few cases that fall into the inclusion criteria, so this strategy was the best option.

## **Significance of the Study**

### **Significance to Theory**

Varied avenues of research are associated with the general topic of sexual crimes including the rates of reporting, why victims do not report, the offender dynamics of these assaults, and prevention methods which could be implemented by the services to reduce the numbers of sexual assaults (Turchik et al., 2015). However, through preliminary research on the topic, I found that there is very limited research on the offender dynamics of adult male-on-male penetrative assaults and none was found within the military-specific literature beyond demographic information (Javid, 2018; Miller et al., 2018; O'Toole et al., 2014).

I made contributions to theory and practice by exploring the dynamics of these cases through the lens of an exploratory analysis of the crimes, specifically, what was found by looking at how, when, and why the offender chose their particular victim and what situational dynamics were in play for the assault to take place. Finally, this study was an important first step for a full exploration of male-on-male assaults that will allow for hypothesis development and testing in future research.

### **Significance to Practice**

Through this research, a better understanding of the offender's behaviors and mindset was gathered so military and civilian law enforcement officers can better conduct interview/interrogation techniques and investigation activities. Not having information about this population, or their crimes make it very difficult to properly train investigators on how to conduct these investigations or interview the subjects. Adult males are

victimized at higher rates than what is reported, and even when they are reported, the victim is often not taken seriously. Furthermore, this population of offenders has a tremendous amount of information to teach us regarding sex offenders. How they chose their victims, how they operate, new typologies, and currently unknown variables connected to assault, are all information that needs to be explored and documented.

Finally, knowing about these offenders and their victims provides better prevention methods. Currently, most prevention programs are developed with female victims in mind, and it often leaves males with a false sense of security and little resources when the crime does happen to them (Castro et al., 2015; Hines et al., 2012). Education and prevention methods need to be improved so that all service members are aware of risk factors for potential victimization to keep themselves safe.

### **Significance to Social Change**

There are many different definitions of social change including “the process of transforming patterns of thought, behavior, social relationships, institutions, and social structure to generate beneficial outcomes for individuals, communities, organizations, society, and/or the environment beyond the benefits for the instigators of such transformations” (Stephan et al., 2015, p. 1252). Another is prosocial behavior such as solidarity, cooperation, helping behavior, and altruism that is geared towards assisting those who are at a disadvantage (Thomas et al., 2009). Ultimately, social change means being a part of something that makes a difference in people’s lives to improve the world they live in or the circumstances they are experiencing.



Through this research, avenues to educate the potential male victims on ways that they can keep themselves safe and prevent an assault from occurring in the first place can lead to the prevention of future assaults. Additionally, through an understanding of the unique barriers and dynamics of these assaults, treatment and response programs are better informed on the specific needs of these victims. Last, by gathering a better understanding of the offenders, earlier detection measures can be proposed, better investigation and interview techniques developed, and improved treatment methods for sexual offenders to reduce recidivism, and other adverse outcomes, can be created and implemented.

### **Summary and Transition**

This chapter has discussed the background of the research proposed including the purpose and problem statement. Additionally, it outlined the nature of the study, the research questions, the conceptual framework used, its scope, and limitations. Chapter 2 will further explore these areas through a thorough review of the literature on the RAT, military subtleties that may contribute to sexual victimization within its ranks, as well as the historical research conducted concerning victims, offenders, and assault dynamics of male-on-male sexual assaults within the military.

## Chapter 2: Literature Review

Adult male-on-male sexual assault is one of the most underreported violent crimes in America, and although the military has a reporting rate of 13%, these cases still pose a challenge for law enforcement, prosecutors, commanders, and victim advocates responsible for responding to this crime (Castro et al., 2015; Davis et al., 2017; Ioannou et al., 2017; Lowe & Rogers, 2017; Miller et al., 2018; United States Department of Defense, 2019a).

Prior research shows that myths surrounding male-on-male sexual assault still abound, and there is a significant gap in the literature regarding specific male offender behavior and characteristics in these acts (Castro et al., 2015; Ioannou et al., 2017; Javid, 2018; Monteith et al., 2019). Little is known about this population and of the studies that have reported on offender dynamics, most have relied upon the victim reporting these details which leaves the information questionable and incomplete (Duchesne et al., 2018; Ioannou et al., 2017; Javid, 2018).

Furthermore, although limited research has been conducted on sexual assaults within the military, there is a gap in the research on male-on-male offenders, who their victims are, what factors make them vulnerable, and the situational dynamics of the assaults. These areas have been overlooked and understudied, specifically when it comes to more violent and penetrative assaults (Castro et al., 2015; Miller et al., 2018).

For the military to be successful in reducing the numbers of sexual assaults within its ranks, it must cease overlooking this population of victims and offenders, and take strides to determine how situational contexts, activities before, during, and after the

assault, and lifestyles of the offender and victims interact to allow this crime to happen (McNeeley, 2015). If left unchecked, military sexual assault, especially those where a male is a victim, can have severe consequences for our nation's service members, the readiness of the unit they are a part of, and the Department of Defense overall (Ashley et al., 2019; Davis et al., 2017; Rosellini et al., 2017; Street et al., 2018; Street et al., 2008).

The purpose of this quantitative research study was to explore the dynamics of male-on-male penetrative sexual assaults in the United States Army. The exploratory design allowed for the development of a greater understanding of these assaults through the discovery of potential themes, trends, and patterns. Since military law enforcement is required to fully and thoroughly investigate all sexual assaults reported to them, these cases provided a plethora of data for research about offender, victim, and situational dynamics of male-on-male assaults.

To begin, this chapter will discuss the theoretical framework of the RAT. Then known military offender dynamics, offender personality development, male victims and the military culture, male rape myths, biases, and victim impacts, victim vulnerability factors, known data on military sexual assault characteristics, victim selection, and offender motivational factors, and information needed for proper investigations will be discussed.

### **Literature Search Strategy**

In an effort to gather the most recent data and research on male-on-male sexual assaults, the Walden University Library, Google Scholar, and relevant online databases were searched for peer-reviewed journal articles dating between 2015 and 2020, using the

keywords *sexual assault, male victims, penetrative assaults, military sexual assault, offender characteristics, military offenders, male-on-male sexual assaults, male-on-male rape, and adult male-on-male sexual assaults*. However, because limited research has been conducted on adult male-on-male offenders, some pertinent articles were included from 2000-2020 regarding this specific offender population.

In addition to the relevant academic databases, military reports were examined regarding sexual assaults through the United States Army Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office (SAPRO) and the RAND Corporation, which has also published reports on military sexual assaults. As articles for the literature review were collected, I reviewed the references section in each to determine if there were additional articles that may be of use to this research. Published books that contained relevant data and information were also encompassed including Hazelwood and Burgess's (2009) *Practical Aspects of Rape Investigations*, Maddan & Pazzani's (2017) *Sex Offenders Crimes and Processing in the Criminal Justice System*, Douglas et al.'s (2011) *Crime Classification Manual*, Youngs's (2013) *Behavioral Analysis of Crime*, and Canter and Youngs's (2009) *Investigative Psychology: Offender Profiling and the Analysis of Criminal Actions*.

Finally, since I approached this study from the RAT perspective, Google Scholar and the Walden library were used to search the keywords *routine activity theory, target congruence, sexual assault, and offender victim relationships*. I also used the Walden dissertation search tools to find dissertations that cover the keywords *sexual assault, rape, routine activities theory, and male-on-male*.

### **Theoretical Foundation**

Cohen and Felson's (1979) RAT is a seminal work that was developed to help experts within the field of criminology explore ways in which crime occurs. Shortly after World War II, those in the field noted a rise in crime rates within the American population and set out to determine what factors were involved in this phenomenon (Cohen & Felson, 1979). As a result of their research, and in an effort to create prevention methods while understanding the dynamics involved, they proposed that crimes do not occur unless three essential elements converge at the same time including a motivated offender, a suitable target, and the absence (or lack) of a capable guardian, as discussed in Chapter 1 (Cohen & Felson, 1979).

As applied to this study, this theory was specifically apt to provide insight into the dynamics of sexual assaults because it not only allowed for a genuine exploration of offenders, victimology and risk, and the situational factors of the crime, but it is also a gender-inclusive look at the cause of sexual violence (Culatta et al., 2017; Pratt, & Turanovic, 2016; Turchik et al., 2015; Wilcox & Cullen, 2018). The RAT allows a crime to be explored by understanding how the offender characteristics, the victimology, and the context in which the crime is committed come together (Canter & Youngs, 2009; Deslauriers-Varin & Beauregard, 2010; Pratt & Turanovic, 2016). McNeeley (2015) had asserted this stating that offenders choose specific places to offend that are familiar and accessible to them and the crimes occur often in places that they encounter during their own routine activity.

In an exploration of appropriate criminological theories to study sexual assault, Turchik et al. (2015), reviewed several biological, psychological, social, and integrated theories to determine which theories were gender-inclusive in their methodological concepts. They found that using a combination of multiple theories, which they termed theory knitting, when researching this population was best practice as an alternative to the strictly male-to-female offending pattern focused research that most practitioners utilize (Turchik et al., 2015). The authors determined that the RAT is generalizable in its inclusiveness of both male and female victims, unlike evolutionary psychology, the feminist theory, and most integrated theories to date which have been very limited in this area (Culatta et al., 2017; Turchik et al., 2015).

This theory is not without criticisms, however. Pratt and Turanovic (2016), noted that since the RAT does not explore the probability of someone becoming a victim, and only focuses on describing the victimization itself, there is a possibility that certain risk factors for victimization are not explored as the theory does not explain which activities pose an elevated risk for offending. However, the RAT is policy development-friendly and, if research is designed correctly around its concepts, it can provide insight into the victimology and behaviors that can reduce the risk for sexual victimization through proper use of guardianship (Pratt & Turanovic, 2016). “An appreciation of how both structural constraints and personal characteristics influence individuals’ self-selection into such risky behaviors which, in turn, increase their likelihood of being victimized” (Pratt & Turanovic, 2016, p 347), is imperative when using the RAT as a theoretical basis in research.

It is believed that the use of the RAT as a framework for this study allowed for a better understanding of what makes these male victims a suitable target for the offenders. For instance, one of the policies of the U.S. Army is that military members, especially in training, are to have a “battle buddy” with them at all times (Miller et al., 2018). Unfortunately, this can place those who are vulnerable to sexual assault in close contact with an offender whom they are supposed to be able to trust (Miller et al., 2018; Silber et al., 2019). Awareness of military relationships and how positions of power enable offenders, the level of trust that military members have for each other, and activities that victims engage in, can help to shape better protective measures and policies (Monteith et al., 2019).

Finally, prevention methods within the United States military have focused on how they can overcome situations that allow for an absence of a capable guardian (Miller et al., 2018; Street et al., 2018). Understanding the situational contexts that these assaults occur within, assists prevention training and methodology to be more effective in protecting possible victims of sexual assault (Street et al., 2018), and using the RAT to explain “how” these crimes occur, versus “why” was appropriate for the alignment of the proposed research questions (Spivak, 2011). This is an imperative component within the Department of Defense’s sexual assault prevention plan, yet the research has not been done in order to fully understand the crimes, the victims and offenders, or the situational contexts to determine which measures could be effective (United States Department of Defense, 2019b). The collected data provided an understanding of how the offender characteristics, the victimology, and the context in which the crime was committed came

together (Canter & Youngs, 2009; Deslauriers-Varin & Beauregard, 2010; Pratt & Turanovic, 2016). This research was not intended to discover the motivations of these offenders, but to expose the dynamics involved to curb their activities within the military environment through proper prevention, investigation, and prosecution techniques.

### **Literature Review: Key Variables and Concepts**

#### **Military Offender Demographics**

Demographically, most known military offenders are married, have less than a college education, are White, within the enlisted ranks, and assault female victims (Greathouse et al., 2015; Rosellini et al., 2017). Miller et al., (2018) reported the most common characteristics in their sample was that the offender-victim relationship was personal, often a friend or intimate partner, not random and occurred on base in private rather than public locations, either at the victim or offender's residence (Miller et al., 2018). Many sexual assaults included penetrative crimes, involved alcohol or drugs, but did not include any sort of physical restraint (Miller et al., 2018). However, this information included cases that were overwhelmingly male-on-female assaults, and the authors did not differentiate if there were any differences with the male-on-male sexual violence due to the low percentages of these cases (Miller et al., 2018).

This is consistent with civilian population studies which state that most male-on-male offenders are found to be White with a heterosexual orientation, are an average age of 25.8 years, and act alone when committing their crimes (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009; Ioannou et al., 2017). Sexually violent crimes most often occur within the victim or offender's home, have some level of physical or verbal violence including threats,



weapons use, or both, and include various sexual acts with the most common being anal penetration or being forced to perform oral sex on the offender (Ioannou et al., 2017; Matthews et al., 2018).

Offenders of sexual crimes tend to have many victims and often are not caught for their offenses. For example, DeLisi et al. (2016) found that of the 34 participants in their study on repeat offending had sexually offended against 148 victims, with a maximum number of sex crime events possibly reaching over 800,000, showing that not only were the offenders serial offenders but that they had a large victim pool. High rates of victims were also shown in the findings of both Lisak and Miller's (2002) and Stander et al.'s (2008) research.

Lisak and Miller (2002) conducted a study on 1,882 men in the university community regarding acts of interpersonal violence to help explore the rates of undetected offenders, meaning those who have never been arrested for a sexual crime. Using the Sexual Experiences Survey, it was found that 120 of the men had committed 439 acts that met the legal definitions of rape (Lisak & Miller, 2002). Seventy-six of the males were serial rapists who averaged 5.8 rapes each (Lisak & Miller, 2002). Additionally, these offenders were also responsible for 3,698 other interpersonal violent acts such as child physical and sexual abuse, intimate partner violence, and battery (Lisak & Miller, 2002).

Specific to the military, Stander et al., (2008) surveyed 5,226 female, and 5,969 male, naval recruits before they left for initial entry training. They found that 13% of the males in the study had perpetrated some sort of sexual violence before joining the

military (Stander et al., 2008). Due to the extensive background checks of recruits before this point, which would have disqualified these men had they been caught and charged with the crimes, they are considered undetected like the offenders in Lisak and Miller's study (2002). The major limitation of both Lisak and Miller (2002) and Stander et al., (2008) is that the results were gathered through self-reported measures which can be inherently unreliable. However, both studies lend to the potential numbers of the offender population and the potential number of victims in the military ranks.

Offenders often have a history of repeated perpetrations of both sexual and nonsexual crimes. In a study looking at 29 military veterans who had been required to register as sex offenders, Schaffer and Zarilla (2018) found that 55% were sexually violent predators and many had a history of convictions for intimate partner violence, been a respondent to a protection order while in the military, and been arrested for a mean of 3.7 crimes each. Offenders reported high drug or alcohol abuse rates and 38% had reported been homeless (Schaffer & Zarilla, 2018). A history of interpersonal violence among offenders was also found by Miller et al. (2018).

Unfortunately, very little research has been conducted on the offenders of male-on-male sexual assaults, and only generalized offender research within the military community has been conducted (Greathouse et al., 2015; Miller et al., 2018; O'Brien et al., 2015; O'Toole et al., 2014; Rosellini et al., 2017). What has been done, was exploratory and leaves gaps within the literature regarding the true prevalence of this crime, the characteristics and behaviors of these offenders as well as the circumstances

surrounding the assaults (Greathouse et al., 2015; Miller et al., 2018; Rosellini et al., 2017).

### **Offender Personality and Development**

As observed in historical research, those in the military tend to have higher rates of negative childhood experiences, such as physical or sexual abuse, and often join the military to escape these problems (Castro et al., 2015; Miller et al., 2018). Unfortunately, those with histories of abuse have been shown to not only have higher rates of revictimization but of being offenders themselves (Castro et al., 2015; Levenson & Socia, 2016). To determine the motivational development of offenders, researchers have begun to recognize the link between childhood adverse experiences and violent behavior such as rape (Drury et al., 2017; Levenson & Socia, 2016; Levenson et al., 2016; Martinez-Catena et al., 2016).

In Levenson and Socia (2016), the authors used the Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) scale with a group of 679 convicted sex offenders. The findings were that there was a significant correlation of higher ACE scores with higher levels of violence, more victims, and a greater arrest history (Levenson & Socia, 2016). The ACE is a series of 10 yes or no scaled questions which ask about childhood sexual and physical abuse, neglect, and multiple types of household dysfunction (Levenson & Socia, 2016).

Among these offenders, 53% experienced verbal abuse, 42% physical abuse, 38% sexual abuse, and 38% emotional neglect (Levenson & Socia, 2016). Furthermore, 54% grew up in a single-parent household and 47% of them lived in an environment where there was substance abuse occurring (Levenson & Socia, 2016). Only 16% of the

offenders reported no ACE, while 45.7% reported four or more factors (Levenson & Socia, 2016). It has been found that those with higher ACE scores tend to have a greater propensity towards criminal activities, especially violent criminal activities (Drury et al., 2017; Levenson & Socia, 2016). Often these men that have been abused in childhood result in a sexual motivation that is based on dominance and aggression (Toates et al., 2017).

Childhood experiences are only part of the issue. After all, many in the adult population have high ACE scores, yet never go on to commit violent crimes. In adulthood, many military offenders have reported significant psychological problems such as depression or anxiety, Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, sexual trauma history, and suicidal ideations (Schaffer & Zarilla, 2018). Coupled with higher ACE scores that could be prevalent, offenders may have elevated rates of poorer social, emotional, and cognitive functioning resulting in difficulties with interpersonal relationships, maladaptive coping methods, and distorted cognitive schemas (Levenson & Socia, 2016; Youngs, 2013).

This correlation should not disbar those with high ACE scores from joining the military, but it is something that response and treatment programs should bear in mind. A recognition that offenders often have higher ACE scores can help investigators develop proper interview and interrogation themes by understanding and playing into some of the cognitive distortions found in this population, such as treating the offender like a victim (Beauregard et al., 2017; Douglas et al., 2011; Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009).

## **Male Victims and Military Culture**

During the Fiscal year of 2018, approximately 7,500 (or 0.7%) of active duty Army males reported that they had been a victim of sexual violence (United States Department of Defense, 2019a). These numbers include those victims who have experienced acts ranging from unwanted fondling and touching, to forcible, penetrative rape (United States Department of Defense, 2019a). However, the true rate of male victimization is not known due to low reporting rates among this population (United States Department of Defense, 2019a).

Historically, males who were homosexual were not allowed to enlist in the United States Military. This prohibited many victims from reporting their assaults for fear of being removed from the military as the myth that males could not be sexually assaulted was believed by the majority of commanders and investigators (Brady, 2016; Romaniuk & Loue, 2017). More recently, one of the largest barriers to reporting sexual assaults for male victims who had been assaulted by other males was DADT, which was signed into law by President William J. Clinton in 1993. This policy was considered a compromise between those who were advocating for the decriminalization of homosexuality in the United States military, and those who did not believe that the homosexual population could openly serve within its ranks without causing degradation of mission accomplishment (Romaniuk & Loue, 2017).

However, the unintended consequence of this law was that many male victims who would have come forward to report their assaults did not feel safe about doing so due to the very real chance they would be discharged from the service (Monteith et al.,

2019; Romaniuk & Loue, 2017; Warner & Armstrong, 2020). This could occur whether the victim was heterosexual or homosexual in that, if the case was not founded as an assault, it could be assumed that the sexual activity was consensual, and their reporting violated DADT (Elder et al., 2017; Romaniuk & Loue, 2017).

Many service members responded to the repeal of DADT and the allowance of homosexuals within the service with anger and fear stating that they felt uncomfortable serving next to homosexuals (Romaniuk & Loue, 2017). Some stated they did not want to carry out routine activities such as showering or sharing a sleeping area with those who are attracted to the same sex, often believing that homosexuals were “predators” and would make living and serving with them difficult (Romaniuk & Loue, 2017). These fears were unfounded, and it has been found that the integration of openly homosexual military members has gone smoothly (Romaniuk & Loue, 2017).

Unfortunately, even upon its repeal, the stigma for male victims remained as one of the largest reasons that many do not come forward and report their assault, and gender biases, myths, and stereotypes are important factors when researching male victimization (Romaniuk & Loue, 2017; Savard et al., 2017). Offenders know that these biases and myths still abound within the military population and may use this to their advantage. Additionally, gender biases may play a role in the decision by commanders to prosecute these cases or not (Warner & Armstrong, 2020).

