

Family and Intimate Partner Violence in Idaho: Trends from 2004—2007

Idaho State Police
Statistical Analysis Center

Family and Intimate Partner Violence Trends: 2004—2007

Idaho State Police
Planning, Grants and Research Bureau
Statistical Analysis Center
Meridian, ID 83680-0700
(208) 884-7044
Pgr@isp.idaho.gov

Website:
[Www.isp.state.id.us/pgr/Research/sac.html](http://www.isp.state.id.us/pgr/Research/sac.html)

Author: Janeena Jamison Wing
Editors: Misty Kifer, Jill Eden, Mary Burke and Meredith Pond
April 2009

Cost information for this publication is available from the Idaho State Police in accordance with Idaho Code, Section 60 202. This project was supported by Grant No. 2006-STCC-88, 2007-STCC-88 and 06-BJSC-00. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not represent the official position or policies of the United States Department of Justice.

What is intimate partner violence (IPV)?

An act of violence, such as murder, rape, robbery, assault or any forcible sex offenses committed by a spouse, ex-spouse, boyfriend or girlfriend.

This report summarizes statistics regarding family, and intimate partner violence victims from the following sources:

- Idaho Incident Based Reporting System (IIBRS) data based on all victims crime including victims of family and intimate partner violence
- 2005 Crime in Idaho Victimization Survey

What is non-intimate partner (non-IPV) family violence?

An act of violence, such as murder, rape, robbery, assault or any forcible sex offenses committed by a relative, such as a parent, child, sibling, grandparent, or in-law.

Table 1. Number of Incidents and Victims of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) versus Non Intimate Partner Family Violence

Year	Non-Intimate Partner Family Violence		Intimate Partner Violence		Total Domestic Violence		Total Crime Victims	
	Incidents	Victims	Incidents	Victims	Incidents	Victims	Incidents	Victims
2004	2,847	3,467	5,558	6,160	8,405	9,627	56,807	65,643
2005	2,907	3,494	5,839	6,413	8,746	9,907	55,228	63,879
2006	2,749	3,280	5,740	6,317	8,489	9,597	53,906	62,245
2007	2,813	3,373	5,590	6,205	8,403	9,578	52,130	60,735

This report details information regarding intimate partner violence (IPV), non-intimate partner (non-IPV) family violence, and total domestic violence, which is the combination of both. These numbers are also compared with overall victims of crime to help determine characteristics of victims.

How many people are victims of violence committed by intimates?

From 2004 through 2007 there were 25,095 victims of reported incidents of intimate partner violence. The rate of reported intimate partner violence in Idaho stayed around 4 per 1,000 persons between 2004 through 2007.

How many people are victims of domestic violence?

From 2004 through 2007 there were 38,709 victims of reported incidents of domestic violence (including intimate partners).

The rate of family violence in Idaho has stayed around 7 per 1,000 persons. Among family violence incidents, there were more involving an intimate partner than a non-intimate family member. Roughly two-thirds of domestic violence incidents included an intimate partner in the event.

The number of victims reporting intimate partner violence from the 2005 Crime in Idaho survey, however, indicates this number is much higher. There were 140.9 per 1,000 individuals reporting lifetime acts of emotional or physical abuse at the hands of an intimate partner and 33.9 per 1,000 individuals (81 out of 2390) reporting acts of emotional or physical abuse at the hands of an intimate partner in 2005.

Demographics of Victims: Age

Domestic violence and intimate partner violence victims were younger on average than other victims of crime.


Between 2004 through 2007 the average age of all victims of crime was 34.0 (32.0 median). Victims of violent crime were younger on average than other victims of crime (26.8 compared to 37.5).

- The average age of all domestic violence victims was 27.9.
- The average age of intimate partner victims was 31.1.
- The average age of victims of non-Intimate partner family violence was 21.9.

Chart 1 shows how the ages of non-IPV family violence victims versus IPV victims is nearly the mirror opposite. This is due to the fact that over half (66.8%) of all non-intimate family violence victims were under 25 years of age (Chart 1), while only a little over a third (36.4%) of IPV victims were under 25. Nearly half (47.1%) of all family violence victims were under the age of 25.

The average age of Idaho's population is 34.2 and 27.2% are under the age of 17. Idaho's percent of individuals by age category are also given in Chart 1. A higher proportion of domestic violence and intimate partner violence victims were 18 to 44 than the general population. In addition, 22.0% of Idaho's population is over 55 years old, yet only 4.4% of Non-IPV victims, only 2.1% of IPV victims, and only 2.9% of domestic violence victims were over 55.

Chart 1 Percent of IPV, Non-IPV and Total FV Victims Falling Within Each Age Category versus Percent of Idaho's Population Within Each Age Category



Demographics of Victims: Gender, Race and Ethnicity

Gender:

Victims of all crimes committed between 2004 through 2007 were 51.5% male and 48.0% female. However, victims of domestic violence, IPV, and non-IPV family violence victims were more often female than male.

- 71.7% of domestic violence victims were female.
- 78.5% of intimate partner violence victims were female.
- 59.2% of non-intimate family violence victims were female.

Therefore, although most victims of family violence were female, a greater portion of non-IPV victims were male compared to IPV victims (40.8% compared to 21.5%).

Race:

The majority of all crime victims during this time period were white (91.4%). Most family violence victims, including IPV and non-IPV victims were also white.

- 93.8% of domestic violence victims were white.
- 92.8% of intimate partner victims were white.
- 94.3% of non-intimate family violence victims were white.

Based on the 2005-2007 American Community Survey, 92.1% of Idaho's population is white. Considering Idaho's population, individuals of Asian descent were underrepresented in the victim population and individuals of black descent were slightly overrepresented in the victim population. An equal proportion of Native Americans existed in the family violence population; however, a smaller proportion of Native Americans existed amongst all crime victims in comparison with Idaho's population.

Table 2. Race of Intimate Partner Violence, Non-Intimate Partner Family Violence, Domestic Violence, and All Victims versus Idaho's population

<i>Race</i>	<i>Non-intimate Family Violence</i>	<i>Intimate Partner Violence</i>	<i>Domestic Violence</i>	<i>All victims</i>	<i>Idaho Population</i>
White	92.8%	94.3%	93.8%	91.4%	92.1%
Native American	1.1	1.2	1.2	0.6	1.2
Black	0.9	1	1	0.7	0.6
Asian	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.5	1.3
Unknown	4.8	2.9	3.6	6.8	0
Total (N)	13,614	25,095	38,709	252,503	1,499,402

Ethnicity

Total victims of crime were 83.9% Non-Hispanic and 6.7% Hispanic.

- 9.9% of domestic victims were Hispanic
- 10.1% of intimate partner violence victims were Hispanic.
- 9.5% of non-intimate family violence victims were Hispanic.

Based on the 2005-2007 American Community Survey 9.5% of Idaho’s population is of Hispanic or Latino ethnicity. Therefore, Hispanic victims of IPV, non-intimate family violence, and total domestic violence victims existed fairly equal to their proportion in the population. However, Hispanics were under-represented among total crime victims (6.7% compared to 9.5%).

Injuries Associated with Incident:

Nearly half (47.2%) of all victims of crime had at least one injury during the incident. Intimate partner violence victims, however, were much more likely to have received an injury in comparison to other victims of crime, including domestic violence and total crime victims (56.3% compared to 50.4% and 47.2% respectively). Victims of non-intimate partner family violence were less likely than other victims to have received at least one injury.

There were significant differences between the types of injuries experienced by intimate partner versus non-intimate partner family violence victims. The most common injury type for all victims of crime was a minor injury.

- 89.5% of intimate partner victims receiving an injury had a minor versus a major injury.
- 91.0% of non-intimate family victims receiving an injury had a minor versus a major injury.
- More victims of non-intimate family violence, intimate partner violence, or domestic violence received major injuries versus minor injuries in comparison with total crime victims (91.0%, 89.5% and 89.9% compared to 86.9%).
- Severe injuries, such as a possible internal injury or “other major injury” were more prevalent among intimate partner versus non-intimate partner family violence victims.
- Severe lacerations and apparent broken bones were slightly more common among all victims of crime versus domestic violence victims (3.6% compared to 1.7%, and 2.1% compared to 1.2%)

Table 3. Type of Injury Victim Received by Relationship with Offender

Type of Injury	Non-Intimate Family Violence	Intimate Partner Violence	Domestic Violence	Total Victims
Minor injury	91.0%	89.5%	89.9%	86.9%
Major injury:				
Possible internal injury	1.4	2.2	1.9	1.6
Severe Laceration	1.9	1.6	1.7	3.6
Apparent broken bones	1.6	1.1	1.2	2.1
Unconscious	0.7	1	0.9	1.2
Loss of teeth	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.4
Other major injury	3.3	4.4	4.1	4.2
% Injured	39.8%	56.3%	50.4%	47.2%
Total	10,422	18,512	28,934	76,817

Injury by Age:

All victims with injuries tended to be older versus younger.

