



PATTERNS OF CHILDHOOD SEXUAL VICTIMIZATION IN MICHIGAN: MICR 2013 REPORT

**PATTERNS OF CHILDHOOD SEXUAL VICTIMIZATION IN MICHIGAN:
MICR 2013 REPORT**

Gregory Drake, M.S.

Edmund F. McGarrell, Ph.D.

Michigan Justice Statistics Center
School of Criminal Justice
Michigan State University

December 2015

This project was supported by Grant No. 2014-MU-CX-K037 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Michigan Justice Statistics Center

The School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University, through the Michigan Justice Statistics Center, serves as the Statistical Analysis Center (MI-SAC) for the State of Michigan. The mission of the Center is to advance knowledge about crime and justice issues in the state of Michigan while also informing policy and practice. The Center works in partnership with the Michigan State Police, Michigan's State Administering Agency (SAA), as well as with law enforcement and criminal justice agencies serving the citizens of Michigan.

For further information see: <http://cj.msu.edu/programs/michigan-justice-statistics-center/>

About the Authors

Gregory Drake received his Bachelor's and Master's degrees in Criminal Justice from the Rochester Institute of Technology and is currently enrolled in the Criminal Justice Doctoral program at Michigan State University. Greg's research interests are the efficacy of public policy in criminal justice and community responses to crime and justice. His research has appeared in the Journal of Crime and Justice, Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, and International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice.

Edmund F. McGarrell is Director and Professor in the School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University. He also is Director of the Michigan Justice Statistics Center that serves as the Statistical Analysis Center for the state of Michigan. McGarrell's research focuses on communities and crime with a specific focus on violence prevention and control. Recent articles appear in Crime and Delinquency, Criminology and Public Policy, Journal of Criminal Justice and Journal of Experimental Criminology.

Patterns of Childhood Sexual Victimization in Michigan:
MICR 2013 Report

Final Report

December 2015

Gregory Drake, M.S.

Edmund F. McGarrell, Ph. D.

Michigan Justice Statistics Center
Michigan State University

Executive Summary

In an effort to shed light on the problem of childhood sexual victimization in the state of Michigan, Michigan Incident Based Reporting Statistics were utilized to study patterns of childhood victimization, offender characteristics and the relationship between victims and offenders. During 2013, there were over 8,000 incidents in the state of Michigan with 8,350 unique victims and 7,295 unique offenders. Females are the victims in the vast majority of cases and males are the offenders in the overwhelming number of cases. Males tend to be at greatest risk for victimization at young ages, although females are at greatest risk at all ages. A sizeable portion of victimization involves offenders who are close in age to the victim but there are also large numbers of incidents that involve offenders considerably older than the victims. Most sexual offenses committed against children involve offenders known to the victim. Offenses committed by strangers are rare. Parents, guardians, and other youth care providers should be aware that if childhood sexual victimization occurs or is suspected, it is most likely committed by someone known to the youth and often involve an adult caregiver.

Consequences of Childhood Sexual Victimization

Child sexual victimization is a particular concern due to the vulnerability of child victims and the potential lasting effects of sexually based offenses on children. Jackson and Deye (2015) suggested that violent victimization of any kind during childhood can have profound and permanent effects of children, most notably in the development of their “behavioral, educational, physical, and mental functioning” (pg. 86). Work by Briere and Elliott (1994) found this to be true in regards to the long term consequences of childhood sexual victimization as well. Briere and Elliott stated that victims of childhood sexual victimization were more likely to exhibit symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder, develop cognitive distortions (e.g. misperceptions of society or the world as more dangerous than in actuality), struggle communicating with others, create avoidance mechanisms (e.g. drug use, inflicting self-harm, suicide), and develop emotion distress (e.g. anger, depression, anxiety). Briere and Elliott also suggested that these consequences follow into adulthood

Prior research (e.g., Finkelhor, Ormond, and Chaffin, 2009; Snyder, 2000) also found that child sexual victimization is complex in terms of the basic characteristics of child victims, the characteristics of perpetrators of child sexual victimization, and the characteristics of the victim-offender relationship. This research, however, is limited and we are not aware of similar analyses conducted in the state of Michigan. Consequently, there is a need to study these patterns of child sexual victimization and offending in the state of Michigan. Fortunately, the Michigan Incident Based Reporting System makes this possible.

