# Measuring Rape and Sexual Assault: Successive Approximations to Consensus

Ronet Bachman
Dept. of Sociology and Criminal Justice
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19711
Email: Ronet@Udel.edu
Phone: 302.831.2581

Paper Presented to
The National Academy of Sciences[1]
June 6, 2012
Washington, DC

[1] "This paper was commissioned for the National Academies Workshop on Measuring Rape and Sexual Assault in BJS Surveys. The workshop was convened by the Committee on National Statistics on June 5-7, 2012 in Washington, DC with support from the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Opinions and statements included in the paper are solely those of the individual author, and are not necessarily adopted or endorsed or verified as accurate by the Committee on National Statistics or the National Academy of Sciences, including the National Academy of Engineering, Institute of Medicine, or National Research Council."

## Introduction

In 1975, Susan Brownmiller (1975) utilized a landscape virtually devoid of survey data measuring rape to document the fact that rape and sexual assault in U.S. society was vastly underestimated. Ten years later, Ms. Magazine and psychologist Mary Koss (1985) garnered headlines about the reality of rape for college women, reporting the results of surveys on college campuses that revealed 1 in 4 college women met the legal criteria to be classified as victims of rape or attempted rape. This survey, called the Sexual Experiences Survey (SES), was the first large-scale attempt that used explicit behaviorally specific questions to measure rape. Instead of asking about general "attacks," respondents were actually asked about "sexual intercourse." Despite wide-spread academic consensus that the instrument was valid, the 1 in 4 statistic became an instant target for critics, claiming methodological flaws with the survey upon which the numbers were based (Gilbert, 1992) or that women should not be classified as rape victims if they did not perceive themselves as such (Roiphe, 1993). This survey was soon followed in 1992 by a national survey, called the National Women's Study (NWS), which was published by the National Victim Center and conducted by Dean Kilpatrick and his colleagues. The NWS also used explicitly worded questions to ask women aged 18 and older not only about sexual intercourse, but also about oral and anal rape. Meanwhile, the Bureau of Justice Statistics was in the process of re-designing its National Crime Survey (after the redesign in became known as the National Crime Victimization Survey) to better measure hard to capture victimizations like domestic violence and rape. The new instrument would ask about forced or unwanted sexual intercourse, but it did not use the graphic language of the SES or the NWS.

Together, these studies appear to have captured society's attention and acknowledgment of the problem. In 1994 Congress mandated the federal government to provide a valid estimate

of the magnitude of violence against women, including rape and stalking, as part of its Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), which was part of the larger Omnibus 1994 Crime Control Act. Prior to this call, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) was planning a survey to measure stalking, but after the 1994 VAWA, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention partnered with NIJ to fund a national survey with a sample size large enough to make subgroup comparisons. The survey was fielded in 1995 and became known as the National Violence Against Women Survey (the survey also surveyed men) (Tjaden and Thoennes, 2000).

Today, over 25 years since the Sexual Experiences Survey was developed by Koss, there is still no accepted universal standard for measuring the magnitude of rape. In fact, the two largest surveys that measure victimization sponsored by the federal government, the National Crime Victimization Survey, and the National Intimate Partner Violence and Sexual Violence Survey, utilize vastly different measurement tools.

Valid and reliable statistical data on violence against women in general and rape in particular are essential for many reasons. The first step in preventing sexual violence is to conceptually and numerically define its prevalence. This also includes defining the characteristics of those most affected, including subgroups by race/ethnicity and age. Unfortunately, crime policy is too often motivated by things other than empirical facts, such as celebrated cases, stereotypical images, and media hype (Alvarez & Bachman, 2009; for specific examination of sex offender legislation, see Leon, 2011). Moreover, having valid data at the sub-national level as well as data over time to document the changes in trends of victimization is also extremely important. As Groves and Cork (2008, p. 63) note, "The dangers of the lack of information [victimization data] are less effective policies and poor allocation of state and federal resources."

Scholars and practitioners alike long ago agreed that random sample surveys of the population are the best method for estimating the most realistic rates of victimization. Data from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), such as the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) and the National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS), rely exclusively on reports of victimization to the police. Because a large percentage of violent crimes, and the majority of rape and sexual assaults, are never reported to police, these data do not provide an accurate estimate of the number of individuals affected by these victimizations. For this reason, this paper will focus exclusively on an assessment of surveys designed to measure rape and sexual assaults. The national surveys conducted by the federal government will be examined in detail: the ongoing National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), and the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS). The National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS) and the National College Women Sexual Victimization (NCWSV), which were mandated by VAWA will also be examined. The second part of the paper will examine the methodological differences between these two surveys and others that have attempted to measure rape and sexual assault at the international, national, and local levels. Finally, the problem s associated with existing measurement tools and procedures will be reiterated and suggestions for the future will be outlined.

**National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS)**

The Bureau of Justice Statistics sponsors the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), which is the only ongoing national random sample survey that provides annual estimates along with trend data on victimization including rape. Recognizing the limitations of police reports to the measure the true magnitude of victimization, the U.S. Justice Department instituted the originally named National Crime Survey (NCS) in 1972 to uncover the "hidden

crime" that did not come to the attention of the police. Redesigned in the late 1980s to better measure victimizations in the home and sexual assault, the survey was renamed the NCVS. Today, the NCVS is the primary source of information on criminal victimization in the U.S. The sample is selected using a stratified, multi-stage cluster design to represent the U.S. population. Approximately 40,000 households (household are the primary sampling units), comprising nearly 74,000 residents aged 12 and older were interviewed in the most recent year for which data are available (2010) with a response rate of 86%. NCVS households are interviewed a total of seven times at 6-month intervals over a 3-year period (6 panels). The first interview is typically conducted face-to-face, with the remaining interviews are conducted by telephone using a CATI system.

The redesigned NCVS was introduced into the sample beginning in 1989 and fully implemented by 1992. This new questionnaire was a huge improvement in the survey's question wording to measure rape and sexual assault (Bachman & Taylor, 1994). Prior to the redesign, the respondents were not asked directly about experiencing forced or coerced sexual behavior. Instead, respondents were classified as rape or sexual assault victims if they self-reported they had been raped after general questions regarding being "attacked" or "threatened" in any way.

In addition to new screening questions, another issue the redesign examined was the appropriate reference period used. There are two problems inherent in respondents recalling previous victimizations. The first is a respondent simply forgetting that a victimization happened altogether. The second is erroneously placing a victimization within the reference period, when it actually happened before the reference period (telescoping). Based on cognitive research demonstrating that longer recall periods yielded poorer reports and that a reference period of 12 months generally reduced the reporting of incidents by approximately 30% (Cantor & Lynch,

2000), a 6-month reference period was adopted. Other changes to encourage respondent recall were incorporated into the screening instrument of the redesigned NCVS. The classification of incidents is actually a two-stage process using a screening instrument that uses "short cues" for each victimization type to promote recall (Groves & Cork, 2008). The classification of a respondent as a specific type of victim (e.g. rape victim) occurs in the second stage when an incident report is completed for each affirmative response on the screening instrument. This is an important mechanism for filtering out ineligible events. In addition, the information collected in the more detailed incident form provides the contextual characteristics of a crime event (e.g. victim/offender relationship, weapon presence, injuries sustained, medical care received) (NCVS codebook, ICPSR).