The average age of all victims of crime with an injury was 27.9. Victims of crime with no injuries averaged 25.6 years old. The same trend occurred for domestic violence and intimate partner violence victims.

- Family violence victims with no injury averaged 26.6 years old, while the average age of family violence victims with an injury was 29.3.
- Victims of non-intimate family violence with no injuries averaged 21.0 years old versus 23.0 average age of non-injured non-intimate family violence victims.
- Victims of intimate partner violence with no injuries averaged 31.0 versus 31.5 average age of all injured IPV victims.

A higher average age existed among non-intimate family violence victims who experienced the following (compared to 21.9 average age):

- Loss of teeth: 29.8
- Severe laceration: 29.4
- Minor injury: 24.0
- Apparent broken bones: 23.4
- Unconscious: 23.0

Non-intimate family violence victims who were younger than average (21.9 average for non-intimate family violence victims):

- Possible internal injuries: 19.1
- Other major injuries: 17.6

Intimate partner violence victims with injuries who were above the average age of intimate partner victims (age 31.1) included:

- Loss of teeth: 38.0
- Apparent broken bones: 34.7
- Severe laceration: 33.5

Table 5. Average age of Victim by Type of Injury and Relationship to Offender

Type of Injury	Non-Intimate Family Violence	Intimate Partner Violence	Domestic Violence	Total Victims
Minor injury:	24.0	31.4	29.3	27.8
Major injury:				
Unconscious	23.0	30.3	29.0	27.8
Severe laceration	29.4	33.5	32.2	29.4
Possible internal injury	19.1	31.1	28.7	28.0
Loss of teeth	29.8	38.0	36.1	29.4
Apparent broken bones	23.4	34.7	30.6	28.1
Other major injury	17.6	31.7	28.5	27.9
No injury	21.0	31.0	26.6	25.6
All with Injury	23.0	31.5	29.3	27.9
Total Average	21.9	31.1	27.9	26.8


Intimate partner violence victims who experienced unconsciousness were below the average age of intimate partner victims (30.3 compared to 31.1).

No victims of domestic violence or total victims of violence had injury types with lower than average ages. All victims with injuries for domestic violence and total victims of crime were older than average.

To look at this further, breaking up victims by age category, a higher proportion of older victims were injured than younger (Chart 2).

- 33.4% of IPV victims under age 18 were injured during the incident versus 57.0% of those aged 55 and over.
- 36.3% of non-intimate family violence victims were injured versus 45.1% of non-intimate family violence victims aged 55 and over.

Therefore, it was more common among victims of domestic violence for there to be adults with injuries versus children with injuries.



Injury and Gender:


Female victims of intimate partner violence were more likely to have received major injuries in comparison to men.

Victims of all crime with injuries were 53.2% female and 46.8% male. However, domestic violence victims with injuries were much more likely to be female versus male (72.0% versus 28.0%).

- 79.1% of intimate partner victims with injuries were female (20.8% male).
- 53.9% of non-intimate family violence victims with injuries were female (46.0% male).

However, male victims of non-intimate family violence were more likely to have injuries than female non-intimate partner victims (Chart 3).

- 54.7% of total female crime victims were injured versus 54.0% of total male crime victims.
- 50.7% of female domestic violence victims were injured versus 48.5% of male domestic violence victims.
- 57.1% of intimate victims were injured versus 52.1% of male intimate victims.
- 35.8% of non-intimate family violence female victims were injured versus 45.0% of male IPV victims.



Female victims of crime were more likely to experience a minor injury versus major in comparison to male victims of crime (91.4% compared to 84.8%) (Table 6).

- For domestic violence victims, males were less likely to have experienced a major injury in comparison to females (7.2% compared to 10.0% major injury).
- However, female victims of intimate partner violence were more likely to have received major injuries in comparison to men (10.8% compared to 4.8% major injury).
- Male victims of non-intimate family violence were also more likely than females to have received major versus minor injuries (10.0% compared to 6.7% major injury).

Some types of injuries had higher or lower tendencies to be found among male or female victims. (Table 7).

The injury with the greatest association between male versus female victims of crime was severe laceration. Total victims of crime with severe lacerations by

gender were 78.7% male versus 21.2% female. Severe lacerations were much more common among male victims of all crime than among male victims of domestic, or intimate partner violence. (78.7% compared to 45.9% and 33.5%)

Table 6: Non-IPV, IPV, Total FV and Total Victims: Percent Male and Percent Female By Type of Injury

Type of Injury	Gender	Non-IPV			FV	Total victims
		IPV	IPV	IPV		
Minor injury	F	93.3	89.2	90.0	91.4	
	M	90.0	95.2	92.8	84.8	
Major injury:						
Apparent broken bones	F	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.2	
	M	2.0	0.3	1.1	3.1	
Loss of teeth	F	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	
	M	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.7	
Other major injury	F	3.0	5.3	4.8	3.8	
	M	3.9	1.6	2.6	4.7	
Possible internal injury	F	1.3	2.7	2.4	2.0	
	M	1.5	0.3	0.9	1.3	
Severe laceration	F	0.9	1.4	1.3	1.5	
	M	3.0	2.7	2.8	6.2	
Unconscious	F	0.4	1.2	1.1	0.9	
	M	0.8	0.1	0.4	1.6	
		F	2,059	7,699	9,758	18,981
Total injured victims		M	1,753	2,029	3,782	16,664

Table 7. Percent Male Versus Female with Injuries By Relationship

Type of Injury	IPV		Non-IPV		Total FV		Total victims	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Major injury:								
Apparent broken bones	94.5	5.5	47.0	53.0	76.7	23.3	31.0	69.0
Loss of teeth	82.4	17.6	40.0	60.0	72.7	27.3	23.6	76.4
Possible internal injury	96.7	3.3	50.0	50.0	87.2	12.8	63.5	36.5
Severe lacerations	66.5	33.5	26.4	73.6	54.1	45.9	21.2	78.7
Unconscious	97.0	3.0	36.4	63.6	86.0	14.0	39.6	60.2
Other major injury	92.7	7.3	47.3	52.7	82.4	17.6	47.6	52.2
Minor injury	78.1	21.9	54.8	45.0	71.4	28.5	55.0	44.8
No injury	75.5	24.5	62.9	36.6	70.3	29.7	56.6	42.9
Total	76.6	23.3	59.4	40.3	44.4	55.9	55.5	43.8

Injuries among non-intimate family violence victims were more likely to be male versus female. Unconscious (63.6% male) severe laceration (73.6%), loss of teeth (60.0%), other major injury (52.7%) and apparent broken bones (53.0%) all had more male than female injured non-IPV victims.

Injury and Race:

Depending upon race, some victims had higher or lower tendencies for injury.

Total Crime Victims

Among total crime victims, a greater proportion of crime victims who were Native American experienced injuries than all victims of crime (55.9% compared to 46.8%). White victims were also slightly more likely to have an injury than average (47.2% compared to 46.8%) (Table 8).

Table 8: Race of Victim by Relationship to Offender: Percent Injured

Victim/Offender Relationship	White	Native American	Black	Asian	Unknown	Total
Total Victims	47.2%	55.9%	44.3%	46.2%	37.3%	46.8%
Total FV	50.3	57.2	47.8	58.0	41.0	50.0
IPV	56.9	55.6	50.0	56.3	50.1	56.6
Non IPV	40.9	47.4	45.9	52.4	32.9	40.7

Domestic Violence

Domestic violence victims who were Asian or Native American were more likely to have received an injury than total victims of family violence.

- 58.0% of Asian FV victims and 57.2% of Native American victims had an injury compared to 50.0% of all domestic violence victims.

Intimate Partner Violence


No victims of IPV by race had a significantly greater portion with injury than average. However, victims who were Black or of unknown race were less likely to have received an injury. (50.0% and 50.1% respectively compared to 56.6%).

Non-Intimate Partner Family Violence

Asian, Native American and Black victims of Non-intimate family violence victims were more likely to experience an injury than average non-intimate family violence victims (52.4%, 47.4%, and 45.9% respectively compared to 40.7%). White victims of non-intimate family violence were equally represented.

Looking at the race of injured victims by whether or not they had received a major versus a minor injury (Chart 4), Black victims were more likely to have experienced a major versus a minor injury in comparison to victims of other races.

- 17.5% of injured total Black crime victims, 15.8% of injured Black non-intimate family violence victims, 15.8% of injured Black IPV victims and 15.8% of injured Black domestic violence victims experienced major versus minor injuries.



Injury and Ethnicity:

Victims had a higher or lower tendency for injury depending upon ethnicity.