Furthermore, military culture itself can discourage reporting of sexual assaults by male victims (Castro et al., 2015; Warner & Armstrong, 2020). Noted causes of sexual assault within the military included accepted gender stereotypes and hyper-masculinity

prevalence, historical and religious influences such as women's roles in society, high rates of prior victimization among military members, the sense of entitlement among the males in the military, a prevalence of alcohol use, and a level of cultural acceptance of sexual indiscretions (Castro et al., 2015; Duchesne et al., 2018; Warner & Armstrong, 2020). Systemic myths regarding sexual assault such as veils of ignorance regarding victims of assault, the belief that there should be an abundance of physical evidence in "true" sexual assault cases, that victims only report as a way of revenge, and that females are asking for it by their behavior or dress, still abound (Castro et al., 2015; Warner & Armstrong, 2020).

Military-specific situational risks exist for male service members that can factor into assault dynamics as well (Ashley et al., 2019). For military members, certain locations are frequented that may place them at higher risk of victimization (Ashley et al., 2019). Male victims have reported that workplace environments where isolation is prevalent, such as on deployment or temporary duty (TDY), and certain career fields, such as majority male combat arms fields, were particularly risky for male members (Ashley et al., 2019). Males also note that situations where they were socially isolated raised the risk of victimization (Ashley et al., 2019; Savard et al., 2017).

Once an assault does occur, there are cultural factors that often preclude a victim from reporting to military law enforcement. These factors included high values placed on performing members of the organization, an emphasis on problem resolutions at the lowest level, and team allegiance that kept many victims from coming forward (Castro et al., 2015). Additionally, the military reporting system, military resilience programs

focused on coping in high-stress environments, an emphasis on training, living arrangements, and the military legal system all lead to an environment accepting of or dismissing the seriousness of, sexual violence (Castro et al., 2015; Matthews et al., 2018; Warner & Armstrong, 2020).

Additionally, cultures and societies that laud male toughness and dominance, acceptance of violence and hyper-masculine behaviors, are at a higher risk of having sex offenders among them (Castro et al., 2015; Toates et al., 2017). This could be a particularly concerning and relevant factor among military members who are in male-dominated career fields such as combat arms, where these behaviors are rewarded.

### **Male Rape Myths, Biases, and the Impact on Victims and Case Outcomes**

Monteith et al. (2019), and Sadler et al. (2018), explored the distinct way that male service members and veterans experience military sexual traumas, well as their reasoning for not coming forward and reporting their assault or seeking help. Ten distinct themes were found in these two studies including beliefs on masculinity, sexuality, and gender roles, resulting changes in beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors, an attitude of secrecy, how disclosure and reactions from others can negatively influence reporting, feeling a sense of betrayal from others and the military institution, interpersonal difficulties caused by reporting, potentially negative effects on their career and military disillusionment, avoidant coping methods, and cumulative trauma experienced (Duchesne et al., 2018; Monteith et al., 2019; Sadler et al., 2018).

Furthermore, male rape myths still abound within society that present barriers for victims coming forward and reporting their assault (O'Brien et al., 2015). One of the



most prevalent myths that are reported is that men do not get raped, or that “real men” cannot become victims (O’Brien et al., 2015), and many service members believe rape myths surrounding males in that they assume only females can be sexually victimized (Monteith et al., 2019; Sadler et al., 2018). Victimized men often become highly secretive after an assault due to this and very few report their assault to military authorities, friends, or even family members due to the intense feelings of shame, guilt, and betrayal (Duchesne et al., 2018; Elder et al., 2017; Matthews et al., 2018; Monteith et al., 2019).

Victims tend to feel a sense of betrayal from those that they do disclose to, often being met with negative responses and some deem that their command does not support their disclosures as well (Mancini & Pickett, 2016; Monteith et al., 2019) as demonstrated through surprise and disbelief by some participants in Sadler et al.’s study, as one individual stated “(s)o to tell me that men are being raped in the military is one that takes me for a loop. I’m now questioning how many of my soldiers, males, have been raped now?” (Sadler et al., 2018, p 10).

This can lead to a feeling of institutional betrayal and a belief that the military culture itself had contributed to their victimization (Castro et al., 2015; Monteith et al., 2019). In addition to institutional distrust and betrayal, victims feel as though their assault may harm their military career and are often subject to reprisal actions when they do report (Elder et al., 2017; Monteith et al., 2019). National Guard and Army Reserve soldiers often experienced unique barriers faced by male victims due to their specific mission requirements of being part-time soldiers, specifically in deployed environments (Sadler et al., 2018). These soldiers remain with the same unit personnel, sometimes their

entire careers, which can cause a lack of privacy that could exacerbate the shame and stigma among male victims (Mancini & Pickett, 2016; Sadler et al., 2018). Exploring the differences in reporting rates, assault dynamics, and duty status would be an important step in prevention and response programs developed for both active duty and reserve or guard soldiers.

Javid (2018) found similar issues within the civilian population, especially among homosexual males. It was found that among these victims, the stigmas, stereotypes, biases of police officers and the criminal justice system, as well as the fear of not being believed, all played a role in nondisclosure of the crime and the investigation not continuing if it was reported (Javid, 2018). Homosexuals were found to have a more difficult time being taken seriously when they did report, in contrast to their heterosexual counterparts (Javid, 2018). For both homosexual and heterosexual males, there is a belief that, as males, they should be able to prevent themselves from becoming a victim of sexual assault, and if they were not able to, are weak and lack power (Duchesne et al., 2018; Javid, 2018; Monteith et al., 2019; Sadler et al., 2018).

Another prevalent belief is that only homosexual males are sexually assaulted (O'Brien et al., 2015). As a result, heterosexual identified victims report that they felt less masculine which causes them to question their own masculine identity and gender role and many victims blame themselves wondering if they had "sent out signals" to other males that they were interested in sexual activities with them (Elder et al., 2017; Monteith et al., 2019). These reactions come from internal, and sometimes external, attacks on their perceived masculinity and self-blame from the assaults (Elder et al., 2017). Victims then

feel as if they need to become hypermasculine in their behaviors and attitudes to avoid blame and reaffirm heterosexuality to themselves and others (Elder et al., 2017; Monteith et al., 2019). They often engage in frequent sexual activities to feel sexually desirable to females and regain a sense of control over their lives, as well as take steps to appear strong to avoid feeling weak by developing a strong muscular appearance or avoid expressing any emotions but anger (Elder et al., 2017; Monteith et al., 2019). Victims also report that they became hypervigilant for signs that other men may be homosexual and develop negative attitudes towards those whom they perceive are (Monteith et al., 2019).

Victims report experiencing a loss of trust in others, an inability to have intimate and personal relationships, and feel that they needed to be hypervigilant to their surroundings while avoiding situations that reminded them of their assault (Elder et al., 2017; Monteith et al., 2019). These impacts may have serious consequences on the outcome of sexual assault investigations and the potential for a successful court-martial (Warner & Armstrong, 2020). Cases where victims recant their allegation or decline to participate in the investigation, or there is a command structure that buys into rape myths, may cause a case to not progress through the criminal justice system (Warner & Armstrong, 2020).

### **Victim Vulnerability Factors**

Many victims report a history of prior sexual assault and sexual harassment from the offender as well as post-assault stalking, harassment, and retaliation (Miller et al., 2018; Street et al., 2018; Street et al., 2008). This is a noteworthy factor for military

assaults due to the vulnerability of many members because of a prior sexual assault, often in their childhood (Culatta et al., 2017). Studies have shown that this factor has a high correlation with the individual being victimized again in the future, making them highly suitable targets for military offenders, especially those victims who are homosexual or bisexual (Culatta et al., 2017; Hequembourg et al., 2015; Levenson & Socia, 2016; Matthews et al., 2018). Research has also shown that many sexual assaults that occur within the military environment involve the offender or victim being under the influence of alcohol or drugs (Greathouse et al., 2015; Miller et al., 2018). This can cloud recollection of details and impact the case outcomes of these assaults (Warner & Armstrong, 2020).

Other researchers have explored specific factors which led to vulnerability for sexual assaults on males which included being of a younger age, having a history of alcohol and drug use, being single, being an ethnic minority, lower socioeconomic background, and spending more time in bars and clubs (Bunch et al., 2015; Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2001). This is often due to their involvement in riskier activities, such as meeting people who were strangers or living in higher crime areas, that often correlated with these variables (Bunch et al., 2015; Hines et al., 2012). Additionally, higher rates of alcohol or drug abuse are common among victims after a sexual assault, opening them up to further victimization as well as disciplinary repercussions from the military (Culatta et al., 2017; Street et al., 2018).

An understanding of this information could be particularly important to explore with military populations in that much of the younger soldier's time is spent in places

such as bars, off-post parties and hotels, or other service member's barracks room which could potentially raise their risk of victimization (Ashley et al., 2019; Miller et al., 2018).

Vulnerability, and its role in offenders selecting a certain victim, can be a factor in assaults where the victim is under the influence of alcohol or drugs, is isolated, or has experienced prior victimization (Beauregard et al., 2017; Hines et al., 2012; Pedneault & Beauregard, 2014; Tewksbury et al., 2008).

Future research on these factors could further expand the field's knowledge of male victims and the legal, cultural, and social contexts at play in victim nonreporting. This could enhance the investigation, prevention, and response abilities of those entities that serve this victim population. To get more male victims to come forward and seek support and/or report their assault, a better understanding of the dynamics of these assaults must be explored (Monteith et al., 2019). Ultimately, the more victims who come forward, the better the opportunity that the military justice system has to prosecute offenders who continue to harm fellow service members.

### **Known Data on Military Sexual Assault Situational Characteristics**

Each year the Department of Defense completes a report which is provided to Congress that explores the cases, rates, trends, and initiatives of each service for that fiscal year (United States Department of Defense, 2019a). The FY 2018 report, released in April of 2019, gives an overall picture of sexual assaults within the United States Army. The report noted that between FY 2009 and FY 2018, the rates of unrestricted reports went from 2.5 per 1000 service members to 5.5 per 1000 service members respectively, showing an increase in the reporting rates (United States Department of

Defense, 2019a). However, the prevalence rates between those years went from 8,600 in FY 2010 to 5,200 in FY 2016, based upon surveys of service members (United States Department of Defense, 2019a).

In 2018, there were 2,306 Army service member victims whose cases were reported to military law enforcement (United States Department of Defense, 2019a). Of these, 80% of them were in the ranks of E1 to E4, 72% were under the age of 24, 22% were males, and 45% of the reported cases involved penetrative assaults (United States Department of Defense, 2019a). Out of 1,768 known service member offenders, 95% were male, 57% were E1 through E4, and 49% were under the age of 24 (United States Department of Defense, 2019a). A total of 1,316 of these cases were service members on another service member assaults, with 218 of those being male-on-male cases (United States Department of Defense, 2019a).

The average case took 150 days to complete the investigation and 379 cases proceeded to a court-martial (United States Department of Defense, 2019a). Most of the victims reported within 31-365 days post-assault (N= 663) with reports that occurred within three days post-assault being second (United States Department of Defense, 2019a). Midnight to six am was the most prevalent time for assaults, and they were found to occur most often on Saturdays (United States Department of Defense, 2019a).

A total of 402 assaults involving male victims were closed during FY 18 that were considered serious or penetrative cases (United States Department of Defense, 2019a). Of the male victims of a service member on service member assault, 81 experienced a rape,

four experienced aggravated sexual assault, 358 experienced sexual assault, and 10 experienced aggravated sexual contact (United States Department of Defense, 2019a).

Prior year data as included in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 report, stated that most of the male victims experienced hazing and bullying type incidents (United States Department of Defense, 2018). However, 124 male members reported victimization through penetrative assaults and 74% of them had been under the influence of alcohol or drugs at the time of their assault (United States Department of Defense, 2018). Although the data provided through these reports clarify the overall picture of sexual assaults within the Army, it fails to look at case-specific information which leaves a lot of unknown information, especially since approximately 86% of victims never report their crime (Brady, 2016). However, the demographic data that is included in the report is an important step in beginning to understand the scope of the problem, and many of the variables included in the report will also be included in this study's data analysis. It is also unknown what factors lead to acquittals versus convictions in these cases.

In Miller et al., (2018), the authors documented the findings of 192 Air Force Office of Special Investigations criminal offense reports as well as 61 Judge Advocate General's Corps court-martial records of sexual assaults that occurred in the United States Air Force between 2012 and 2013 (Miller et al., 2018). The authors found that both female and male victims who had been sexually assaulted were confused about the conditions that needed to be met to report a case of sexual assault, that offenders who sexually assaulted an intimate partner or spouse also have a history of intimate partner violence, most offenders take advantage of those who give them their trust, and are

intoxicated at the time of the assault, and that offenders often contact their victim in an attempt to persuade them to not report the sexual assault (Miller et al., 2018).

Additionally, many of the assaults occurred in settings where binge drinking by the victim or the offender, was prevalent (Miller, et al., 2018). Statistically, the authors found that most Air Force victims were female (94%), 21 to 23 years of age, active duty military, and in the pay grades of E1-E4 (Miller et al., 2018). Offenders were found to be overwhelmingly male (>90%), 24 years of age or older, and E1-E4 pay grade (Miller et al., 2018). It is unknown if this pattern would hold for male-on-male offenders since this population has not been researched thoroughly (Miller et al., 2018).

When looking specifically at the case outcomes of sex crimes investigations, specific assault characteristics were found to have a negative impact on whether an offender was brought to justice (Warner & Armstrong, 2020). Cases where there was a delay in reporting, a lack of victim cooperation during the investigation or prosecution, alcohol involvement, ambiguous consent, especially in the cases of a higher ranking offender, or a lack of corroborating evidence, significantly reduced the likelihood that a case would go to court-martial or even result in other disciplinary actions (Warner & Armstrong, 2020). For male victims, it has also been noted that a belief in male rape myths, such as men cannot be victims of rape, could influence command decisions for further action (Warner & Armstrong, 2020).

Unfortunately, most of the research that has been conducted in the past tends to disregard the dynamics of male-on-male cases since the numbers are not statistically significant to the overall population of reported sexual assaults (Brady, 2016; Miller et



al., 2018; Warner & Armstrong, 2020). This leaves a dearth of information on these cases which can be detrimental when investigations are conducted due to a lack of understanding about the victims and the offenders (Romaniuk & Loue, 2017).

### **Victim Selection Patterns and Motivational Factors**

Demographics of offenders are much easier to obtain than understanding the individual motivational characteristics of each. An understanding of what may motivate an offender is imperative to the successful investigation and interviewing process (Beauregard et al., 2017; Douglas et al., 2011; Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009; Maddan & Pazzani, 2017). Among male-on-male offenders, dominance and aggression have been noted as common motivational factors (Toates et al., 2017) and male-on-male offenders, historically, have been divided into two categories based upon the motivations of the offenders themselves when committing the crime (Greathouse et al., 2015; Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009). The first category consists of males who are homosexual and commit their assaults against other homosexual men to gain a sense of intimacy or sexual gratification (Greathouse et al., 2015; Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009).

Conversely, there is the offender who is often heterosexual and who commits sexual assaults in an expression of dominance or control over another male (Greathouse et al., 2015; Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009). Dominance/aggression is often reinforced through extrinsic consequences such as a victim showing signs of fear or submission, and intrinsic consequences such as enhanced physical and emotional effects after aggressive behavior (Almond et al., 2014; Toates et al., 2017). Victims of these offenders could be either homosexual or heterosexual since the act was not about sexual attractiveness, but

social dominance (Greathouse et al., 2015; Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009; Ioannou et al., 2017).

Sex offenders have a variety of motivational bases and there are contributory factors that align to cause them to commit an offense (Toates et al., 2017; Youngs, 2013). Some research has shown that sexual motivation manifests itself as sexual behavior depending on the excitatory and inhibiting factors that the offender encounters (Canter & Youngs, 2009; Toates et al., 2017). Excitation factors may include such things as pornography, fantasy development and rehearsal, and the use of alcohol or drugs (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009; Toates et al., 2017). Inhibitions often come in the form of concern for consequences or feelings of fear and disgust (Toates et al., 2017).

Investigators need an understanding of the victimology, motivation, and intent behind the assault to properly interview an offender (Canter & Youngs, 2009; Douglas et al., 2011; Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009). That is, there is something about the victim that causes a specific reaction in the offender, even if it is on an unconscious level (Toates et al., 2017). Triggers, or situational or emotional context that starts the offense reaction, play a role in that “motivation can be aroused by a particular incentive stimulus, the triggering capacity of which is modulated by internal states” (Toates et al., 2017, p 240). This leads to the fact that offenders choose their victims based upon their suitability to meet their needs, whether the offense is planned or unplanned (Canter & Youngs, 2009; Toates et al., 2017; Youngs, 2013).

For some offenders, this may be the desire to punish or degrade a certain population, such as homosexuals, or out of anger at the person for a perceived rejection

(Almond et al., 2014; Greathouse et al., 2015; Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009; Toates et al., 2017). Motives behind this system include gaining power, affiliation, the achievement of the person's goals, a real or imagined grievance, self-pity, the need for control, entitlement, disrespect of a certain population, and cognitive distortions (Toates et al., 2017).

Victim selection and their offender's possible motivation were also explored by Youngs (2013) and Almond et al. (2014). Based on David Cantor's Investigative Psychology research, it was found that offenders select victims with one of three schemas as their motivational backdrops (Almond et al., 2014; Youngs, 2013). The first, *Victim as Object* states that offenders do not have any specific aim to harm their victims, but they also have no empathetic response to the victim as they exploit them for their personal pleasure (Youngs, 2013). These offenders tend to be motivated by control and instrumentally of the crime is a factor as well in that they often steal items from their victims for personal gain (Almond et al., 2014; Youngs, 2013).

The *Victim as Vehicle* schema is one in that the offender is using the victim as a representation of their actual target (Youngs, 2013). These offenders are often more hostile, violent in their behaviors, and the motivation behind the assaults tends to be a venting of their frustration and anger at themselves, another person, or the world in general (Almond et al., 2014; Youngs, 2013). This type of offender is consistent with many of the heterosexual male-on-male offenders (Greathouse et al., 2015; Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009).

Finally, the *Victim as Person* schema leads the offenders to treat their victim as a person and engage in a pseudo-relationship with them, often as a result of an unmet need for intimate interaction (Almond et al., 2014; Youngs, 2013). This behavior is consistent with other research on male-on-male offenders who are homosexual and seek to have the victim involved in the act (Almond et al., 2014; Greathouse et al., 2015; Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009).

Victim selection can be highly conditional depending upon the physical environment in which the offender is in (Beauregard et al., 2017; Canter & Youngs, 2009; Deslauriers-Varin & Beauregard, 2010). Offenders often have a specific script that they follow when looking for victims that guides where, how, and whom they look for, and the level of force used against the victim is independent of the target selection process (Beauregard et al., 2017; Deslauriers-Varin & Beauregard, 2010). The actions of the offender rely heavily on the victim's actions before the crime took place and the offender's specific motivation (Almond et al., 2014; Beauregard et al., 2017; Deslauriers-Varin & Beauregard, 2010).

When questioned, however, offenders often report that situational factors outside their control lead to their offending, and that they do not specifically seek out or groom victims for their offenses, but that the offenses committed were due to random encounters while taking part in their routine activities (Farmer et al., 2016; Pedneault & Beauregard, 2014). Furthermore, offenses committed are only a minor activity within their lives, but where and how they spend their time can give insight into victim selection and open exploration of other common factors among this group could contribute to an

understanding of these offenders (Canter & Youngs, 2009; Pedneault & Beaugard, 2014).

### **Information Needed for Proper Investigation and Interviewing**

Much of the knowledge needed about offenders for proper investigation and interviewing techniques can be gleaned from victim interviews and can help investigators develop a picture of how to approach the offender using themes and tactics (Beaugard et al., 2017; Canter & Youngs, 2009; Youngs, 2013). The use of a behavioral-oriented interview of victims has been shown to assist investigators in obtaining detailed information about the offender, their tactics, motivations, and personality characteristics (Beaugard et al., 2017; Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009; Perry et al., 2018).

To accomplish this, the United States Army Military Police School, Behavioral Sciences Education and Training Division (2017), developed the Trauma-Informed Interview which is taught to all agents who investigate sexual assaults. This technique focuses on acknowledging the trauma that the victim experienced, allowing the individual to narrate their experience in a free flow format. This technique consists of using open-ended questions such as “Tell me more about...”, “Help me understand...” and “Describe...” to encourage long answers, employs questions which address sensory information, body sensations, thoughts, emotional and physical reactions, as well as asking the victim how the experience impacted their life. In doing so, victim interviews are better suited to not only glean the impact of victimization but also critical information about the offenders (Wilson et al., 2016).

Behaviors and actions of the offender can help determine the basis of the offending style of the perpetrator as well as possible personality traits and characteristics that investigators can use throughout their investigation (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009; Martinez-Catena et al., 2016; Wojcik & Fisher, 2019; Youngs, 2013). These behaviors include the method of approach, the offender's control of the victim, the offender's use of physical force, the offender's reaction to resistance, any sexual dysfunctions identified, the type and sequence of sexual acts, the offender's verbal activity, any forced victim verbal activity, any sudden change in the offender's attitude, their level of criminal experience, any items taken, and indications that the victim was targeted (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009; Perry et al., 2018). Investigators can use this information to help identify or narrow down a list of offenders and is invaluable during subject interviews to assist in identifying appropriate themes and approaches that should be used (Beauregard et al., 2017; Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009; Perry et al., 2018; Wojcik & Fisher, 2019).