To measure rape and sexual assaults, respondents are both directly asked and indirectly asked about rape and sexual assault victimizations first through short cue screening questions designed to trigger memories of particular contexts, locations, and offenders, followed by a specific question regarding unwanted sexual acts:

> *Since [end date for 6-month reference period], were you attacked or threatened OR did you have something stolen from you: a) at home including the porch or yard, b) at or near a friend's, relative's, or neighbor's home, c) at work or school, d) in places such as a storage shed or laundry room, a shopping mall, restaurant, bank, or airport, e) while riding in any vehicle, f) on the street or in a parking lot, g) at such places as a party, theater, gym, picnic area, bowling lanes, or while fishing or hunting, OR h) did anyone attempt to attack or attempt to steal anything be long to you from any of these places.*
>
> *(Other than any incidents already mentioned,) has anyone attacked or threatened you in any of these ways: a) with any weapon, for instance, a gun or knife, b) with anything like a baseball bat, frying pan, scissors, or stick, c) by something thrown, such a rock or bottle, d) include any grabbing, punching, or choking, e) any rape, attempted rape or other type of sexual attack, f) any face to face threats, OR g) any attack or threat or use of force by anyone at all? Please mention it even if you are not certain it was a crime.*
>
> *People often don't think of incidents committed by someone they know. (Other than any incidents already mentioned,) did you have something stolen from you OR were you*

*attacked or threatened by: a) someone at work or school, b) a neighbor or friend, c) a relative or family member, d) any other person you've met or known?*

*Incidents involving forced or unwanted sexual acts are often difficult to talk about. (Other than any incidents already mentioned,) have you been forced or coerced to engage in unwanted sexual activity by:*
*a. Someone you didn't know before*
*b. A casual acquaintance?*
*c. Someone you know well?*

If respondents reply yes to any of these questions, they are then asked to describe in their own words exactly what happened. In the incident report, they are further queried, *"Did the offender hit you, knock you down or actually attack you in any way? Did the offender TRY to attack you? Did the offender THREATEN you with harm in any way? What actually happened?"* If they say an attack was attempted to threatened, they are asked, *"How did the offender TRY to attack you?" How were you threatened? Any other way?"* If they respond that they experienced unwanted sexual contact, they are also asked, *"You mentioned some type of unwanted sexual contact with force. Do you mean forced or coerced sexual intercourse including attempts?"* If they mention rape, they are asked, *"You mentioned rape. Do you mean forced or coerced sexual intercourse?"* If they respond no, they are asked, *"What do you mean?"* The same query is used for attempted rapes. And finally, they are asked about the injuries they may have suffered. Even if they responded no to the first query on rape, they could still be classified as rape victims if they say they were raped here. In addition, all rape victims previously classified as rape, attempted rape, and sexual assault other than rape are automatically classified as sustaining these forms of injuries. Thus, classifying a respondent as a victim of rape or sexual assault is actually a two-stage process in the NCVS methodology, but can occur numerous ways. Several forms of sexual violence are categories including completed and attempted rapes (including threats) and other forms of sexual assault not including some type of intercourse (vaginal, anal, oral).

Importantly, the cost of conducting the NCVS has grown but Congressional funding has remained essentially flat for BJS (Groves & Cork, 2008). As a result, sample size cuts have been implemented to the NCVS as follows: 1996 (12%), 2002 (4%), in 2006 (16%), and in 2007 (14%). The most recent cut in 2007 coincided with another major change in the NCVS estimation procedures in attempt to essentially nullify the effects of the sample cuts. Historically, NCVS estimates of victimization have included "bounding" the second interview with the first to eliminate the potential of "telescoping" an event into a reference period when it actually occurred earlier. Recall that the sample design is a panel, and households (and respondents if they do not move) remain in the sample for 3 years. During the first interview of the panel, respondents typically report more victimizations than in subsequent interviews. This is primarily due to this cognitive error of "telescoping." To offset this bias, the NCVS historically utilized a bounding procedure in which first-time interviews were not included in the incidence rate estimates, but only served to "bound" the remaining interviews. However, in an attempt to offset the significant sample reduction in 2007, these first interviews began to be used in the annual estimates (Rand, 2008). Estimates were statistically adjusted to control for the elimination of bounding, but the fact remains that the NCVS has lost an important methodological tool that allowed them to produce less biased estimates compared to surveys that do not employ the bounding procedure.

The effects of these sample cuts have had deleterious consequences for estimating low-base rate crimes such as rape and sexual assault, and in the ability of the NCVS to estimate the differential risk of subgroups of the population (e.g. by age and race/ethnicity) experiencing these victimizations. In the 2011 report describing criminal victimization in the United States for 2010 (Truman, 2011), total estimates for rape and sexual assault victimization were provided but virtually no other point estimates, except for victimization estimates against whites, were

provided without a caution to readers stating, "Care should be taken in interpreting the change in the rate of rape or sexual assault because estimates are based on a small number of cases." For example, Table 1 below presents information about the victim-offender relationship of rape/sexual assault victimizations in 2010 and Table 2 presents incidence rates by race/ethnicity and age group.

Table 1. Rape/sexual assault victimization by victim/offender relationship, NCVS 2010

| | Number |
|---|---|
| **Male Rape/Sexual Assault Victims** | |
| Total | 15,020 ! |
| Nonstranger | 11,730 ! |
| Intimate | -- ! |
| Other Relative | -- ! |
| Friend/Acquaintance | 11,730 ! |
| Stranger | 1,220 ! |
| Unknown | 2,070 |
| | |
| **Female Rape/Sexual Assault Victims** | |
| Total | 169,370 |
| Nonstranger | 124,030 |
| Intimate | 29,010 ! |
| Other Relative | 12,920 ! |
| Friend/Acquaintance | 82,100 |
| Stranger | 41,950 |
| Unknown | 3,390 ! |

! Interpret with caution: estimate based on 10 or fewer sample cases, or relative standard error is greater than 50%.
Source: Adapted from Truman (2011). Criminal Victimization, 2010. Table 5. CNJ 235508, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

| Table 2. Rape/sexual assault victimization rates per 1,000 persons age 12 or older by race/ethnicity and age, NCVS 2010 | |
|---|---|
| **Demographic Characteristic of Victim** | **Violent Rape/Sexual Assault Victimizations per 1,000 persons age 12 or older** |
| **Race/Hispanic Origin** | |
| White | 0.7 |
| Black | 1.1 ! |
| Hispanic | 0.8 ! |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | -- ! |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 0.6 ! |
| Two or more races | 1.2 ! |
| | |
| **Age** | |
| 12-14 | 2.7 ! |
| 15-17 | 1.7 ! |
| 18-20 | 1.1 ! |
| 21-24 | 1.5 ! |
| 25-34 | 1.3 ! |
| 35-49 | 0.6 ! |
| 50-64 | -- ! |
| 65 or older | 0.1 ! |
| ! Interpret with caution: estimate based on 10 or fewer sample cases, or the relative standard error is greater than 50%.<br>Source: Adapted from Truman (2011). Criminal Victimization, 2010. Table 9. CNJ 235508, Bureau of Justice Statistics. | |