Total Crime Victims

For all victims of violent crime, Hispanic victims had a higher proportion receiving injuries than Non-Hispanic (52.5% compared to 46.8%) (Table 9).

Table 9: Percent of Injured Victims by Ethnicity and Relationship to Offender

Ethnicity	Non-Intimate Family Violence	Intimate Partner Violence	Domestic Violence	Total Victims
	Hispanic	41.8%	62.2%	46.4%
Non-Hispanic	41.1	56.3	49.9	46.8

Domestic Violence

Hispanic domestic violence victims had a smaller percentage who received an injury than Non-Hispanic FV victims (46.4% compared to 49.9%)

Intimate Partner Violence


A greater proportion of Hispanic victims of IPV received an injury than non-Hispanic (62.2% compared to 56.3%).

Non-Intimate Family Violence

Among all non-intimate family violence incidents, Hispanic victims had relatively the same proportion receiving injuries as Non-Hispanic (41.8% versus 41.1%).

Total crime victims and non-intimate family Hispanic victims had a greater tendency to receive a major injury than non-

Hispanic victims (12.4% compared to 8.8% and 14.8% compared to 11.9% respectively) (Chart 5). However, among IPV victims and domestic violence victims there was an almost equal tendency towards major injury for both Hispanic and Non-Hispanic victims (10.1% compared to 10.8% and 10.7% compared to 10.3% respectively).



Relationship to victim:

The most common relationship between victim and offender for all victims of crime was acquaintance (19.0%) followed by boy/girlfriend (12.3%) and spouse (10.7%).

- Intimate partner relationships accounted for 16.4% of total victim relationships and family relationships including intimate accounted for 25.3% of total victim/offender relationships.
- Family relationships without intimate partners composed 9.0% of all victim relationships.

The most common relationship types for **domestic violence** included:

- spouse or common-law spouse (31.5%),
- boy/girlfriend (28.7%),
- and child (21.1%).

The victim was listed as an offender in 11.0% of all family violence incidents.

The most common relationships between victims and offenders of **intimate partner violence** included spouse or common law spouse (48.6%) and boy/girlfriend (44.3%) relationships.

- In 13.0% of the IPV incidents the victim was also listed as an offender during the incident.
- An ex-spouse was the offender in 6.5% of IPV incidents for a total of 1,632 incidents between 2004 and 2007.

The most common relationship types for **non-intimate family violence** included:

- child (34.1%),
- parent (17.5%),
- sibling (16.6%),
- other family (12.5%),
- and step-child (7.5%).

Table 10: Victim/Offender Relationship for Total Crimes

Relationship	N	%
Acquaintance	18,254	19.0
Boy/girlfriend	11,803	12.3
Spouse	10,237	10.7
Relationship unknown	8,431	8.8
Otherwise known	8,075	8.4
Victim was Offender	7,647	8.0
Stranger	7,531	7.8
Child	4,672	4.9
Friend	2,988	3.1
Parent	2,615	2.7
Common-law spouse	2,452	2.6
Sibling	2,334	2.4
Ex-spouse	1,777	1.8
Other family	1,751	1.8
Neighbor	1,599	1.7
Stepchild	1,030	1.1
In-law	557	0.6
Child of boy/girlfriend	481	0.5
Step parent	400	0.4
Grandchild	308	0.3
Employee	250	0.3
Stepsibling	214	0.2
Child watched by babysitter	208	0.2
Homosexual Relationship	181	0.2
Employer	140	0.1
Grandparent	139	0.1
Total	96,074	100

Relationship to victim by type of crime:

Women were more likely to be involved in a forcible sex offense with an acquaintance rather than an intimate, another relative or a stranger.

For total **forcible sex** offense victims, the most common victim/offender relationships included:

- acquaintance(25.9%),
- relationship unknown (9.5%),
- and otherwise known (8.5%),

Nearly one-third (32.3%) of **forcible rape** (a subset of forcible sex offenses) was committed by an acquaintance.

For total **non-forcible sex offenses**, the most common victim/offender relationships included:

- Boy/girlfriend (41.4%),
- acquaintance (23.1%)
- and friend (9.3%).

For total **property crimes** the most common victim/offender relationships included:

- unknown (18.0%),
- boy/girlfriend (16.6%),
- and acquaintance (15.9%),

For all **assault offenses** the most common victim/offender relationships were:

- acquaintance (17.9%),
- boy/girlfriend (12.3%)
- victim was offender (9.8%),
- and otherwise known (8.2%),

Table 11. Percent of Crime by Relationship to Offender

Relationship	Non-forcible sex offense	Forcible sex crime	Property crime	Assault offense
Boy/girlfriend	41.4	6.9	16.6	12.3
Acquaintance	23.1	25.9	15.9	17.9
Friend	9.3	8.0	2.8	2.6
Relationship unknown	6.5	9.5	18.0	7.7
Otherwise known	5.9	8.5	4.4	8.2
Child	3.4	8.3	0.6	5.0
Sibling	3.2	4.4	1.3	2.4
Other family	1.6	8.1	0.4	1.3
Victim was offender	1.2	0.6	0.6	9.8
Step-sibling	0.8	1.7	0.1	0.1
Child of boy/girlfriend	0.7	1.6	0.1	0.4
Stepchild	0.7	4.1	0.3	0.9
Employee	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.2
Neighbor	0.6	3.0	1.2	1.4
In-law	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.6
Child watched by babysitter	0.3	1.3	0.0	0.1
Employer	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1
Homosexual relationship	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2
Spouse	0.1	0.9	9.6	12.4
Stranger	0.1	3.8	14.9	7.9
Common-law spouse	0.0	0.0	2.8	3.0
Grandchild	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.2
Grandparent	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2
Parent	0.0	0.1	5.5	3.1
Step-parent	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.5
Ex-spouse	0.0	0.5	3.7	1.5

Relationship Type by Injury:

Homosexual and common-law spouse relationships were more likely to involve an injury than other types of relationships.

Over half (55.9%) of intimate partner violence victims received an injury during the incident where as 39.4% of non-intimate family violence victims received an injury. About half (50.1%) of total domestic violence victims received injuries.

Based on the proportion receiving an injury in the incident, the most violent intimate partner relationships or relationship with the highest proportion of victims with injuries were homosexual relationships, followed by common-law spouse and boy/girlfriend relationships.

- 67.5% of victims involved in violence in a homosexual relationship acquired an injury.
- 60.5% of victims in incidents involving their common-law spouse received an injury.
- 56.7% of victims in an altercation with boy/girlfriend received and injury.
- 55.7% of victims in an altercation with spouse received an injury.

Relationship types with incidents involving less injuries occurred with:

- stepchild (39.3%),
- stranger (38.8%),
- in-law (37.9%),
- other family (34.5%),
- stepsibling (26.3%),
- and grandchild (19.3%),.

Table 12. Severity of Injury Score by Relationship to Victim and Percent of Victims with Injury by Relationship to Offender

Relationship	% with injury	n
Homosexual relationship	67.5	132
Common-law spouse	60.5	1,616
Boy/girlfriend	56.7	7,673
Spouse	55.7	7,039
Friend	50.0	58
Relationship unknown	46.7	238
Victim offender	46.6	3,095
Neighbor	45.0	20
Grandparent	44.6	101
Stepparent	42.4	281
Acquaintance	42.3	319
Sibling	42.2	1,635
Ex-spouse	41.0	940
Child	40.7	3,290
Otherwise known	40.5	220
Child of boy/girlfriend	40.4	329
Parent	40.2	1,761
Stepchild	39.3	756
Stranger	38.8	67
In-law	37.9	354
Other family	34.5	1,246
Stepsibling	26.3	137
Grandchild	19.3	234
Total IPV	55.9	17,393
Total non-intimate family violence	39.4	9,689
Total domestic violence	50.1	27,082*

*Total victims are based on all the victim's relationship to all offenders involved in domestic violence incidents.

Relationship to Offender and Age of Victim:

The average age of all family violence victims was 27.9.

The average age of all victims in incidents involving the following offender relationships:

- grandparent (60.9),
- parent (44.9)
- stepparent (38.4),
- in-law (36.1),
- stranger (29.2),
- other family (21.1),
- sibling (20.6),
- child of boy/
girlfriend (12.4)
- stepsibling (11.3).
- grandchild (10.6),
- child (10.4),
- stepchild (14.4),
- and the baby (2.2).

The average age of intimate partner victims by relationship:

- ex-spouse (34.2)
- spouse (34.0),
- homosexual relationship (29.9),
- common-law spouse (29.7),
- and boy/girlfriend (28.6).