One of the major limitations of prior research in this area is that these behavioral indicators have been researched and employed in, almost exclusively, male-on-female sexual assaults (Perry et al., 2018). It is unknown how they would generalize to male-on-male assaults and whether the behaviors manifested by the offenders would reveal the same traits and characteristics of this population. The EDA methodology which was employed with this research shed some light on the validity of using this technique with male-on-male cases which is further discussed in Chapter 5.

### **Gaps in Literature**

As seen through the research above, military cultural factors influence the reporting rates of male victims who have been victimized by other males. Also, the limited research conducted upon this offender population has been almost exclusively conducted in the civilian population, and it is unknown if it can be generalized to military offenders (Warner & Armstrong, 2020). Another limitation with prior research is that it has been noted that for many of these cases, drugs or alcohol are used, often surreptitiously given to the victim by the offender to immobilize and manipulate their victim, but this dynamic has not been fully explored (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009; Miller et al., 2018). It was believed that this is a common occurrence in military male-on-male assaults and was explored specifically through the research questions.

A greater understanding of military male-on-male offenders will assist investigators with further development of interview and interrogation techniques, investigation skills, and victim response. It will also assist prosecutors with the knowledge needed to successfully prosecute these cases. Finally, knowing what situation factors lead to these assaults can help the military develop better prevention and response techniques.

### **Summary and Conclusions**

Male-on-male sexual violence presents a unique challenge to those who respond and investigate these crimes. Prior research has focused on male-on-female assaults and many of the theories used to study these crimes are not gender-inclusive. The military population and its cultural factors that may lead to this crime are understudied, yet

research shows that the majority of male-on-male victims are White, in their mid-twenties, and heterosexual, which accounts for a large portion of military males. More research is needed on this topic to fully understand the offenders, the victims, and the situational context of this crime to prevent and respond acceptably. Chapter 3 will identify and explore the methodology that has been undertaken to properly identify the variables associated with male-on-male sexual assaults within the U.S. Army.



### Chapter 3: Research Method

The purpose of this quantitative exploratory study was to explore the dynamics of male-on-male penetrative sexual assaults in the United States Army. The variables examined included victim-offender relationship, length of the relationship, the specific sexual crime committed, nonsexual crimes discovered through the investigation, alcohol or drug use by either victim or offender during the incident, the evidence identified such as medical, electronic, or forensic evidence, demographics of the victim and offender including age, rank, military occupational specialty (MOS), deployment history of the offender, and identified sexual orientation of those involved. Additionally, location, time, and circumstances of the assault were explored including the presence of paraphilia, fantasy reenactment, the use of weapons or physical force, violence involvement, grooming or stalking behaviors identified, and case outcomes were assessed through the data collection and analysis.

This chapter will discuss the research design and its rationale as well as define and describe variables to be employed. Also, it will explain how EDA is consistent with proper research designed used to advance knowledge in the field regarding male-on-male sexual crimes through the lens of the RAT. Next, the methodology utilized, and the data analysis plan will be discussed. These sections will include the sample population chosen, how a nonprobability sampling method was employed and why, the process for gaining access to the data, and how it was analyzed, including a discussion on the software used and statistical tests employed. Additionally, internal and external threats and statistical conclusion validity are discussed, and the processes taken to neutralize and mitigate those

threats are examined. Finally, ethical procedures that were used to protect the data and the individual information in the case files are explained.

### **Research Design and Rationale**

This research used exploratory data analysis as its methodological design. Developed by John Tukey, this method of analysis is used to simplify information collected during data mining of a large number of variables by looking for detectable data patterns leading to new empirical phenomena or theories (Jebb et al., 2017; Komorowski et al., 2016; Tukey, 1977; Yu, 2017).

“The goal of EDA is not to marshal strong statistical evidence, but to discover and learn from the data” (Jebb et al., 2017, p. 267). As such, EDA was developed to employ an abductive approach to new data as a flexible method of discovery especially suited for phenomena exploration, outlier and anomaly detection, development of reliable research on a subject population, gain valuable insight into a topic, and construction of a dataset that is available for future confirmatory data analysis research (Behrens & Yu, 2003; Jebb et al., 2017; Komorowski et al., 2016).

This design has been noted to be an underutilized method of research throughout multiple fields of study (Behrens & Yu, 2003; Jebb et al., 2017; Ma et al., 2017). However, EDA, and its abductive approach, helps to explore “what we do not know we do not know” (Ma et al., 2017, p. 2). EDA employs both univariate and multivariate, graphical, and nongraphical techniques to explore the variables included in the analysis (Komorowski et al., 2016). Univariate techniques will allow for a comparison of known data reported in the research already conducted on military sexual assault with what is

found in male-on-male cases. Additionally, since limited research has been done on male-on-male offenders in general, and none has been completed on military offenders of these crimes, multivariate EDA provided a view into the characteristics of the offenders and situational dynamics of the cases which can better inform risk factor detection and investigative techniques.

Because this technique is aimed at the discovery of information, the data gathered maximized and was not limited to a strict set of hypothesis limits. As a result of this research design, I was able to explore the relationship between the victim, offender, and assault characteristics that are associated with male-on-male sexual assaults and may lead to better prevention, response, and investigative techniques.

There were no time or resource constraints with this research design other than the time it would take to gather and analyze the data.

Variables for each research question are depicted in Tables 1 through 3. These variables were analyzed using a nominal (categorical) or ordinal level of measurement. Appendix B includes the variable coding information.

**Table 1***Research Question 1, Variable and Levels of Measurement*

| Variables  | Level of Measurement |
|--|----------------------|
| Age of the offender  | Ordinal              |
| Deployment history of offender                               | Ordinal              |
| Identified sexual orientation of offender                    | Nominal              |
| Known prior investigation(s) of offender for nonsexual crime | Nominal              |
| Known prior investigation(s) of offender for sexual crime    | Nominal              |
| Military Occupational Specialty of offender                  | Nominal              |
| Prior Victimization  | Nominal              |
| Race of offender   | Nominal              |
| Rank of the offender   | Ordinal              |

**Table 2***Research Question 2, Variables and Levels of Measurements*

| Variables  | Level of Measurement |
|--|----------------------|
| Age of the victim                                    | Ordinal              |
| Deployment history of victim                         | Ordinal              |
| Identified sexual orientation of victim              | Nominal              |
| Military occupational specialty of victim            | Nominal              |
| Prior Victimization                                  | Nominal              |
| Race of victim                                       | Nominal              |
| Rank of the victim                                   | Ordinal              |
| Relationship status of victim at time of the assault | Nominal              |
| Service component of victim                          | Nominal              |

**Table 3***Research Question 3, Variables and Levels of Measurements*

| Variables  | Level of Measurement |
|--|----------------------|
| Alcohol or drug use at the time of assault             | Nominal              |
| Case outcome   | Nominal              |
| Case year  | Ordinal              |
| Day of the assault                                     | Nominal              |
| Evidence identified/available                          | Nominal              |
| Force/violence used, NOT during assault                | Nominal              |
| Initial law enforcement notification method            | Nominal              |
| Items taken from the scene by the offender             | Nominal              |
| Length of relationship between offender and victim     | Ordinal              |
| Length of time to disclosure to Law Enforcement        | Ordinal              |
| Location had security measures in place                | Nominal              |
| Location of assault                                    | Nominal              |
| Location where alcohol or drugs were being served/used | Nominal              |
| Method of approach                                     | Nominal              |
| Multi-Victim Offender                                  | Nominal              |
| Offender committed a co-occurring nonsexual crime(s)   | Nominal              |
| Offender confessed                                     | Nominal              |
| Offender injury  | Nominal              |
| Offender interviewed                                   | Nominal              |
| Offender's control of the victim                       | Nominal              |
| Offenders reaction to resistance                       | Nominal              |
| Original responding agency                             | Nominal              |
| Paraphilia/Fantasy present                             | Nominal              |
| Photographs of the victim taken                        | Nominal              |
| Prostitution/sex trafficking involvement               | Nominal              |
| Restricted to unrestricted report                      | Nominal              |
| Sexual crime(s) committed                              | Nominal              |
| Signs of preplanned assault                            | Nominal              |
| Stalking/grooming behaviors                            | Nominal              |
| Time of the assault                                    | Nominal              |
| Type of relationship between offender and victim       | Nominal              |
| Verbal activity by offender during assault             | Nominal              |
| Verbal threats/harassment used, NOT during assault     | Nominal              |
| Victim declined to participate                         | Nominal              |
| Victim forced verbal activity during assault           | Nominal              |
| Victim injury  | Nominal              |
| Victim recanted  | Nominal              |
| Victim response to assault                             | Nominal              |
| Victim Strangled                                       | Nominal              |
| Video of the victim taken                              | Nominal              |
| Witnesses present at time of assault                   | Nominal              |

## Methodology

### Population

The target population for this study was male-on-male sexual assaults contained in Army Criminal Investigative Division case files. The case files included charges of Article 120a, *Rape*, Article 120b *Sexual Assault*, Article 125, *Forcible Sodomy* (before 2012), and Article 120c, *Aggravated Sexual Contact*, where the case was referred to a court-martial between the years of 2009-2019. Although Aggravated Sexual Contact does not involve penetration, these cases involve constitute high levels of force or threats, often result in injury to the victim, and can be considered an attempted rape or sexual assault. It is important to understand the factors related to this crime in the context of rapes or sexual assaults, since it may reveal guardianship factors that were successful in interrupting the act which may have escalated to a more serious assault.

In total, Army CID command provided 260 case files that may have met the criteria. Upon review, I found 171 individual cases that were able to be used, which included a total of 124 offenders and 168 victims due to some victim and offender overlap. No cases were included where a female victim or offender was identified. Furthermore, no cases where an identified victim was under the age of 18 were included.

### Sampling and Sampling Procedures

Due to the small number of cases that fit the required criteria, the purposive sampling method of total population sampling was used as the sampling strategy (Laerd Dissertation, 2012). The use of this method is appropriate when the total number of cases

is small, and they have varied characteristics that are uncommon to a general population (Laerd Dissertation, 2012).

This sampling strategy has many advantages for research such as what was conducted, specifically that it allowed for targeting of the niche demographics that I used for my variables while including a diverse range of male-on-male cases that fit my target population (Ayres, 2019). Additionally, it allowed for both the average cases, as well as the extreme cases, to be analyzed and provided a basis for future research with the sampled cases (Ayres, 2019). The biggest advantage of this sampling technique in the context of this dissertation is that it allowed for the selection of all cases that fall within the target population to better understand the victim, offender, and situational dynamics of male-on-male cases.

### **Archival Data**

Archival data was used since it is considered a time and effort saving method that did not require a gathering of the initial data and was cost-efficient in that it did not require compensation to participants, which reduced the resources needed (Jones, 2010). To access the archival data contained in CID investigative case files, a letter of cooperation from U.S. Army CID command representatives was received which permitted access to the case files. A complete review of the research proposed was also completed by the Army University Ethics Board which determined that there were no ethical issues in the proposed research. Finally, access was granted upon approval from the Walden University Institutional Review Board, number 08-03-20-0739855.

All cases where Army CID investigated the case, meet the inclusion criteria, and were referred to a military court-martial, were gathered and included in the study. Investigative case files are considered to be an accurate representation of all investigative activities that occur during a sexual assault investigation to include agent reports, evidence documents, witness, victim, and offender statements, as well as peripheral information that was gathered throughout the investigation. Each investigation is subject to multiple levels of review before it is approved to be closed and, since only cases that have been sent to a court-martial were included, the information gathered is considered sufficient enough to provide for adequate data collection. Cases referred to court-martial have acceptable levels of information regarding the victim, offender, and elements of the offense to receive an opinion of probable cause needed for adjudication.

### **Instrumentation and Operationalization of Constructs**

Since the literature review did not reveal a comprehensive instrument of all needed variables, the variables chosen for this work were an aggregate of multiple studies and their identified variables (Greathouse et al., 2015; Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009; Jones et al., 2015; Miller et al., 2018). Collection of this data was based on a modified version of the IC-SOS: Phase 2 Presentence Investigation Report (PIR) Data Codebook and study variables included in the research of Miller et al. (2018), Street et al. (2018), Warner and Armstrong (2020), and Hazelwood and Burgess (2009).

All variables developed were nominal (categorical) or ordinal levels of measurement and allowed for a solid quantitative study, while keeping validity and reliability at the forefront. Pains were taken to ensure that each of the variables measured



were either used in previous studies exploring male-on-male assaults or were developed to measure military-specific dynamics that are not measured elsewhere, but were available within the archival data. Having a convergence of this instrument with those that have been historically used, improved the validity measurement of the data that was gathered (Heale & Twycross, 2015).

Additionally, the data contained in the files were believed to represent a true and complete picture of the case investigated due to the use of this information within a court-martial. Therefore, it was assumed that the information contained were valid reports of the variables of interest that were being explored for this study. Variables are well defined through the definitions provided in this chapter as to what each constitutes as well as where the variable was adopted.

### **Variable Definitions and Sources**

*Apologetic language*: Offender apologizes for the assault i.e. “You didn’t deserve this” (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009).

*Attempting to flee*: A reaction to victim resistance such as trying to leave assault by running, getting into a car, etc. (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009).

*“Battle buddy”/ escort*: The offender was a peer who was acting as a “Battle Buddy” or escort at the time of the assault (Miller et al., 2018).

*Blitz*: This Method of approach is when the offender uses injurious force to immediately subdue their victim and the victim has no opportunity to resist (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009, p. 85).

*Cease the demand:* An offender's reaction to victim resistance where the offender stops the demand for an action or behavior from the victim and moves onto another demand for the victim or phase of the sexual attack (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009, p. 88).

*Compromise or negotiate:* An offender's reaction to resistance where the offender compromises or negotiates with the victim by agreeing to a victim's suggestion or by giving the victim alternatives to the activity originally demanded (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009, p. 88).

*Con:* This Method of approach involves approaching the victim openly using a trick or ruse to gain the victim's confidence and negate any feelings of danger until they can overcome any resistance (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009, p. 84).

*Concerned language:* Language used by the offender such as "let me know if I'm hurting you" or "are you okay?" (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009, p. 92).

*Co-workers:* The victim and offender work together or are in the same unit but have no further social interactions with one another (Miller et al., 2018).

*Deployed environment:* The victim and offender were deployed to a theater of operation at the time of the assault (Miller et al., 2018).

*Descriptive language:* Language that the offender uses during the assault such as "tell me what you are doing right now" (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009, p. 92).

*Disclosing language:* Language that the offender uses where he tells the victim personal information about himself (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009, p. 92).

*Drill Sergeant/ instructor:* The offender was a drill instructor or an instructor of the victim (Miller et al., 2018).

*Drug/alcohol facilitated:* Victim was intoxicated through drug or alcohol consumption beyond the ability to consent (Miller et al., 2018).

*Freezing:* A victim's reaction to the assault where he experiences tonic or collapsed immobility, better known as rape paralysis (Miller et al., 2018).

*Hostile language:* Language used by the offender that is cruel such as telling the victim to shut up or using homophobic language (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009, p. 92; Miller et al., 2018).

*Intimate partner:* The victim and offender were in an intimate relationship such as dating or married (Miller et al., 2018).

*Inquisitive language:* Language used by the offender where they ask the victim for personal information (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009, p. 92).

*Medical or behavioral health provider:* The offender was acting in a position where they were providing medical, dental, or psychological care to the victim at the time of the assault (Miller et al., 2018).

*Method of approach:* The offender's approach method for gaining access to the victim including a blitz attack, a con or ruse, a surprise attack, plying the victim with drugs or alcohol, or acting while the victim is asleep or unconscious (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009, p. 84)

*Offender's control of the victim:* Any action(s) that the offender takes to establish and keep control over a victim during the assault including their mere presence, verbal threats, the presence or use of a weapon, or physical force (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009, p. 85).

*Personal items:* Items that allow the offender to remember and/or relive the crime and/or victims, such as “trophies” or “souvenirs” (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009, p. 94).

*Position of trust over the victim:* The offender was a supervisor or leader over the victim or held a historical position of trust such as a doctor or cleric (Warner & Armstrong, 2020).

*Prostitution/sex trafficking involvement:* The victim or offender has a history of soliciting or acting as a “prostitute” meaning the exchange of sexual activity for money or other reciprocation (Slater et al., 2014).

*Roommates/barracks mates:* Victim and offender lived together but were not in an intimate relationship (Miller et al., 2018).

*Social acquaintance/ friends:* The victim and offender knew each other through social settings (Miller et al., 2018).

*Subordinate/ supervisor:* The victim and offender had a subordinate/superior relationship (Miller et al., 2018).

*Surprise:* This Method of approach involves the sudden capture of the victim with no injurious force and typically involves threats and/or the presence of a weapon to subdue the victim (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009, p. 85).

*Victim Asleep/ unconscious:* The victim was asleep or unconscious when the assault occurred, even if only at the beginning (Miller et al., 2018).

*Victim forced verbal activity during assault:* The offender demanded that the victim speak certain words or phrases that enhanced the act for him (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009, p. 93).

### **Data Analysis Plan**

For data analysis, each case was explored in its totality to identify and record the variables noted throughout the investigation. Utilizing prior similar research (Greathouse et al., 2015; Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009; Jones et al., 2015; Miller et al., 2018) a set of variables used to explore offender, victim, and sexual assault characteristics were developed. Identified variables were entered into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software and standard descriptive statistics, such as percentages and frequencies, were determined. Data were assessed for missing information and any variable that was missing in more than 10% of the cases was not included in the overall analysis. However, EDA requires that this data be identified and noted during the results and discussion chapters of the study, as it could contribute to the overall picture of these assaults as the importance of the data on future research is unknown (Jebb et al., 2017; Komorowski et al., 2016; National Institute of Standards and Technology, 2013).

As the initial analysis was completed, it informed appropriate model analysis development which led to a better understanding of relationships, themes, and patterns that may have occurred (Jebb et al., 2017; Skiadas & Bozeman, 2019). By employing EDA along with univariate and multivariate statistical analysis, the goal was to determine the significance of each variable, or groups of variables, and generalized patterns and themes of victims, offenders, and situational characteristics of the assaults. Simple statistical analysis was completed on all variables as they pertained to their specific research question. Univariate nongraphical statistics were collected to determine trends in victim and offender demographic characteristics including frequency, proportions, and

percentages. Construction of appropriate tables were completed which presented relationships across variables.

### **Research Questions**

Quantitative Research Question 1: What are the characteristics of offenders in male-on-male sexual assaults in the United States Army?

Quantitative Research Question 2: What are the characteristics of victims in male-on-male sexual assaults in the United States Army?

Quantitative Research Question 3: What situational factors characterize male-on-male sexual assaults in the United States Army?

### **Threats to Validity**

To address external validity threats, a total population sample was employed. The sample represents a sizable portion of all male-on-male sexual assaults that the Army investigated during the study inclusion years and the assumption was made that these cases are a representative sample of a common sexual violence case.

Although the design was not confirmatory, these threats could be present in exploratory data analysis as well if the researcher is not completely open-minded and willing to allow the data to show what is discovered or if the instrument designed to gather data was not representative (Jebb et al., 2017). Although the variable coding was unique, the current research used instrumentation based upon previous researchers and variables tested using military populations (Miller et al., 2018).

Statistical testing is a valuable tool for determining if the research that has been conducted is valid and applicable to a larger population (Frankfort-Nachmias & Leon-

Guerrero, 2018). Furthermore, it allows safeguards against possible random effects influencing our perception of the data (Frankfort-Nachmias & Leon-Guerrero, 2018). However, EDA at its core is not a confirmatory method of data analysis so statistical conclusion validity is not an issue (Jebb et al., 2017). As applied to the current study, this design was specifically apt to provide insight into the dynamics of male-on-male sexual violence because it not only allowed for a genuine exploration of offenders, victimology and risk, but the situational factors of the crime without preconceived notions that can bias normal hypothetico-deductive research (Fife & Rodgers, 2019; Jebb et al., 2017; Ma et al., 2017; National Institute of Standards and Technology, 2013).

In an exploratory data analysis, properly interpreting and evaluating these findings is an important limitation to be considered. Missing or inaccurate data or investigator bias may influence the reporting of information and could impact the preciseness of the results gathered during data analysis. However, the CID auditing and multilevel review process that these case files must go through in the process of investigation and referral to court-martial make this threat minimal.