The NCVS does not capture lifetime prevalence rates, but estimates annual incidence rates of victimization. Unlike prevalence rates, which capture the number of people within a subgroup that were victimized during a give time period (e.g. lifetime or past 12 months), incidence rates indicate the number of separate victimizations that are perpetrated against people within a given group during a specific time period. The number of victimizations presented in Table 1 are weighted estimates. It is important to note that the vast majority of estimates in both Tables 1 and 2 are noted with an exclamation warning. The methodology section states that this warning indicates a "small number of cases," with a cut-off of 10 or fewer un- weighted cases. The methodology section of the report further notes that for 2010, the estimates of rape/sexual

assault were based on 57 total unweighted cases. This is a relatively small number of cases. Clearly, the ability to disaggregate this total to examine many important epidemiological differences is precarious at best and erroneous at worst. For example, it is not possible to reliability examine the different offenses subsumed under the umbrella category of rape/sexual assault, or to disaggregate the total number to infer basic subgroup differences (e.g. age, race, victim/offender relationship), or to track changes in rates of sexual violence over time. As we will see in all surveys, small base numbers like this are not uncommon when estimating the magnitude of rape annually and underscores the necessity surveys using a large sample size. It is important to note that at the NAS meeting, BJS Director James Lynch reported that Congress has provided funds to allow the sample of the NCVS to be increased.

Despite the challenges the NCVS faces because of budget constraints, it remains the only survey that produces annual rates of victimization including rape and sexual assaults, and despite the sample cuts, it remains the largest random sample survey that measures the "dark figure" of crime that never makes it to the attention of the police.

**The National Violence Against Women Survey**

In the 1990s, the perception of violence against women as a criminal justice problem evolved to be seen as coexisting under the umbrella of public health (Tjaden, 2005). As such, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDCP) became involved in the estimation of violence against women, including intimate partner violence, rape and sexual assaults, and stalking. As noted above, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) of 1994, which was Title IV of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (PL 103-322), required the Attorney General to report on the incidence of violence against women including stalking

(Section 40610). Although a national survey had recently been funded by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to estimate the magnitude of stalking, the CDC contributed additional VAWA funds that facilitated an increased sample size to allow comparisons across subgroups of the population. The survey became known as the National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS) (there was also a companion survey that measured violence against men) (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2003). Conducted in 1995, the NVAWS relied on a Random Digit Dialing (RDD) sampling method and resulted in a sample of 8,000 women and 8,000 men 18 years of age or older. Interviews were conducted using the CATI system and resulted in a response rate for females of 72%. NVAWS generated lifetime and 12 month prevalence rates (number of people within a particular demographic group who are victimized during the time period), as well as 12 month incidence rates. The questions used to measure rape were very graphic in nature and defined for respondents exactly what was meant:

*1) Has a man or boy ever made you have sex by using force or threatening to harm you or someone close to you? Just so there is no mistake by sex we mean putting a penis in your vagina.*
*2) Has anyone, male or female, ever made you have oral sex by using force or threat of force? Just so there is no mistake, by oral sex we mean that a man or boy put his penis in your mouth or someone, male or female, penetrated your vagina or anus with their mouth.*
*3) Has anyone ever made you have anal sex by using force or threat of harm? Just so there is no mistake, by anal sex we mean that a man or boy put his penis in your anus.*
*4) Has anyone, male or female, ever put fingers or objects in your vagina or anus against your will or by using force or threats?*
*5) Has anyone, male or female, ever attempted to make you have vaginal, oral, or anal sex against your will, but intercourse or penetration did not occur?*

There was not a two-stage process of classification used in the NVAWS; if respondent responds "yes" to any, they were classified as a victim of completed or attempted rape (depending upon the question). Results indicated that approximately 302,091 women were raped in the previous 12 months (prevalence rate), with the total number of rape victimizations being 876,064 (incidence rate). It is important to note, however, that the incidence rate was actually based on only 24 un-weighted cases of

females who had been victims of rape or attempted rape in the previous 12 months. We will return to this measurement issue later in the paper.

Importantly, this survey collected information about all previous victimizations, not just those that occurred in the previous 12 months. As such, it allowed the interconnections among women's experiences with violence over a lifetime to be examined. For example, results indicated women who were sexually assaulted as children or adolescents were more likely to be sexually assaulted as adults.

**National College Women Sexual Victimization Study (NCWSVS)**

VAWA 1994 also mandated a national baseline study on campus sexual assault to "examine the scope of the problem of campus sexual assaults and the effectiveness of institutional and legal policies in addressing such crimes and protecting victims" (Section 40506). Accordingly, BJS and NIJ funded the National College Women Sexual Victimization Study (CVWSVS) (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000). The sampling design was a 2-stage probability method that selected colleges based on location and enrollment of all institutions of higher education with 1,000 or more students. A total of 4,446 college women were interviewed with a response rate of 84%. The CATI survey was conducted during the 1996-1997 academic year and used "Since school began in the Fall of 1996" as the reference period, which was approximately 7 months at time of surveys.. The NCWSVS used a hybrid to measure rape and sexual assault, combining the graphic behavior specific questions used by the NVAWS with the 2-stage incident report process used by the NCVS to classify victims. Fisher and her colleagues simultaneously conducted another survey that measured the volume of all violence against women on college campuses called the National Violence Against College Women Study (NVACWS). This version used the exact wording and estimation methods of the NCVS to measure rape. This created an opportunity to conduct a quasi-experiment to test the differences

in question wording on prevalence and incidence estimates, which we will return to later. The exact wording of the questions used in the NCWSVS is as follows:

*1) Since school began in the Fall 1996, has anyone made you have sexual intercourse by using force or threatening to harm you or someone close to you? Just so there is no mistake, by intercourse I mean putting a penis in your vagina.*

*2) Since school began in the Fall 1996, has anyone made you have oral sex by force or threat of harm? By oral sex, I mean did someone's mouth or tongue make contact with your vagina or anus or did your mouth or tongue make contact with someone else's genitals or anus.*

*3) Since school began in the Fall 1996, has anyone made you have anal sex by force or threat of harm? By anal sex, I mean putting a penis in your anus or rectum?*

*4) Since school began in the Fall 1996, has anyone ever used force or threat of harm to sexually penetrate you with a foreign object? By this, I mean, for example, placing a bottle or finger in your vagina or anus?*

*5) Since school began in fall 1996, has anyone attempted but not succeeded in making you take part in any of the unwanted sexual experiences that I have just asked you about? For example, did anyone threaten or try but not succeed to have vaginal, oral, or anal sex with you or try unsuccessfully to penetrate your vagina or anus with a foreign object or finger?*