Table 13: Relationship of Victim to Offender by Age of Victim: Percent in Each Age Category

Relationship to Offender		N	0-17	18-25	26-35	36-45	46-55	55+	Ave age.
Boy/girlfriend		11,091	11.4	36.7	24.3	19.9	6.7	1.0	28.6
Spouse		9,821	0.7	23.7	32.4	29.4	10.4	3.4	34.0
Child		4,611	88.4	8.2	2.1	1.0	0.2	0.0	10.4
Victim offender		4,267	8.2	28.6	27.9	23.8	8.7	2.8	31.2
Parent		2,411	0.5	0.4	10.9	49.1	25.3	13.8	44.9
Common-law spouse		2,346	2.2	40.5	29.6	20.5	5.8	1.3	29.7
Sibling		2,271	50.8	23.3	10.6	10.3	3.7	1.2	20.6
Other family		1,733	53.8	15.5	10.2	11.3	5.9	3.3	21.1
Ex-spouse		1,628	0.5	19.0	37.5	29.8	11.2	2.1	34.2
Stepchild		1,019	80.7	12.5	3.4	2.4	0.5	0.6	14.4
In-law		544	7.7	22.2	25.6	17.5	14.5	12.5	36.1
Child of boy/girlfriend		469	80.0	9.0	6.2	3.6	1.1	0.2	12.4
Acquaintance		453	36.2	26.0	13.9	15.9	6.4	1.5	24.1
Stepparent		388	9.8	5.9	14.7	14.8	21.6	6.2	38.4
Relationship unknown		357	27.2	29.7	18.5	16.2	7.0	1.4	25.2
Grandchild		310	86.5	10.6	1.6	0.6	0.0	0.6	10.6
Otherwise known		303	27.1	25.1	15.8	21.5	7.9	2.6	33.2
Stepsibling		205	88.3	6.3	2.0	2.4	0.5	0.5	11.3
Homosexual relationship		175	6.3	31.4	30.3	28.0	3.4	0.6	29.9
Grandparent		132	4.5	0.8	0.8	3.0	15.9	75.0	60.9
Friend		91	40.7	34.1	13.2	6.6	4.4	1.1	20.9
Stranger		78	19.2	28.2	17.9	23.1	6.4	5.1	29.2
Neighbor		33	27.3	27.3	9.1	21.2	12.1	3.0	28.5

Note: Victims were limited to those with at least one offender related by either family or as an intimate partner to the offender.

If an other relationship type was involved in the domestic violence incident, the average age of victims based on other relationship types included:

- victim was offender (31.2),
- stranger (29.2),
- neighbor (28.5),
- relationship unknown (25.2),
- acquaintance (24.1),
- and friend (20.9).

Race by Relationship to Offender:

93.8% of total victims of crime were white.

Victim/offender relationships where the victim was more likely to be white than of another race (considering 93.8% of victims were white) included:

- step sibling (97.1%)
- Otherwise known (97.1%),
- stranger (96.2%)
- ex-spouse (95.9%)
- parent (95.4%)
- common-law spouse (94.5%)
- boy/girlfriend (94.2),
- and spouse (94.2%),

Victim/offender relationships where the victim was disproportionately a race other than white included:

- in-law (91.5%)
- child (91.1)
- neighbor (90.9%).
- and homosexual relationship (89.3%)

Table 14: Relationship to Offender by Victim's Race

Relationship to Victim	N	Native				
		White	American	Asian	Black	Unknown
Boy/girlfriend	11,111	94.2	1.5	0.4	1.0	2.9
Spouse	9,837	94.2	0.9	0.7	1.0	3.2
Child	4,666	91.1	1.1	0.5	1.3	6.0
Victim was offender	4,275	93.1	1.8	0.3	1.5	3.2
Parent	2,418	95.4	1.0	0.2	0.4	3.0
Common-law spouse	2,352	94.5	1.7	0.5	1.5	1.8
Sibling	2,281	93.2	1.3	0.3	0.8	4.5
Other family	1,748	93.0	1.2	0.1	1.0	4.8
Ex-spouse	1,632	95.9	0.7	0.4	0.4	2.6
Stepchild	1,019	92.2	0.8	0.4	1.2	5.4
In-law	544	91.5	1.8	0.4	0.4	5.9
Child of boy/girlfriend	472	93.6	1.3	0.6	0.8	3.6
Stepparent	388	93.6	0.8	0	1.3	4.4
Relationship unknown	358	93.0	1.1	0.3	0.6	5.0
Grandchild	311	93.2	1.0	0.3	0	5.5
Otherwise known	307	97.1	0.3	0.3	0.3	2.0
Stepsibling	205	97.1	1.0	0	0	2.0
Homosexual relationship	177	89.3	2.3	0.6	3.4	4.5
Grandparent	133	93.2	0	1.5	0	5.3
Friend	91	93.4	3.3	1.1	2.2	0
Stranger	78	96.2	0	0	0	3.8
Neighbor	33	90.9	0	0	0	9.1
Total Domestic Violence Victims	38,709	93.8	1.2	0.4	1.0	3.6

Note: Victims limited to those with at least one offender related as either family or an intimate partner.

Gender by Relationship to Offender:

71.7% of domestic violence victims were female.

Considering 71.7% of domestic victims were female, some relationship types were disproportionately female. Victim/offender relationships where the victim was more likely to be female than average included:

- boy/girlfriend (80.9%),
- common-law spouse (77.9%),
- spouse (76.8),
- grandparent (75.2%),
- ex-spouse (73.8%),
- parent (73.3%),
- and homosexual relationship (72.3%).

Relationships where the victims were disproportionately male (considering 28.1% of family violence victims were male) included:

- neighbor (63.6%),
- stepparent (61.1%),
- stranger (53.8%),
- victim was offender (50.7%),
- child (45.7%),
- sibling (44.5%),
- acquaintance (42.2%),
- stepchild (42.0%),
- otherwise known (41.4%),
- child of boy/girlfriend (41.1%),
- other family (38.8%),
- relationship unknown (38.5%),
- in-law (36.9%),
- stepsibling (36.6%),
- and friend (35.2%).

Table 15: Victim/Offender Relationship by Victim Gender

Relationship Offender	N	% Female	% Male
Boy/girlfriend	11,111	80.9	19.0
Spouse	9,837	76.8	23.1
Child	4,666	43.7	45.7
Victim offender	4,275	49.3	50.7
Parent	2,418	73.3	26.6
Common law spouse	2,352	77.9	22.1
Sibling	2,281	55.2	44.5
Other family	1,748	61.0	38.8
Ex-spouse	1,632	73.8	26.1
Stepchild	1,019	57.8	42.0
In-law	544	62.9	36.9
Child of boy/girlfriend	472	58.9	41.1
Acquaintance	453	54.7	42.2
Stepparent	388	38.4	61.1
Relationship unknown	358	61.5	38.5
Grandchild	311	70.4	28.9
Otherwise known	307	58.6	41.4
Stepsibling	205	63.4	36.6
Homosexual relationship	177	72.3	27.7
Grandparent	133	75.2	24.8
Friend	91	64.8	35.2
Stranger	78	46.2	53.8
Neighbor	33	36.4	63.6
Total Domestic Violence Victims	38,709	71.7	28.1

Note: Victims limited to those with at least one offender related as either family or an intimate partner.

Ethnicity by Relationship to Offender:

9.9% of domestic violence victims were Hispanic

Considering 9.9% of domestic violence victims were Hispanic, some victim/offender relationships involved victims who were disproportionately Hispanic. A higher than average proportion of Hispanic victims was found among incidents involving:

- relationship unknown (16.2%),
- common-law spouse (13.8%),
- other family (13.3%),
- acquaintance (13.2%),
- otherwise known (11.4%),
- and sibling (11.3%),
- in-law (10.5%).

Non-Hispanic victims (84.4%) were more commonly involved in relationships with a/an:

- stepsibling (90.7%),
- grandparent (90.2%),
- stepparent (88.9%),
- parent (88.0%),
- homosexual relationship (87.0%),
- ex-spouse (86.9%),
- victim was offender (86.2%),
- stranger (85.9%),
- boy/girlfriend (85.6%),
- and child of boy/girlfriend (85.2%).

Table 16. Ethnicity of Victim by Victim/Offender Relationship

Relationship	Total	% Hispanic	% Non-Hispanic	% Unknown
Boy/girlfriend	11,111	9.6%	85.6%	4.8%
Spouse	9,837	10.2	84.3	5.5
Child	4,666	9.2	82.4	8.3
Parent	2,418	7.0	88.0	5.0
Common-law spouse	2,352	13.8	82.7	6.3
Sibling	2,281	11.3	82.7	6.0
Other family	1,748	13.3	78.9	7.7
Ex-spouse	1,632	7.8	86.9	5.3
Stepchild	1,019	8.8	83.2	7.9
In-law	544	10.5	81.4	8.1
Child of boy/girlfriend	472	8.9	85.2	5.9
Acquaintance	453	13.2	77.9	8.8
Stepparent	388	4.6	88.9	6.4
Relationship unknown	358	16.2	74.0	9.8
Grandchild	311	7.4	81.4	11.3
Otherwise known	307	11.4	81.4	7.2
Victim offender	212	8.9	86.2	5.0
Stepsibling	205	3.9	90.7	5.4
Homosexual relationship	177	6.2	87.0	6.8
Grandparent	133	3.0	90.2	6.8
Friend	91	9.9	83.5	6.6
Stranger	78	7.7	85.9	6.4
Neighbor	33	0.0	84.8	15.2
Employer	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Total Domestic Violence Victims	38,709	9.9	84.4	5.7

Note: Victims limited to those with at least one offender related as either family or an intimate partner.