Finally, although EDA has been recognized as a valuable technique, many have stated that EDA is a questionable research practice that is equated with “p-hacking”, “data fishing”, or “HARKing”, especially when results are reported as confirmatory versus exploratory and preliminary data (Fife & Rodgers, 2019; Sijtsma, 2016). To guard against this, EDA will not be used as a confirmatory process, but a bottom-up summarization of data that has been explored in its fullness (Behrens & Yu, 2003; Jebb et al., 2017; Komorowski et al., 2016; National Institute of Standards and Technology,

2013; Sijtsma, 2016; Sijtsma et al., 2016). As such, the last step within EDA is retrodution of the data, meaning the use of the logic of discovery to form an explanation of what the results mean for practical use (Haig, 2005; Hoaglin et al., 2000; Levin-Rozalis, 2010). This analysis “is an ongoing process of presentation of data gathered in the field, presentation of explanations of these data, and an examination of their logical connection in such a way that all the findings derive logically from the explanations” (Levin-Rozalis, 2010, p 9). This research assisted in the development of future confirmatory data analysis research, but the information found in this exploratory study is not generalizable beyond the cases presented without further studies.

### **Ethical Procedures**

Permission for this study was gained from the Walden University’s Institutional Review Board before any data gathering or analysis commenced to ensure ethical research. When conducting social research, there is always a possibility of an ethical concern since we are dealing with human beings who have the right to autonomy and confidentiality, as well as the right to not be harmed in our pursuits of research (Babbie, 2017).

For this research, beneficence was a concern, even though there were no real-time participants. The research population that was included are males who have committed sexual assault against other males in the United States Army, as well as their victims. Although archival data will be used, there was a risk of identification of the population due to the low percentage of males being investigated for assaulting other males and the original data had individual identifying characteristics, thus making it nonconfidential. To



combat this, a sufficient number of cases were included, and only aggregate data was reported to reduce the risk as much as possible.

Issues of confidentiality and anonymity were addressed by safeguarding the files using numerical codes to identify the case files as information was being gathered. Additionally, any information stored on my personal computer was assigned passwords known only to the researcher. All original case files were maintained on a government-owned computer which was password protected and all information gathered was deidentified before placement on my personal computer.

A second ethical consideration was that the military is often considered a convenient population (Walden University, 2014) so this may have been a concern regarding the ethical guideline of justice (University of Iowa, n.d.). However, the decision in choosing this population came from the fact that the investigation reports were more complete, and therefore give a more generalizable result.

There is no conflict of interest in this study. Although I am employed with the United States Army, the information for the data analysis was provided by US Army CID Command which does not influence myself, my employment, or the outcome of the research.

### **Summary**

This chapter discussed the research design and its rationale including a description of the variables to be used. Also, it explained how EDA is consistent with proper research designed used to advance knowledge in the field regarding male-on-male sexual crimes. Next, the methodology employed as well as the data analysis plan was

discussed. These sections included the sample population chosen, how a nonprobability sampling method was employed and why, the process for gaining access to the data used, and how it was analyzed including a discussion on the software used and statistical tests. Finally, threats to internal, external, and statistical conclusion validity were discussed and the processes taken to neutralize and mitigate those threats were examined. Additionally, ethical procedures used to protect the data and the individual information in the case files were explained.

## Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this exploratory quantitative research study was to investigate and explore the dynamics of male-on-male penetrative sexual assaults in the United States Army. I utilized EDA to explore multiple variables including victim-offender relationship, length of the relationship, the specific sexual crime committed, nonsexual crimes discovered through the investigation, alcohol or drug use by either victim or offender during the incident, the evidence identified such as medical, electronic, or forensic evidence, demographics of the victim and offender including age, rank, military occupational specialty (MOS), deployment history of the offender, and identified sexual orientation of those involved. Additionally, location, time, and circumstances of the assault were explored including the presence of paraphilia, fantasy reenactment, the use of weapons or physical force, violence involvement, and grooming or stalking behaviors identified were determined through the data collection. The analysis established generalized patterns and themes of victims, offenders, and situational characteristics of the assaults through simple statistical analyses on all variables as they pertain to their specific research question. Additionally, I conducted univariate nongraphical statistics to determine trends in victim and offender demographic characteristics, including frequency and percentages, to explore the three research questions listed below:

Quantitative Research Question 1: What are the characteristics of offenders in male-on-male sexual assaults in the United States Army?

Quantitative Research Question 2: What are the characteristics of victims in male-on-male sexual assaults in the United States Army?

Quantitative Research Question 3: What situational factors characterize male-on-male sexual assaults in the United States Army?

In this chapter, I will discuss the data collection steps taken and the results found through exploration of victimization characteristics, offender data, and the situational dynamics presented in the case files. Finally, the results found are summarized.

### **Data Collection**

During September 2020, 260 cases were sent to me by the US Army, CID Command over a secure Department of Defense web-based platform and downloaded to a government laptop. I reviewed these cases to determine if they met the inclusion criteria of a male-on-male, penetrative sexual crime, that occurred between 2009 and 2019, and where a decision of probable cause had been confirmed. I did not include any cases where a female offender or victim was identified, where a victim was listed as under the age of 18, or where there was no penetration of at least one of the offender's identified victims in multi-victim cases.

Of the provided 260 case files, I identified 171 individual cases that met this criterion which included 168 victims and 124 offenders, as three of the victims were identified in two separate cases, and 34 of the offenders had multiple victims. The number of cases per year are as follows: 2009 ( $n = 17$ ), 2010 ( $n = 10$ ), 2011 ( $n = 10$ ), 2012 ( $n = 12$ ), 2013 ( $n = 10$ ), 2014 ( $n = 31$ ), 2015 ( $n = 13$ ), 2016 ( $n = 16$ ), 2017 ( $n = 10$ ), 2018 ( $n = 18$ ), and 2019 ( $n = 14$ ). I then reviewed and coded the cases using the designed variable coding list as noted in Appendix B. Each case was deidentified and assigned a

random number and the founded variable codes were placed into SPSS for further analysis. Table 4 presents the demographics of the offenders and victims in these cases.

**Table 4**

*Victim and Offender Demographics*

| Victim and Offender Demographics |                               | Victims (n=168) |       | Offenders (n=124) |       |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-------|-------------------|-------|
|                                  |                               | n               | %     | n                 | %     |
| Age                              | 18-24                         | 137             | 81.5% | 66                | 53.2% |
|                                  | 25-30                         | 27              | 16.1% | 44                | 35.5% |
|                                  | 31-35                         | 4               | 2.4%  | 6                 | 4.8%  |
|                                  | 36-40                         | 0               | 0.0%  | 6                 | 4.8%  |
|                                  | 40+                           | 0               | 0.0%  | 2                 | 1.6%  |
| Identified Race                  | White                         | 138             | 82.1% | 73                | 58.9% |
|                                  | African American              | 17              | 10.1% | 39                | 31.5% |
|                                  | American Indian/Alaska Native | 2               | 1.2%  | 2                 | 1.6%  |
|                                  | Asian or Pacific Islander     | 5               | 3.0%  | 8                 | 6.5%  |
|                                  | Other                         | 6               | 3.6%  | 2                 | 1.6%  |
| Rank                             | E1 thru E3                    | 97              | 57.7% | 53                | 42.7% |
|                                  | E4 thru E6                    | 71              | 42.3% | 67                | 54.0% |
|                                  | E7 thru E9                    | 0               | 0.0%  | 1                 | 0.8%  |
|                                  | WO1 thru WO5                  | 0               | 0.0%  | 1                 | 0.8%  |
|                                  | O1 thru O3                    | 0               | 0.0%  | 2                 | 1.6%  |
| Relationship Status              | Single                        | 139             | 82.7% | 93                | 75.0% |
|                                  | Married                       | 18              | 10.7% | 16                | 12.9% |
|                                  | Divorced                      | 0               | 0.0%  | 1                 | 0.8%  |
|                                  | Unknown                       | 11              | 6.5%  | 14                | 11.3% |

Two variables were discussed in Chapter 3 which will not be included in the data since no cases reported them as a dynamic of the case. Those two variables are prostitution or sex trafficking involvement and forced victim verbal activity.

Additionally, there were not enough cases that contained information on the deployment history of the victim or offender, so this information will also not be included.

A total population sample was used for this study. This sampling strategy allowed for targeting proper exploration of the large number of included variables, while incorporating a diverse range of male-on-male cases. Additionally, this sampling technique allowed for both average cases and extreme cases, to be analyzed which will provide a basis for future research with the sampled cases. Although many sexual assaults are not reported to Army investigators, this sampling technique allowed for the selection of all cases that fall within the target population available to better understand the victim, offender, and situational dynamics of male-on-male cases. To address external validity threats, the total population sample represented a sizable portion of all male-on-male sexual assaults that the Army investigated during the study inclusion years, and the assumption was made that these cases are a representative sample of a common sexual violence case.

## **Study Results**

### **Offender and Victim Dynamics**

Through analysis, it was found that the majority of both victims and offenders fell within the 18-24-year-old age range (69.5%,  $n = 203$ ), were White (73.2%,  $n = 211$ ), and single (79.5%,  $n = 232$ ). Offenders tended to be slightly older than victims with 35.5% ( $n = 44$ ) being in the 25-30-year-old age range compared with only 16.1% ( $n = 27$ ) of the victims falling in that range. No victims were over the age of 35, and only eight offenders were over 35 years old. Table 5 depicts the age ranges of victims and offenders, Table 6

depicts the race of the victims and offenders, and Table 7 depicts the relationship status of the victims and offenders at the time of the assault.

**Table 5**

*Age Ranges of Victims and Offenders*

| Age Range | Victims<br>( <i>n</i> = 168) |       | Offenders<br>( <i>n</i> = 124) |       | Total Sample<br>( <i>N</i> = 292) |       |
|-----------|------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|-------|
|           |                              |       |                                |       |                                   |       |
| 18-24     | 137                          | 81.5% | 66                             | 53.2% | 203                               | 69.5% |
| 25-30     | 27                           | 16.1% | 44                             | 35.5% | 71                                | 24.3% |
| 31-35     | 4                            | 2.4%  | 6                              | 4.8%  | 10                                | 3.4%  |
| 36-40     | 0                            | 0.0%  | 6                              | 4.8%  | 6                                 | 2.1%  |
| 40+       | 0                            | 0.0%  | 2                              | 1.6%  | 2                                 | 0.7%  |

**Table 6**

*Race of Victims and Offenders*

| Race                          | Victims<br>( <i>n</i> = 168) |       | Offenders<br>( <i>n</i> = 124) |       | Total Sample<br>( <i>N</i> = 292) |       |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|-------|
|                               |                              |       |                                |       |                                   |       |
| White                         | 138                          | 82.1% | 73                             | 58.9% | 211                               | 72.3% |
| African American              | 17                           | 10.1% | 39                             | 31.5% | 56                                | 19.2% |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 2                            | 1.2%  | 2                              | 1.6%  | 4                                 | 1.4%  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander     | 5                            | 3.0%  | 8                              | 6.5%  | 13                                | 4.5%  |
| Other                         | 6                            | 3.6%  | 2                              | 1.6%  | 8                                 | 2.7%  |

**Table 7**

*Relationship Status of Victims and Offenders*

| Relationship Status | Victims<br>( <i>n</i> = 168) |       | Offenders<br>( <i>n</i> = 124) |       | Total Sample<br>( <i>N</i> = 292) |       |
|---------------------|------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|-------|
|                     |                              |       |                                |       |                                   |       |
| Single              | 139                          | 82.7% | 93                             | 75.0% | 232                               | 79.5% |
| Married             | 18                           | 10.7% | 16                             | 12.9% | 34                                | 11.6% |
| Divorced            | 0                            | 0.0%  | 1                              | 0.8%  | 1                                 | 0.3%  |
| Unknown             | 11                           | 6.5%  | 14                             | 11.3% | 25                                | 8.6%  |

The most common military occupational specialty (MOS) among both offenders and victims was combat arms (41.4%,  $n = 121$ ) followed by the medical and emergency field (13.0%,  $n = 38$ ). Also found was that 96.9% ( $n = 283$ ) of both offenders and victims were active duty service members. Table 8 depicts the military occupational specialty of the victims and offenders.

**Table 8**

*Military Occupational Specialties of Victims and Offenders*

| Military Occupation             | Victims<br>( $n = 168$ ) |       | Offenders<br>( $n = 124$ ) |       | Total Sample<br>( $N = 292$ ) |       |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|-------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|-------|
| Administrative support          | 14                       | 8.3%  | 14                         | 11.3% | 28                            | 9.6%  |
| Intelligence and combat support | 16                       | 9.5%  | 19                         | 15.3% | 35                            | 12.0% |
| Arts and media                  | 1                        | 0.6%  | 2                          | 1.6%  | 3                             | 1.0%  |
| Legal and law enforcement       | 13                       | 7.7%  | 7                          | 5.6%  | 20                            | 6.8%  |
| Combat                          | 77                       | 45.8% | 44                         | 35.5% | 121                           | 41.4% |
| Mechanic                        | 8                        | 4.8%  | 5                          | 4.0%  | 13                            | 4.5%  |
| Computers and technology        | 4                        | 2.4%  | 4                          | 3.2%  | 8                             | 2.7%  |
| Medical and emergency           | 19                       | 11.3% | 19                         | 15.3% | 38                            | 13.0% |
| Construction and engineering    | 11                       | 6.5%  | 6                          | 4.8%  | 17                            | 5.8%  |
| Transportation and aviation     | 5                        | 3.0%  | 4                          | 3.2%  | 9                             | 3.1%  |

Among cases where sexual orientation was identified, victims were more likely to be heterosexual (67.9%,  $n = 114$ ), whereas the identified sexual orientation of offenders was more often noted as homosexual (43.5%,  $n = 54$ ) or bisexual (18.5%,  $n = 23$ ). It should be noted, however, that 19.6% ( $n = 33$ ) of the victims and 33.9% ( $n = 42$ ) of the offenders did not have an identified sexual orientation in the case file. Table 9 depicts the identified sexual orientation of the victims and offenders if known.



**Table 9***Identified Sexual Orientation of Victims and Offenders*

| Sexual Orientation | Victims<br>( <i>n</i> = 168) |       | Offenders<br>( <i>n</i> = 124) |       | Total Sample<br>( <i>N</i> = 292) |       |
|--------------------|------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|-------|
|                    |                              |       |                                |       |                                   |       |
| Heterosexual       | 114                          | 67.9% | 5                              | 4.0%  | 119                               | 40.8% |
| Homosexual         | 15                           | 8.9%  | 54                             | 43.5% | 69                                | 23.6% |
| Bisexual           | 6                            | 3.6%  | 23                             | 18.5% | 29                                | 9.9%  |
| Unknown            | 33                           | 19.6% | 42                             | 33.9% | 75                                | 25.7% |

Victims most often were in the ranks of E1-E3 (57.7%, *n* = 97) followed by E4-E6 (42.3%, *n* = 71). Offenders more often were in the ranks of E4-E6 (54.0%, *n* = 67) followed by E1-E3 (42.7%, *n* = 53). No offenders were reported over the rank of O3. Table 10 depicts the rank of the victims and offenders.

**Table 10***Rank of Victims and Offenders*

| Rank         | Victims<br>( <i>n</i> = 168) |       | Offenders<br>( <i>n</i> = 124) |       | Total Sample<br>( <i>N</i> = 292) |       |
|--------------|------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|-------|
|              |                              |       |                                |       |                                   |       |
| E1 thru E3   | 97                           | 57.7% | 53                             | 42.7% | 150                               | 51.4% |
| E4 thru E6   | 71                           | 42.3% | 67                             | 54.0% | 138                               | 47.3% |
| E7 thru E9   | 0                            | 0.0%  | 1                              | 0.8%  | 1                                 | 0.3%  |
| WO1 thru WO5 | 0                            | 0.0%  | 1                              | 0.8%  | 1                                 | 0.3%  |
| O1 thru O3   | 0                            | 0.0%  | 2                              | 1.6%  | 2                                 | 0.7%  |

Most offenders and victims were considered social acquaintances or friends (63.2%, *n* = 108) who had known each other for 1 to 12 months (36.8%, *n* = 63). Table 11 depicts the type and length of relationships between victims and offenders at the time of the assault.

**Table 11***Type and Length of Relationship Between Victims and Offenders*

| Variable               | Type and Length of Relationship       | Frequency | %     |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|-------|
| Type of Relationship   | Stranger                              | 14        | 8.2%  |
|                        | Intimate partner                      | 5         | 2.9%  |
|                        | Social acquaintance/ Friends          | 108       | 63.2% |
|                        | Co-workers                            | 14        | 8.2%  |
|                        | Roommate/ Barracks mate               | 15        | 8.8%  |
|                        | Subordinate/ Supervisor               | 13        | 7.6%  |
|                        | Medical or Behavioral Health provider | 2         | 1.2%  |
| Length of Relationship | Unknown                               | 36        | 21.1% |
|                        | Under 1 month                         | 14        | 8.2%  |
|                        | 1 to 12 months                        | 63        | 36.8% |
|                        | Over 12 months                        | 43        | 25.1% |
|                        | Stranger                              | 15        | 8.8%  |

Through interviews with the victims and offenders of these cases, it was found that six of the offenders (4.8%) and eight of the victims (4.8%) reported a history of prior sexual or physical abuse, either in childhood or adulthood and three of the victims reported being assaulted by two of the offenders within the sample. Of the 124 offenders, 34 (27.4%) had multiple victims accredited to them with the highest being an offender with five known victims. Finally, there were 16 (9.3%) offenders who had known prior investigations for nonsexual crimes, and 23 (13.4%) had been investigated for a prior sexual offense, including two cases of child pornography possession.

**Assault Situational Dynamics**

It was found that most assaults occurred in the home or barracks room of the offender (34.5%,  $n = 59$ ) or victim (26.3%,  $n = 45$ ). In 39.8% ( $n = 68$ ) of the cases, alcohol was being served or consumed in the location where the assault took place. Of the known times and days, assaults most often occurred between the hours of midnight and

six a.m. (60.2%,  $n = 103$ ) on a Friday (15.8%,  $n = 27$ ), Saturday (17.0%,  $n = 29$ ), or Sunday (11.7%,  $n = 20$ ). In most cases, witnesses were not present in the assault location (84.8%,  $n = 145$ ), however, in the remaining assaults, witnesses were often in an adjoining room or nearby area. Table 12 depicts the locations, times, and dates of the assaults.

**Table 12**

*Assault Location, Time, and Date*

| Variable         | Assault Location, Time, and Date           | Frequency | %     |
|------------------|--|-----------|-------|
| Assault Location | Deployed environment, barracks             | 7         | 4.1%  |
|                  | Deployed environment, place of duty        | 1         | 0.6%  |
|                  | Deployed environment, other                | 2         | 1.2%  |
|                  | On post, Home/barracks of victim           | 45        | 26.3% |
|                  | On post, Home/barracks of offender         | 59        | 34.5% |
|                  | On post, Victim, and offender co-habitate  | 8         | 4.7%  |
|                  | Off post, Home of victim                   | 5         | 2.9%  |
|                  | Off post, Home of offender                 | 5         | 2.9%  |
|                  | Off post, Victim, and offender co-habitate | 7         | 4.1%  |
|                  | Place of duty/work                         | 8         | 4.7%  |
|                  | On post, Bar/tavern/club                   | 1         | 0.6%  |
|                  | On post, other                             | 18        | 10.5% |
|                  | Off post, other                            | 5         | 2.9%  |
| Time of Assault  | 0000-0600                                  | 103       | 60.2% |
|                  | 0601-1200                                  | 8         | 4.7%  |
|                  | 1201-1800                                  | 2         | 1.2%  |
|                  | 1801- 2359                                 | 17        | 9.9%  |
| Day of Assault   | Monday                                     | 6         | 3.5%  |
|                  | Tuesday                                    | 2         | 1.2%  |
|                  | Wednesday                                  | 8         | 4.7%  |
|                  | Thursday                                   | 15        | 8.8%  |
|                  | Friday                                     | 27        | 15.8% |
|                  | Saturday                                   | 29        | 17.0% |
|                  | Sunday                                     | 20        | 11.7% |

Stalking, grooming, or sexual harassment was noted in 38.6% ( $n = 66$ ) of the cases, which was aimed at not only the victim but other individuals who had contact with

the offender. Two of the cases were results of a commander's investigations into reported sexual harassment or equal opportunity complaints within the unit. Furthermore, 9.9% ( $n = 17$ ) of the victims reported that they were victims of retaliation, threats, or harassment following the assault, often by the offender or the offender's friends. No instances of command retaliation or reprisal were noted in the cases.