Studying Childhood Sexual Victimization using Michigan Incident Crime Reporting Data

Michigan’s Incident Based Crime Reporting system is part of the National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS). Incident based reporting offers a richer source of data than traditional Uniform Crime Reporting of aggregate crime statistics. Specifically, NIBRS provides detailed case reports of each crime incident, including victim and offender information. In Michigan, the NIBRS system is referred to as the Michigan Incident Crime Reporting system (MICR).

MICR defines child as any minor seventeen years of age or younger. Michigan also includes nine different classifications of sexual based offenses within MICR, some of varying degrees, including (sic): “Obscenity”, “Peeping Tom”, “Sex Contact Forcible”, “Sexual Penetration Blood/Affinity”, “Sexual Penetration Object”, “Sexual Penetration Oral/Anal”, “Sexual Penetration Penis/Vagina”, “Sexual Penetration Non-Forcible Other”, and “Sex Offense Other”. Therefore, a child sexual offense includes any of these nine offense classifications where the victim was younger than eighteen years of age.

Incident-based reporting data, MICR included, requires a “row” of data for each unique aspect of a crime. For example, if a single victim was victimized by a single offender, but was the victim of several crimes, MICR data produces a “row” of data that includes victim and offender information for each unique charge the arresting officer applies to a crime incident.¹ A similar situation occurs when a single offender victimizes several individuals (i.e. data is recorded for each victim, but redundant data is produced on the single offender) or when multiple offenders victimize a single individual. The analytical issue is to study the characteristics of victims, offenders, and victim-offender relationships without duplicating the

¹ For example, a crime incident where an offender is charged with both robbery and resisting arrest produces two “rows” of data within MICR that include redundant offender information. If not handled properly in the analysis of NIBRS data, this can result in duplicate counts of the same offender information.

victims, offenders, or relationships. When attempting to count the number of child sexual assault victims, for example, this involves producing data that have all the pertinent information without counting victims or offenders more than once.

In this analysis of MICR data, five data sets on child sexual victimization are produced, shown in Table 1. The first file contains all cases with information regarding offenses committed by offenders, including separate “rows” of data for separate offenses committed by the same offender during the same incident. The second file eliminates duplicate cases, or “rows”, of offenders that committed multiple offenses during one incident, and thus has accurate demographic information regarding the 7,295 unique child sex offenders in Michigan in 2013. The third and fourth files are constructed similarly with regards to victims. The third file contains information on the 8,387 unique victim offenses, and the fourth file eliminates duplicate victim data, so as to provide accurate demographic information on the 8,350 unique victims of sexual offenses. The last file contains information, including victim and offender relationships, on every unique victim/offender pairing, of which there were 9,280. This differs from victim or offender offenses as an incident with two offenders and one victim produces only one victim offense, as per NIBRS recording, but produces two unique victim offender relationships. Each of the following tables throughout this paper uses data from these five data sets, and are labeled with the data set from which they derive.

Table 1
MICR Child Sexual Victimization,
Numbers of Offenders, Victims, and Pairings

	Frequency
Offender Offenses	8113
Unique Offenders	7295
Victim Offenses	8387
Unique Victims	8350
Unique Victim/Offender Pairings	9280

Previous Examination of Childhood Sexual Victimization using NIBRS Data

Snyder (2000) produced one of the first examinations of child sexual victimization using National Incident Based Reporting System data. Using six years of pooled NIBRS data from 1991 to 1996, Snyder’s findings offered baseline rates of child sexual victimization². In regards to the age distribution of victims, Snyder reported that two-thirds of victims of sex offenses were juveniles (younger than 18 years of age). Snyder found two distinct trends within the NIBRS data, with victimization rates peaking first among 4-5 year olds and again between the ages of 13-14. Snyder found this trend to hold for all types of sex offenses other than rape, which did not show high rates of victimization among children younger than ages 13-14.

Snyder (2000) reported that females were more than six times as likely as males to be the victim of sex offenses nationally, though this disproportion increased with age (e.g. 69% of

² Even if rates of crime generally have fallen since the early 1990’s, we predict that the data reported by Snyder offer a national baseline for comparison of the distribution of sex offenses (e.g. male vs. female offending or the relative distribution of offense type prevalence). The present analysis offers the opportunity to assess this prediction, at least with respect to patterns of childhood sexual victimization in the state of Michigan.

victims younger than six were female, whereas more than 90% of victims older than 13 were female). Snyder found that males were most likely to be the victim of sex offenses at the age of four, and females were most likely to be victimized at the age of 14, though they were also at increased risk, double relative to males, at the age of four.