Offenses Involved by Relationship to Offender:

Total Crime Victims

Victims of crime most often experienced offenses of larceny (31.5%) or simple assault (22.1%) followed by vandalism (17.6%) and burglary (10.2%).

Domestic Violence

The most common offenses involved in domestic violence, however, included simple assault (75.3%) and aggravated assault (9.6%).

Intimate Partner

Intimate Partner victims most often experienced simple assault (78.5%) and aggravated assault (10.2%).

Non-Intimate Partner Family

Non-intimate partner family victims experienced simple assault (69.5%), forcible fondling (13.7%) and aggravated assault (8.6%).

Both Family and Intimate Partner Involved

Victims involved in incidents where both a family member and an intimate partner were involved most often experienced simple assault (81.3%) followed by aggravated assault, intimidation, and kidnapping (4.5% each).

Table 17. Offenses involved in Incident by Relationship to Offender

Offense	Total Crime	Intimate Partner	Non-Intimate Family	Both Intimate and Family involved	Domestic violence
Larceny	31.5	0.3	0.1	0.6	0.3
Simple assault	22.1	78.5	69.5	81.3	75.3
Vandalism	17.6	3.7	2	2.6	3.1
Burglary	10.2	0.3	0.1	0	0.2
Aggravated assault	4.3	10.2	8.6	4.5	9.6
Fraud	3.9	0	0	0	0
Motor vehicle theft	3.7	0.1	0.1	0	0.1
Intimidation	2.7	6.3	3.2	4.5	5.2
Forcible fondling	1.8	0.9	13.7	2.6	5.4
Forgery	1.6	0	0	0	0
Rape	1	1.5	1.6	1.9	1.6
Stolen property offense	0.9	0	0	0	0
Robbery	0.5	0.1	0.1	0	0.1
Kidnapping	0.4	1.2	1.3	4.5	1.2
Non-forcible sex offense	0.4	1.7	0.8	3.2	1.4
Statutory rape	0.4	0	0.3	3.2	1.2
Arson	0.3	0	0	0	0
Sodomy	0.1	0.1	0.9	0	0.4
Sexual assault with an object	0.1	0.1	0.4	0	0.2
Murder	0.1	0.1	0.2	0	0.1
Incest	0	0	0.5	0	0.2
Negligent manslaughter	0	0	0.1	0	0
Total	252,502	25,098	13,769	155	38,712

Note: Total percents do not equal 100% because more than one offense may be related per incident

Depending on the victim's relationship with the offender, the type of offenses involved in the incident differed.

- 78.5% of intimate partner victims were involved in incidents of simple assault, whereas 69.5% of non-intimate partner victims were involved in simple assault.
- Forcible fondling occurred in 13.7% of non-intimate family violence incidents, but in only 0.9% of intimate partner incidents.
- Intimidation occurred in 6.3% of intimate partner incidents, but in only 3.2% of non-intimate partner family violence incidents.

Offense by Percent Related to Intimate or Non-Intimate Partner

Some offenses had greater tendencies to be involved in incidents with family or intimate partners (Table 18).

Table 18. Number of Offenses Experienced by Victims by Percent involved with Intimate, Non-Intimate, or Family Offender

Intimate Partners

Looking at total victims of crime, intimate partners accounted for 9.9% of all victim relationships, however intimate partners were involved in:

- 42.8% of non-forcible sex offenses,
- 35.2% of simple assaults,
- 29.4% of kidnapping,
- 23.6% of aggravated assault,
- 23.2% of intimidation,
- 16.8% of murder,
- 16.0% of rape, and
- 14.3% of justifiable homicide.

Offenses:	N	% Non-intimate family	% Intimate Partner	% Both family and intimate	% Domestic Violence
Larceny	79,480	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
Simple assault	55,889	17.1	35.2	0.2	52.1
Vandalism	44,385	0.6	2.1	0.0	2.7
Burglary	25,769	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.3
Aggravated assault	10,832	10.9	23.6	0.1	34.4
Fraud	9,788	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
Motor vehicle theft	9,462	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.3
Intimidation	6,807	6.4	23.2	0.1	29.5
Rape	2,420	9.1	16	0.1	25
Stolen property offense	2,157	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.4
Robbery	1,205	1.2	1.8	0.0	3.0
Kidnapping	1,038	16.9	29.4	0.7	45.6
Non-forcible sex offense	1,011	10.8	42.8	0.5	53.1
Statutory rape	937	4.5	0.1	0.5	49.9
Arson	784	0.1	0.9	0.0	1.0
Sodomy	358	34.6	5.9	0.0	40.5
Sexual assault with an object	251	23.5	6.4	0.0	29.9
Murder	155	16.8	16.8	0.0	33.5
Incest	75	90.7	2.7	0.0	93.3
Blackmail	50	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0
Negligent manslaughter	21	33.3	9.5	0.0	42.9
Bribery	12	0.0	8.3	0.0	8.3
Justified homicide	7	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3
Total	252,502	5.5	9.9	0.1	15.3

Domestic Violence Victims

Family relationships composed 15.3% of victim relationships. However, family relationships accounted for:

- 93.3% of incest,
- 53.1% of non-forcible sex offenses,
- 52.1% of simple assault,
- 49.9% of statutory rape,
- 45.6% of kidnapping,
- 42.9% of negligent manslaughter,
- 40.5% of sodomy,
- 34.4% of aggravated assault,
- 33.5% of murder,
- 29.9% of sexual assault w/an object,
- 29.5% of intimidation, and
- 25.0% of rape.

Non-Intimate Family

The offenses most highly associated with non-intimate partner family incidents included:

- incest (90.7%),
- sodomy (34.6%),
- negligent manslaughter (33.3%),
- sexual assault with an object (23.5%),
- simple assault (17.1%),
- kidnapping (16.9%),
- murder (16.8%)
- aggravated assault (10.9%),
- rape (9.1%),
- and intimidation (6.4%).

Cases involving both intimate and family partners accounted for 0.1% of relationships, but accounted for 0.7% of kidnapping, 0.5% of non-forcible sex offenses, and 0.2% of simple assault.

Offense and Age:

Younger victims were more often involved in incidents of non-forcible and forcible sex offenses.

- For all forcible and non-forcible sex offenses, the vast majority of victims were juveniles (under 18). The average age of non-forcible sex offenses was 15.1 and the average age for forcible sex offense victims was 14.6.
- Intimidation as well as property offenses had less juvenile victims but more victims between the ages of 18-35.
- Victims of all property crimes were older than victims of all crime (38.6 compared to 34.8).

Considering 23.3% of victims were under 18, offenses found disproportionately among juvenile victims include the following (Table 19):

- statutory rape (98.9%),
- forcible fondling (94.4%),
- incest (89.7%),
- forcible sex offenses (84.9%),
- sodomy (83.4%),
- sexual assault with an object (77.6%),
- rape (52.4%),
- kidnapping (35.0%),
- and murder (28.8%).

Table 19. Offense by Age of Victim: Percent per Age Group

Offense	n	0-17	18-25	26-35	36-45	46-55	55+
Simple assault	29,042	17.5%	25.8%	23.2%	22.3%	8.4%	3.0%
Aggravated assault	3710	16.2	24.7	21.7	23.4	10.3	3.6
Forcible sex offenses	2907	84.9	8.2	3.4	2.7	0.7	0.1
Forcible fondling	2103	94.4	4.1	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.0
Intimidation	1985	8.5	23.7	26.1	26.6	11.0	4.0
Vandalism	1193	2.8	31.2	25.7	27.7	10.4	2.2
Rape	603	52.4	23.7	11.6	9.0	3.0	0.3
Kidnapping	472	35.0	26.7	17.8	16.9	2.5	1.1
Statutory rape	467	98.9	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sodomy	145	83.4	6.2	3.4	6.2	0.7	0.0
Larceny	99	6.1	29.3	30.3	20.2	9.1	5.1
Burglary	88	11.4	23.9	23.9	23.9	14.8	2.3
Sex assault with object	76	77.6	5.3	7.9	7.9	1.3	0.0
Incest	68	89.7	4.4	2.9	0.0	1.5	1.5
Murder	52	28.8	1.9	9.6	28.8	11.5	19.2
Robbery	36	13.9	16.7	30.6	16.7	16.7	5.6
Motor vehicle theft	26	0.0	38.5	15.4	26.9	19.2	0.0
Total	38,571	23.3	23.8	21.3	20.8	8.0	2.9

Note: Victims limited to those with at least one offender related as either family or an intimate partner.