In 22 cases (12.9%), there were identified actions that the assault was preplanned such as arranging for others to be out of the barracks room in order to isolate the victim or providing excessive alcohol or drugs to the victim. The two main methods of offender approach noted were the con (69.6%,  $n = 119$ ), and the use of a surprise (30.4%,  $n = 52$ ). The con approach included cases where the victim had been drinking and the offender used this to lower his defenses before committing the assault. Cases where the victim was asleep or unconscious, with no alcohol or drug use involved, were included in cases identified as a surprise approach. Alcohol or drug use by the victim to the point of incapacitation was noted in 59.2% ( $n = 102$ ) of the cases, and equally, 59.2% ( $n = 102$ ) of the cases involved a victim who was asleep or unconscious at least during part of the assault.

Alcohol and drug use were noted to be a factor with victims and offenders. 67.2% ( $n = 115$ ) of offenders reported drinking alcohol before the assault compared to only 18.1% ( $n = 31$ ) of the offenders who reported being sober. Victims had a higher rate of alcohol use with 77.2% ( $n = 132$ ) reporting being intoxicated versus only 14.6% ( $n = 25$ ) being sober. Offenders were noted to surreptitiously drug their victim in 14 cases,

including two cases where the victim also had alcohol in their system. Table 13 depicts the alcohol and drug use of the victims and offenders at the time of the assaults.

**Table 13**

*Alcohol and/or Drug Use by Victims and Offenders*

| Alcohol and/or Drug Use                           | Frequency | %     |
|---|-----------|-------|
| Alcohol use, offender                             | 111       | 64.9% |
| Drug use, offender                                | 1         | 0.6%  |
| Alcohol and drug use, offender                    | 4         | 2.3%  |
| Offender sober                                    | 31        | 18.1% |
| Alcohol use, victim                               | 113       | 66.1% |
| Drug use, victim                                  | 9         | 5.3%  |
| Alcohol and drug use, victim                      | 5         | 2.9%  |
| Alcohol use, victim surreptitious/forced          | 2         | 1.2%  |
| Drug use, victim surreptitious/forced             | 2         | 1.2%  |
| Alcohol and drug use, victim surreptitious/forced | 12        | 7.0%  |
| Victim sober                                      | 25        | 14.6% |

During the assault, offenders were noted to control their victims through multiple means, the most common of which being their mere presence (69.9%,  $n = 119$ ). This was noted as being possible due to the high levels of alcohol use or lack of consciousness of the victim due to sleep or alcohol intoxication. Offenders were also noted to have used minimal physical force, often just enough to manipulate the victim's body, in 22.8% ( $n = 39$ ) of the assaults. Weapons and a moderate level of force were only observed in a small percentage of the cases. Although an outlier finding, it should be noted that of the eight cases where a moderate level of force was used, no heterosexual offenders were reported as five were homosexual, two were bi-sexual, and one was unknown. Table 14 depicts the tactics used by the offender to control the victim, and Table 15 identifies those tactics based upon the sexual orientation of the victim and offenders.

**Table 14***Offender's Control of The Victim During Assault*

| Type of Control             | Frequency | %     |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-------|
| Mere presence               | 119       | 69.6% |
| Verbal threats              | 2         | 1.2%  |
| Presence of a weapon, gun   | 1         | 0.6%  |
| Presence of a weapon, knife | 2         | 1.2%  |
| Physical force minimal      | 39        | 22.8% |
| Physical force, moderate    | 8         | 4.7%  |

**Table 15***Offender's Control of the Victim Based on Sexual Orientation*

| Sexual Orientation of Offender | Sexual Orientation of Victim | <i>n</i>        | Level of Force            | Freq | %      |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|------|--------|
| Unknown                        | Unknown                      | <i>(n = 19)</i> | Mere presence             | 13   | 68.4%  |
|                                |                              |                 | Physical force, minimal   | 5    | 26.3%  |
|                                |                              |                 | Physical force, moderate  | 1    | 5.3%   |
| Unknown                        | Heterosexual                 | <i>(n = 31)</i> | Mere presence             | 23   | 74.2%  |
|                                |                              |                 | Verbal threats            | 1    | 3.2%   |
|                                |                              |                 | Presence of weapon, gun   | 1    | 3.2%   |
|                                |                              |                 | Physical force, minimal   | 6    | 19.4%  |
| Unknown                        | Homosexual                   | <i>(n = 1)</i>  | Mere presence             | 1    | 100.0% |
| Unknown                        | Bisexual                     | <i>(n = 1)</i>  | Mere presence             | 1    | 100.0% |
| Heterosexual                   | Heterosexual                 | <i>(n = 10)</i> | Mere presence             | 7    | 70.0%  |
|                                |                              |                 | Physical force, minimal   | 3    | 30.0%  |
| Homosexual                     | Unknown                      | <i>(n = 10)</i> | Mere presence             | 8    | 80.0%  |
|                                |                              |                 | Presence of weapon, knife | 1    | 10.0%  |
|                                |                              |                 | Physical force, minimal   | 1    | 10.0%  |
| Homosexual                     | Heterosexual                 | <i>(n = 46)</i> | Mere presence             | 36   | 78.3%  |
|                                |                              |                 | Presence of weapon, knife | 1    | 2.2%   |
|                                |                              |                 | Physical force, minimal   | 8    | 17.4%  |
|                                |                              |                 | Physical force, moderate  | 1    | 2.2%   |
| Homosexual                     | Homosexual                   | <i>(n = 13)</i> | Mere presence             | 5    | 38.5%  |
|                                |                              |                 | Physical force, minimal   | 5    | 38.5%  |
|                                |                              |                 | Physical force, moderate  | 3    | 23.1%  |
| Homosexual                     | Bisexual                     | <i>(n = 4)</i>  | Mere presence             | 2    | 50.0%  |
|                                |                              |                 | Physical force, minimal   | 1    | 25.0%  |
|                                |                              |                 | Physical force, moderate  | 1    | 25.0%  |
| Bisexual                       | Unknown                      | <i>(n = 6)</i>  | Mere presence             | 3    | 50.0%  |
|                                |                              |                 | Physical force, minimal   | 2    | 33.3%  |
|                                |                              |                 | Physical force, moderate  | 1    | 16.7%  |
| Bisexual                       | Heterosexual                 | <i>(n = 28)</i> | Mere presence             | 19   | 67.9%  |
|                                |                              |                 | Physical force, minimal   | 8    | 28.6%  |
|                                |                              |                 | Physical force, moderate  | 1    | 3.6%   |
| Bisexual                       | Homosexual                   | <i>(n = 1)</i>  | Mere presence             | 1    | 100.0% |
| Bisexual                       | Bisexual                     | <i>(n = 1)</i>  | Verbal threats            | 1    | 100.0% |

Offenders were noted by the victims to be silent during their assaults (53.2%,  $n = 91$ ) or use pseudo-courting language (39.8%,  $n = 68$ ) when engaging with the victim. Other verbal behavior which was noted in outlier cases include hostile ( $n = 2$ ), concerned ( $n = 1$ ), inquisitive ( $n = 1$ ), disclosing ( $n = 1$ ), apologetic ( $n = 1$ ), and threatening ( $n = 4$ ). Victims responded to the assault in a variety of reported ways with verbal resistance (31.0%,  $n = 53$ ) and verbal with physical resistance (25.1%,  $n = 46$ ) being the most noted. Even when victims used physical resistance, it was minimal and only five offenders (4.0%) were injured by victim resistance/fighting back versus 20 victims who were injured during the assault (11.7%). Table 16 depicts the victim's response during the assault.

**Table 16**

*Victim Response During Assault*

| Victim Response                          | Frequency | %     |
|--|-----------|-------|
| Verbal resistance                        | 53        | 31.0% |
| Physical resistance                      | 12        | 7.0%  |
| Nonviolent/passive resistance            | 23        | 13.5% |
| Attempting to flee                       | 7         | 4.1%  |
| Freezing                                 | 9         | 5.3%  |
| Victim in and out of consciousness       | 11        | 6.4%  |
| Verbal and physical resistance           | 46        | 25.1% |
| Verbal and nonviolent/passive resistance | 13        | 7.6%  |

Offenders reacted to this resistance through ceasing the demand (45.0%,  $n = 77$ ), ignoring the victim and continuing the acts (17.5%,  $n = 30$ ), or using force (17.0%,  $n = 29$ ) most often respectively. Also, there were 17 victims (9.9%) who were unconscious during the entire assault, and therefore, did not offer any resistance. Finally, 11 (6.4%) of



the offenders fled when the victim resisted and seven (6.4%) attempted to compromise or negotiate with the victim for further acts.

Offenders were noted to commit multiple sexual acts upon the victims during the assaults with offender to victim fellatio being the most common single act (43.3%,  $n = 74$ ) and offender to victim fellatio as well as anal penetration (12.3%,  $n = 21$ ) being the most common multiple acts. In addition to sexual crimes, 11(6.4%) offenders committed a co-occurring nonsexual crime, which included providing alcohol to underage victims, burglary, or assault. Table 17 depicts the sexual act or acts committed by the offender during the assault.

**Table 17**

*Sexual Act(s) Committed During Assault*

|               | Sexual Act(s) Committed                                     | Frequency | %     |
|---------------|---|-----------|-------|
| Single Act    | Offender to victim fellatio                                 | 74        | 43.3% |
|               | Anal penetration  | 16        | 9.4%  |
|               | Made to penetrate   | 1         | 0.6%  |
|               | Touching/ fondling over clothes                             | 20        | 11.7% |
|               | Touching/ fondling under clothes                            | 13        | 7.6%  |
| Multiple Acts | Offender to victim fellatio and victim to offender fellatio | 10        | 5.8%  |
|               | Offender to victim fellatio and anal penetration            | 21        | 12.3% |
|               | Offender to victim fellatio and made to penetrate           | 13        | 7.6%  |
|               | Victim to offender fellatio and anal penetration            | 1         | 0.6%  |
|               | Anal penetration and made to penetrate                      | 2         | 1.2%  |

**Law Enforcement Response and Evidence Identified**

Disclosing a sexual assault is a personal decision and many victims do not come forward for a variety of reasons. In these cases, 21 of the victims (12.3%) chose to initially opt for restricted reporting for their assault. Victims most often reported within 1 to 6 days of their assault (32.2%,  $n = 55$ ), or within 1 month to a year (30.4%,  $n = 52$ ).

Most reports came into law enforcement within one-month time (58.0%,  $n = 99$ ). Since the window for possible evidence recovery is within five days of the assault, victims coming forward within this time frame resulted in 42 (24.6%) of the cases having medical evidence, and 51 (29.8%) of the cases having DNA evidence available. Initial law enforcement notification was made most often through direct victim reporting (46.8%,  $n = 80$ ) or through the Sexual Response Program victim advocates (36.3%,  $n = 62$ ). Table 18 depicts the time to the disclosure of the assault to law enforcement following an assault and Table 19 depicts how the notification was made.

**Table 18**

*Time to Disclosure to Law Enforcement*

| Time to Disclosure | Frequency | %     |
|--------------------|-----------|-------|
| Immediate          | 21        | 12.3% |
| 1 day to 6 days    | 55        | 32.2% |
| 1 week to 1 month  | 23        | 13.5% |
| 1 month to 1 year  | 52        | 30.4% |
| Longer than 1 year | 20        | 11.7% |

**Table 19**

*Initial Law Enforcement Notification Method*

| Initial Law Enforcement Notification Method                           | Frequency | %     |
|---|-----------|-------|
| Victim reported   | 80        | 46.8% |
| Friend or neighbor reported   | 1         | 0.6%  |
| Other family member reported  | 2         | 1.2%  |
| Doctor, nurse, or other health care provider reported                 | 6         | 3.5%  |
| Minister, clergy, priest, rabbi, or another religious leader reported | 1         | 0.6%  |
| SARC/VA reported  | 62        | 36.3% |
| Supervisor reported   | 16        | 9.4%  |
| Unit member/coworker reported   | 1         | 0.6%  |
| Law enforcement or security guard direct observation                  | 2         | 1.2%  |

Once a disclosure was made and an investigation started, not all the victims participated or cooperated with the subsequent investigation. However, these victims were outliers, as 154 (90.1%) of the victims participated through the entirety of the case. According to the victims in the cases, recantations were a result of harassment by the offender and not due to a false report. Table 20 depicts the participation level of the victim and whether the victim recanted after disclosure.

**Table 20**

*Victim Participation in Investigation and Prosecution*

| Victim Participation in Investigation and Prosecution |                                     | Frequency | %     |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----------|-------|
| Victim declined to participate                        | Yes, from onset of investigation    | 7         | 4.1%  |
|   | Yes, during investigation           | 2         | 1.2%  |
|   | Yes, upon referral to court-martial | 8         | 4.7%  |
|   | Victim participated                 | 154       | 90.1% |
| Victim recanted                                       | No                                  | 168       | 98.2% |
|   | Yes                                 | 3         | 1.8%  |

In 123 (71.9%) of the cases, the offender consented to be interviewed by law enforcement. Of those interviewed, 28 (22.8%) offenders did not confess, but 48 (28.1%) offenders made partial admissions to the acts. In 37 (21.6%) the cases, a full confession was made by the offender, often in a second interview, and ten (5.8%) cases resulted in a post polygraph confession. In seven cases (4.1%), an identified paraphilia or fantasy enactment was discovered through offender interviews.

Digital evidence was available in 47 (27.5%) of the cases, often in the form of text or social media messages where offenders would apologize to the victim or through pre-text phone calls where admissions were made. In six cases (3.5%) photographs were

taken of the victim, and in five cases (2.9%) videos of the assault were made by the offender, including two cases where victims were unaware they had been assaulted until a law enforcement officer found the videos while conducting an indecent viewing investigation into the offender.

### **Case Outcomes**

During 2009-2019, 75 (43.9%) of the cases resulted in a court-martial for a sexual crime, three (1.8%) resulted in court-martial for a nonsexual crime, eight (4.7%) resulted in a conviction in an Article 15 hearing for a sexual crime, eight (4.7%) for a nonsexual crime, and 41 (24.0%) resulted in other nonjudicial punishment. Additionally, 29 (17.0%) of the cases were dismissed and seven (4.1%) of the cases that proceeded to court-martial resulted in acquittals. No discernable pattern was noted between the year of the case and the outcome.

### **Summary**

This chapter identified the male-on-male offenders through analysis of their age, race, relationship status at the time of the assault, identified sexual orientation, rank, military occupational specialty, deployment history, service component, and known prior criminal offenses. Characteristics of victims of these assaults were identified through analysis of their age, race, relationship status at the time of the assault, identified sexual orientation, rank, military occupational specialty, and service component. Situational dynamics of the assault were identified through analysis of the length and type of relationship between victim and offender, alcohol or drug use of either the victim or offender at the time of the assault, case year, day, time, and location specifics of the

assault, victim or offender injuries resulting from the assault, evidence recovered or removed from the scene, harassment, threats, force and/or violence used both during and after the assault, co-occurring crimes committed during the assault, the offender's and victim's actions before, during, and after the assault, law enforcement notification and response, and case outcomes. In Chapter 5, I will discuss the findings through an interpretation and analysis of the findings, the limitations of the study, recommendations for future research, implications for social change, and conclusion.

## Chapter 5: Discussion

The purpose of this exploratory quantitative research study was to investigate and explore the dynamics of male-on-male penetrative sexual assaults in the United States Army. Prior literature had been conducted on sexual violence within the military population, but there was a gap in the research on male-on-male offenders. Specifically, who their victims are, what factors make them vulnerable, and the situational dynamics of the assaults that were unexplored amongst this population. These areas have been overlooked and understudied, particularly when it comes to more violent and penetrative assaults. The exploratory nature of this study revealed many characteristics of offenders, victims, and situational dynamics which were unknown regarding male-on-male sexual assault. Combined with the theoretical framework of the RAT, a better understanding of these assaults was accomplished which will allow for improved prevention, response, investigation, and prosecution abilities.

Study results revealed both victims and offenders were most likely to be 18-24 years old, active duty, combat soldiers, White, and single. Offenders identified more often as homosexual, while victims identified more often as heterosexual. Results revealed that most victims were in the rank of E1-E3 and offenders were E4-E6, although nearly all fell into the E4 rank in this group. Victims and offenders were, largely, social acquaintances or friends and knew each other for at least 1 to 12 months. The assaults most often took place within the offender's or victim's barracks room or home, on a weekend, between the hours of midnight and six a.m. Offenders used a con method of approach and the most common sexual act was offender to victim fellatio. Preassault

alcohol use was 67% and 76% of the cases for offenders and victims, respectively. Law enforcement notification was made through victim reporting and 44.5% of reports were within 1 week of the assault. In 71.9% of the cases, the offender consented to an interview resulting in admissions or confessions in 55.6% of the cases. In 81.9% of the cases, at least one type of digital, forensic, or medical evidence was available. Offenders were punished in 135 cases, with a conviction in a court-martial for their sexual crime being the most common case outcome.

Although this study was exploratory in nature, and therefore not meant to have confirmatory findings, several themes and patterns were discovered through analysis. This chapter will discuss the research through an interpretation and retrodution analysis of the findings, the limitations of the study, recommendations for future research, implications for social change, and a conclusion.

### **Interpretation of Findings**

The RAT states that three things must converge for a crime to take place: a motivated offender, a suitable target, and the lack of a capable guardian (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Additionally, these crimes often occur within the routine activities that offenders and victims engage regularly and the dynamics which surround an assault are often considered “normal,” everyday occurrences (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Turchik et al., 2015).

### **Motivated Offenders and Suitable Victims**

Demographically, prior research on military offenders revealed that they were male, married, White, in the enlisted ranks E1-E4, over the age of 24, and knew their

victim (Miller et al., 2018). These offenders used little to no force to perpetrate their crime and often assaulted their victims within a private setting such as the victim's or offender's residence (Miller et al., 2018). Most of these assaults involved a penetrative crime, alcohol and/or drug use, and younger victims who were new to the unit or military in general (Miller et al., 2018). Civilian studies on male-on-male offenders showed similar demographics in that most offenders were White, in their mid-20s, and heterosexual (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009; Ioannou et al., 2017). These offenders acted alone when they committed their crimes, often assaulted within their or the victim's home, had some level of violence involved, and committed acts such as anal penetration or forcing the victim to perform fellatio (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009; Ioannou et al., 2017).

The results of this study found that many of these dynamics held with a few exceptions. The three major differences were that offenders were found to be most often single, younger than 24 years of age, and, of those with a known sexual orientation, the offenders were homosexual or bisexual with heterosexual victims.

### **Levels of Violence and Cognitive Distortions**

In contrast to prior research on male-on-male offenders which found that it was heterosexual offenders who were more violent due to their motivations of dominance and aggression (Greathouse et al., 2015; Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009), one outlier finding discovered in this study was that very few cases involved any level of violence beyond what was needed to perpetrate the act. The cases that did have a level of violence involving moderate force, comprised a homosexual or bisexual offender with a



homosexual victim. Overall, offenders did not seem to be motivated through dominance, aggression, victim fear, or submission (Greathouse et al., 2015; Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009), but often took steps to ensure that the victim was unable to resist through alcohol or drug incapacitation or sleep.

In line with Almond et al.'s (2014) and Young's (2013) *Victim as a Person* schema, offenders in this study were, at least in their mind, engaging in a pseudo-relationship with their victim. I believe this is highlighted through the use of either silence or a pseudo-courting verbal behavior. Additionally, a cognitive distortion exhibited by multiple offenders interviewed revealed statements that they assaulted because of curiosity, impulsivity, or because they were intoxicated. Such statements to CID which highlight this thought process from the offender included:

- “I was drunk and curious” (Case 49).
- “Ya, I had a weakness, I made a mistake” (Case 92).
- “It was an accident” (Case 21).
- Offender stated he “did not know why he did it” (Case 47).
- “The victim was a ‘target of opportunity’ due to the offender wanting to have sexual contact with someone and could not find anyone else available” (Case 133).
- The offender stated he “didn’t remember anything because he was drunk, so he didn’t do it” (Case 125).

These distortions also assisted the offenders in reducing the inhibitions they may have felt in offending against other males. As noted in Toates et al., (2017), these

inhibitions come in the form of concern for the consequences of feeling fear, disgust, or remorse for their acts. Offenders, therefore, will use excitation factors to overcome those feelings, with the main avenue for reduction being alcohol or drug consumption to lessen the inhibitions (Toates et al., 2017).

### **Victim Selection and Cognitive Distortions**

The common pattern found in almost every case was an offender inviting the victim to his barracks room (or victim inviting the offender to his room) to watch movies or play video games, the victim ingesting large amounts of alcohol, subsequently passing out, and awaking to the offender performing fellatio on him. Many of the offenders specifically targeted underage victims and plied them with alcohol to lower their defenses. Offenders chose their victims based upon their suitability to fulfill their needs as noted in Toates et al., (2017) study, and then found a way to make them vulnerable and compliant to perpetrate their acts.

