THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

THE DIFFERING RISK FACTORS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF INTRAFAMILIAL AND
EXTRAFAMILIAL CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

SARAH HENRY
SPRING 2018

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for baccalaureate degrees
in Sociology and Criminology
with honors in Sociology

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Richard Felson
Professor of Criminology and Sociology
Thesis Supervisor

Stacy Silver
Associate Professor of Sociology and Human Development and Family Studies
Honors Advisor, Sociology and Criminology
Director, Undergraduate Program in Sociology
Honors Adviser

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

This study examines some of the characteristics and risk factors of intrafamilial (family) and extrafamilial (outsider) child sexual. Few studies have examined the characteristics of either type of abuse. Many studies look at risk factors but do not examine abuse by family members and outsiders separately. I emphasize the role of opportunity, i.e., the circumstances that bring victims in contact with offenders in the absence of guardians. I use a survey of children to look at a child's age, gender, and family structure to see if they affect whether the child is abused and whether the abuser is a family member or an outsider. I identify which is more likely to be repeated and which is more likely to have a greater level of intimacy. I use binomial and multinomial logistic regression as well as chi-square. The results suggest that the younger a child is the more at risk they are for family sexual abuse. Females are more likely to be abused than males by family members and outsiders. Reconstituted families and single parent families are particularly likely to increase the risk of sexual abuse in general and by family members. Abuse by outsiders is likely to involve more intimate sexual encounters than family abuse. This knowledge gives us a greater understanding of who is at risk and what they are at risk of when looking at family and outsider child sexual abuse.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

INTRODUCTION

A large number of children are sexually abused (Ullman, Hilweg & Finkelhor 1999). Sometimes the offenders are strangers and sometimes they are people known to the victim. Those known to the victim include members of the child's family (e.g., stepparents, parents, siblings) or non-relatives (e.g., coaches, teachers, friends). Using data collected from two surveys done in Finland in 2008 and 2013, I compare abuse by family members to abuse by outsiders. I use this information to examine the risks and characteristics of intrafamilial and extrafamilial child sexual abuse. Opportunity plays a large role in connecting how the risk factors and characteristics of the abuse relate to the victim's relationship with the abuser. I use the Routine Activity Approach to identify the role opportunity plays and to gain a better understanding. My focus will be on the victim throughout my study. Three questions I hope to answer are: Are the risk factors different for sexual abuse by relatives versus non-relatives?   Does the victim's relation to the abuser affect whether the abuse will be repeated? Does the intimacy of the sexual abuse depend upon the victim's relation to the abuser?

The rationale for conducting this work is to gain a better understanding of two aspects of childhood sexual abuse: how risk factors influence the victim-abuser relationship and how that relationship affects the characteristics of the abuse. By seeing how risk factors differ between intrafamilial and extrafamilial child sexual abuse, we can better know when children are more at risk and by whom. Law enforcement can use this information to improve their investigation. For example, if my results show that children at specific ages are more likely to be abused by a member of the family then this information could give investigators more information on where

to start, making the investigation more efficient. This research will also help us better grasp how abuse affects the victim by providing us with more information on the characteristics of the abuse. Parents can use the information to better protect their children, and appropriate child care employees or volunteers can be trained in recognizing abuse. While looking at the characteristics of these two types of sexual abuse on intimacy and repetition we can better understand how to help victims. Especially with repetition, we can know if it may be an ongoing relationship that needs to be stopped. Also, examining causes and effects can help to gauge who may be more at risk for revictimization. By continuing this type of research, we can positively affect our community and our children's safety. Child sexual abuse is a topic that many are afraid to talk about but keeping it in the dark only further promotes it.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Many scholars have made strides in research on childhood sexual abuse. To build on what they have accomplished, this paper will focus specifically on the differences between intrafamilial and extrafamilial child sexual abuse to add to our collective knowledge and understanding. The purpose of the study is to compare intrafamilial (family) and extrafamilial (outsider) abuse, specifically looking at characteristics and risk factors. First, I examine whether the risk factors affect whether the child is sexually abused by a family member or outsider. The specific risk factors I plan to focus on are age, sex, and family structure. Second, I identify the difference in characteristics of family and outsider abuse. The characteristics of the abuse I will pay particular attention to are repetition (the number of incidents with the same offender) and the level of intimacy (how physically intimate the abuse became). Previous studies have not been helpful in looking at the differences between risk factors of intrafamilial and extrafamilial sexual abuse because they combine the two. We have reason to believe that the risk factors do differ, and therefore research is needed on this topic (Black, Heyman, Smith Slep 2001).

Theory

The main theory from which my inquiry stems is Opportunity Theory, also known as Routine Activities Approach. The idea behind Opportunity Theory is that the more opportunity there is for crime to occur the more likely it will occur. Undertones of this theory can be found in the old saying "opportunity makes the thief" (Felson and Clarke 1998:1). I plan to look at how

the Routine Activities Approach explains child sexual abuse risk factors. In the Routine Activities Approach, crime occurs when the three aspects "motivated offender, suitable target, and the absence of a capable guardian" come together (Cohen and Felson 1979:589, Leclerc & Felson 2014). This approach relates to child sexual abuse in that the "motivated offender" can gain access to a child easily depending on their relation, creating an opportunity for abuse to occur. The supervision of a child is at the center of the Routine Activity Approach (Leclerc & Felson 2014). Finkelhor and Baron found that "parental unavailability" increases the risk of abuse greatly. I will not be directly testing the theory but use it as my basis when considering factors like age, sex, family structure, repetition, and intimacy with respect to the offender and likelihood of access.