In regards to sex offenders, Snyder (2000) found that almost all (96%) were male. He found that those female offenders reported to NIBRS were most likely to victimize children younger than six. The most common age for a sex offender involved in childhood sexual victimization was 14, though the majority of offenders (77%) were 18 years of age or older. Snyder reported that relative to adult offenders (18 years and older), youth who commit sex offenses against other youth were less likely to commit rape and more likely to commit sodomy, forcible fondling, or sexual assault with an object.

Snyder (2000) found that more than one-fourth of all offenders were family members of victims, a proportion that climbed to nearly one-half when victims were under the age of six. Offenders of childhood sex offenses were reported to NIBRS as a stranger in only 7% of all cases, a rate that increased with age of victim. For example, cases with victims younger than age six reported strangers in only 3.1% of the incidents, and cases with victims between 12-17 years of age reported strangers as the offender in nearly one-tenth of cases (9.8%).

In a 2009 report, Finklehor, Ormrod, and Chaffin (2009) examined the nature of child sexual victimization by other youth (e.g. both victim and offender are 17 years or younger) using NIBRS data from 2004. Previously, Snyder reported that nearly one-in-four sex offenders from 1991 to 1996 were younger than 18. Finklehor, Ormrod, and Chaffin (2009) similarly found that about one-in-four sex offenders were younger than 18. However, when looking exclusively at cases where victims were less than age 18, the rate rose to more than one-in-three (35.6%). The majority of these youthful sex offenders, more than 80%, were between the ages of 12 and 17. Finklehor, Ormrod, and Chaffin (2009) noted that an undisclosed number of offenders, a “small number” (pg. 3), were reported to NIBRS as younger than seven years of age. Finklehor, Ormrod, and Chaffin (2009) reported that more than nine-in-ten of these youthful offenders were male, consistent with adult sexual offenders (Snyder, 2000), and relative to their female counterparts tended to be younger, were more likely to have male victims, and victimized children that were younger on average.

Child Sexual Victimization in Michigan

The following tables (2-12) show the basic distributions of offender and victim age, gender, and offense type using MICR data from 2013. Additional tables, including distributions of offender and victim age differences and relationships, are also provided. Lastly, conclusions are offered regarding the nature of childhood sexual victimization in Michigan.

Table 2
Offender Age
(Unique Offenders)

Age	#	% of Total	Age	#	% of Total
7	78	1.1%	< 17*	2519	35.1%
8	75	1.0%	18-24	1517	21.1%
9	85	1.2%	25-34	1064	14.8%
10	91	1.3%	35-44	868	12.1%
11	131	1.8%	45-54	473	6.6%
12	193	2.7%	55-64	235	3.3%
13	279	3.9%	65-74	98	1.4%
14	336	4.7%	75-84	21	0.3%
15	381	5.3%	85+	3	0.0%
16	380	5.3%	Unk.	384	5.3%
17	490	6.8%	Total*	7182	

*113 offenders under the age of 7 were removed from the analysis

Table 2 shows the age distribution of offenders of sex offenses. It should be noted that 113 offenders were listed as being under the age of seven. Consistent with prior research, these incidents were removed from the analysis as they likely reflect reporting errors in the NIBRS data (Finklehor, Ormrod, and Chaffin, 2009).

The majority of offenders, just over half, were younger than 24 years of age, with the largest grouping being those younger than 17 years of age (35.1%). The oldest offender was 93 years of age, though offending tended to decline with age. These patterns are consistent with national trends (Snyder, 2000; Finklehor, Ormrod, and Chaffin, 2009).

Table 3
Offender Age and Gender
(Unique Offenders)

Age	# Females	% of all Females	# Males	% of all Males
7	15	2.3%	62	0.9%
8	13	2.0%	62	0.9%
9	18	2.8%	67	1.0%
10	22	3.4%	68	1.0%
11	24	3.7%	107	1.6%
12	29	4.5%	164	2.5%
13	31	4.8%	248	3.8%
14	33	5.1%	303	4.6%
15	36	5.5%	345	5.2%
16	23	3.5%	356	5.4%
17	32	4.9%	458	7.0%