*6) Not counting the types of sexual contact already mentioned, have you experienced any unwanted or uninvited touching of a sexual nature since school began in fall 1996? This includes forced kissing, touching of private parts, grabbing, fondling, and rubbing up against you in a sexual way, even if it is over your clothes.*

*7) Since school began in fall 1996, has anyone attempted but not succeeded in unwanted or uninvited touching of a sexual nature?*

*8) Since school began in fall 1996, has anyone made or tried to make you have sexual intercourse or sexual contact when you did not want to by making threats of nonphysical punishment, such as lowering a grade, being demoted or fired from a job, damaging your reputation, or being excluded from a group for failure to comply with requests for any type of sexual activity?*

*9) Since school began in fall 1996, has anyone made or tried to make you have sexual intercourse or sexual contact when you did not want to by promises of rewards, such as raising a grade, being hired or promoted, being given a ride or class notes, or getting help with coursework from a fellow student if you complied sexually?*

*10) Since school began in fall 1996, has anyone made or tried to make you have sexual intercourse or sexual contact when you did not want to by simply being overwhelmed by someone's continual pestering and verbal pressure?*

If respondents responded yes to any of these questions, a second-stage incident report, similar to the NCVS, was completed to classify the incident into a crime category and gather more detailed information about the contextual characteristics of the incident (e.g. victim/offender relationship, location of occurrence). Questions 1 through 4 measured completed rapes and question 5 measured attempted rape. The other questions measured other forms of

sexual coercion. Victimizations were classified using a hierarchical coding scheme that classified the most severe type of sexual victimization that occurred within an incident (Fisher et al., 2000). Results indicated that 1.7% of the sample experienced a completed rape and an additional 1.1% experienced an attempted rape for a total of 2.8% of the women who had experienced some type of rape victimization since the school year began. The incident rate per 1,000 female students for both completed and attempted rape was 35.3. Fisher et al. extrapolated, "For a campus with 10,000 women, this would mean the number of rapes could exceed 350" (2000, p. 11).

We will return to the work of Fisher and her colleagues later in the paper when the methodological differences across surveys are discussed.

**National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS)**

After the National Violence Against Women Survey, the CDC (partnered with NIJ) has most recently funded the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS), which was fielded in 2010. This survey was conducted using a Random Digit Dialing frame that used both landline and cell phone data bases. A total of 9,086 females and 7,421 males 18 years of age or older completed the telephone interviews, with a weighted cooperation rate of 81.3%.[i] To enhance response rates, respondents were offered $10 to participate. This survey measured many sexual offenses including completed and attempted rape and for the first since the Sexual Experiences Survey developed by Koss, included in the definition of rape those victimizations that occurred when the victim was "drunk, high, drugged, or passed out and unable to consent." This inclusion is consistent with most state rape and sexual assault statutes that include victimizations under these conditions. It also measured sexual coercion that was operationalized by asking respondents if they had unwanted intercourse after being pressured through numerous

behaviors. The specific screening questions used in the NISVS asked about victimizations experienced in respondents' lifetimes and in the previous 12 months:

*How many people have ever….*
**exposed their sexual body parts to you, flashed you, or masturbated in front of you?*
** made you show your sexual body parts to them? Remember, we are only asking about things that you didn't want to happen.*
** made you look at or participate in sexual photos or movies?*
**harassed you while you were in a public place in a way that made you feel unsafe?*
** kissed you in sexual way? Remember, we are only asking about things that you didn't want to happen.*
** fondles or grabbed your sexual body parts?*

*When you were drunk, high, drugged, or passed out and unable to consent, how many people ever….*
** had vaginal sex with you? By vaginal sex, we mean that {if female: a man or boy put his penis in your vagina} {if male: a women or girl made you put your penis in her vagina}*
** {if male} made you perform anal sex, meaning that they made you put your penis into their anus?*
** made you receive anal sex, meaning they put their penis into your anus?*
** made you perform oral sex, meaning that they put their penis in your mouth or made you penetrate their vagina or anus with your mouth?*
** made you receive oral sex, meaning that they put their mouth on your {if male: penis} {if female: vagina} or anus?*
**made you receive oral sex, meaning that they put their mouth on your {if male: penis} {if female: vagina} or anus?*

How many people have ever used physical force or threats to physically harm you to make you…
** have vaginal sex?*
** {if male} perform anal sex?*
** receive anal sex?*
** make you perform oral sex?*
** make you receive oral sex?*
** put their fingers or an object in your {if female: vagina or} anus?*

How many people have ever used physical force or threats of physical harm to….
**{if male} try to make you have vaginal sex with them, but sex did not happen?*
** try to have {if female: vaginal} oral, or anal sex with you, but sex did not happen?*

How many people have you had vaginal, oral, or anal sex with after they pressured you by…..
**doing things like telling you lies, making promises about the future they knew were untrue, threatening to end your relationship, or threatening to spread rumors about you?*
**wearing you down by repeatedly asking for sex, or showing they were unhappy?*
**using their authority over you, for example, your boss or your teacher?*

If respondents replied affirmative, they were also asked how many times this happened in the past 12 months and an incident report was completed for each type of victimization. It is not possible to compare estimates produced by the NISVS to the NCVS because only lifetime and 12 month prevalence rates are presented, which indicate the proportion of women aged 18 and over

have experienced sexual violence in their lifetimes and in the past 12 months. Estimated 12 month prevalence rates for women are presented below in Table 2.

| Table 2. NISVS 2010, 12 Month Prevalence of Sexual Violence for Women 18 and older | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Weighted % | Estimate Number of Victims |
| **Rape** | 1.1 | 1,270,000 |
| Completed forced penetration | 0.5 | 620,000 |
| Attempted forced penetration | 0.4 | 519,000 |
| Completed alcohol/drug facilitated penetration | 0.7 | 718,000 |
| **Other Sexual Violence** | 5.6 | 6,646,000 |
| Made to penetrate | * | * |
| Sexual coercion | 2.0 | 2,410,000 |
| Unwanted sexual contact | 2.2 | 2,600,000 |
| Non-contact unwanted sexual experiences | 3.0 | 3,532,000 |

* Estiamate is not reported; relelative standard error > 30% or cell size < 20.
Source: Black, Basile, Breiding, Smith, Walters, Merrick, Chen, & Stevens. 2011. The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey: 2010 Summary Report. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Adapted from Table 2.1.

Because of the small sample size, 12 month prevalence rates could not be estimated for the differential risk of rape across age, race/ethnicity, or other subgroups. Further, because the NISVS was conducted at one point in time, trends in victimization cannot be examined over time. However, it is clear that the estimate of the number of women affected by rape and sexual assault obtained by the NISVS are much higher compared to those obtained by the NCVS on their face.[ii] Not only was the wording of the questions used in this survey graphic and behaviorally-specific, the survey also included questions regarding victimizations that occurred while the victim was "drunk, high, drugged, or passed out and unable to consent," which are not included in the NCVS.