Other literature by Walker, Golden, and Vanhouten (2001) discusses the location aspect of opportunity. Just like any crime the motivated offender needs a proper location to commit the crime. Location relates to child sexual abuse in that family members would have access to a suitable target in different locations than an outsider (Leclerc & Felson 2014). These locations would be more private, like a bedroom where more intimate or repeated abuse could occur.

The child's family structure, age, and gender influence what the child does and who they are around. Younger children spend more time in the home and therefore create a greater opportunity of being abused by a family member. When looking at a child's gender, different situational factors create opportunities for sexual abuse to occur (Wortley & Smallbone 2006). Girls tend to spend more time in the home (Huston, Wright, Marquis, and Green 1999). This time in the home creates a greater opportunity for family sexual abuse. A child's family structure affects who is in the home. A single parent or reconstituted family will have more people in the

home that are not biologically related to the child, thus giving them the same opportunity as a family member.

Characteristics

Repetition

A major finding throughout literature dealing with sexual assault is the theme of re-victimization. Not all studies take the offender being the same person into account. However, a 1986 study took the same offender and their relation to the victim into account by looking at what they deemed duration. Duration was not the number of incidents but how long the abuse continued. In this study, they found that the only intrafamilial abuse lasted more than a year (Mian, Wehrspann, Klajner-Diamond, LeBaron, & Winder 1986). This discovery was upheld by a more recent study that found extrafamilial abuse more likely to just be a single incident than intrafamilial abuse (Fischer & McDonald 1998). Erickson, Walbek, and Seely (1988) also found family sexual abuse to be more repetitive.

While some studies did not focus on when the re-victimization occurred, Boney-Mccoy and Finkelhor conducted a study focusing on the re-victimization of children while they are still children. This study reports that prior abuse, sexual or not, increases the chances of re-victimization as a child (Boney-Mccoy & Finkelhor 1995).

Also, Herman's (1981) study of father-daughter incest promotes the idea that if someone experienced sexual abuse as a child, they are more at risk for sexual assault later. We can also look at Moeller & Bachmann (1993), who focused on both sexual and non-sexual child abuse in their study and maintained that prior abuse puts someone at a greater risk for re-victimization.

While all of these studies showed that prior victims are more at risk for re-victimization they lacked specifics dealing with the offender. First, these scholars did not address whether the separate incidents were with the same offender. A victim of child sexual abuse can have multiple incidents of abuse with the same offender. They also did not discuss the victim's relation to the offender or they only looked at a specific relationship. I feel these findings are important to include because they address a pattern of repetition. My study will be able to focus on the re-victimization with the same victim and offender.

Following prior research, I hypothesize that intrafamilial sexual abuse is more likely than extrafamilial sexual abuse to be repeated by the same offender because they have more consistent access to the victim and therefore more opportunity. Re-victimization is an important aspect that can encompass the same or different a offender. Instead of just focusing on re-victimization itself, I will look at why it may happen specifically with the same offender.

Level of Intimacy

As mentioned before, child sexual abuse is an uncomfortable topic in itself without delving into the specifics of what happened. That may be the reason why the literature on it is not as extensive. However, some studies did ask specifically about the physical act as well as information on the offender's relation to the child.

These studies suggest that intrafamilial abuse tends to be more serious or intimate (Fischer & McDonald 1998). Fondling was more common for a neighbor or a more distant relative such as great uncle or step-father (Muram 1989). Another study agreed with previous studies that in intrafamilial child sexual abuse, over multiple incidents, the physical acts

gradually progressed reaching very intimate levels (Erickson, Walbek, and Seely 1988). Even

when an extrafamilial abuser had the same opportunity, a greater level of intimacy was less

likely to occur.

However, other studies did not find intrafamilial abuse to be more intimate. In fact, one

study found no statistical difference between who the abuser was and the intimacy of the abuse.

Concerning intimacy, this study only found that fondling was the most common and "dry"

intercourse was only found in intrafamilial abuse. (Mian, Wehrspann, Klajner-Diamond,

LeBaron, & Winder 1986). Russell (1983), however, conducted a study that ended with opposite

results. This study argues that less serious or intimate forms of sexual abuse that occur within the

family in the same generation are less likely to be reported; therefore, it is hard to know the true

number of incidents. He further states over half of extrafamilial child abuse cases were

categorized as very serious ("ranging from forced penile-vaginal penetration to attempted

fellatio, cunnilingus, analingus, anal intercourse--not by force"), whereas less than 25% of

intrafamilial cases were categorized very serious ("ranging from forced digital penetration of the

vagina to nonforceful attempted breast contact or simulated intercourse") (Russell 1983:140).

From the larger and more recent findings, I hypothesize that intrafamilial abuse will be

more intimate Since family members will have more access to the child in more secluded and

intimate locations, I believe family abuse will be more intimate.