Age	# Females	% of all Females	# Males	% of all Males
< 17	295	45.4%	2333	35.4%
18-24	96	14.8%	1416	21.5%
25-34	103	15.8%	960	14.6%
35-44	76	11.7%	861	13.1%
45-54	33	5.1%	414	6.3%
55-64	17	2.6%	197	3.0%
65-74	5	0.8%	71	1.1%
75-84	0	0.0%	19	0.3%
85+	0	0.0%	2	0.0%
Unk.	25	3.8%	314	4.8%
Total	650		6587	

*113 offenders under the age of 7 were removed from the analysis

*Offender gender was unrecorded for some offenders

Table 3 shows the distribution of offenders by recorded age and gender. The vast majority of offenders, more than 91% were male. Both male and female offenders showed similar age distributions and both tended to be younger than 24. Comparing between genders, a higher proportion of female offenders were younger than 17 years of age, though the vast majority of offenders younger than 17 were still male. Again, this is consistent with national trends (Snyder, 2000; Finklehor, Ormrod, and Chaffin, 2009).

Table 4
Offender Offense Type
(Offender Offenses)

Offense	#	% of Total
Obscenity	89	1.1%
Peeping Tom	25	.3%
Sex Offense Other	764	9.4%
Sex Contact Forcible CSC 2nd	1670	20.6%
Sex Contact Forcible CSC 4th	1287	15.7%
Sex Pen. Blood/Affinity	21	.3%
Sex Pen. Non-Forcible Other	85	1.0%
Sex Pen. Object CSC 1 st	274	3.4%
Sex Pen. Object CSC 3rd	107	1.3%
Sex Pen. Oral/Anal CSC 1st	778	9.6%
Sex Pen. Oral/Anal CSC 3rd	326	4.0%
Sex Pen. Penis/Vagina CSC 1st	1999	24.6%
Sex Pen. Penis/Vagina CSC 3rd	688	8.5%
Total	8113	

Table 4 shows the distribution of sex offenses. The most frequent sex offense in 2013 was Sexual Penetration of the Penis/Vagina CSC 1st, followed by forcible sexual contact CSC 2nd and forcible sexual contact CSC 4th. These distributions are consistent with previously examined national trends (Snyder, 2000).

Table 5
Offense Type by Offender Gender
(Offender Offenses)

Offense	Offender Gender					Total
	# Females	% of all Females	# Males	% of all Males	Unk.	
Obscenity	9	1.4%	65	1.0%	15	89
Peeping Tom	0	0%	11	.2%	14	25
Sex Offense Other	39	5.9%	318	4.8%	407	764
Sex Contact Forcible CSC 2nd	157	23.9%	1390	20.8%	133	1670
Sex Contact Forcible CSC 4th	143	21.7%	1045	15.6%	99	1287
Sex Pen. Blood/Affinity	2	.3%	16	.2%	3	21
Sex Pen. Non-Forcible Other	6	.9%	76	1.1%	3	85
Sex Pen. Object CSC 1st	31	4.7%	216	3.2%	27	274
Sex Pen. Object CSC 3rd	15	2.3%	85	1.3%	7	107
Sex Pen. Oral/Anal CSC 1st	55	8.4%	671	10.0%	52	778
Sex Pen. Oral/Anal CSC 3rd	27	4.1%	290	4.3%	9	326
Sex Pen. Penis/Vagina CSC 1st	120	18.2%	1870	28.0%	9	1999
Sex Pen. Penis/Vagina CSC 3rd	54	8.1%	628	9.4%	6	688
Total	658		6681		774	8113

Table 5 shows the distribution of sex offenses among both men and women offenders. For men, the most frequent offenses were Sexual Penetration of the Penis/Vagina CSC 1st followed by forcible sexual contact CSC 2nd and forcible sexual contact CSC 4th. Female offenders were slightly more likely to be perpetrators of forcible sexual contact CSC 2nd and forcible sexual contact CSC 4th.

Table 6
Distribution of Offenses by Offender Age
(Offender Offenses)

Offense	Age									Total
	< 17	18 - 24	25 - 34	35 - 44	45 - 54	55 - 64	65 - 74	75 - 84	85+	
Obscenity	10	16	6	8	6	1	1	0	0	78
Peeping Tom	0	0	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	11
Sex Offense Other	15	74	56	50	20	16	4	0	0	365
Sex Contact Forcible CSC 2nd	38	181	302	254	160	92	43	7	2	1538
Sex Contact Forcible CSC 4th	70	138	141	117	84	41	15	7	1	1156
Sex Pen. Blood/Affinity	1	2	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	18
Sex Pen. Non-Forcible Other	19	30	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	82
Sex Pen. Object CSC 1st	7	45	42	36	25	19	4	1	0	247
Sex Pen. Object CSC 3rd	16	16	16	11	4	1	1	0	0	96
Sex Pen. Oral/Anal CSC 1st	38	135	107	82	47	16	8	0	0	715
Sex Pen. Oral/Anal CSC 3rd	26	84	29	15	5	4	5	1	0	313
Sex Pen. Penis/ Vagina CSC 1st	156	549	314	257	109	47	18	4	0	1986
Sex Pen. Penis/ Vagina CSC 3rd	101	265	59	46	20	4	2	1	0	681