For example, one witness described an offender's behavior as "predatory behavior" as the offender would look for individuals who were intoxicated and offer to "take care of them" (Case 116). Another offender, a medic in a combat unit, used muscle relaxers to drug his victims before the assault. He would tell the victims that they were Tylenol or Motrin and would help with their potential hangover from alcohol consumption. When the victims would come in and out of consciousness during the assault, he would tell them he was "just checking on them" or "conducting an experiment" (Cases 144-148). In yet another case, a victim reported that he came forward with his assault because "his unit was coming back from the field and they will probably

drink and he knows this is the subject's 'prime time to do this stuff'" (Case 154). A second victim of this same offender received a text message from the offender stating,

I was hoping it was only going to be us two tonight. I was trying to get you to drink. I wanted to get you blackout drunk, watch Netflix or something, get you blacked out drunk and maybe something could've happened. (Case 156)

This offender mindset coupled with the unique circumstances of trust that occurs in the military left many victims vulnerable to assault. In concurrence with Ashley et al. (2019), most victims and offenders came from the combat arms career field. These soldiers must be able to rely on each other in combat, trust one another with their lives, and form bonds that last a lifetime. Victims of these assaults did not think anything of going up to a fellow service member's room and having a few drinks. One victim described the offender as his "best friend" and that he would "do anything for him" (Case 34), and in another case, a witness stated, "(t)he next day I told (the victim) he should tell someone, but he told me he was afraid it would ruin (subject)'s career and he didn't want that to happen" (Case 45). This team allegiance was noted in Castro et al.'s (2015) study to be a common reason that victims in a military setting do not come forward and report their assaults.

### **Victim Reactions and Cognitive Distortions**

When the assaults did occur, many of the victims were not able to physically react because of the shock, confusion, and terror that they were being assaulted by someone they termed their friend, coupled with the fact that they were being assaulted while under

the influence of alcohol or drugs diminishing their ability to fight back. This came out during victims' interviews in which the agents would inquire what their thought process was during the assault:

- I felt my buddy wasn't listening to me. I gave up fighting and just took it. I didn't want any of this to happen. I don't know if he raped me. I feel violated because he knew I didn't want to do anything. (Case 29)
- I was getting really scared because mainly of confusion on why he was doing this. I felt afraid because I didn't want any of this, but I was scared no one would hear me or no one would be there for me. I was thinking, would people believe me if I told them? Would I be looked at as someone who just wanted attention? I shouldn't have drank too much because if I wouldn't have I would have gotten myself out of this situation a long time ago. (Case 132)

The lack of a violent reaction or response from the victims may have led to the cognitive distortion that the victim was consenting to the act. As one multi-victim offender stated, "It was consensual and if it wasn't, he could of bit my dick off, if he didn't want to do it, but I made him suck my dick and I made him spread his butt cheeks" (Case 139). The victim, in this case, was in and out of consciousness during the act due to severe alcohol intoxication.

One victim stated his reason for not fighting back was due to the fear of what the offender would do if he reacted. "I was too scared to move because I felt his teeth on my penis, and I did not want him to bite my penis" (Case 77). In turn, victims stated that not

fighting back, often through no choice of their own, caused them to doubt their strength and left them with feelings of shame and guilt.

- I was weak, I tried to struggle my way out, but he had his weight on my arms. I was scared, scared more than anything. The shame and memory will be with me for the rest of my life. Shame that I couldn't stop him. (Case 71)
- I can't even think of the words to describe it at the moment. I don't know, used, guilty, like I let it happen. I kind of felt worthless. Completely and totally uncomfortable. I honestly didn't even want to look at myself. (Case 74)

Other offenders believed that since some acts were consensual, they had consent for all acts that occurred. In these cases, victims reported that when they asked the offender to stop the acts, the offender would become physically forceful. For example, in one case, the offender stated, "If I start, I'm not going to stop" (Case 120). In other cases, the victims felt as if they had no choice but to comply with the offender out of fear and therefore would participate in the acts. Appropriate questioning by CID agents, however, revealed that the acts were indeed, not consensual as noted in the quotes below:

- "I did not at all want this sort of activity, but since he had a gun and he was an officer, I felt like there was nothing I could say or do to make him stop" (Case 69).
- "I tried to just relax so it would stop hurting. My entire body was frozen. It was terrifying. I couldn't relax, I was tensed up and afraid" (Case 165).

- “I was very scared of being there all alone with him and him being so aggressive and much stronger than me. I realized I didn’t have any choice.” (Case 168).
- “I was scared and wanted it to stop but was too afraid to do anything to make him stop. I was afraid if he knew I was awake, he might choke me or threaten me or hurt me” (Case 36).
- “I did not know what to do at that point so I just allowed him to get whatever he was trying to get so it wouldn’t last long. I felt like a cornered kid who did not know what to do” (Case 46).
- “For me, the easiest response and answer was to do what he wants. I feel like such a coward for allowing him to overpower me and do that to me. I felt weak” (Case 37).

### **Criminal Behavior**

Like prior research (DeLisi et al., 2016; Lisak & Miller, 2002; Stander et al., 2008), this study found that many offenders had multiple victims. Not all the victims were “hands-on”, meaning a sexual assault occurred, but 66 cases noted that victims had been sexually harassed by the offender. This was significant within this population since several of the penetrative assaults were discovered through sexual harassment or equal opportunity violation investigations that had been started within the unit. The offenders were often well recognized among unit members as someone who made sexual comments, jokes, or innuendos, touched individuals in a nonsexual manner, took indecent

videos or photographs of males in their unit, or were known to target newer members of the unit to gain their trust.

Additionally, offenders would make homosexual comments to the victims as a way of testing their responses. For example, one offender made “gay” jokes and advances towards the victim, stating he was going to “man rape” him when his roommate left the room (Case 6). These behaviors were noted to be accepted, particularly within combat units where sexual harassment and comments made to other males were dismissed by both the unit members and command, as being “normal”. Unfortunately, many of the offenders use this “testing of the waters” with the victims through sexual harassment as a way to convince themselves that the victim was amenable to future sexual acts.

In addition to sexual harassment, 39 of the offenders were also found to have prior investigations for other sexual and nonsexual crimes. This is a dynamic that is well known in prior research, specifically in Lisak and Miller’s (2002) and Schaffer and Zarilla’s (2018) work. Drug possession, assault, domestic violence, resisting arrest, burglary, larceny, and traffic violations were among the most common nonsexual crimes. Offenders who had prior reports for sexual crimes included those who had been investigated in cases ranging from previous cases of rape, indecent viewing, sexual assaults committed in college, inappropriate relationships with trainees, and abusive sexual contacts. Finally, two offenders were also found to have child pornography in their possession during the investigation into their assaults.

### **Paraphilic Behavior and Fantasy**

Prior sexual violence history and paraphilic behavior have been known to coincide with recurring sexual behavior and multiple victims (Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009). Two sexual assault cases were results of indecent viewing investigations where offenders had videoed or photographed victims without their knowledge. The voyeur/offender in one of those investigations was noted as having over 100 victims recorded on his cell phone and computer, along with two known hands-on victims. Another offender was found to be secretly videotaping his roommate having sexual intercourse with his girlfriend. Other paraphilic behavior noted in the cases included an offender who engaged in cross-dressing during his crimes and one who targeted the victim specifically because he identified as a transsexual.

Victim selection by the offenders often are those in their direct unit and assaults occur during routine activities. Contrary to what the offenders said in their interviews, these assaults often occurred as the victim was asleep, unconscious, or incapacitated through ingesting drugs or alcohol. This is in line with prior research that found that many offenders state that their offense occurred in an environment that had factors allowing it, as well as a vulnerable victim that was available at that certain point of time (Farmer et al., 2016). Similar to Ioannou et al.'s (2017) research, offenders in this study performed various acts with their victims through the course of the assault. Unlike their research, however, the acts that were found to be the most prevalent were offender to victim fellatio or offender to victim fellatio in addition to anal penetration. This was an important distinction when exploring military sexual assaults in that this offender



behavior could be seen as an extension of fantasy enactment with the victim as motivation for the assault since it was them performing acts upon the victim and they had less of a chance of rejection to those acts.

### **Effects of Don't Ask, Don't Tell**

Prior research noted that DADT may have had a chilling effect on victims and that the military population would have problems with the integration of openly bisexual and homosexual individuals (Romaniuk & Loue, 2017). However, the effects of DADT were not noted in the results as stopping victims from coming forward, even though, it was a concern for many of them that they would be perceived as homosexual when their assault was reported. Comments such as, "I didn't want to speak up at first because I am scared people would spread rumors that I am gay" (Case 121) and "...my family hates gays and stuff like that. I still haven't told them; my family is all I've got" (Case 29). Although this was a concern for some victims, the overwhelming response during victim disclosures was positive and no indications of homophobia or retaliation due to sexual orientation were noted. Individuals who were interviewed in these cases, including witnesses and victims, stated that they were unconcerned with the sexual orientation of their fellow service members. Warner and Armstrong (2020) argued that gender bias may be a factor in a commander's decision to send a case to court-martial. However, the perceived or known sexual orientation of either the victim or offender was not found to have any effect on the commander's decisions to send cases to court-martial.

### **Lack of Guardianship**

Unfortunately for these victims, and in line with the RAT, the actions that they took before the crime which made them vulnerable, were normal everyday activities. As noted in Miller et al., (2018) and this study, binge drinking was a common factor for victim vulnerability in sexual assault cases. Yet, drinking, being alone with another male, and trusting their battle buddies, are all things that led to them being a suitable victim for their motivated offender. But it is not feasible to prohibit service members from going to each other's barracks rooms and hanging out. The dynamics of both living and working on the military installation, especially for younger and lower-ranking troops, would make this impractical.

This study revealed that some actions could have been taken to provide for a higher level of security, nonetheless. It was noted that many of the barracks room doors did not have a functioning lock and allowed the offender to enter the victim's room while they were sleeping. Additionally, many of the barracks areas did have camera security systems, but they were not functional, or they had "blind spots" that limited the view of the camera. Finally, although there was a Charge of Quarters (CQ) on duty in the barracks area, they often were only available to respond after an assault occurred. Those with CQ duties and witnesses to the assaults noted that nothing was unusual about males drinking together and going into each other's rooms, so they were not able to intervene before an assault took place. As recommended by Miller et al. (2018), having a roving noncommissioned officer (NCO) within the barracks area may have helped mitigate some of the assaults from occurring.

The lack of taking sexual harassment when it was male-on-male seriously, also left another important guardianship measure lacking. Many commanders and enlisted leadership did begin serious investigations into the offender's cases of sexual harassment. However, the line unit members often did not see sexual harassment as a "big deal" and did not take steps to stop it or intervene, thus leaving a victim vulnerable to further assaults.

### **Limitations of the Study**

As noted in Chapter 1, the limitations of this research are that the data gathered were restricted to what is included in the case files and only included a small number of cases. Since male-on-male sexual assault is one of the most underreported crimes and this study relied upon those who made an unrestricted report to law enforcement, it is unknown if cases that were not reported to law enforcement would include the same dynamics.

Another limitation of this work is that only penetrative cases were included. Since this is a small portion of the total sexually violent acts reported to the military, it is unknown if the dynamics, or victim and offender characterizations would be different in those cases that did not involve penetration. It also did not include cases where probable cause was not established. Historically, sexual assault crimes are notoriously hard to prove, especially since there is often a delay in reporting and little to no evidence. Therefore, there are potentially many more legitimate cases that were not included in this research that may have altered the results found. It is also unknown if victim selection and vulnerability factors would be the same in a female-on-male perpetrated assault.

Another limitation was that only six cases involved members of the National Guard and none involved the Army Reserves. Although some insight was gained into these cases, only those who were on Active duty orders at the time of assault were included. Differing dynamics may be at play in these groups if assaults which occurred during training weekends or summer drill were included.

Finally, the objective of this research study was to provide a basis for future research and hypothesis testing as well as evidence-based best practice results for prevention, response, investigation, and prosecution of male-on-male sexual assaults. Although the RAT helps to identify the “how” of a crime occurring, it does not explain the “why” (Pratt & Turanovic, 2016) which still leaves a gap of information to be explored about these cases. Since the study was exploratory in nature, the results cannot be generalized or conclusive without further research and hypothesis testing. Nevertheless, this study provides a starting point for research on this population and provided insight into a little-studied phenomenon.

### **Recommendations**

Prevention of sexual assault will only occur when a thorough understanding of offender motivation and development is gained (Canter & Youngs, 2009; Hazelwood & Burgess, 2009; Toates et al., 2017; Youngs, 2013). The demographics gathered in this study do not reveal inner motivation, although some motivational factors are exhibited through offender actions. Future qualitative research should be conducted with offenders in an effort to glean information on their thought processes during the crimes, their

victimology preference, and their need-based and criminal behavior to better understand them.

As part of that research, personal histories of the offenders, specifically their ACE scores, should be evaluated. When Levenson and Socia's (2016) conducted their research on convicted sexual offenders, they found a high number of offenders with negative ACE scores. Gleaned through offender interviews in these cases, 4.8% of offenders offered that they had a history of childhood sexual or physical assault, with some even using this as an excuse for committing their crimes. One offender termed his acts as his "inner demons and voices" resulting from his childhood abuse (Case 130). Furthermore, 4.8% of the victims in this study also reported a history of sexual abuse during their law enforcement interviews. Future research on both offender and victim experience with child abuse and/or high ACE scores should be done which would allow for insight into the potential motivation behind an offender's acts or vulnerability factors of a victim that may stem from this abuse.

Additionally, although the deployment histories of the offenders and victims were explored in this research, not enough of the cases provided information on the number or circumstances of deployments taken by the victims or offenders. Since deployment, especially to combat zones, often results in increased risks of subsequent depression, suicidal ideations, alcohol and drug use, involvement in high-risk activities, and post-traumatic stress, this is a variable that should be explored as these factors can lead to offending or being victimized (Ashley et al., 2019; Bunch et al., 2015; Castro et al., 2015; Schaffer & Zarilla, 2018; Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2001).

Since their presence was noted in multiple cases, another area of future study that would be worthwhile is how fantasy and paraphilic behavior is manifested in male-on-male assaults. It has been noted in the research that those whose crimes involve paraphilias tend to be less amenable to treatment and have a higher rate of paraphilic disorders tend to fall on the predator side of the spectrum (Hickey, 2015). Fantasy is the critical element in many sex offenses as well as a central aspect of many paraphilias. These fantasies reflect a deep psychological need that often starts in childhood or early adolescence (Ressler et al., 1992). Research done by the FBI has found that fantasies are often the result of unresolved early traumatic events in the life of a child, sometimes due to neglectful parents or other caretakers, which causes the child to retreat into the fantasy world (Kirsch & Becker, 2007). Fantasies and paraphilias are highly dependent upon what a person experiences in their daily life, specifically in what they see, feel, or read (Gee et al., 2004).

It is important for investigators and those working with individuals with paraphilias to understand where a paraphilia comes from, what fantasy is it serving, and what behavior is exhibited during the fantasy or acting out of the paraphilia (Hickey, 2015). As fantasies move from within the mind to someone acting them out in a criminal manner, the fulfillment of this need is often reflected in their crime scenes as well as their choices of victims and can give investigators clues as to what offender they should be looking for. Future research should be conducted to better explore the fantasy and paraphilic behaviors of male-on-male offenders.

## Implications

### Implications for Social Change

One of the biggest implications for social change comes from the knowledge that has been gained from this research in that we now have a starting point for future research on male-on-male assaults. To date, so little research has been done on this unique offender and victim population that it often left victims to believe that they were alone in their trauma and that they did not have anyone to turn to (Elder et al., 2017). In conjunction with male childhood victimization research done by organizations such as RAINN.org and 1in6.org, this research shows that adult male victimization does occur, and males are just as affected by their assaults as females. Assault leads to potential suicidal behavior, interpersonal problems, increased drug and alcohol use, and other negative potential outcomes. By highlighting that the male rape myths such as “men can’t be raped” and “men aren’t affected by rape” are not true, stigmatization of these victims can be reduced (O’Brien et al., 2015; Warner & Armstrong, 2020).

One of the greatest concerns of male victims is that when they come forward to report the assault, others will not believe them or that others would believe they are homosexual when they are not (Elder et al., 2017). This research found that the initial disclosure of the assault was often met with support, compassion, empathy, and action by those they told. The prevention and response programs were shown to be beneficial to the victims and many of these cases were prosecutable due to early reporting. Hopefully, this knowledge will encourage others who have been sexually assaulted to come forward,

without fear, and know that the policies are in place within the military system to support them.

### **Implications for Practice**

As a stakeholder for victim support, prevention and response programs will be provided more information on ways that they can educate the military population regarding sexual assault. They will be able to emphasize the importance of having a sexual assault exam done as soon as possible after the assault, even if the report is restricted. Additionally, they can bring light to the linkage between sexual harassment and sexual violence by encouraging soldiers to report all sexual harassment and not just male-to-female harassment. This should allow for quicker identification of problem behaviors by individuals and allow for commanders to do their job investigating, punishing, and potentially discharging offenders before an assault occurs.

For investigators of these assaults, this research emphasizes the need for continued thorough investigations which can result in successful prosecutions. It was noted that the victim interview questioning had improved from 2009 to 2019 resulting in more information gathered from the victims. Trauma-informed interviewing techniques allowed for the gathering of case information that was not historically asked for such as thoughts, emotions, feeling, and reactions that the victim had before, during, and after the assault.

Additionally, the use of a polygraph as a tool for gaining offender confessions was apparent. Although the polygraph examination itself is not admissible for court, proper questioning techniques of the offenders during initial interviews allowed for



better-crafted polygraph questions and subsequent confessions. Agents should be encouraged to continue the use of this tool to gain confessions and promote better prosecutions. Knowledge gained from this research will be included in courses taught by the Military Police School to better educate agents and prosecutors on the dynamics of these assaults so that they are aware of some of the uniqueness that they may encounter within these investigations. As a result of improved prevention, response, and investigation strategies, more victims will feel comfortable coming forward and more offenders will be held accountable for their actions.

### **Conclusions**

This research has provided much-needed insight into the dynamics of sexual assaults of males within the United States Army. Information about offenders, victims, and the assault dynamics have been overlooked in the past, and this study provides a firm foundation needed to expand research on this population. Prior research which has focused on male-on-female assaults and many of the theories used to study these crimes is not gender-inclusive, which this study provided. Additionally, it gave insight into how military populations and their coinciding cultural factors may lead to this crime. This research may provide a prevention framework to be enacted by command entities in the future. This can improve not only the training of the investigative body but also may inspire fostering a more comfortable climate for victims to come forward sooner when they have been assaulted.

## References

- Almond, L., McManus, M. A., & Ward, L. (2014). Male-on-male sexual assaults: An analysis of crime scene actions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 29*(7), 1279-1296. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513506282>
- Ashley, O. S., Lane, M. E., Morgan, J. K., Charm, S., Tharp, A., & Brown, M. (2019). Perceptions of high-risk situations for sexual assault: Gender differences in the U.S. Air Force. *Military Medicine, 184*(3/4), 443–450. <https://doi.org/10.1093/milmed/usy350>
- Ayres, C. (2019, April 2). 18 advantages and disadvantages of purposive sampling. <https://connectusfund.org/6-advantages-and-disadvantages-of-purposive-sampling>
- Babbie, E. (2017). *Basics of social research* (7th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Barr, D. J., Levy, R., Scheepers, C., & Tily, H. J. (2013). Random effects structure for confirmatory hypothesis testing: Keep it maximal. *Journal of Memory and Language, 68*(3), 255-278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2012.11.001>
- Beauregard, E., Busina, I., & Healey, J. (2017). Confessions of sex offenders: Extracting offender and victim profiles for investigative interviewing. *Journal of Criminal Psychology, 7*(1), 13-28. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCP-10-2016-0031>
- Beauregard, E., Rebocho, M. F., & Rossmo, D. K. (2010). Target selection patterns in rape. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling, 7*, 137–152. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jip.117>

- Behrens, J. T., & Yu, C. (2003). Exploratory data analysis. In *Handbook of psychology* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Brady, H. L. (2016). Justice is no longer blind: How the effort to eradicate sexual assault in the military unbalanced the military justice system. *University of Illinois Law Review*, 193–250. <https://www.illinoislawreview.org/wp-content/illr-content/articles/2016/1/Brady.pdf>
- Bunch, J., Clay-Warner, J., & Lei, M. (2015). Demographic characteristics and victimization risk: Testing the mediating effects of routine activities. *Crime & Delinquency*, 61(9), 1181–1205. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128712466932>
- Burkholder, G. J., Cox, K. A., & Crawford, L. M. (2016). *The scholar-practitioner's guide to research design*. Laureate Publishing.
- Canter, D., & Youngs, D. (2009). *Investigative psychology: Offender profiling and the analysis of criminal action*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Castro, C. A., Kintzle, S., Schulyer, A. C., Lucas, C. L., & Warner, C. H. (2015). Sexual assaults in the military. *Current Psychology Report*, 17(54), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-015-0596-7>
- Center for Innovation in Research and Teaching. (n.d.). Sampling methods for quantitative research. [https://cirt.gcu.edu/research/developmentresources/research\\_ready/quantresearch/sample\\_meth](https://cirt.gcu.edu/research/developmentresources/research_ready/quantresearch/sample_meth)

- Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review*, *44*, 588-608.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2094589>
- Culatta, E., Clay-Warner, J., Boyle, K. M., & Oshri, A. (2017). Sexual revictimization: A routine activity theory explanation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1–25.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517704962>
- Darke, P., Shanks, G., & Broadbent, M. (1998). Successfully completing case study research: Combining rigour, relevance, and pragmatism. *Information Systems Journal*, *8*(4), 273-289. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2575.1998.00040.x>
- Davis, L., Grifka, A., Williams, K., & Coffey, M. (Series Ed.). (2017). *2016 workplace and gender relations survey of active duty members* (No. AD1032638).  
<https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1032761.pdf>
- DeLisi, M., Caropreso, D. E., Drury, A. J., Elbert, M. J., Evans, J. L., Heinrichs, T., & Tahja, K. M. (2016). The dark figure of sexual offending: New evidence from federal sex offenders. *Journal of Criminal Psychology*, *6*(1), 3-15.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/jcp-12-2015-0030>
- Department of Defense Directive 1304.26 (1993) Qualification standards for enlistment, appointment, and induction.  
<https://biotech.law.lsu.edu/blaw/dodd/corres/html2/d130426x.htm>
- Deslauriers-Varin, N., & Beauregard, E. (2010). Victims' routine activities and sex offenders' target selection scripts: A latent class analysis. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal*

*of Research and Treatment*, 22(3), 315–342.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063210375975>

Douglas, J., Burgess, A. W., Burgess, A. G., & Ressler, R. K. (2011). *Crime classification manual: A standard system for investigating and classifying violent crimes* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Drury, A., Heinrichs, T., Elbert, M., Tahja, K., DeLisi, M., & Caropreso, D. (2017).