Risk Factors

Age

The age of the child can play a major role in a child's risk of sexual abuse. An article by Finkelhor and Baron (1986) shows that overall children in the preadolescent years are most likely to be victimized. However, Finkelhor and Asdigian (1996) found that older children are more at risk for being abused. Age is not only a risk factor for the abuse itself but also affects who the abuser is. At different ages, children participate in different activities that make them susceptible to different offenders. Younger children tend to spend more time with family members, while adolescents participate in more activities outside of their family. Much of the literature shows that victims of intrafamilial child sexual abuse tend to be younger. In 1986, children under 5 were 1.7 times more likely to be abused by a family member than children in the 5 to 6 age category (Mian, Wehrspann, Klajner-Diamond, LeBaron, & Winder 1986). Russell (1983) supports this idea in a study of only female victims, reporting 71% of the victims of intrafamilial sexual abuse were under the age of 14, while 65% of extrafamilial sexual abuse happened to children under the age of 14. A separate study discovered children who experience intrafamilial child sexual abuse are around 3 years younger than victims of extrafamilial abuse (Fischer & McDonald 1998). The De Jong (1983) study did not separate intrafamilial and extrafamilial, but it did separate known and unknown offenders. In this study they found the younger the victim was the less likely they were assaulted by a stranger. "Children are more vulnerable to parental assault by being smaller, more dependent, or weaker" (Finkelhor & Asdigian 1996:15).

Delinquency also is an age-related activity that affects victimization. Delinquency puts a child more at risk for non-family abuse (Finkelhor & Asdigian 1996). Older children and boys are more likely to be involved in delinquent activities; putting themselves in a place with other offenders that may take advantage of them. While I will not be looking at delinquency, it is important to view it as an example of the different routine activities that come along with age and sex (Finkelhor & Asdigian 1996).

Age-related findings all seem to point toward the same outcome of younger children being more likely abused at home. However, some did not show significant difference which I hope to better understand through my own data analysis. Since younger children spend a majority of their time with family members and older children are more independent and involved with activities chaperoned by outsiders, I hypothesize that younger children will be more at risk for intrafamilial sexual abuse and older children more at risk for extrafamilial abuse.

Gender

Concerning the risk factor of gender, research has shown that girls are more likely than boys to be victims of sexual abuse (Finkelhor & Baron 1986). However, some literature found males to be more commonly abused by a family member than a non-family member (Mian, Wehrspann, Klajner-Diamond, LeBaron, & Winder 1986). In contrast, an earlier study displayed that "males were more likely than females to be assaulted by a stranger or acquaintance" (De Jong 1983:157-158). Russell (1983) conducted a study on only female victims that found females who are sexually abused under the age of 18 are more likely to be abused by a non-relative. His percentages were, 16% experienced intrafamilial abuse, 31% experienced

extrafamilial, and 38% experienced intrafamilial and/or extrafamilial abuse (Russell 1983). This

study offered more insight in that it not only looked at whether the offender was related to the

victim, but if the victim knew the offender as well. The breakdown was "11% were total

strangers, 29% were relatives, and 60% were known to the victims but unrelated to them"

(Russell 1983:140). Based off more recent studies, I hypothesize that girls will be abused more

than boys overall, but boys are more likely to be abused by an outsider than a family member

and girls by a family member. Girls spend more time in the home and therefore family members

have a greater access and opportunity to abuse while outsiders would have less access them

(Huston, Wright, Marquis, and Green 1999).

Family Structure

The last risk factor I examine is family structure. The presence of both parents, one

parent, or a non-biological parent has been found to be related to child sexual victimization

(Turner et al. 2007). Families with both biological parents present tend to impose less risk for

child sexual abuse (Gwirayi 2012) while families with a single parent or a stepparent increase the

risk for child victimization (Lauritsen 2003, Savolainen 2007). Reconstituted families or families

with a stepparent tend to have more dysfunction or conflict between the parents and the child.

This dysfunction can create a greater risk of abuse (Finkelhor & Baron 1986, Hetherington et al.

1998, Savolainen 2007). Therefore, children in reconstituted families are more likely to

experience an incident of victimization, especially victimization perpetrated by a family member.

Finkelhor and Asdigian found that family structure was not as large of a risk factor when dealing

with abuse by a non-family member. However, they did find the presence of a stepparent to be a

risk factor for parental abuse (1996). The presence of a stepparent provides opportunity by having someone who is not biologically related in the same household. One of the reasons people will not abuse a family member is because they cannot get passed the biological component. With a stepparent this is not an issue. They have the same amount of opportunity as a biological family member without the biological connection that may hold some offenders back. Also, having a stepparent or single parent can also create dysfunction in the home as described above.