Considering 23.8% of victims were between 18—25 years old, offenses overrepresented in this population include:

- motor vehicle theft (38.5%),
- vandalism (31.2%),
- larceny (29.3%),
- kidnapping (26.7%),
- simple assault (25.8%),
- and aggravated assault (24.7%).

Offenses disproportionately found among 26—35 year olds (population equals 21.3%) included:

- robbery (30.6%),
- larceny (30.3%),
- intimidation (26.1%),
- vandalism (25.7%),
- burglary (23.9%),
- and simple assault (23.2%).

Offenses disproportionate among 36-45 year olds include (population equals 20.8%):

- murder (28.8%),
- vandalism (27.7%),
- motor vehicle theft (26.9%),
- intimidation (26.6%),
- burglary (23.9%),
- aggravated assault (23.4%),
- and simple assault (22.3%).

Offenses found disproportionate among 46-55 include (population equals 8.0%):

- motor vehicle theft (19.2%),
- robbery (16.7%),
- burglary (14.8%),
- murder 11.5%),
- intimidation (11.0%),
- vandalism (10.4%),
- aggravated assault 10.3%),
- and larceny (9.1%).

Offenses found disproportionate among 55 and over included (population equals 2.9%):

- murder (19.2%),
- robbery (5.6%),
- larceny (5.1%),
- intimidation (4.0%),
- and aggravated assault (3.6%).

Offense by Average age of Victim and Relationship to Offender

Assault offenses:

The most common offenses of simple and aggravated assault each had over 40% of victims below 25 years, and nearly half of the population of victims was between the ages of 18 to 35 (Table 14). Simple assault victims were slightly younger on average than aggravated assault victims (27.9 average for simple assault versus 28.6 for aggravated assault). By relationship to offender, all aggravated assault victims were older than simple assault victims.

The average age for offenses of simple assault for victims with non-intimate partner family offenders was 24.1 years old, and averaged 25.2 years old for aggravated assault. Victims with intimate partner offenders involved in incidents of simple assault averaged 31.6 years old, and averaged age 32.3 for offenses of aggravated assault.

Sex offenses:

Sex offense victims were considerably younger than the rest of victims. Forcible sex offense victims averaged age 10.0 in incidents involving a non-intimate partner family member and averaged age 21.6 in incidents involving an intimate partner. Non-forcible sex offense victims averaged 12.7 if the offender was a non-intimate family member and age 15.8 if the offender was an intimate partner.

Murder:

The oldest average age of victims was among murder victims with an intimate partner offender who averaged 45.2 years old, compared to 31.6 the average age of all murder victims.

Table 20. Offense by Average Age of Victim by Relationship to Offender

Offense	Non-intimate Family	Intimate Partner	Domestic Violence	Total Victims
Simple assault	24.1	31.6	29.1	27.9
Aggravated assault	25.2	32.3	30.1	28.6
Non-forcible sex offense	12.7	15.8	15.2	15.1
Intimidation	33.3	32.5	32.7	32.2
Property offense	38.8	30.5	32.3	38.6
Forcible sex offenses	10.0	21.6	12.5	14.6
Kidnapping	12.4	28.6	22.8	20.9
Murder	24.8	45.2	35.0	31.6
Total	21.9	31.2	27.9	34.8

Offenses by Gender:

Total Crime

Females composed 48.2% of the victim population. Offenses with greater associations with female versus male victims included:

- forcible rape (98.7%),
- non-forcible sex offenses (94.3%),
- statutory rape (95.7%),
- incest (76.0%),
- intimidation (64.7%),
- simple assault (54.7%),
- forcible fondling (78.1%),
- sexual assault with an object (88.0%),
- all forcible sexual offenses (82.9%),
- and kidnapping (71.1%).

Overall, crimes with a tendency towards male victims (considering male victims represented 51.8% of victim population) included:

- negligent manslaughter (70.0%),
- embezzlement (68.1%),
- murder (67.1%),
- motor vehicle theft (63.9%),
- arson (62.4%),
- blackmail (62.0%),
- robbery (61.6%),
- stolen property (61.0%),
- aggravated assault (60.8%),
- burglary (58.0%),
- property crime (55.6%),
- larceny (55.1%),
- vandalism (55.1%).

Table 21. Offense by Relationship to Offender: Percent Female

% Female	N	Total Crime	Intimate Partner	Non-Intimate Family	Domestic Violence
Property crime	164,551	44.4%	86.6%	68.4%	82.5%
Larceny	79,146	44.9	86.7	75.0	84.7
Vandalism	44,095	44.9	86.0	68.7	82.0
Burglary	25,679	42.0	90.7	69.2	87.5
Motor vehicle theft	9,433	36.1	88.9	71.4	84.0
Forgery	4,038	49.4	100.0	0.0	50.0
Stolen property	2,059	39.0	100.0	25.0	62.5
Robbery	1,191	38.4	90.9	57.1	77.8
Arson	735	37.6	100.0	0.0	87.5
Simple assault	55,721	54.7	76.1	56.4	69.7
Aggravated assault	10,794	39.2	84.2	44.7	71.7
Intimidation	6,745	64.7	88.7	67.2	84.2
Kidnapping	1,037	71.1	83.9	60.0	75.3
Forcible sex offenses	7,159	82.9	94.4	78.2	80.5
Forcible fondling	4,469	78.1	92.0	78.1	79.5
Forcible rape	2,420	98.7	98.5	98.6	98.5
Forcible sodomy	357	48.2	90.5	46.0	52.4
Sexual assault w/object	251	88.0	100.0	79.7	84.0
Non-forcible sex offense	1,011	94.3	98.2	81.7	95.0
Statutory rape	937	95.7	98.1	90.5	97.6
Incest	75	76.0	100.0	76.5	77.1
Murder	155	32.9	76.9	34.6	55.8
Negligent manslaughter	20	30.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Total	252,502	48.2	78.6	59.6	71.8

Domestic Violence

Total victims of domestic violence were 71.8% female. Offenses overrepresented include:

- property crimes (82.5%), including burglary (87.5%), arson (87.5%), larceny (84.7%), motor vehicle theft (84.0%), motor vehicle theft (84.0%), vandalism (82.0%), and robbery (77.8%).
- intimidation (84.2%)
- kidnapping (75.3%)
- forcible sex offenses (80.5%) including: forcible rape (98.5%) sexual assault with an object (84.0%), and forcible fondling (79.5%).
- non-forcible sex offenses (95.0%) including: statutory rape (97.6%) and incest 77.1%).

Crimes with higher proportions of male domestic violence victims (28.2%) included:

- forgery (50.0%),
- negligent manslaughter (50.0%),
- forcible sodomy (47.6%),
- murder (44.2%),
- stolen property (37.5%),
- and simple assault, (30.3%).

Intimate Partner

Among intimate partner victims, crimes where females were overrepresented (considering intimate partner victims were 78.6% female) included:

- all property crimes (86.6%), including: forgery (100.0%), stolen property (100.0%), arson (100.0%) burglary (90.7%), robbery (90.9%), larceny (86.7%), and vandalism (86.0%).
- non-forcible sex offenses, (98.2%), including: incest (100.0%) and statutory rape (98.1%)
- forcible sex offenses (94.4%), including: sexual assault with an object (100.0%) forcible rape (98.5%), forcible sodomy (90.5%), forcible fondling (92.0%) and forcible sodomy (90.5%).
- intimidation (88.7%),
- kidnapping (83.9%)
- aggravated assault (84.2%).

Male intimate partner victims (21.4%) were more likely to be involved in offenses of negligent manslaughter (50.0%), simple assault (23.9%), and murder (23.1%).

Non-Intimate Family

Non-intimate family victims were 59.6% female.

Crimes overrepresented by female victims included:

- non-forcible sex offenses (81.7%),
- property crime (68.4%), including: vandalism (75.0%), motor vehicle theft (71.4%) and burglary (69.2%).
- intimidation (67.2%),
- Kidnapping (60.0%),
- forcible sex offenses (78.2%), including: statutory rape (76.5%) and incest (76.5%).

Crimes overrepresented by male non-intimate family victims (40.4%) included:

- Forgery (100.0%)
- Arson (100.0%)
- murder (65.4%) and negligent manslaughter (50.0%),
- aggravated assault (55.3%),
- forcible sodomy (54.0%),
- negligent manslaughter (50.0%),
- fraud (50.0%),
- simple assault (43.6%),
- and robbery (42.9%).