**Methodological Differences Across Surveys**

How many females in the United States are victims of rape and sexual assault every year? The answer, of course, depends on which survey you are using to make your estimate. Before discussing the methodological differences across surveys, it is important to underscore the fact

that underreporting plagues our ability to obtain estimates of all victimizations for a number of reasons, regardless of the rigor of a particular survey and sampling methodology. This is especially true for rapes. Victims are not only reluctant to report their experiences to law enforcement, but may also be reluctant to report to survey interviewers for a number of reasons including fear that their reports will not remain anonymous, shame and embarrassment, and fear of reprisal from the offender. To aid comparisons across surveys, Appendix A presents the sampling frame and design, reference period, and exact questions used for a number of national and international surveys that have measured rape.

Conceptually, there is not a great deal of variation in how surveys define rape. The World Health Organization's definition of rape is, *"physically forced or otherwise coerced penetration of the vulva or anus with a penis or other body part or object."*[iii] The NISVS defines rape as *"completed or attempted unwanted vaginal (for women), oral, or anal penetration through the use of physical force or threats to physically harm and includes times when the victim was drunk, high, drugged, or passed out and unable to consent."*[iv] And the NCVS defines rape as *"forced sexual intercourse including both psychological coercion as well as physical force. Forced sexual intercourse means vaginal, anal, or oral penetration by the offender(s). This category also includes incidents where the penetration is from a foreign object such as bottle. Includes attempted rapes, male as well as female victims, and both heterosexual and homosexual rape. Attempted rape includes verbal threats of rape."*[v] The main difference is that the NISVS also includes incidents that occur when the victim was drunk, high, drugged, or passed out and unable to consent. Besides the Sexual Experiences Survey conducted by Koss and her colleagues, the NISVS has been the only survey to do this, despite the fact that this victimization meets the legal definition of rape in virtually every state. Except for this difference, these conceptual definitions

are quite similar. However, as we have seen, exactly how these surveys measure rape victimizations is quite different. As such, emphasis in this section will be placed on the operationalizations of rape and sexual assault across surveys rather than the conceptual definitions of rape. The operationalization process involves the development of procedures to measure that which we intend to measure (Bachman & Schutt, 2012).

*Question Wording – Evidence that more detail is better!*

One of the most visible methodological differences across surveys is the screener questions used to ask respondents about previous victimizations. As detailed above, the NCVS uses broad cues of "attacked or threatened" and also direct reference to "forced or unwanted sexual contact," and "any rapes or attempted rapes." It also provides cues to many locations (e.g. school, parties, work) and classes of offenders (e.g. someone at work or school, a relative or family member). However, unlike the NISVS, it does not ask questions with graphic behaviorally-specific language (e.g. "meaning that they put their penis in your mouth), nor ask specifically about all the forms of intercourse (e.g. oral, anal, vaginal) that legally constitute rape including incidents when the victim was incapacitated in any way (e.g. drunk, high, passed out). Unlike the NISVS, however, the NCVS does included incidents that were "threatened."

Using the available data from the NCVS and other surveys including the National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS), researchers have demonstrated that NCVS estimates of rape and sexual assault are typically lower than the surveys utilizing more behavior-specific language, even after making the sample parameters as comparable as possible (e.g. limiting the sample to women 18 years of age and older, limiting the analyses to completed rapes only) (Bachman, 2000; Jaquier, Fisher, & Killias, 2006; Rand & Rennison, 2005). Unfortunately, despite adjusting the data to make the comparisons as similar as possible, some

methodological differences cannot be controlled. For example, it is not possible to control the context of the surveys (e.g. a survey introduced to respondents as a "crime survey" versus a survey that was introduced as one interested in women's health), the two-stage classifying process used in the NCVS, and the bounding that was present in the NCVS estimation procedures at the time.

To validly compare the effect of question wording on estimates, a study would actually have to begin with that research question in mind. This opportunity presented itself when Bonnie Fisher and her colleagues (2000) began their investigation into the victimization of college students. Funded by the Bureau of Justice Statistics and the National Institute of Justice, the project was designed to represent a quasi-experiment in which two nationally representative samples of college students were given two different versions of a screening instrument (for a detailed explanation of the experiment, see Fisher, 2009). One version used wording identical to the NCVS and was referred to as the National Violence Against College Women (NVACW) study, while the other, referred to as the National College Women Sexual Victimization Study (NCWSVS) used graphic behaviorally-specific screening questions (see above) consistent with the NVAWS. Besides these differences, the two surveys were virtually identical in other methodological respects including their sampling frames and designs, sample sizes (each over 4,000) the interviewing context (female interviewers using CATI), and both surveys were conducted in the fall of 1996 using the same reference period. As such, this study represents a true measurement experiment and the most sophisticated study to date that has examined whether question wording significantly impacts prevalence estimates of rape. Using the NCVS wording, results indicated that .16% of the women reported experiencing a completed rape compared to 1.1% of the sample using the behavior-specific wording. A similar differential was

found for attempted rates. Thus, behavior-specific wording produced estimates over 10 times larger than the survey relying on NCVS question wording. Because all other methods were essentially equal, the only difference that could account for this disparity in estimates is the question wording.

*Series Victimizations*

As noted above, the NCVS generally reports incidence rates of victimization, which indicate how many new victimizations occurred during a specified period (e.g. annually). Historically in the NCVS, a series victimization was defined as 6 or more similar but separate crimes for which the victim was unable to recall individually or describe in detail to an interviewer. When a respondent reports a series victimization, they are asked to report the number of times this victimization occurred and interviewers then collect detailed information for the most recent victimization only. Because of concerns about the measurement error that may be associated with series victimizations, including whether all in a series occurred within the reference period and whether the characteristics of the most recent event actually reflect the characteristics of the other events in the series, until recently, BJS has excluded series victimizations from annual estimates. However, after examining the effects of including series victimizations in annual estimates (Lauritson, et al., 2012), NCVS estimates for 2010, the most recent year for which data is available, incorporated a new technique for including these high volume repeat victimizations (Truman, 2011). Series incidents are now counted as the number reported by the victim, but are capped at 10 (Truman, 2011, p. 4). As expected, the estimate of violent victimization increased when series victimizations were included within annual estimates, however, the general trends in violent crime were not affected. An analysis of series victimizations revealed that they have declined in number and proportion over time. Violent

series victimizations primarily consist of intimate partner violence, school violence, and work-related violence. Regarding the decision by BJS to include series victimization, Lauritson et al. explains, "The strategy for counting series victimizations balances the desire to estimate national rates and account for the experiences of persons with repeated victimizations while noting that some estimation errors exist in the number of times these victimizations occurred." (2011, p. iii).