However, children in single parent or stepparent families are also at risk for abuse by an outsider (Turner et al. 2007). A decent portion of the literature looks specifically at family structure based on the presence of a father figure, especially a stepfather. The transition from a single mother alone to a single mother with stepfather increases the risk for girls but not for boys (Finkelhor, Hotaling, Lewis, & Smith 1990). Also, stepfathers are the most likely to commit the most intimate sexual abuse of any other relative (Russell 1983). Russell (1983) found the percent of girls who had a stepfather and were abused by that stepfather was quadruple the percent of girls abused by their natural fathers. In another study done the same year, the presence of a stepfather or foster father was frequently found among victims; however, they were not always the abuser. This means that their presence is not just a risk factor in them being the abuser, but a risk factor for abuse itself (Gruber & Jones 1983). While both reconstituted families and single parent families show an increased risk of child sexual abuse they have not been compared to one another. They have only been compared when dealing with child physical abuse where children with a stepparent were found to be more at risk than children with single parents (Daly & Wilson). I want to see if this is also true for child sexual abuse. I hypothesize that the presence of a stepparent or a family with only a single parent are more likely to cause intrafamilial sexual abuse.

Current Study

Through the literature we gain a fuller understanding of what is known and what is left to discover. As I delve further into some unanswered questions, I hypothesize that younger children will be more at risk for intrafamilial sexual abuse and older children more at risk for extrafamilial abuse, girls will be abused more than boys overall, but boys are more likely to be abused by an outsider than a family member and girls by a family member. Families with a stepparent or single parent are more likely to have intrafamilial sexual abuse to occur over extrafamilial. Finally, I hypothesize that intrafamilial sexual abuse is more likely than extrafamilial sexual abuse to be repeated by the same offender, and intrafamilial abuse will be more intimate.

DATA & METHODS

Data

The data I am using was collected in Finland through two separate surveys done in 2008 and 2013. The surveys I am using are of children in sixth and ninth grade with ages ranging from ten to seventeen. This data includes demographic information on the child as well as information on the child's family. The portion of the data that deals with child sexual abuse looks at abusers who are at least 5 years older than their victim. Respondents reported their age at the time of the incident as well as the older person's age at the time. These can be used to identify the age difference between the two parties. Doing this revealed that not all of the entries in this subset were consistent with the older person being 5 or more years older. To produce the most accuracy, I retain people who reported an age difference of four years as long as they answered "yes" to an earlier question about whether they had ever had sexual contact with someone five or more years older. If they skipped the question or answered "no," I excluded those responses. These cases totaled to 2483 cases. The data does not include as much information about the abuser as it does the victim, but it does include what the abuser's relationship was to the child and information on the abuse itself. Respondents could report up to three separate incidents of sexual abuse with different offenders.

My data comes from Finland, which is more open to asking children specific questions dealing with child sexual abuse. This is a strength of the data because it contains information the US does not have in its own domestic surveys. The laws in Finland on child sexual abuse are

comparable to the laws in the US, so I believe that we can apply the results from this data to the US. I believe this is likely comparable to not only the US, but most westernized countries do to the similarities in laws.

Measurements

The age of the victim during the time of the abuse and gender of the child are the two demographic risk factors I focus on. I recode male as 0 and female as 1. The other main risk factor that I focus on deals with the victim's family structure. I concentrate on whether there is a step parent, single parent, or other family structure. Family structure is a set of dummy variables with four categories. Those categories are Nuclear Family, Single Parent, Reconstituted Family, and Other Family. I combine the category of father and stepmother with mother and stepfather to create the variable Reconstituted Family. I recode the rest as Nuclear Family, Single Parent, and Other Family to create binary variables.

Next, I will focus on two separate characteristics of child sexual abuse. I plan to look at the intimacy of the abuse as well as the number of incidents or repetition of the abuse. When dealing with intimacy of abuse, I recode the variables describing "what happened?" into seven categories going from most intimate to least intimate: Penetration, simulated intercourse, touched naked privates, touched clothed privates, exposed privates, petting, and suggestion of sexual act. When looking at repetition, I will focus on the variable that asks, "How many different sexual encounters did you have with this same person?" The responses given were once, 2-10 times, and over 10 times. Both characteristics are ordinal variables that deal with child sexual abuse.

For my interests I combine the types of offenders into two categories. The offenders in the survey are persons who are at least five years older than the victim. I split the offenders into intrafamilial and extrafamilial. I combine cousin, uncle or aunt, grandparent, brother/step-brother, sister/step-sister, father, step-father, mother, and step-mother into the intrafamilial category and separate the rest into the extrafamilial category. These two categories are how I split the offender for each risk factor and characteristic.

The last variable I include is education. I combine the mother and father's education to have the variable of parent education. This variable specifies if one or both or their parents went to college. This variable gives us an idea of the respondent's socioeconomic status.

Analysis

Logistic Regression will be the most practical way to look at the relationship between age, sex and family structure of victim and relation to the offender. I will also consider chi-square tests for the characteristics of abuse. I will look at regression with each variable and use a combination of mother and father's education as a control variable for socioeconomic status. I will use Nuclear Family as the reference group. I use binomial logistic regression when I want to compare only those who have been abused, but multinomial when I want to compare those who were abused to those who were not abused. I will also split who the offender is into categories of abuse by a father or stepfather and abuse by other and compare it with presence of a stepfather. I do this to look at the relationship of the presence of abuse when a stepfather is present, and to see if the stepfather is the abuser as well.