*Offenses for 113 offenders under the age of 7 were removed

*Offender age for 388 Offender Offenses was unknown

Table 6 shows the distribution of offenses by offender age. The most common age for the commission of most sexual offenses was between 18 and 24 years of age, though this differs by specific crime (e.g. forcible sexual contact). The most frequent age/offense pairing was the commission of 549 Sexual Penetrations of the Penis/Vagina CSC 1st by 18-24 year olds.

Table 7
Victim Age and Gender
(Unique Victims)

Age	Victim Gender				Total
	# Females	% of all Females	# Males	% of all Males	
< 1	21	.3%	10	.6%	31
1	30	.5%	8	.5%	38
2	139	2.1%	38	2.3%	177
3	287	4.3%	123	7.4%	411
4	350	5.2%	145	9.3%	497
5	283	4.2%	177	10.6%	462
6	287	4.3%	138	8.3%	425
7	272	4.1%	115	6.9%	389
8	219	3.9%	111	6.6%	331
9	231	3.5%	100	6.0%	331
10	242	3.6%	75	4.5%	317
11	280	4.2%	72	4.3%	352
12	412	6.2%	82	4.9%	495
13	703	10.5%	79	4.7%	782
14	1007	15.1%	124	7.4%	1131
15	1033	15.5%	138	8.3%	1171
16	520	7.8%	74	4.4%	595
17	352	5.3%	62	3.7%	414
Total*	6668		1671		8350

* Gender was unreported for 11 victims

Table 7 shows the age and gender distributions of victims of sex offenses. Unlike child sexual *offenders*, the vast majority of whom were male, the *victims* of sex offenses were predominantly female (80%). The nature of male and female victimization also appears to differ. For males, the highest risk was between ages three and nine. For the most part, the risk of victimization for males then declined with the exception of ages 14-15. In contrast, girls in their teen years were at greatest risk of victimization. Although female risk increased with age, females were at higher risk at all ages. These patterns are consistent with historical trends nationally (Snyder, 2000).

Table 8
Victimization Type by Gender
(Victim Offenses)

Offense	Gender				Total
	# Females	% of all Females	# Males	% of all Males	
Obscenity	81	1.2%	8	.5%	89
Peeping Tom	30	.4%	3	.2%	33
Sex Offense Other	649	9.7%	223	13.3%	875
Sex Contact Forcible CSC 2nd	1389	20.7%	421	25.1%	1815
Sex Contact Forcible CSC 4th	1067	15.9%	280	16.7%	1347
Sex Pen. Blood/Affinity	17	< .1%	3	.2%	20
Sex Pen. Non-Forcible Other	77	1.1%	5	.3%	82
Sex Pen. Object CSC 1st	252	3.8%	31	1.9%	283
Sex Pen. Object CSC 3rd	91	1.4%	12	.7%	103
Sex Pen. Oral/Anal CSC 1st	386	5.8%	438	26.2%	827
Sex Pen. Oral/Anal CSC 3rd	203	3.0%	126	7.5%	329
Sex Pen. Penis/Vagina CSC 1st	1846	27.5%	83	5.0%	1929
Sex Pen. Penis/Vagina CSC 3rd	613	9.1%	42	2.5%	655
Total*	6701		1675		8387

*Gender was unavailable for 11 victims

Table 8 shows the distribution of offenses among male and female victims. Female victims were disproportionately the victims of Sexual Penetration Penis/Vagina CSC 1st followed by Forcible Sexual Contact in the 2nd and 4th degree. Male victims were disproportionately the victims of Sexual Penetration Oral/Anal CSC 1st followed by Forcible Sexual Contact CSC 2nd.