Adverse childhood experiences, paraphilias, and serious criminal violence among federal sex offenders. *Journal of Criminal Psychology*, 7(2), 105–119.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/JCP-11-2016-0039>

Duchesne, S., Seyller, M., & Chariot, P. (2018). Male sexual assault in Paris, France area:

An observational study over 8 years. *Forensic Science International*, 290, 16–28.

<https://doi.org/10.1010/j.forsciint.2018.06.018>

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *The Academy of*

*Management Review*, 14(4), 532–550. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258557>

Elder, W. B., Mata-Galan, E. L., Domino, J. L., & Kilmartin, C. (2017). Masculinity as

an avoidance symptom of posttraumatic stress. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*,

18(3), 198–207. <https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000123>

Farmer, M., McAlinden, A., & Maruna, S. (2016). Sex offending and situational

motivation: Findings from a qualitative analysis of desistance from sexual offending. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative*

*Criminology*, 60(15), 1756–1775. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X16668175>

- Ferdinando, L. (2019, April 3). DoD releases annual report on sexual assault in the military. <https://dod.defense.gov/News/Article/Article/1508127/dod-releases-annual-report-on-sexual-assault-in-military/>
- Fife, D., & Rodgers, J. L. (2019). Exonerating EDA, expanding CDA: A pragmatic solution to the replication crisis. *PsyArXiv*, 1-34.  
<https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/5vfq6>
- Frankfort-Nachmias, C., & Leon-Guerrero, A. (2018). *Social statistics for a diverse society* (8th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Gee, D. G., Devilly, G. J., & Ward, T. (2004). The content of sexual fantasies for sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse, 16*(4), 315–331.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/107906320401600405>
- Greathouse, S., Saunders, J., Matthews, M., Keller, K., & Miller, L. (2015). *A review of the literature on sexual assault perpetrator characteristics and behaviors*. RAND Corporation.  
[https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research\\_reports/RR1000/RR1082/RAND\\_RR1082.pdf](https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR1000/RR1082/RAND_RR1082.pdf)
- Haig, B. D. (2005). An abductive theory of scientific method. *Psychological Methods, 10*(4), 371-388. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989x.10.4.371>
- Hazelwood, R. R., & Burgess, A. (2009). *Practical aspects of rape investigation* (4th ed.). CRC Press.
- Heale, R. (2015). Validity and reliability in quantitative research. *Evidence Based Nursing, 18*(3), 66-67. <https://doi.org/10.1136/eb-2015-102129>

- Hequembourg, A. L., Parks, K. A., Collins, R. L., & Hughes, T. L. (2015). Sexual assault risks among gay and bisexual men. *Journal of Sex Research, 52*(3), 282-295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2013.856836>
- Hickey, E. (2015). *Serial murderers and their victims* (7th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Hines, D. A., Armstrong, J. L., Palm Reed, K., & Cameron, A. Y. (2012). Gender differences in sexual assault victimization among college students. *Violence and Victims, 27*(6), 992–940. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.27.6.922>
- Hoaglin, D. C., Mosteller, F., & Tukey, J. W. (2000). *Understanding robust and exploratory data analysis*. Wiley-Interscience.
- Ioannou, M., Hammond, L., & Machin, L. (2017). Male-on-male sexual assault: Victim, offender and offence characteristics. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling, 14*(2), 189-209. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jip.1483>
- Javid, A. (2018). Male rape, masculinities, and sexualities. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice, 52*, 199-210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlcrj.2017.12.003>
- Jebb, A. T., Parrigon, S., & Woo, S. E. (2017). Exploratory data analysis as a foundation of inductive research. *Human Resource Management Review, 27*, 265-276. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2016.08.003>
- Jones, C. (2010). Archival data: Advantages and disadvantages for research in psychology. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 4*(11), 1008-1017. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00317.x>
- Jones, M. A., Henry, L. M., Meehan, J., Seward, J. R., Murray, N. L., Capparelli, A. L., & Moore, K. (2015). Presentence Investigation Report Data Instrument (PIRCI)

[Measurement Instrument]. Center for Applied Criminal Case Analysis.

Melbourne, FL.

Kirsch, L. G., & Becker, J. V. (2007). Emotional deficits in psychopathy and sexual sadism: Implications for violent and sadistic behavior. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 27(8), 904–922. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2007.01.011>

Kohlbacher, F. (2006). The use of qualitative content analysis in case study research. In *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 7(1), 1-30. Institut für Qualitative Forschung. <http://epub.wu.ac.at/5315/1/75-195-1-PB.pdf>

Komorowski, M., Marshall, D. C., Salciccioli, J. D., & Crusain, Y. (2016). Exploratory data analysis. In *Secondary analysis of electronic health records* (pp. 185-203). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-43742-2\\_15](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-43742-2_15)

Laerd Dissertation. (2012). Total population sampling.

<http://dissertation.laerd.com/total-population-sampling.php>

Lee, P. J. (2014). *This man's military: Masculine culture's role in sexual violence* [Master's thesis]. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep13889>

Levenson, J. S., & Socia, K. M. (2016). Adverse childhood experiences and arrest patterns in a sample of sexual offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 31(10), 1883–1911. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088626051557075>

Levenson, J. S., Willis, G. M., & Prescott, D. S. (2016). Adverse childhood experiences in the lives of male sex offenders: Implication for trauma-informed care. *Sexual*



*Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 28(4), 340–359.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063214535819>

Levin-Rozalis, M. (2010). Using abductive research logic: ‘The logic of discovery’, to construct a rigorous explanation of amorphous evaluation findings. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*, 6(13), 1-14.

[https://journals.sfu.ca/jmde/index.php/jmde\\_1/article/view/251/249](https://journals.sfu.ca/jmde/index.php/jmde_1/article/view/251/249)

Lin, J., & Simon, W. (2016). Examining specialization among sex offenders released from prison. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 28(3), 253-267.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063214547581>

Lisak, D., & Miller, P. M. (2002). Repeat rape and multiple offending among undetected rapists. *Violence and Victims*, 17(1), 73-84.

<https://doi.org/10.1891/vivi.17.1.73.33638>

Lowe, M., & Rogers, P. (2017). The scope of male rape: A selective review of research, policy, and practice. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 35, 38-43.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2017.06.007>

Lundrigan, S., & Mueller-Johnson, K. (2013). Male stranger rape: A behavioral model of victim-offender interaction. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 40(7), 763-783.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854812474451>

Ma, X., Hummer, D., Golden, J. J., Fox, P. A., Hazen, R. M., Morrison, S. M., Downs, R. T., Madhikarmi, B. L., Wang, C., & Meyer, M. B. (2017). Using visual exploratory data analysis to facilitate collaboration and hypothesis generation in

cross-disciplinary research. *International Journal of Geo-Information*, 6(368), 1-

11. <http://doi.org/10.3390/ijgi6110368>

Maddan, S., & Pazzani, L. (2017). *Sex offenders' crimes and processing in the criminal justice system*. Wolters Kluwer.

Mancini, C., & Pickett, J. T. (2016). The good, the bad, and the incomprehensible: Typifications of victims and offenders as antecedents of beliefs about sex crimes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 31(2), 257-281.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260514555373>

Martinez-Catena, A., Redondo, S., Frerich, N., & Beech, A. R. (2016). A dynamic risk factors-based typology of sexual offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 1-25.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X16629399>

Matthews, M., Farris, C., Tankard, M., & Dunbar, M. S. (2018). *Needs of male sexual assault victims in the U.S. armed forces*. RAND Corporation.

[https://www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_reports/RR2167.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2167.html)

McNeeley, S. (2015). Lifestyle-routine activities and crime events. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 31(1), 30-52.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986214552607>

Miller, L. L., Keller, K. M., Wagner, L., Donohue, A. G., Marcellino, W., Greathouse, S. M., Matthews, M., & Ayer, L. (2018). *Air Force sexual assault situations, settings, and offender behavior*. RAND Corporation.

[https://www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_reports/RR1589.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1589.html)

- Monteith, L. L., Gerber, H. R., Brownstone, L. M., Soberay, K. A., & Bahraini, N. H. (2019). The phenomenology of military sexual trauma among male veterans. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 20(1), 115–127.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000153>
- National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2013). Exploratory data analysis. In *Engineering statistics handbook*. <https://www.itl.nist.gov/div898/handbook>
- O'Brien, C., Keith, J., & Shoemaker, L. (2015). Don't tell: Military culture and male rape. *Psychological Services*, 12(4), 357-365.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/ser0000049>
- O'Toole, M. E., Kilmartin, C., & Peterson, J. (2014). Sexual assault in the military: A discussion of the current status and future prevention. *Violence and Gender*, 1(1), 3-8. <https://doi.org/10.1089/vio.2013.1503>
- Pedneault, A., & Beauregard, E. (2014). Routine activities and time use: A latent profile approach to sexual offenders' lifestyles. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 26(1), 34–57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063212470705>
- Perry, L. A., Dover, T. J., Lancaster, S. L., Allen, N. E., Keel, T. G., & Eliopoulos, L. N. (2018). Development of a sexual assault event typology based on event attributes. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 45(11), 1709-1722.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854818784617>
- Pratt, T. C., & Turanovic, J. J. (2016). Lifestyle and routine activity theories revisited: The importance of “risk” to the study of victimization. *Victims and Offenders*, 11(3), 335–354. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2015.1057351>

RAINN.org. (2019). Victims of sexual violence: Statistics.

<https://www.rainn.org/statistics/victims-sexual-violence>

Ressler, R., Burgess, A., & Douglas, J. (1992). *Sexual homicides*. Simon & Schuster Inc.

Romaniuk, J. R., & Loue, S. (2017). Military sexual trauma among men: A review of the literature and a call for research. *Best Practices in Mental Health, 13*(1), 81–105.

<https://ezp.waldenulibrary.org/login?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.proquest.com%2Fdocview%2F2011566187%3Faccountid%3D14872>

Rosellini, A. J., Monahan, J., Street, A. E., Petukhova, M. V., Sampson, N. A., Benedek, D. M., Bliese, P., Stein, M. B., Ursano, R. J., & Kessler, R. C. (2017). Predicting sexual assault perpetration in the US Army using administration data. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine, 53*(5), 661–669.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2017.06.022>

Sadler, A. G., Cheney, A. M., Mengeling, M. A., Booth, B. A., Torner, J. C., & Young, L. B. (2018). Servicemen's perceptions of male sexual assault and barriers to reporting during active component and reserve/national guard military service. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1*–28.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518780407>

Savard, D. M., Kelley, T. M., & Merolla, D. M. (2017). Routine activities and criminal victimization: The significance of gendered spaces. *Journal of Interpersonal*

*Violence, 1*–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517721170>

Schaffer, B. J., & Zarilla, L. (2018). Military veteran sex offenders: Visible and on the radar. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 28(1), 109-124.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2017.1377135>

Schry, A. R., Hibberd, R., Wagner, H. R., Turchik, J. A., Kimbrel, N. A., Wong, M., Elbogen, E. E., Strauss, J. L., Brancu, M., & Veterans Affairs Mid-Atlantic

Mental Illness Research, Education and Clinical Center Workgroup (2015).

Functional correlates of military sexual assault in male veterans. *Psychological*

*Services*, 12(4), 384–393. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ser0000053>

Shareia, B. (2016). Qualitative and Quantitative case study research method on social science: Accounting perspective. *Dimension*, 2(3), 23-28.

[https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/1fe9/50120a8dc85a60aed368e38fb8b6b09f5a10.](https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/1fe9/50120a8dc85a60aed368e38fb8b6b09f5a10.pdf)

[pdf](https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/1fe9/50120a8dc85a60aed368e38fb8b6b09f5a10.pdf)

Sijtsma, K. (2016). Playing with data—or how to discourage questionable research practices and stimulate researchers to do things right. *Psychometrika*, 81(1), 1-

15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11336-015-9446-0>

Sijtsma, K., Veldkamp, C. L., & Wicherts, J. M. (2016). Improving the conduct and reporting of statistical analysis in psychology. *Psychometrika*, 81(1), 33-38.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11336-015-9444-2>

Silber, A. O., Lane, M. E., Morgan, J. K., Charm, S., Tharp, A., & Brown, M. (2019).

Perceptions of high-risk situations for sexual assault: Gender differences in the U.S. Air Force. *Military Medicine*, 184(3/4), 443–450.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/milmed/usy350>

- Skiadas, C. H., & Bozeman, J. R. (2019). *Data analysis and applications 1: Clustering and regression, modeling-estimating, forecasting and data mining*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Slater, C., Woodhams, J., & Hamilton-Giachritsis, C. (2014). Can serial rapists be distinguished from one-off rapists? *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 32, 220-239. <http://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2096>
- Spivak, A. L. (2011). Criminological perspectives. In *Sexual violence: Beyond the feminist--evolutionary debate* (pp. 67-96). <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/waldenu/reader.action?docID=1057861&pg=5>
- Stander, V. A., Merrill, L. L., Thomsen, C. J., Crouch, J. L., & Milner, J. S. (2008). Premilitary adult sexual assault victimization and perpetration in a Navy recruit sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23(11), 1636-1653. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260508314325>
- Stephan, U., Patterson, M., & Kelly, C. M. (2015). Organizations driving positive social change: A review of mechanisms and an integrative framework. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2015(1), 1250-1281. <https://doi.org/0.5465/ambpp.2015.14391abstract>
- Street, A. E., Hilbert, A. J., Eliezer, D., Axelrod, S. H., Dyches, K. D., & Galbreath, N. W. (2018). Sexual Assault. In *American military life in the 21st century: Social, cultural, and economic issues and trends* (pp. 255-269). ABC-CLIO.

- Street, A. E., Stafford, J., Mahan, C. M., & Hendricks, A. (2008). Sexual harassment and assault experienced by reservists during military service: Prevalence and health correlates. *Journal of Rehabilitation Research & Development*, 45(3), 409–420. <https://doi.org/10.1682/JRRD.2007.06.0088>
- Tewksbury, R., & Mustaine, E. E. (2001). Lifestyle factors associated with the sexual assault of men: A routine activity theory analysis. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 9(2), 153–182. <https://doi.org/10.3149/jms.092.153>.
- Tewksbury, R., Mustaine, E. E., & Stengel, K. M. (2008). Examining rates of sexual offenses from a routine activities perspective. *Victims and Offenders*, 3, 75–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564880701752306>
- Thomas, E. F., McGarty, C., & Mavor, K. I. (2009). Transforming “apathy into movement”: The role of prosocial emotions in motivation action for social change. *Personality & Social Psychology Review*, 13(4), 310–333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868309343290>
- Toates, F., Smid, W., & van den Berg, J. W. (2017). A framework for understanding sexual violence: Incentive-motivation and hierarchical control. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 34, 238-253. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2017.01.001>
- Tukey, J. W. (1977). *Exploratory data analysis*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Turchik, J. A., Hebenstrei, C. L., & Judson, S. S. (2015). An examination of the gender inclusiveness of current theories of sexual violence in adulthood: Recognizing male victims, female perpetrators, and same-sex violence. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838014566721>

United States Army (2019). Careers and job categories.

<https://www.goarmy.com/careers-and-jobs/browse-career-and-job-categories.html>

United States Army Military Police School, Behavioral Sciences Education and Training Division (2017). Trauma informed victim interview.

United States Department of Defense. (2018). *Department of Defense fiscal year 2017 annual report on sexual assaults in the military*. Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program.

[https://www.sapr.mil/public/docs/reports/FY17\\_Annual/DoD\\_FY17\\_Annual\\_Report\\_on\\_Sexual\\_Assault\\_in\\_the\\_Military.pdf](https://www.sapr.mil/public/docs/reports/FY17_Annual/DoD_FY17_Annual_Report_on_Sexual_Assault_in_the_Military.pdf)

United States Department of Defense. (2019a). *Department of Defense fiscal year 2018 annual report on sexual assaults in the military*. Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program. <https://www.sapr.mil/reports>

United States Department of Defense. (2019b). *Prevention plan of action 2019-2023: The Department's renewed strategic approach to prevent sexual assault*. Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness.

<https://www.sapr.mil/sites/default/files/PPoA%20Final.pdf>

United States Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (2019a.) Restricted reporting. <https://www.sapr.mil/restricted-reporting>

United States Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (2019b.) Unrestricted reporting. <https://www.sapr.mil/unrestricted-reporting>

United States Government. (2019). *Manual for courts-martial* (2019 ed.). Independently Published.



University of Iowa. (n.d.). A summary of the Belmont report.

<https://hso.research.uiowa.edu/summary-belmont-report>

Walden University. (2014). Office of research integrity and compliance: Institutional review board for ethical standards in research.

<http://academicguides.waldenu.edu/researchcenter/orec>

Warner, C. M., & Armstrong, M. A. (2020). The role of military law and systemic issues in the military's handling of sexual assault cases. *Law & Society Review*, 54(1), 265-300. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lasr.12461>

Wilcox, P., & Cullen, F. T. (2018). Situational opportunity theories of crime. *Annual Review of Criminology*, 1, 123–148. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-criminol-032317-092421>

Wilson, C., Lonsway, K., Archambault, J., & Hopper, J. (2016). *Understanding the neurobiology of trauma and implications for interviewing victims*. Retrieved from End Violence Against Women International website:

<https://www.evawintl.org/Library/DocumentLibraryHandler.ashx?id=842>

Wojcik, M. L., & Fisher, B. S. (2019). Overview of adult sexual offender typologies. In *Handbook of sexual assault and sexual assault prevention* (pp. 241-256). Springer.

Youngs, D. (Ed.). (2013). *Behavioural analysis of crime: Studies in David Canter's investigative psychology*. Ashgate Publishing.

Yu, C. H. (2017). Exploratory data analysis. *Oxford Bibliographies*, 1-31.

<https://doi.org/10/OBO/9780199828340-0200>

Zainal, Z. (2007). Case study as a research method. *Jurnal Kemanusiaan*, 5(1), 1-6.