RESULTS

In Tables 1 and 2, I present the descriptive statistics for each variable for children that experienced abuse. Age was the only continuous variable, so it is the only one with a mean and standard deviation. Overall, we see that more than half involve multiple encounters or repeated abuse. Penetrative sex was found to be the most common level of intimacy. Here we see that females make up a majority of the respondents. Nuclear family is also found to be the most common family structure with single parent and reconstituted following in that order. Looking at the respondent's 'parents' education only around 14 percent graduated from college. This is specifically for respondents who experienced sexual abuse which may explain such a low education rate in the parents.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Percentage
Characteristics	
Repetition	
Once	46.6%
2-10 times	42%
Over 10 times	11.4%
Intimacy	
Suggesting something sexual	10.3%
Petting or caressing	12.3%
Exposed private parts	6%
Touch private parts over clothing	16.1%
Touch naked private parts	6.7%
Simulated sex	10.3%
Penetrative sex	38.5%

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Percentage
Risk Factors	
Age at the time of incident	(mean) 13.55 (SD) 2.578
Sex	
Female	74.7%
Male	25.3%
Family Structure	
Nuclear Family	62.6%
Single Parent	21.9%
Reconstituted Family	12.5%
Other Family	2.6%
Control	
Parent has a college education	14.4%

Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations between how often the abuse was repeated and the relationship with the offender are presented in Table 3. For intrafamilial abuse, most incidents were repeated, but it rarely happened over ten times. A good portion of outsider abuse only occurred once. The percentage for over ten times was the lowest category for both family and outsider abuse. However, family abuse being repeated over 10 times had a larger percentage than outsider abuse,

which suggests that family is more likely to be repeated over 10 times **than** outsider **abuse**. When looking at the table we see that family abuse has higher percentages than outsider abuse for abuse that occurred more than once. **The results are not significant, but it does appear that abuse involving family members was more likely to be repeated.**

Table 3 Crosstabulation of How Often the Abuse was Repeated and Relationship with the Offender

	Once	2-10 times	Over 10 times	
Family	38.2%	44.9%	16.9%	100%
Outsider	47.2%	42.1%	10.6%	100%
Pearson's Chi-square: 4.536 p-value: 0.104				

Crosstabulations between the level of intimacy and the relationship with the offender are presented in Table 4. The acts are arranged from most intimate to least. Intimate touching of private parts over clothing is a higher percentage category for both outsider and family abuse. In fact, it is the highest form of abuse for family abuse. It looks like penetrative sex could also be driving the significance, although we are not getting much of a change in intimacy. If we combine the three least categories and the following three, we see that penetrative sex does not follow the same pattern. Excluding penetrative sex, the other more intimate acts are higher for family abuse than outsider abuse. I found this to be statistically significant with Pearson's chi-square. There is more touching in family than outsider abuse. Family abuse has less penetrative sex and more minor sexual interaction; while outsider abuse is more penetrative.

Table 4 Crosstabulation of Level of Intimacy and Relationship with Offender

	Penetrative Sex	Simulated Sex	Touch Naked Private Parts	Touch Private Parts Over Clothing	Exposed Private Parts	Petting or Caressing	Suggest Something Sexual	
Family	24.6%	13.5%	14.3%	27.8%	2.4%	13.5%	4.0%	100%
Outsider	40.8%	10.4%	6.5%	15.0%	5.6%	11.9%	9.8%	100%
Pearson's Chi-square: 37.606 p-value: **.000**								

Crosstabulations between gender and the relationship with the offender are presented in Table 5. Females had a slightly higher percentage than males of abuse from family members but are about the same. This was not found to be statistically significant. Overall both males and females were more commonly abused by an outsider.

Crosstabulations between family structure and the relationship with the offender are presented in Table 6. Looking at the different family structures we see that nuclear family, single parent, and other family structures had around 5% of the abuse from a family member. However, the categories containing a stepparent had over 10% of the incidents of abuse by a family member. Between families with a stepfather and families with a stepmother, families with stepfathers had a slightly higher percentage of family abuse.

Crosstabulations between presence of a stepfather with if abuse was perpetrated by a father figure presented in table 7. Looking specifically at the relationship between having a stepfather and if the father/stepfather was the abuser, the results show that having a stepfather increased the percentages of being abused by the father/stepfather. In general, it increases the chances of being abused not just by a stepfather but by anyone. Having a stepfather did not appear to have an effect on the stepfather or father more likely being the abuser. The presence of

a stepfather specifically did make a child more at risk of sexual abuse and this is statistically

significant.

Table 5 Crosstabulation of Relationship with Offender and Gender

	Family	Outsider	
Female	6.6%	93.4%	100%
Male	5.8%	94.2%	100%
Pearson's Chi-square: .334 p-value: .563			

Table 6 Crosstabulation of Relationship with Offender and Family Structure

	Family	Outsider	
Nuclear Family	5%	95%	100%
Single Parent	6.1%	93.9%	100%
Mom + Stepdad	13.5%	86.4%	100%
Dad + Stepmom	11.1%	88.9%	100%
Other	5.5%	94.5%	100%
Pearson's Chi-square: 24.776 p-value: **.000**			

Table 7 Crosstabulation of Presence of a Stepfather with whether Offender was a Father Figure

	Not abused	Abused by Father/Stepfather	Abused but not by Father/Stepfather	
Both Biological Parents	94.5%	0.0%	5.5%	100%
Stepfather and Mother	90.9%	0.7%	8.4%	100%
Pearson's Chi-square: 138.889 p-value: **.000**				

Binary Logistic Regression

Table 8 shows the results of the binary logistic regression with each variable. This table represents the relationship between the risk factors and intrafamilial and extrafamilial child sexual abuse. Through this regression we are predicting the abuse by family versus abuse by an outsider.