Offense by Race:

91.4% total victims were white.

Total Victims

Crimes overrepresented by white victims included:

- sexual assault with an object (97.2%),
- forcible rape (95.1%),
- motor vehicle theft (94.9%),
- forcible sodomy (94.1%),
- non-forcible sex crimes (93.7%),
- statutory rape (93.7%) and incest (93.3%),
- aggravated assault (93.5%),
- kidnapping (93.3%)
- simple assault (93.1%),
- and burglary (93.0%).

Crimes overrepresented by victims of another race (8.6%) included:

- stolen property (16.8%),
- arson (14.4%),
- negligent manslaughter (14.3%),
- fraud (12.3%),
- intimidation (11.0%),
- larceny (9.5%)
- and vandalism (9.4%).

Table 22. Percent versus Total Race by Offense and Relationship to Victim

Offense	Total Victims		Intimate Partner		Non-Intimate Partner		Domestic Violence	
% white	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Property	90.9	165,401	94.9	1,028	95.6	302	95.1	1,394
Larceny	90.5	79,480	98.8	83	93.8	16	98	98
Vandalism	90.6	40,206	94.3	917	95.4	281	94.6	1,194
Burglary	93.0	25,769	96.0	72	100.0	13	96.6	88
Motor vehicle theft	94.9	9,462	94.4	18	100.0	7	96	24
Robbery	92.0	1,205	100.0	22	100.0	14	100	36
Arson	85.6	784	100.0	7	100.0	1	100	8
Simple assault	93.1	55,889	94.4	18,596	92.8	9,564	93.9	27,355
Aggravated assault	93.5	10,129	94.3	2406	93.3	1,102	94.0	3,722
Intimidation	89.0	6,055	93.2	1577	91.7	436	92.9	2,006
Kidnapping	93.3	1,038	93.8	305	96.6	175	94.7	473
Non-forcible sex crimes	93.7	1,011	94.2	433	94.5	109	94.2	537
Statutory rape	93.7	937	94.2	431	97.6	42	94.4	468
Incest	93.3	75	100.0	2	92.6	68	92.9	70
Forcible sex	92.2	7,195	90.9	374	92.5	2,273	92.3	2,643
Forcible fondling	90.7	4,504	93.0	227	92.2	1,738	92.2	2,109
Forcible rape	95.1	2,420	96.1	388	94.1	220	95.4	605
Forcible sodomy	94.1	358	85.7	21	92.7	124	91.7	133
Sex assault with object	97.2	244	93.8	16	98.3	59	97.3	75
Negligent manslaughter	85.7	21	50.0	2	74.4	7	66.7	9
murder	92.3	155	92.3	26	96.2	26	94.2	52
Total	91.4	25,098	94.3	92,098	92.8	13,769	93.8	36311

Domestic Violence

Offenses where domestic victims were more likely to be white (93.8%) included:

- sexual assault with object (97.3%),
- forcible rape (95.4%),
- property crimes (95.1%), including: robbery (100.0%), arson (100.0%), larceny (98.0%), and burglary (96.6%), motor vehicle theft (96.0%), and vandalism (94.6%).
- kidnapping (94.7%).

Offenses where domestic victims were more likely to be of another race than white (6.2%) included:

- negligent manslaughter (33.3%),
- stolen property (25.0%),
- forcible sex offenses (7.7%), including: forcible sodomy (8.3%), and forcible fondling (7.8%).
- incest (7.1%)
- and intimidation (7.1%).

Intimate Partner

A larger portion of intimate partner victims were white than existed in the population of overall victims (94.3% compared to 91.4%). Offenses where intimate partner victims were more likely than average to be white included:

- Incest (100.0%)
- larceny (98.8%),
- forcible rape (96.1%)
- burglary (96.0%),
- and sexual assault with an object (93.8%)

Offenses with intimate partner victims who were less likely to be white (5.7%) included:

- intimidation (6.8%)
- kidnapping (6.2%)
- murder (7.7%)
- forcible sex offenses (9.1%), including forcible sodomy (14.3%).

Non-Intimate Family

A greater proportion of victims who were involved in incidents of non-intimate partner family violence were white than existed in the population of total victims (92.8% compared to 91.4%). Offenses where Non-IP family victims were more likely to be white included:

- sexual assault with object (93.8%)
- non-forcible sex crimes (94.5%), including statutory rape (97.6%),
- property crimes (95.6%), including: burglary, (100.0%), motor vehicle theft (100.0%), robbery (100.0%), arson (100.0%), vandalism (95.4%), and larceny (93.8%).
- kidnapping (96.6%),
- murder (96.2%),
- forcible rape (94.1%),
- and aggravated assault (93.3%)

Offenses associated with non-intimate family victims of a race other than white (7.2%) included:

- negligent manslaughter (25.6%),
- and intimidation (8.3%).

Offense by Ethnicity:

Total victims of crime were 6.7% Hispanic.

Total Victims

Offenses with a disproportionate number of Hispanic victims of total crimes included:

- murder (19.4%).
- aggravated assault (12.1%),
- kidnapping (10.9%),
- robbery (10.5%),
- non-forcible sex offenses (10.4%), including statutory rape (10.7%).
- motor vehicle theft (10.1%),
- simple assault (9.1%),
- forcible sex offenses (7.9%), including forcible sodomy (8.9%), forcible fondling (8.2%), and forcible rape (7.6%).

Table 23. Relationship to Offender by Percent of Victims of Hispanic Ethnicity

Offenses where total crime victims were less likely to be Hispanic included:	Offense	Total crime		Intimate Partner		Non-intimate Family		Domestic Violence	
		%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • intimidation (5.6%), • total property crimes, (5.5%), • burglary (5.1%), • larceny (4.6%), • and sexual assault with an object (2.1%). 	Property	5.5	165,401	9.3	1,083	10.4	316	9.5	1,394
	Larceny	4.6	79,480	13.3	83	0	0	11.2	98
	Vandalism	6.4	44,385	9.1	917	28	281	9.2	1,194
	Burglary	5.1	25,769	4	75	15.4	13	5.7	88
	Motor vehicle	10.1	9,462	11.1	18	42.9	7	20	25
	Robbery	10.5	1,205	4.5	22	35.7	14	16.7	36
	Non-forcible sex offense	10.4	105	12.5	433	8.3	15	11.5	537
	Statutory rape	10.7	937	12.5	431	9.5	42	12.2	468
	Incest	6.7	75	100	2	7.4	68	7.1	70
	Simple assault	9.1	55,889	10.2	195	9.3	9,564	9.9	2,913
	Aggravated assault	12.1	10,832	11.1	2,551	11.5	1,181	11.3	3,722
	Intimidation	5.6	6,807	6.4	1,577	5.7	436	6.2	2,006
	Kidnapping	10.9	1,038	11.8	305	12.6	175	12.1	473
	Forcible sex	7.9	7,195	12.6	374	9.4	2,273	9.8	2,643
	forcible fondling	8.2	4,504	15	227	9.2	1,886	9.8	2,109
	forcible rape	7.6	2,420	8.2	388	12.7	220	9.9	605
	forcible sodomy	8.9	358	0.0	0	10.5	124	9	2,420
	sexual assault with object	2.1	251	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
	Negligent manslaughter	23.8	21	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
	Murder	19.4	155	11.5	26	19.2	26	15.4	52
	Total	6.7	252,502	10.1	25,098	9.5	13,769	9.9	38,712

Domestic Violence

Slightly less than 10% (9.9%) of domestic violence victims were Hispanic. Offenses where family victims were associated with Hispanic ethnicity included:

- motor vehicle theft (20.0%),
- robbery (16.7%),
- murder (15.4%).
- statutory rape (12.2%),
- kidnapping (12.1%),
- non-forcible sex crimes (11.5%),
- aggravated assault (11.3%),
- and larceny (11.2%).

Offenses where the domestic violence victim was less likely to be Hispanic included:

- incest (7.1%),
- intimidation (6.2%),
- and burglary (5.7%).

Intimate Partner

About 10% of intimate partner victims were Hispanic. Offenses where intimate partner victims were more likely to be Hispanic included:

- larceny (13.3%),
- forcible sex offenses (12.6%), including forcible fondling (15.0%),
- non-forcible sex offenses (12.5%),
- statutory rape (12.5%),
- kidnapping (11.8%),
- murder (11.5%)
- aggravated assault (11.1%)
- and motor vehicle theft (11.1%).