This strategy will undoubtedly increase rates of rape and sexual assault in future estimates, however, the cap at 10 still deflates the estimates compared to other surveys that report incidence rates but do *not* cap the number. For example, the National Violence Against Women Survey (NCAWS) reported that the average number of rapes reported by female victims was 2.9 (Tjaden & Thoeness, 2006, p. 8 Exhibit 2), however the highest number of rape victimizations reported by victims was 24 (Bachman, 2000). Clearly outliers such as this have the potential of affecting incidence rates of victimization. Outliers such as this are not unlikely. For example, although Koss and her colleagues do not report the range of incidents reported by individual respondents, they do report the number of victims versus incidents upon which their incidence rates are based. For example, they report that 143 women reported a total of 236 incidents of attempted intercourse by alcohol or drugs, 63 women experienced a total of 98 incidents of intercourse by threat or force, and so on (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987, p. 168, Table 5). As noted earlier, the NISVS 2010 report by CDC did not publish incidence rates of rape and sexual assault victimization, only lifetime and 12 month prevalence rates.

*Survey Context*

There are also differences in how surveys attempting to measure rape are introduced to to respondents. As the name implies, the NCVS is a clear indicator to respondents that interviewers are interested in "crimes" they have experienced. Despite the screening instrument asking

questions that use short cues to facilitate recall of events by many different types of perpetrators and in many different locations, all respondents have been primed with the notion that this is, in fact, a crime survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Justice. In fact, the first screening question begins, "I'm going to read some examples that will give you an idea of the kinds of crimes the study covers." (Rand & Rennison, 2005, p. 273). In contrast, the NISVS, conducted by the CDC, is presented to respondents as a survey interested in health related issues. In fact, as the 2010 report notes, "Interviewers ask a series of health-related questions at the outset of the survey to establish rapport and establish a health context for the survey." (Black, et al., 2011, p . 8). These contextual differences across surveys may lead some respondents in "health" and or "safety" related surveys to report victimizations that may not be reported by respondents in "crime" related surveys like the NCVS.

*Sampling Frames, Reference Periods, and Estimation Procedures*

The NCVS remains the only victimization survey of the general population that obtains its sample through a multi-stage cluster sampling design of U.S. households. The NCVS sample is drawn from the decennial census and is representative of the total U.S. population that resides in non-institutionalized housing (e.g. excluding prisons, nursing homes) but includes boarding houses and dormitories. This would include residences regardless of a telephone being present in the household. In contrast, the NISVS and the NVAWS both relied on the probability sampling method of Random Digit Dialing (RDD). It should be noted that the NISVS included a RDD selection of both landlines and cell phones, which in our society today, is better than relying exclusively on landlines.

Eligible respondents for both the NISVS and the NVAWS were individuals 18 years of age or older, while the NCVS includes individuals age 12 and older. While individuals in the

early stage of adolescence tend to have lower rates of victimization compared to those in older adolescence (beginning at around 17 and peaking in the late 20's), it is important to measure victimizations that occur for these younger individuals. In fact, the Crime Survey for England and Wales (originally called the British Crime Survey) recently conducted a victimization survey of 10-15 year olds. These younger individuals are particularly vulnerable to crimes that occur in schools like bullying and harassment. It is not clear what the inclusion of these younger individuals within the sample has on overall rates of rape victimization compared to surveys relying exclusively on those 18 years of age and older.

The reference periods used across surveys is also different. As noted above, the NCVS currently asks respondents to report victimizations occurring in the 6 months prior to the interview. The selection of this 6-month reference period was the result of research indicating that compared to longer reference periods, the 6-month window resulted in less measurement error. All other surveys noted in Appendix A have generally asked about victimizations that occurred "in your lifetime," and if respondents reported a victimization, they were then asked whether it occurred within the "previous 12 months." This method allows surveys to estimate both lifetime and 12 month prevalence estimates. Based on research examining reference periods (Cantor & Lynch, 2000), this methodological difference may serve to increase estimates obtained by the NCVS compared to other surveys, because respondents have a greater likelihood of forgetting incidents farther in the past. However, the trauma associated with a rape or sexual assault is an extremely salient memory and this may serve to nullify this effect since salient events are significantly less likely to be forgotten.

And finally, the two-stage process of classifying incidents into crime categories used by the NCVS is different than the estimation procedures used in all other surveys, except the recent

National College Women Sexual Victimization Study, that also used a two-stage process. As Rand and Rennnison note, "In lieu of explicit questions, NCVS uses extensive and detailed screen questions which promote recall of a broad range of victimizations across many contexts." (Rand & Rennison, 2005, p. 272). As can be seen above, these screening questions ask respondents directly about rape, attempted rape and other types of sexual attacks, behaviorally specific questions involving "forced or unwanted sexual attacks," and other questions providing short cues to specific types of locations (e.g. school, home, work), offenders (e.g.. a family member, someone you know well), and actions that could be associated with a victimization (e.g. face to face threats). Affirmative responses to any of these screening questions trigger an incident report to be completed that will probe for more details about what actually occurred and whether the act in question should be classified as a victimization, and if so, what.

In contrast, all other surveys have used the screening questions alone to classify incidents. If respondents reply yes to a particular question, say one measuring completed rape, they are counted as completed rape victims. Some contend that unless respondents are further probed on what actually happened, some incidents may erroneously be classified as rapes when their experiences did not qualify according to most legal statues of rape (Fisher, Daigle, & Cullen, 2010). The incident report of the NCVS asks respondents to clarify their experiences in several ways including the question, "Do you mean forced or coerced sexual intercourse?" mitigates this potential. To incorporate the best methods across all surveys, Fisher and her colleagues (Fisher, Daigle, & Cullen, 2010) employed both behaviorally specific screening questions and a two-stage process to classify victimizations with an incident report after the screening questions were asked. Evidence from their study suggests that the two-stage process did screen out incidents that would have been counted as rapes had a one-stage process been

used. Fisher explains, "of the 325 incidents that screened in on the rape screen questions, 21 of them could not ultimately be classified because the respondent could not recall enough detail in the incident report; 59 were then classified as 'undetermined' because the respondent refused to answer questions or answered 'don't know' to one or more questions in the incident report that would have allowed the incident to be categorized as rape; 155 were classified as a type of sexual victimization other than rape; and 90 were classified as rape" (Fisher, 2009, p. 144).

How much these methodological design differences independently affect estimates of rape and sexual assault is difficult to determine. As noted, one feature (reference period) of the NCVS may serve to increase estimates relative to other surveys while most would serve to decrease estimates. Whether they significantly affect estimates is also virtually impossible to determine. What we do know now is that question wording matters and it matters a great deal (Fisher, 2009) and that the inclusion of the heretofore excluded series victimizations also matters (Lauritsen, 2012). The next section will provide recommendations about the future of survey research investigating rape and sexual assault.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

As a society, our conceptions of rape and sexual assault have significantly evolved during the past several decades. This evolution in societal awareness has had a reciprocal relationship with the estimates of rape that have been produced by surveys and how we have produced them. Despite this increased awareness, there is still no universal standard on the best way to ask respondents about their victimization experiences. In fact a perusal of Appendix A reveals a wide range of questions intended to measure essentially the same thing. The silver lining to this cloud is that researchers appear to be coming to a consensus. When the NCS was being redesigned into the NCVS in the late 1980's, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) was reluctant to

allow a survey conducted by a federal agency to use graphic language such as "penis" and "anal intercourse." Today, the OMB fully supports the CDC sponsored NISVS survey that uses these terms. Moreover, Fisher and her colleagues stated after their quasi-experimental design testing the difference question wording to measure rape, "The challenge in science is to probe for a study's potential weaknesses so as to illuminate the next set of investigations that might more fully calibrate ways of studying the phenomenon" (p. 18). Their results should leave little doubt that using this behavior-specific language is superior to other forms of eliciting recall for respondents, including that still used by the NCVS.