The first risk factor is age. The independent variable is the respondent's age at the time of the incident of abuse and whether the abuse was intrafamilial (family) or extrafamilial (outsider) is the dependent variable. The relationship between age and the child's relationship with the abuser is significant ($p<.05$). With intrafamilial being 1 and extrafamilial being 0, age has a negative relationship with who the offender is; which means the younger the respondent's age at the time of the incident, the more likely the abuser was by a family member. Looking at the second demographic risk factor, gender, I found this relationship to be not significant.

Family structure is separated into four binary categories, but nuclear family was left out of the binary logistic regression to be the reference group. Looking at the results for family structure, only reconstituted families are found to have a significant relationship to who the abuser was. Since the coefficient for this relationship is positive, being in a reconstituted family makes the child more at risk for family abuse than outsider abuse than if a child is a part of a nuclear family. While not significant, we do see that the other family structure category has a substantial negative coefficient.

The control variable is the parent's education. Parent education was not found to be significant. Analyses not presented suggest the parent's education did not change the relationship of any of the other variables. The age at the time of the incident and reconstituted families are

still statistically significant and their coefficients change very little. Therefore, the results

including parent education support my current findings.

Table 8 Binary Logistic Regression Predicting Abuse by Outsiders and Family Members

Variables	b	SE.	Sig.
Parents' College Education	-0.206	.471	.662
Age	**-0.290**	.028	**.000**
Female	0.055	.245	.822
Family Structure			
Single Parent	0.004	.271	.987
Reconstituted Family	**1.065**	.255	**.000**
Other Family	-0.609	.791	.441
Constant	0.020	.447	.965

Multinomial Logistic Regression

I also conducted a multinomial logistic regression with the same factors I used for the binary logistic regression, with the exception of age at the time of the incident because that would only be present in cases of abuse. The binary logistic regression compared incidents of sexual abuse, but in the multinomial logistic regression I am comparing respondents who experienced family or outsider abuse to those who experienced no abuse. In Table 9 we can see the results of this test. The results show that girls are at greater risk of abuse by outsiders (p<0.05). Also, any family structure compared to a nuclear family structure have coefficients that are positive with the exception of other family which means that a child with a single parent, stepparent increases a child's risk of being abused by an outsider. Also, or being female increases a child's risk of being abused by an outsider.

In comparing family abuse to no abuse, all risk factors are significant except for other family. The coefficients again are positive. However, some have increased dramatically. The coefficient for reconstituted family is much stronger for family abuse than outsider. Reconstituted family is more important for family abuse than outsider abuse. Single parent families also have a stronger coefficient when looking at family abuse compared to outsider abuse. All the coefficients increase but reconstituted family has the most dramatic increase with single parent following. Girls are more likely than boys to be abused by a family member or outsider.

The variable measuring if the child's parent went to college to test the relative relationship of risk factors to if the abuser was family or an outsider. The parent's education is not significant and is not of primary focus.

Table 9 Multinomial Logistic Regression Predicting Abuse by Outsiders and Family Members Compared to No Abuse

Variables	Outsider			Family		
	B	SE	Sig.	b	SE	Sig.
Parent Education	-.142	0.084	0.092	-.485	.380	.202
Female	**1.150**	.051	**.000**	**1.322**	.211	**.000**
Family Structure						
Single Parent	**.481**	.057	**.000**	**.004**	.001	**.001**
Reconstituted Family	**.400**	.072	**.000**	**1.461**	.209	**.000**
Other Family	**.889**	.144	**.000**	.819	.594	.122
Intercept	-3.989	.067	.000	-7.187	.281	.000

DISCUSSION

In this study, the data from two large surveys of Finnish youth were merged so that I could examine how risk factors and characteristics differ for sexual abuse from family members versus outsiders. The results display the differences and exemplify opportunity's part. A limitation of this study is that a good portion of the abuse was between a child and someone five years older that they viewed as their partner or saw themselves as being in a relationship with. While this is categorized as abuse, some of the children involved did not see it this way.

When I examine repetition and how it differs between family and outsider abuse, I see that abuse by a family member was likely to happen more than once, while outsider abuse mostly happened once. The percentages present mixed evidence. However, we can surmise that abuse by family members was more likely to occur repeatedly, even though this was not statistically significant. These findings are not consistent with the limited literature discussed earlier since they are not significant. It may not have been statistically significant because the number of cases of family abuse is small; most of the abuse in my sample is by outsider. There is still reason to believe that family abuse is more commonly repeated. Opportunity explains why family abuse is more likely to be repeated than outsider abuse. Family members have a greater access to the child. A child's family is relatively consistent throughout their life while teachers, coaches, neighbors, etc. could all change. The change of these outsiders is more likely and more common than that of family members. For example, each year a child receives a new teacher. Family members will have access to the child for years, while that access may vary as the child ages,

they still will have more consistent access and therefore be able to abuse the child more than once. They have more continual contact.