Offenses where intimate partner victims were less likely to be Hispanic included:

- total property crimes (9.3%), including vandalism (9.1%), robbery (4.5%) and burglary (4.0%)
- vandalism (9.1%),
- forcible rape (8.2%).
- intimidation (6.4%),


Non-Intimate Partner Family

Less than 10% (9.5%) of non-intimate partner family violence victims were Hispanic. Offenses where non-intimate family violence victims were more likely to be Hispanic included:

- property crimes (10.4%), including: motor vehicle theft (42.9%), robbery (35.7%), vandalism 28.0%), and burglary (15.4%)
- murder (19.2%).
- forcible rape (12.7%),
- kidnapping (12.6%),
- aggravated assault (11.5%),
- forcible sodomy (10.5%),

Offenses where the non-intimate partner family victim was less likely to be Hispanic included:

- non-forcible sex offenses (8.3%), including incest (7.4%)
- and intimidation (5.7%).



Appendix:

Maps and Tables Concerning Trends and Percent
Change in Family Violence and Intimate Partner Violence Victims

Chart 6. Rates of Intimate Partner Violence per 1,000 persons: 2007




Chart 7. Percent Change Intimate Partner violence: 2004—2007




Chart 8. Rate of Non-Intimate Family Partner Violence per 1,000: 2007




Chart 9. Percent Change Non-Intimate Partner Violence: 2004-2007




Chart 10. Family Violence Rate per 1,000: 2007




Chart 11. Percent Change Family Violence: 2004-2007




Table 25. Family Violence Victims and Rate per 1,000 persons

County	2004		2005		2006		2007	
	N	Rate per 1,000	N	Rate per 1,001	N	Rate per 1,000	N	Rate per 1,000
Ada	2,277	6.82	2,293	6.60	2,374	6.56	2,189	5.86
Adams	10	2.88	11	3.12	10	2.87	10	2.82
Bannock	788	10.1	797	10.14	726	9.14	697	8.72
Bear Lake	4	0.66	4	0.67	9	1.52	23	3.92
Benewah	58	6.51	36	3.98	40	4.34	42	4.54
Bingham	243	5.72	403	9.40	331	7.68	385	8.86
Blaine	96	4.57	104	4.92	79	3.69	83	3.85
Boise	26	3.6	39	5.39	35	4.69	56	7.40
Bonner	269	6.88	261	6.54	273	6.76	293	7.14
Bonneville	970	10.9	967	10.65	909	9.72	985	10.20
Boundary	56	5.47	55	5.30	39	3.68	35	3.22
Butte	8	2.87	3	1.08	5	1.82	6	2.17
Camas	4	3.92	3	2.83	8	7.50	4	3.63
Canyon	1,239	7.9	1,361	8.32	1,298	7.57	1,265	7.05
Caribou	29	4.08	29	4.17	16	2.34	22	3.21
Cassia	186	8.87	194	9.28	140	6.74	113	5.39
Clark	0	0	0	0.00	2	2.21	5	5.52
Clearwater	55	6.64	59	7.15	59	7.13	54	6.56
Custer	14	3.43	8	1.99	3	0.73	9	2.16
Elmore	213	7.32	185	6.46	138	4.86	171	5.93
Franklin	23	1.93	33	2.74	28	2.33	40	3.28
Fremont	50	4.04	35	2.85	41	3.31	27	2.16
Gem	121	7.7	128	7.98	118	7.24	117	7.09
Gooding	67	4.71	95	6.71	114	8.04	103	7.23
Idaho	112	7.33	104	6.85	85	5.57	56	3.65
Jefferson	49	2.39	18	0.85	98	4.47	103	4.51
Jerome	155	8.15	135	7.01	126	6.41	91	4.54
Kootenai	1,030	8.46	1,012	7.98	1,091	8.35	1,094	8.14
Latah	72	2.01	64	1.78	110	3.05	136	3.75
Lemhi	19	2.48	26	3.37	17	2.20	34	4.41
Lewis	26	7.18	26	7.22	29	8.02	22	6.14
Lincoln	8	1.89	5	1.14	3	0.68	2	0.45
Madison	34	1.02	44	1.26	39	1.08	45	1.23
Minidoka	115	6.11	112	6.03	60	3.24	91	4.90
Nez Perce	222	5.87	213	5.59	176	4.57	177	4.55
Oneida	17	4.18	8	1.95	6	1.47	10	2.44
Owyhee	66	6.11	47	4.38	50	4.65	37	3.42
Payette	127	5.96	152	7.00	170	7.68	154	6.77
Power	43	5.67	28	3.70	25	3.26	27	3.51
Shoshone	98	7.71	79	6.17	105	8.14	94	7.32
Teton	30	4.18	49	6.60	30	3.84	9	1.08
Twin Falls	504	7.42	580	8.37	488	6.85	535	7.32
Valley	49	6.29	59	7.25	59	6.80	66	7.38
Washington	33	3.32	35	3.50	24	2.38	35	3.45
ISP	12	*	8	*	11	*	26	*
Total Idaho	9,627	6.92	9,907	6.95	9,597	6.56	9,578	6.72

Table 26. Intimate Partner Violence Victims: 2004—2007

County	2004		2005		2006		2007	
	N	Rate per 1,000	N	Rate per 1,000	N	Rate per 1,000	N	Rate per 1,000
Ada	1,484	4.45	1,647	4.74	1,694	4.68	1,555	4.16
Adams	7	2.02	9	2.55	7	2.01	7	1.97
Bannock	521	6.66	516	6.56	473	5.95	468	5.86
Bear Lake	3	0.49	2	0.34	7	1.18	10	1.71
Benewah	44	4.94	26	2.87	26	2.82	29	3.14
Bingham	152	3.58	225	5.25	194	4.50	183	4.21
Blaine	66	3.14	82	3.88	55	2.57	56	2.60
Boise	22	3.05	26	3.60	24	3.22	34	4.49
Bonner	171	4.37	176	4.41	162	4.01	182	4.43
Bonneville	549	6.18	523	5.76	517	5.53	573	5.94
Boundary	31	3.03	35	3.37	26	2.45	17	1.56
Butte	4	1.44	2	0.72	5	1.82	5	1.80
Camas	4	3.92	2	1.88	8	7.50	3	2.72
Canyon	793	5.06	901	5.51	912	5.32	845	4.71
Caribou	24	3.38	18	2.59	10	1.46	15	2.19
Cassia	134	6.39	125	5.98	92	4.43	96	4.58
Clark	0	0.00	34	38.16	0	0.00	2	2.21
Clearwater	36	4.35	0	0.00	40	4.84	29	3.52
Custer	13	3.18	6	1.49	2	0.49	4	0.96
Elmore	156	5.36	129	4.50	90	3.17	123	4.26
Franklin	13	1.09	19	1.58	11	0.91	22	1.80
Fremont	26	2.10	21	1.71	24	1.94	14	1.12
Gem	78	4.96	89	5.55	69	4.23	80	4.85
Gooding	38	2.67	48	3.39	47	3.32	50	3.51
Idaho	69	4.52	54	3.56	50	3.28	42	2.74
Jefferson	28	1.36	10	0.47	68	3.10	56	2.45
Jerome	92	4.84	73	3.79	64	3.26	37	1.84
Kootenai	677	5.56	683	5.39	762	5.83	762	5.67
Latah	53	1.48	47	1.31	75	2.08	81	2.23
Lemhi	12	1.56	17	2.20	11	1.42	29	3.76
Lewis	12	3.32	13	3.61	21	5.80	13	3.63
Lincoln	7	1.65	1	0.23	2	0.46	1	0.22
Madison	19	0.57	22	0.63	17	0.47	21	0.57
Minidoka	73	3.88	62	3.34	43	2.32	54	2.91
Nez Perce	160	4.23	146	3.83	120	3.11	116	2.98
Oneida	7	1.72	8	1.95	5	1.22	5	1.22
Owyhee	35	3.24	29	2.70	30	2.79	20	1.85
Payette	82	3.85	97	4.47	99	4.47	102	4.48
Power	21	2.77	21	2.78	13	1.69	17	2.21
Shoshone	65	5.12	39	3.04	55	4.27	54	4.21
Teton	22	3.07	35	4.71	16	2.05	8	0.96
Twin Falls	286	4.21	341	4.92	314	4.41	311	4.26
Valley	39	5.01	32	3.94	34	3.92	37	4.14
Washington	21	2.11	16	1.60	17	1.69	26	2.56
ISP	11	*	6	*	6	*	9	*
Total Idaho	6,160	4.43	6,413	4.50	6,317	4.32	6,203	4.14

Chart 12. Percent of Victims Aware of Domestic Violence Programs in their Area Based on Idaho Crime Victimization Survey : 2005




Chart 13. Areas of Greatest Concern with Domestic Violence:

Rating scale determined after combining all years the county had above average rates of domestic violence between 2004 through 2007, higher than average rates of lifetime domestic violence and higher than average 2005 victims of domestic violence according to the 2005 crime victimization survey.