The NCVS has a clear mandate from Congress to be the national resource of crime victimization in the U.S. independent of official reports to the police. Because it is conducted in an ongoing manner, it is the best mechanism by which trends in victimization along with emerging victimization patterns can be illuminated. As such, it is necessary for BJS to come into compliance with the standards of the scientific community regarding the measurement of violence against women in general, and rape and sexual assault in particular. The behavior-specific language that has been used in all other surveys including the NVAWS, the NCWSV, the NISVS, and internationally in the Crime Survey for England and Wales (see Appendix A) should be incorporated into the NCVS screening instrument. Importantly, amending the NCVS wording to conform to this standard will increase recall from respondents by cueing them to report events they may not have thought of using the current NCVS screening instrument. In addition, to be in compliance with most state rape and sexual assault statutes, questions should also ask about victimizations that occurred when respondents were not able to consent (e.g. when drunk, high, or otherwise incapacitated). However, the two-stage estimation process for classifying victimizations after the screening questions should continue to be used to avoid the

error associated with the classifying incidents based on the screening questions alone (Fisher et al., 2010).

Although not specifically addressed in the body of this paper, it is important to underscore the differential treatment of human subjects provided by the NISVS and the NCVS. Perhaps because the NISVS was conducted by the CDC, it reflected a public health approach in its implementation that followed the dictates of other public health organizations including the World Health Organization (Ellsberg & Heise, 2005). The WHO has been a leader in delineating guidelines to the field of epidemiology when studying violence against women. As WHO notes, "The primary ethical concern related to researching VAW is the potential for inflicting harm to respondents through their participation in the study" (Ellsberg & Heise, 2005, p. 38). Because many perpetrators of intimate partner violence use control as form of abuse, a respondent may suffer physical harm if an abuser finds out that she disclosed information about their relationship to an interviewer. Guidelines to prevent this from happening include interviewing only one person in the household (Ellsberg & Heise, 2005).

In addition, a graduated informed consent process is also recommended, similar to that used by NISVS in its RDD process. When cold calling a potential respondent, the initial person who answered the telephone was provided only general information about the survey topic (e.g. on health related issues). Only after a respondent was selected were they told about the specific topics that would be covered (e.g. violent victimizations). Interviewers should also remind respondents that they can stop the interview at any time, and safety plans should be established between the interviewer and the respondents. For example, NISVS interviewers suggested that respondents answer questions in a private setting and instructed them to just say "goodbye" if they felt unsafe or someone threatening entered the room.

Minimizing respondents' distress by reliving victimization events and providing them with information on services and resources that can help their situation are also necessary. For example, the NISVS and the NVAWS provided telephone numbers for the National Domestic Violence Hotline and the Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network at the end of interviews. Respondent protection is even more complicated when asking about victimizations against minor children as the NCVS does (e.g. it interviews individuals aged 12 or older). Currently, researchers do not fall under the purview of "mandatory reporters" according to most state statutes, and the WHO claims there is no consensus internationally about how to handle cases of child abuse (Ellsberg & Heise, 2005). This is true for cases of elder abuse that are reported by respondents as well. Regardless of statutes not explicitly listing researchers as mandatory reporters, however, interviewers should certainly be required to develop protocols to act in the best interests of a child or an elder when cases of these forms of abuse are revealed.

The use of behavior-specific wording in the screening questions and facilitating the safety of respondents both should serve to increase disclosure of victimizations by respondents. This may ultimately help mitigate the effects of sample cuts BJS has had to implement because of flat Congressional funding for the NCVS. However, to ensure that the differential risk of victimization for subgroups of the population can be monitored annually and over time, increased funding is necessary so the sample size of the NCVS can be restored. This recommendation is consistent with a recent National Research Council report that warned, "In a climate of tight budgets and increasing costs of demographic measurement, federal statistical agencies face real threats….we fear that many surveys, the NCVS among them, can easily die "deaths from a thousand cuts" (Groves & Cork, 2008, p. 121). It is also important to note that budget cuts to the NCVS are occurring at a time when Congress is demanding more efforts to

measure violence against women. For example, VAWA 2005 called for reliable estimates of violence against women of color, with specific attention focused on American Indian and Alaskan Native women (AIAN). Moreover, other federal statutes in the recent past have called for the monitoring of victimizations against the elderly and victimizations against individuals with developmental disabilities to be monitored.

Of specific relevance to this paper is the mandate of the Violence Against Women Act of 2005 (PL 109-162), Title IX, Section 904(s), that calls for NIJ to conduct "a national baseline study to examine violence against Indian women in Indian country." As part of the CDC sponsored NISVS 2010, NIJ infused funds to collect information from an additional sample of AIAN women who had resided on reservation or Alaska Native villages in the past 12 months. The results from this subsample to the NISVS have not yet been published by the CDC. At present, another survey of violence against AIAN women is now being fielded by CDC (partnered with NIJ and conducted by RTI), that will more rigorously attempt to obtain a national probability sample of AIAN women. The survey instrument being fielded (see Appendix A for details) is virtually identical to the original NISVS survey, but based on pretesting for cultural sensitivity to the AIAN population, some wording changes may be implemented. This survey is currently being called the Violence and Victimization Experiences of Indian Women Living in Tribal Communities (VVEIWLTC) Study. [vi]

Given the budgetary constraints that will undoubtedly remain for the foreseeable future, measurement efforts should not be duplicated by both the CDC and the U.S. Department of Justice (under NIJ and BJS), particularly when funds for preventing and responding to violence against women are simultaneously being cut. The costs of conducting these surveys must certainly be addressed. In addition to the basic methodological differences between the NISVS

and the NCVS, it is important to note that the NISVS as well as the NVAWS that came before it, have been conducted by private research organizations. RTI International is the research organization conducting the NISVS. In contrast, the NCVS is conducted from 12 regional offices of the U.S. Census Bureau. As noted above, the sampling technique of the NCVS used by the Census Bureau is a multi-stage cluster method that allows all households to be in the sampling frame regardless of telephone presence. The first interview of the NCVS is also conducted in face-to-face and only the subsequent interviews are conducted using a telephone CATI system. This is unlike all other surveys, including the NISVS, which is conducted one time only and relies on RDD telephone methods of sample selection using only CATI interviews. The methods employed by the NCVS via the Census are, of course, a great deal more expensive than RDD based designs. At a time when we appear to be at the precipice of the NCVS being unable to provide differential risk assessments for subgroups of women in an ongoing manner, particularly for the crime of rape, it is important to consider whether the current NCVS collection methods are the best choice (see Groves and Cork, 2008 for a more detailed discussion of this issue).