Table 9
Victimization Type by Victim Age
(Victim Offenses)

Offense	Victim Age																	
	< 1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Obscenity		1	1			1		2	2	4	4	3	10	8	15	17	12	9
Peeping Tom				1	1			1	1	2	1	3	3	2	5	2	5	6
Sex Offense Other	7	2	10	26	40	34	33	37	25	40	42	46	79	97	124	124	62	47
Sex Contact Forcible CSC 2nd	8	12	48	144	150	145	145	140	107	90	92	99	147	121	143	118	72	33
Sex Contact Forcible CSC 4th	2	4	33	47	77	79	74	54	69	60	59	55	74	142	179	150	106	82
Sex Pen. Blood/Affinity														9	5	6		
Sex Pen. Non-Forcible Other														10	30	42		
Sex Pen. Object CSC 1st	3	4	13	35	34	30	14	8	12	14	7	7	7	15	32	29	13	6
Sex Pen. Object CSC 3rd			1	7	4	3	7	3	2	1	1	3	3	11	12	20	12	13
Sex Pen. Oral/Anal CSC 1st	4	2	24	64	81	74	60	57	46	54	46	41	37	48	58	60	36	35
Sex Pen. Oral/Anal CSC 3rd			4	11	13	22	16	12	11	9	7	8	10	36	64	69	20	17
Sex Pen. Penis/Vagina CSC 1st	3	13	41	74	92	73	75	74	54	57	59	78	119	220	282	312	195	108
Sex Pen. Penis/Vagina CSC 3rd	1		3	3	4	3	1	3	2	4	3	7	14	64	185	231	66	61

Table 9 shows the distribution of offenses by victim age. While the ages of the victims of most sexual offenses tended to cluster most frequently in the 12 to 15 years of age range, victims of Forcible Sexual Contact CSC 2nd showed two distinct high frequency “peaks” from the ages of 3 to 7 and again at the ages of 12 to 15, before victimization declined among 16 and 17 year olds.

Table 10
Offender/Victim Age Difference by Offender Gender
(Unique Offenses)

Age Difference (Years)*	Offender Gender				
	# Females	% of Female Offenders	# Males	% of Male Offenders	Total
Offender Younger	44	5.8%	188	3.0%	232
0 to 2Yrs	162	21.4%	1239	18.1%	1404
3 to 5Yrs	98	13.0%	1293	18.0%	1396
6 to 10 Yrs	101	13.4%	1122	15.5%	1227
11 to 15 Yrs	38	5.0%	481	6.6%	521
16 to 20 Yrs	76	10.1%	524	7.2%	601
21 to 25 Yrs	79	10.4%	648	9.0%	728
26 to 30 Yrs	59	7.8%	490	6.8%	550
31 to 35 Yrs	30	4.0%	339	4.7%	369
36 to 40 Yrs	22	2.9%	247	3.4%	269
41 to 45 Yrs	15	2.0%	198	2.7%	213
46 to 50 Yrs	9	1.2%	131	1.8%	141
50+ Yrs	23	3.0%	231	3.2%	254
Total	756		7131		7887
Unknown					1193

* Formula = (Offender age) – (victim age)

Victim was older than the offender in 269 cases

Of the 8018 pairings where age for both victim and offender was known, counts differ as gender for 69 offenders was unknown

Age for Victim or Offender was unknown for 1193 pairings

133 pairing were removed because the offender was younger than 7 years of age

Table 10 shows the age difference between offender and victim, across male and female offenders. This difference was taken by subtracting the victim’s age from the offender’s age (e.g. offender age – victim age = resulting differences).

For 232 unique offenses, which may include multiple offenders, victims, or offenses types, the offender was younger than the victim.

The pattern of age differences between offender and victim was relatively varied. Although there are a sizeable number of cases where the age difference was five or fewer years (approximately 40% of cases), there were also large numbers of cases involving a larger age difference. Indeed, approximately half of offenders victimized individuals that were more than 10 years younger than themselves.