<https://jurnalkemanusiaan.utm.my/index.php/kemanusiaan/article/view/165>

## Appendix A: Military Occupational Specialties

| Occupation Category                                  | Occupation Specialty   |
|--|--|
| Administrative Support                               | Chaplain (56A)   |
|  | Financial Management Technician (36B)                        |
|  | Financial Manager (36A)                                      |
|  | Human Resources Specialist (42A)                             |
|  | Human Resources Officer (42B)                                |
|  | Quartermaster Officer (92A)                                  |
|  | Religious Affairs Specialist (56M)                           |
|  | Shower/Laundry and Clothing Repair Specialist (92S)          |
| Unit Supply Specialist (92Y)                         |  |
| Intelligence and Combat Support                      | Ammunition Specialist (89B)                                  |
|  | Ammunition Stock Control and Accounting Specialist (89A)     |
|  | Automated Logistical Specialist (92A)                        |
|  | Chemical, Biological, and Nuclear Officer (74A)              |
|  | Chemical, Biological, and Nuclear Specialist (74D)           |
|  | Civil Affairs Officer (38A)                                  |
|  | Civil Affairs Specialist (38B)                               |
|  | Commissioned Officer Candidate (09S)                         |
|  | Counterintelligence Agent (35L)                              |
|  | Cryptologic Cyberspace Intelligence Collector/ Analyst (35Q) |
|  | Cryptologic Linguist (35P)                                   |
|  | Culinary Specialist (92G)                                    |
|  | Diver (12D)  |
|  | Explosive Ordinance Disposal Officer (89E)                   |
|  | Explosive Ordinance Disposal Specialist (89D)                |
|  | Geospatial Intelligence Imagery Analyst (35G)                |
|  | Human Intelligence Collector (35M)                           |
|  | Human Intelligence Collector Recruit (35W)                   |
|  | Intelligence Analyst (35F)                                   |
|  | Interpreter/Translator (09L)                                 |
| Military Intelligence Officer (35A)                  |  |
| Ordinance Officer (91A)                              |  |
| Psychological Operations Officer (37A)               |  |
| Watercraft Operator (88K)                            |  |
| Arts and Media                                       | Band Officer (42C)   |
|  | Combat Documentation/ Production Specialist (25V)            |
|  | Multimedia Illustrator (25M)                                 |
|  | Musician (42R)   |
|  | Public Affairs Mass Communication Specialist (46S)           |
|  | Public Affairs (46A)   |
|  | Special Band Musician (42S)                                  |
| Visual Information Equipment Operator-Repairer (25R) |  |
| Legal and Law Enforcement                            | Criminal Investigations Special Agent (31D)                  |
|  | Firefighter (12M)  |
|  | Internment/Settlement Specialist (31E)                       |
|  | Army Judge Advocate General's Corps Attorney (27A)           |
|  | Military Police (31B)  |
|  | Military Police Officer (31A)                                |
|  | Military Working Dog Handler (31K)                           |
|  | Paralegal Specialist (27D)                                   |

| Occupation Category                                  | Occupation Specialty  |  |
|--|---|--|
| Combat   | Air and Missile Defense Crewmember (14P)                            |  |
|  | Air Defense Artillery Officer (14A)                                 |  |
|  | Air Defense Battle Management System Operator (14G)                 |  |
|  | Air Defense Enhanced Early Warning System Operator (14H)            |  |
|  | Armor Officer (19A)   |  |
|  | Avenger Crewmember (14S)  |  |
|  | Cannon Crewmember (13B)   |  |
|  | Cavalry Scout (19D)   |  |
|  | Field Artillery Fire Finder Radar Operator (13R)                    |  |
|  | Field Artillery Officer (13A)                                       |  |
|  | Fire Control Specialist (13J)                                       |  |
|  | Joint Fire Support Specialist (13F)                                 |  |
|  | Indirect Fire Infantryman (11C)                                     |  |
|  | Infantry Officer (11A)  |  |
|  | Infantryman (11B, 11X)  |  |
|  | M1 Armor Crewman (19K)  |  |
|  | Multiple Launch Rocket System Crewmember (13M)                      |  |
|  | Patriot Fire Control Enhanced Operator/Maintainer (14E)             |  |
|  | Patriot Launching Station Enhanced Operator/Maintainer (14T)        |  |
|  | Special Forces Candidate (18X)                                      |  |
|  | Special Forces Communications Sergeant (18E)                        |  |
|  | Special Forces Engineer Sergeant (18C)                              |  |
|  | Special Forces Assistant Operations and Intelligence Sergeant (18F) |  |
|  | Special Forces Medical Sergeant (18D)                               |  |
|  | Special Forces Officer (18A)  |  |
|  | Special Forces Weapons Sergeant (18B)                               |  |
|  | Mechanic  | AH-64 Attack Helicopter Repairer (15R)       |
|  |   | Air Traffic Control Equipment Repairer (94D) |
| Allied Trade Specialist (91E)                        |   |  |
| Artillery Mechanic (91P)                             |   |  |
| Automatic Test System Operator and Maintainer (94Y)  |   |  |
| Avionic Mechanic (15N)                               |   |  |
| Biomedical Equipment Specialist (68A)                |   |  |
| Bradley Fighting Vehicle System Maintenance (91M)    |   |  |
| CH-47 Helicopter Repairer (15U)                      |   |  |
| Construction Equipment Repairer (91L)                |   |  |
| Fire Control Repairer (91G)                          |   |  |
| Land Combat Electronic Missile System Repairer (94A) |   |  |
| M1 Abrams Tank System Repairer (91A)                 |   |  |
| Multiple Launch Rocket System Repairer (94P)         |   |  |
| Patriot System Repairer (94S)                        |   |  |
| Quartermaster and Chemical System Repairer (91J)     |   |  |
| Short Range Air Defense System Repairer (94T)        |   |  |
| Small Arms/Artillery Repairer (91F)                  |   |  |
| Stryker System Maintainer (91S)                      |   |  |
| Tactical Power Generation Specialist (91D)           |   |  |
| Track Vehicle Repairer (91H)                         |   |  |
| Utilities Equipment Repairer (91C)                   |   |  |
| Watercraft Engineer (88L)                            |   |  |
| Wheeled Vehicle Mechanic (91B)                       |   |  |

| Occupation Category  | Occupation Specialty  |
|--|---|
| Computers and Technology   | Avionic and Survivability Equipment Repairer (94R)          |
|  | Cable Systems Installer-Maintainer (25L)                    |
|  | Computer/Detection Systems Repairer (94F)                   |
|  | Cryptologic Cyberspace Intelligence Collector/Analyst (35Q) |
|  | Cryptologic Linguist (35P)                                  |
|  | Cyber and Electronic Warfare Officer (17B)                  |
|  | Cyber Network Defender (25D)                                |
|  | Cyber Operations Officer (17A)                              |
|  | Cyber Operations Specialist (17C)                           |
|  | Electronic Warfare Specialist (17E)                         |
|  | Geospatial Intelligence Imagery Analyst (35G)               |
|  | Information Technology Specialist (25B)                     |
|  | Intelligence Analyst (35F)                                  |
|  | Microwave Systems Operator/Maintainer (25P)                 |
|  | Military Intelligence Systems Maintainer/Integrator (35T)   |
|  | Multichannel Transmission Systems Operator-Maintainer (25Q) |
|  | Nodal Network Systems Operator-Maintainer (25N)             |
|  | Radio and Communications Security Repairer (94E)            |
|  | Radio Operator Repairer (25C)                               |
|  | Satellite Communication Systems Operator-Maintainer (25S)   |
|  | Signal Officer (25A)  |
|  | Signal Support Systems Specialist (25U)                     |
|  | Signals Collection Analyst (35S)                            |
|  | Signals Intelligence Analyst (35N)                          |
| Test Measurement and Diagnostic Equipment Maintenance Support Specialist (94H) |   |
| Warrant Officer Corps (09W)  |   |
| Medical and Emergency  | Animal Care Specialist (68T)                                |
|  | Behavioral Health Specialist (68X)                          |
|  | Cardiovascular Specialist (68N)                             |
|  | Combat Medic Specialist (68W)                               |
|  | Dental Corps Officer (63)                                   |
|  | Dental Specialist (68E)                                     |
|  | Ear, Nose and Throat Specialist (68U)                       |
|  | Eye Specialist (68Y)  |
|  | Medical Corps Officer (62, 67, 65)                          |
|  | Medical Laboratory Specialist (68K)                         |
|  | Medical Logistic Specialist (68J)                           |
|  | Mortuary Affairs (92M)                                      |
|  | Nurse Corps Officer (66)                                    |
|  | Nutritional Care Specialist (68M)                           |
|  | Occupational Therapy Specialist (68L)                       |
|  | Operating Room Specialist (68D)                             |
|  | Optical Laboratory Specialist (68H)                         |
|  | Orthopedic Specialist (68B)                                 |
|  | Patient Administration Specialist (68G)                     |
|  | Pharmacy Specialist (68Q)                                   |
|  | Physical Therapy Specialist (68F)                           |
|  | Practical Nursing Specialist (68C)                          |
|  | Preventative Medicine Specialist (68S)                      |
|  | Radiology Specialist (68P)                                  |
|  | Respiratory Specialist (68V)                                |
|  | Veterinary Corps Officer (64)                               |
|  | Veterinary Food Inspection Specialist (68R)                 |

| Occupation Category                      | Occupation Specialty   |
|--|--|
| Construction and Engineering             | Bridge Crewmember (12C)                                      |
|  | Carpentry and Masonry Specialist (12W)                       |
|  | Combat Engineer (12B)  |
|  | Concrete and Asphalt Equipment Operator (12V)                |
|  | Horizontal Construction Engineer (12N)                       |
|  | Engineer Officer (12A)                                       |
|  | Geospatial Engineer (12Y)                                    |
|  | Interior Electrician (12R)                                   |
|  | Petroleum Laboratory Specialist (92L)                        |
|  | Petroleum Supply Specialist (92F)                            |
|  | Plumber (12K)  |
|  | Prime Power Production Specialist (12P)                      |
|  | Quarrying Specialist (12G)                                   |
|  | Tactical Power Generation Specialist (91D)                   |
|  | Technical Engineer (12T)                                     |
| Transportation and Aviation              | AH-64 Armament/Electronic/Avionic Systems Repairer (15Y)     |
|  | Air Traffic Control Operator (15Q)                           |
|  | Aircraft Technician (15F)                                    |
|  | Aircraft Pneudraulics Repairer (15H)                         |
|  | Aircraft Powerplant Repairer (15B)                           |
|  | Aircraft Powertrain Repairer (15D)                           |
|  | Aircraft Structural Repairer (15G)                           |
|  | Aviation Officer (15A)                                       |
|  | Aviation Operations Specialist (15P)                         |
|  | Cargo Specialist (88H)                                       |
|  | Motor Transport Operator (88M)                               |
|  | OH-58D Armament/ Electrical/ Avionics Systems Repairer (15J) |
|  | OH-58D Helicopter Repairer (15S)                             |
|  | Parachute Rigger (92R)                                       |
|  | Power Distribution Specialist (12Q)                          |
|  | Radar Repairer (94M)   |
|  | Railway Operations Crewmember (88U)                          |
|  | Transportation Management Coordinator (88N)                  |
|  | Transportation Officer (88A)                                 |
|  | UH-60 Helicopter Repairer (15T)                              |
|  | Unmanned Aircraft Systems Operator (15W)                     |
| Unmanned Aircraft Systems Repairer (15E) |  |

United States Army (2019)

## Appendix B: Variable Coding

| Variable Name  | Variable Coding                                    |
|--|--|
| Age of the offender                                  | 18-24  |
|  | 25-30  |
|  | 31-35  |
|  | 36-40  |
|  | 40+  |
| Age of the victim                                    | 18-24  |
|  | 25-30  |
|  | 31-35  |
|  | 36-40  |
|  | 40+  |
| Alcohol or drug use at the time of assault, offender | Alcohol use, offender                              |
|  | Drug use, offender                                 |
|  | Offender sober                                     |
|  | Alcohol and drug use, offender                     |
|  | Unknown  |
| Alcohol or drug use at the time of assault, victim:  | Alcohol use, victim                                |
|  | Drug use, victim                                   |
|  | Alcohol use, victim surreptitious/forced           |
|  | Drug use, victim surreptitious/forced              |
|  | Victim sober                                       |
|  | Alcohol and drug use, victim                       |
|  | Alcohol and drug use, victim surreptitious/forced  |
|  | Unknown  |
| Case outcome   | Acquittal  |
|  | Conviction, court-martial for sexual crime         |
|  | Conviction, court-martial for nonsexual crime      |
|  | Conviction, Article 15 hearing for sexual crime    |
|  | Conviction, Article 15 hearing for nonsexual crime |
|  | Other nonjudicial punishment                       |
|  | Case dismissed                                     |
| Case year  | 2009   |
|  | 2010   |
|  | 2011   |
|  | 2012   |
|  | 2013   |
|  | 2014   |
|  | 2015   |
|  | 2016   |
|  | 2017   |
|  | 2018   |
|  | 2019   |

| Variable Name   | Variable Coding   |
|---|---|
| Day of the assault  | Monday<br>Tuesday<br>Wednesday<br>Thursday<br>Friday<br>Saturday<br>Sunday<br>Unknown |
| Deployment history of offender                                  | 0<br>1<br>2+<br>Unknown   |
| Deployment history of victim                                    | 0<br>1<br>2+<br>Unknown   |
| Evidence identified/available                                   | Yes, medical/SANE completed<br>Yes, Forensic<br>Yes, Digital<br>None                  |
| Force/violence used, NOT during assault                         | Yes<br>No evidence  |
| Identified sexual orientation of offender                       | Heterosexual<br>Homosexual<br>Bisexual<br>Unknown                                     |
| Offender reported history of childhood sexual or physical abuse | Yes<br>No   |
| Identified sexual orientation of victim                         | Heterosexual<br>Homosexual<br>Bisexual<br>Unknown                                     |
| Victim reported history of previous sexual or physical abuse    | Yes, in childhood<br>Yes, in adulthood  |



| Variable Name  | Variable Coding   |
|--|---|
| Initial law enforcement notification method                  | Victim reported<br>Offender reported<br>Spouse/significant other reported<br>Friend or neighbor reported<br>Other family member reported<br>Doctor, nurse, or other health care provider reported<br>Minister, clergy, priest, rabbi, or another religious leader reported<br>SARC/VA reported<br>Supervisor reported<br>Unit member/coworker reported<br>Stranger/bystander reported<br>Law enforcement or security guard direct observation |
| Items taken from the scene by the offender                   | Yes, evidentiary<br>Yes, valuables<br>Yes, personal<br>No   |
| Known prior investigation(s) of offender for nonsexual crime | Yes<br>No   |
| Known prior investigation(s) of offender for sexual crime    | Yes<br>No   |
| Length of time to disclosure to Law Enforcement              | Immediate<br>1 day to 6 days<br>1 week to 1 month<br>1 month to 1 year<br>Longer than 1 year  |
| Length of relationship between offender and victim           | Under 1 month<br>1 to 12 months<br>Over 12 months<br>None (stranger)<br>Unknown   |
| Location had security measures in place                      | Yes, camera system<br>Yes, security guard/bouncer<br>Yes, alarm system<br>Yes, other<br>No  |

| Variable Name  | Variable Coding  |
|--|--|
| Location of assault                                    | Deployed environment, barracks<br>Deployed environment, place of duty<br>Deployed environment, other<br>On post, Home/barracks of victim<br>On post, Home/barracks of offender<br>On post, Victim, and offender co-habitate<br>Off post, Home of victim<br>Off post, Home of offender<br>Off post, Victim, and offender co-habitate<br>Place of duty/work<br>On post, Bar/tavern/club<br>Off post, Bar/tavern/club<br>On post, other<br>Off post, other<br>Unknown |
| Location where alcohol or drugs were being served/used | Yes<br>No  |
| Method of approach                                     | Blitz<br>Con<br>Surprise<br>Drug/Alcohol facilitated<br>Victim asleep/unconscious  |
| Military Occupational Specialty of offender            | Administrative support<br>Intelligence and combat support<br>Arts and media<br>Legal and law enforcement<br>Combat<br>Mechanic<br>Computers and technology<br>Medical and emergency<br>Construction and engineering<br>Transportation and aviation   |
| Military Occupational Specialty of victim              | Administrative support<br>Intelligence and combat support<br>Arts and media<br>Legal and law enforcement<br>Combat<br>Mechanic<br>Computers and technology<br>Medical and emergency<br>Construction and engineering<br>Transportation and aviation   |
| Offender committed a co-occurring nonsexual crime(s)   | Yes, property<br>Yes, personal<br>Yes, financial<br>No   |

| Variable Name  | Variable Coding   |
|--|---|
| Offender confessed                                   | Yes, partial<br>Yes, full<br>Yes, post-poly<br>No   |
| Offender injured during assault:                     | Yes, mild injury<br>Yes, moderate injury<br>Yes, severe injury<br>No  |
| Victim injured during assault                        | Yes, mild injury<br>Yes, moderate injury<br>Yes, severe injury<br>No  |
| Offender interviewed                                 | Yes<br>No   |
| Offender's control of the victim                     | Mere presence<br>Verbal threats<br>Presence of a weapon, gun<br>Presence of a weapon, knife<br>Use of a weapon, gun<br>Use of a weapon, knife<br>Physical force, minimal<br>Physical force, moderate<br>Physical force, excessive<br>Physical force, brutal |
| Offenders reaction to resistance                     | Cease the demand<br>Compromise or negotiate<br>Flee<br>Threaten<br>Use force<br>Victim unconscious or asleep<br>Ignore  |
| Original responding agency                           | Local civilian law enforcement<br>State law enforcement<br>Military law enforcement, Military Police, Military Police Investigator, CID<br>Other Federal law enforcement  |
| Paraphilia/Fantasy present                           | Yes<br>Unknown, but suspected<br>No   |
| Photographs or video of the victim taken by offender | Yes<br>No   |
| Prostitution/sex trafficking involvement             | Yes, victim<br>Yes, offender<br>No  |

| Variable Name                                      | Variable Coding   |
|--|---|
| Race of offender                                   | Caucasian<br>African American<br>American Indian/Alaska Native<br>Asian or Pacific Islander<br>Other<br>Unknown |
| Race of victim                                     | Caucasian<br>African American<br>American Indian/Alaska Native<br>Asian or Pacific Islander<br>Other            |
| Rank of the offender                               | Unknown<br>E1 thru E3<br>E4 thru E6<br>E7 thru E9<br>WO1 thru WO5<br>O1 thru O3<br>O4 thru O6<br>O7 and above   |
| Rank of the victim                                 | E1 thru E3<br>E4 thru E6<br>E7 thru E9<br>WO1 thru WO5<br>O1 thru O3<br>O4 thru O6<br>O7 and above              |
| Relationship status of offender at time of assault | Single<br>Married<br>Divorced<br>Widowed<br>Unknown   |
| Relationship status of victim at time of assault   | Single<br>Married<br>Divorced<br>Widowed<br>Unknown   |
| Restricted to unrestricted report                  | Yes<br>No   |
| Service component of offender                      | Active<br>National Guard<br>Army Reserve  |
| Service component of victim                        | Active<br>National Guard<br>Army Reserve  |

| Variable Name                                    | Variable Coding  |
|--|--|
| Sexual crime(s) committed                        | Oral penetration, offender to victim<br>Oral penetration, victim to offender<br>Anal penetration<br>Made to penetrate<br>Touching/ fondling over clothes<br>Touching/ fondling under clothes<br>Oral penetration, offender to victim and Oral penetration, victim to offender<br>Oral penetration, offender to victim and Anal penetration<br>Oral penetration, offender to victim and Made to penetrate<br>Oral penetration, victim to offender and anal penetration<br>Oral penetration, victim to offender, and made to penetrate<br>Oral penetration, offender to victim, anal penetration, and made to penetrate<br>Oral penetration, offender to victim, Oral penetration, victim to offender, and anal penetration<br>Oral penetration, offender to victim, Oral penetration, victim to offender, and made to penetrate<br>Anal penetration and made to penetrate |
| Signs of preplanned assault                      | Yes<br>No  |
| Stalking/grooming behaviors                      | Yes<br>No  |
| Time of the assault                              | 0000-0600<br>0600-1200<br>1200-1800<br>1800- 0000<br>Unknown   |
| Type of relationship between offender and victim | Stranger<br>Intimate partner<br>Social acquaintance/ Friends<br>Co-workers<br>Roommate/ Barracks mate<br>Subordinate/ Supervisor<br>"Battle Buddy"/ Escort<br>Medical or Behavioral Health provider<br>Drill Sergeant/ Instructor<br>Religious leader  |

| Variable Name                                | Variable Coding   |
|--|---|
| Verbal activity by offender during assault   | Hostile<br>Concerned<br>Inquisitive<br>Pseudo-courting<br>Disclosing<br>Apologetic<br>Descriptive<br>Threatening<br>Silent  |
| Victim declined to participate               | Yes, from onset of investigation<br>Yes, during investigation<br>Yes, upon referral to court-martial<br>Victim participated   |
| Victim forced verbal activity during assault | Yes<br>No   |
| Victim recanted                              | Yes<br>No   |
| Victim response during assault               | Verbal resistance<br>Physical resistance<br>Pleading, bargaining<br>Threats<br>Nonviolent/passive resistance<br>Attempting to flee<br>Freezing<br>Victim unconscious/asleep<br>Verbal and physical resistance<br>Verbal and nonviolent/passive resistance |
| Victim Strangled                             | Yes<br>No   |
| Video of the victim taken                    | Yes<br>No   |
| Witnesses present at time of assault         | Yes<br>No   |
| Multi-victim case                            | Yes<br>No   |