Continuing with characteristics of abuse, I hypothesized that family abuse would be more intimate. However, this was not entirely the case. Penetrative sex was found to be more frequent in cases of outsider abuse. If we exclude penetrative sex, then the other intimate acts are more frequent in family abuse, which is consistent with my hypothesis and the previous studies. From these results it seems that if the abuse does not reach penetrative sex, it follows a pattern of being more intimate with abuse from a family member. Outsider abuse may more frequently include penetrative sex because they do not need to worry about a biological connection. It could also be because they have less opportunity and therefore view it as their only chance. Thus, we see that family sexual abuse appears to be intimate than outsider abuse except for penetrative sex.

The results for the respondent's age echo the previous literature. The younger a child is the more likely their abuser is a family member. The older a child is the more likely the abuser is an outsider. This directly supports my hypothesis. I suggested that family members have a greater opportunity to sexually abuse a child when they are younger. Younger children require constant supervision and most times it is from other family members. In the years before kids go to school they spend a majority of their time at home and with family. Their activities are limited to outside activities their parents or caretakers take them to. Older children or teens are exposed to more people outside of their family. Older children have more opportunities of freedom and independence that put them in more contact with non-family members. From previous literature and our current findings, it is reasonable to assume that family members have a greater opportunity with younger children and outsiders with older children.

Unlike age, gender is not a predictor of the child's relationship to their abuser, but a predictor of abuse itself. This is not especially surprising since the literature did not bring us to a clear conclusion. The literature demonstrated that girls are sexually abused more often than boys. This is consistent with our results. When looking at our descriptive statistics, girls make up around 75% of the sample of those who have experienced sexual abuse from a larger population that is more evenly split by gender. Also, when comparing either kind of abuse with no abuse we see that females are significantly more likely to be at risk for abuse than males. This is again consistent with previous literature.

The results on family structure lead to the belief that the structure of the family affects what type of relationship the child has with the abuser. A reconstituted family structure is the family structure that I find has the greatest relationship with who the abuser is. The literature mainly talks about stepfathers abusing their stepdaughters, and this relationship supports my findings. My results show that children that are a part of a reconstituted family structure are more likely to be abused by a family member instead of an outsider. Abuse by a family member is much more likely in families with a stepparent. This increase is a lot greater than that of single parent families. This finding can be partly explained through opportunity. For some extrafamilial abusers, they will not abuse anyone biologically related to them. We can assume for some, the idea of sexual relations with a biological relative is too deviant. In a reconstituted family, there are members of the family that are not biological relatives. This means they cohabitate with someone who is not a blood relative. This is, in theory, someone who has access to them every day in private locations like the home. This creates a large space for opportunity. A step-family member has a greater opportunity without biological inhibitions. While the literature focuses on stepfathers, as they make up a good portion of perpetrators in the scenario, they are not the only

abusers in this category. From my crosstabulation we see that just because someone is abused and has a stepfather it does not mean that they are always abused by their stepfather. Step-siblings as well as a stepmother could also be the abuser.

Single parent families are another structure that tend to also have an effect and show significance in my study. It affects abuse by outsiders and family members. Here we can see this happening through opportunity. The lack of two parents my give one parent the opportunity to abuse a child. However, the lack of parent supervision could also create the opportunity for an outsider to abuse the child. Therefore, the single parent family structure as a risk factor does not change in relation to who the abuser is.

CONCLUSION

Through this study we see that some of the risk factors and characteristic of intrafamilial and extrafamilial child sexual abuse are different. Through opportunity, offenders gain access to their victims at certain ages, in certain family structures, to do specific acts. We can see that a victim's age and family structure are significantly different for family and outsider abuse. These risk factors have not been heavily researched and we now have a greater understanding. My results on gender matched with previous literature in that females are overall abused more than boys. Looking more specifically at each gender and comparing them would be an area of further interest. In this study we also see that a child's family structure plays a role in who their abuser is. While my study is consistent with some of the previous literature, it also sheds light on the large risk that children of reconstituted families face of being abused by a family member. This study gives us greater knowledge of how different family and outsider abuse is. This study is especially important because it comes directly from children and involves information on the intimacy of the abuse. This study expands our knowledge of what puts children at risk of family or outsider abuse.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Black, Danielle a, Richard E. Heyman, and Amy M. Smith Slep. 2001. "Risk Factors for Child Sexual Abuse." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 6(2-3):203–29. Retrieved November 21, 2016 (http://www.sciencedirect.com.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/science/article/pii/S1359178900000239).

Boney-Mccoy, Sue and David Finkelhor. 1995. "Prior Victimization: A Risk Factor for Child Sexual Abuse and for PTSD-Related Symptomatology among Sexually Abused Youth." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 19(12):1401–21. Retrieved

Cohen, L. E. 1981. "Modeling crime trends: A criminal opportunity perspective." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 17:140-159.

Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. 1979. "Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach." *American Sociological Review,* 44: 588–608

Daly, Martin and Margo Wilson. n.d. "Child Abuse and Other Risk Factors of Not Living with Both Parents." *Department of Psychology, McMaster University*. Retrieved

De Jong, A. R., Hervada, A. R., & Emmett, G. A. 1983. "Epidemiologic variations in childhood sexual abuse." *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 7: 155–162.