Table 11
Offender/Victim Age Differences by Offense Type
(Unique Offenses)

Offense	Age Difference (Years)*														Total
	Off. Older	0-2	3-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	50+	Unk.	
Obscenity	5	29	13	7	1	3	5	9	3	3	1		2	18	99
Peeping Tom		4			2	3	2	1	1	1	2	2		15	33
Sex Offense Other	18	53	70	70	35	35	47	31	23	12	13	14	10	496	927
Sex Contact Forcible CSC 2nd	23	165	150	248	127	165	192	183	122	89	77	56	109	206	1912
Sex Contact Forcible CSC 4th	79	322	192	136	68	75	99	72	56	45	33	14	41	161	1393
Sex Pen. Blood/Affinity	1	5	2	1		2	3	2		1				4	21
Sex Pen. Non-Forcible Other	2	28	30	13	4	5			2					10	94
Sex Pen. Object CSC 1st	6	26	23	39	15	31	36	17	25	11	11	11	14	37	302
Sex Pen. Object CSC 3rd	6	26	16	16	5	14	9	2	4	1	1	2		11	113
Sex Pen. Oral/Anal CSC 1st	26	110	144	158	57	59	80	62	34	24	27	13	16	85	895
Sex Pen. Oral/Anal CSC 3rd	14	103	97	65	23	12	11	10	5	1	3	3	7	22	376
Sex Pen. Penis/Vagina CSC 1st	36	330	405	384	151	173	217	145	84	76	39	23	53	139	2255
Sex Pen. Penis/Vagina CSC 3rd	16	203	254	90	33	24	27	16	10	5	6	3	2	38	727

* Formula = (Offender age) – (victim age)
 Victim was older than the offender in 232 cases

Table 11 shows the distribution of offenses by offender/victim age differences. As with the general pattern of age differences among offenders and victims, few differences could be seen by offense type. There was some clustering of Sexual Penetration Penis/Vagina CSC 1st and 3rd in cases where the age difference was five years or less.

Table 12
Victim Offender Relationships
(Unique Offenses)

Relationship Type	Frequency	% of Total
Acquaintance or Former Roommate	1739	18.7%
Child	994	10.7%
Other Family Member	881	9.5%
Otherwise Known	879	9.5%
Friend	740	8.0%
Dating (boyfriend/girlfriend)	476	5.1%
Sibling (brother/sister)	459	4.9%
Stranger	334	3.6%
Step-child	245	2.6%
Grandchild	223	2.4%
Step-sibling	192	2.1%
Neighbor	175	1.9%
Child of Boyfriend/Girlfriend	158	1.7%
Former Dating (boyfriend/girlfriend)	97	1.0%
Step-parent	63	.7%
Babysitter (the baby)	61	.7%
Offender	43	.5%
Resident (Boyfriend/Girlfriend)	18	.2%
Homosexual Relationship	15	.2%
In-law	15	.2%
Former Resident (Boyfriend/Girlfriend)	10	.1%
Child in Common	8	.1%
Employee	5	.1%
Parent	3	< .1%
Grandparent	2	< .1%
Employer	2	< .1%
Ex-spouse	1	< .1%
Unreported	1442	15.5%
Total	9280	

Table 12 shows the distribution of the victim offender relationship for each unique offense. The most frequent relationship was that of an acquaintance, followed by an offender's child, and an "unspecified family member". The nature of the victim/offender relationship was unreported in 1,442 offenses, or 15.5%, and was reported as a stranger in only 3.6%. Thus, the vast majority of offenses, between 80.9 and 96.4%, of sexual offenses in Michigan in 2013 were committed by an offender who, in some facet, was known by the victim before the incident took place. This is also consistent with previously examined national trends (Snyder, 2000).

Conclusion

The results of these analyses are consistent with prior research (Snyder, 2000) that also used NIBRS data to examine patterns of child sexual victimization. Females were the victims in the vast majority of cases and males were the offenders in the overwhelming number of cases. Males tended to be at greatest risk for victimization at young ages, although females were at greatest risk at all ages. A sizeable portion of victimization involved offenders who were close in age to the victim but there were also large numbers of incidents that involved offenders considerably older than the victims. Most sexual offenses committed against children involved offenders known to the victim. Offenses committed by strangers were relatively rare. Parents, guardians, and other youth care providers should be aware that if childhood sexual victimization occurs, it is most likely committed by someone known to the youth and often involved adult caregivers.

References

- Briere, J., and Elliott, D. (1994) Immediate and long-term impacts of child sexual abuse. *The Future of Children*, 4(2), 54-69.
- Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, R., and Chaffin, M. (2009). Juveniles who commit sex offenses against minors. Report from the Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention.
- Jackson, A., and Deye, K. (2015). Aspects of abuse: Consequences of childhood victimization. *Current Problems in Pediatric and Adolescent Health Care*, 45(3), 86-93.
- Snyder, H. (2000). Sexual assault of young children as reported to law enforcement: Victim, incident, and offender characteristics. Report to the National Center for Juvenile Justice.