Erickson, W. D., Walbek, N. H., & Seeley, R. K. 1988. "Behavior patterns of child molesters." *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 17: 77–86.

Felson, Marcus and R. V. Clarke. 1998. "Opportunity Makes the Thief: Practical Theory for Crime Prevention." *Police Research Series*.

Finkelhor, D., & Asdigian, N. L. 1996. Risk factors for youth victimization: Beyond a lifestyles theoretical approach. Violence & Victims, 11, 3–20.

Finkelhor, David, Gerald Hotaling, I. A. Lewis, and Christine Smith. 1990. "SEXUAL ABUSE IN A NATIONAL SURVEY OF ADULT MEN AND WOMEN: PREVALENCE, CHARACTERISTICS, AND RISK FACTORS ." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 14:19–28.

Finkelhor, David and Larry Baron. 1986. "Risk Factors for Child Sexual Abuse." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 1(1):43–71. Retrieved November 30, 2016 (http://jiv.sagepub.com.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/content/1/1/43.full.pdf html).

Fischer, Donald G. and Wendy L. Mcdonald. 1998. "Characteristics of Intrafamilial and Extrafamilial Child Sexual Abuse." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 22(9):915–29. Retrieved November 30, 2016

Gruber, Kenneth J. and Robert J. Jones. 1983. "Identifying determinants of risk of sexual victimization of youth: A multivariate approach." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 7(1):17–24.

Gwirayi, Pesanayi. 2012. "Child Sexual Abuse among Urban Secondary School Pupils: Impact of Family Characteristics and Family Structure." *International Review of Social Sciences and Humanities* 3(1):36–50.

Hetherington, E. M., Bridges, M., & Isabella, G. M. 1998. "What matters? What does not? Five perspectives on the association between marital transitions and children's adjustment." *American Psychologist*, 53: 167– 184.

Herman, J. (1981). Father–daughter incest. Professional Psychology, 12(1), 76-80.

Huston, Aletha C., John C. Wright, Janet Marquis, and Samuel B. Green. 1999. "How Young Children Spend Their Time: Television and Other Activities." *Developmental Psychology*35(4):912–25.

Lauritsen, J. L. 2003. "How Families and Communities Influence Youth Victimization." *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*

Leclerc, Benoit and Marcus Felson. 2014. "Routine Activities Preceding Adolescent Sexual Abuse of Younger Children." Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment 28(2):116–31.

Mian, M., Wehrspann, W., Klajner-Diamond, H., LeBaron, D., & Winder, C. 1986. "Review of 125 children 6 years of age and under who were sexually abused." *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 10: 223–229

Moeller, Tamerra P., Gloria A. Bachmann, and James R. Moeller. 1993. "The combined effects of physical, sexual, and emotional abuse during childhood: Long-Term health consequences for women." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 17(5):623–40.

 Muram, David. 1989. "Child Sexual Abuse: Relationship between Sexual Acts and Genital Findings." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 13(2):211–16.

Russell, Diana E. h. 1983. "The incidence and prevalence of intrafamilial and extrafamilial sexual abuse of female children." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 7(2):133–46.

Savolainen, Jukka. 2007. "Family Structure and Adolescent Victimization in Finland: Investigating the Stepfamily as a Source of Risk." *Research on Finnish Society* 1:17–27.

Turner, Heather, David Finkelhor, and Richard Ormrod. 2007. "Family Structure Variations in Patterns and Predictors of ..." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 77(2): 282–295. Retrieved September 26, 2017

Ullmann, Elisabeth, Werner Hilweg, and David Finkelhor. 1999. *Childhood and Trauma: Separation, Abuse, War*. Aldershot, Hants, England: Ashgate.

Walker, Jeffery T., James W. Golden, and Amy C. Vanhouten. 2001. "The Geographic Link Between Sex Offenders And Potential Victims: A Routine Activities Approach." *Justice Research and Policy* 3(2):15–34.

Wortley, R. and Smallbone, S. 2006. "Applying situational principles to sexual offenses against children." Situational prevention of child sexual abuse. *Crime prevention Studies* 19:7–35.

.

Academic Vita of Sarah Henry
seh5488@psu.edu

Education
Criminology and Sociology
Dean's list 6 semesters
Paterno Fellow
Schreyer Honors Scholar

Thesis Title:
The Differing Risk Factors and Characteristics of Intrafamilial and Extrafamilial Child Sexual Abuse
Thesis Supervisor: Dr. Richard Felson

Work Experience:

January 2017-May 2017
Teaching Assistant in Sexual and Domestic Violence
Attended each class and kept track of participation as well as grading reading quizzes
The Pennsylvania State University
Caren Bloom

January 2018-May 2018
Teaching Assistant in Sociology of Deviance
Attended most classes to assist in teaching and graded precis assignments
The Pennsylvania State University
Tim Robicheaux

Presentations:

Guest speaker on child sexual abuse in classes: Crim 406, Crim 467, and Crim 423

Community Service Involvement:

Volunteer with local youth group

Volunteer at Lancaster County Youth Intervention Center