Ultimately, the NCVS has proven itself to be a flexible instrument, and given the appropriate mandates, it has incorporated new questions into the screening instrument in a timely manner. For example, as a result of the Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990, the NCVS added questions in the incident report that probed victims about the possible role of bigotry or prejudice in motivating offender(s). The time is now for BJS to begin to analyze the effects that adding new screening questions to more fully measure rape, and all crimes against women for that matter, would have on overall trends. In all likelihood, the new questions would require a break in the series of the longitudinal trend data, but this is necessary and has several precedents including the last redesign that was fully implemented in 1992, the changes implemented in 2007

(e.g. including the first interview into annual estimates), and the addition of series incidents in the most recent 2010 rates of violence. The time for change is now.

## References


Alvarez, A. & Bachman, R. (2008) *Violence: The enduring Problem.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Bachman, R. & Taylor, B. (1994). The measurement of family violence and rape by the redesigned National Crime Victimization Survey. *Justice Quarterly*, 11, 499-512.

Bachman, R. (2000). A comparison of annual incidence rates and contextual characteristics of intimate partner violence against women from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) and the National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS). *Violence Against women, 6,* 839-867.

Black, Basile, Breiding, Smith, Walter, Merrick, Chen, & Stevens. 2011. The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (): 2010 Summary Report. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Eisease Control and Prevention,

Brownmiller, S. (1975). Against Our Will: Men, Women, and rape. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Bureau of Justice Statistics, Terms & Definitions: Victims. Downloaded in May, 2012 from http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=tdtp&tid=9.

Cantor, D. & Lynch, J.P. (2000). Self-report surveys as measures of crime and criminal victimization. In *Measurement and Analysis of crime and Justice,* Volume 4 of *Criminal Justice 2000,* p. 85-138. NCJ 182411. U.S. Department of Justice.

Ellsbergy, M. & Heise, L. (2005). Researching Violence Against Women: A Practical Guide for Researchers and Activists. Washington, DC: World Health Organization, PATH.

Fisher, B.S., Cullen, F.T., & Turner, M.G. (2000). *The Sexual Victimization of College Women.* NCJ 182369. National Institute of Justice and the Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice.

Fisher, B.S. (2009). The effects of survey question wording on rape estimates: Evidence from a quasi-experimental design. *Violence Against Women, 15,* 133-147.

Fisher, B.S., Daigle, L.E., & Cullen, F.T. (2010). *Unsafe in the Ivory Tower: The Sexual Victimization of College Women.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gilbert, N. (1992). Realities and mythologies of rape. *Society.* 4-10.

Groves, R.M. & Cork, D.L. (2008). *Surveying Victims: Options for Conducting the National Crime Victimization Survey.* Washington, DC: National Research Council.

Kilpatrick, D.G., Edmunds, C.N., & Seymour, A.K. (1992). *Rape in America: A Report to the Nation.* Arlington,, VA: National Victim Center.

Koss, M. (1985). The hidden rape victim. *Psychology of Women Quarterly.* 48, 61-75.

Koss, M.P., Gidycz, C.A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology, 55,* 162-170.

Leon, C.S. (2012). *Sex Fiends, Perverts, and Pedophiles: Understanding Sex Crime Policy in America.* New York: New York University Press.

The National Institute of Justice Violence Against American Indian and Alaska Native Women Program of Research. Downloaded on May 15, from http://www.nij.gov/topics/tribal-justice/vaw-research/welcome.htm.

Rand, M.R. & Rennison, C.M. (2005). Bigger is not necessarily better: An analysis of violence against women estimates from the National Crime Victimization Survey and the National Violence Against Women Survey. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 21(3),*267-291.

Rand, M.R. (2008). Criminal Victimization, 2007. NCJ 224390. Bureau of Justice statistics, U.S. Department of Justice.

Roiphe, K. (1993). *The Morning After: Sex, Fear, and Feminism on Campus.* Boston: Little, Brown, and Co.

Statistics Canada. 2006. The General Social Survey: New Data Overview. Catalogue no. 89-631-X.

Tjaden, T. & Thoennes, N. (2000). *Extent, Nature, and Consequences of Rape Victimization: Findings From the National Violence Against Women Survey.* NCJ 210346. National Institute of Justice and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Tjaden, T. & Thoennes, N. (2006). *Full Report of the Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings From the National Violence Against Women Survey.* National Institute of Justice and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Tjaden, T. (2005). Violence Against Women: A Statistical Overview, Challenges and Gaps in Data Collection and Methodology and Approaches for Overcoming Them. Expert Group Meeting Paper Organized by the UN Divison for the Advancement of Women in collaboration with the Economic Commission for Europe and the World Health Organization.

Truman, J.L. (2011). Criminal Victimization, 2010. NCJ 235508. Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice.

World Health Organization/Long School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. 2010. Preventing Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence against Women: Taking Action and Generating Evidence. Geneva: WHO.

# Appendix: Methodological Details of Studies Conducted at the Local, National, and International Levels Intended to Measure Rape and Sexual Assault.

| Study | Data Collection Methods | Questions/ Definitions |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) – sponsored by BJS | Relies on a nationally representative random sample of American households selected through a multi-stage cluster sampling design. Households are the sampling units and residents **12 years of age and older** are selected for interviews within households. They are asked about their victimization experiences during the 6 months prior to the interview. In 2010, 72,283 individuals age 12 and older were interviewed, with an individual response rate of 87.5%.<br><br>**IMPORTANT SAMPLE NOTES:** Because of budget constraints, several sample cuts have been imposed: a 12% sample cut was imposed in 1996, a 4% in 2002; and 16% cut in 2006. Also, annual estimates are no longer bounded.[vii] These sample cuts have made estimating annual incidents of low base rate offenses like rape, or other subgroup analyses (rape against minority populations or various age groups) virtually impossible. | *Since [end date for 6-month reference period], were you attacked or threatened OR did you have something stolen from you: a) at home including the porch or yard, b) at or near a friend's, relative's, or neighbor's home, c) at work or school, d) in places such as a storage shed or laundry room, a shopping mall, restaurant, bank, or airport, e) while riding in any vehicle, f) on the street or in a parking lot, g) at such places as a party, theater, gym, picnic area, bowling lanes, or while fishing or hunting, OR h) did anyone attempt to attack or attempt to steal anything be long to you from any of these places.*<br><br>*(Other than any incidents already mentioned,) has anyone attacked or threatened you in any of these ways: a) with any weapon, for instance, a gun or knife, b) with anything like a baseball bat, frying pan, scissors, or stick, c) by something thrown, such a rock or bottle, d) include any grabbing, punching, or choking, e) any rape, attempted rape or other type of sexual attack, f) any face to face threats, OR g) any attack or threat or use of force by anyone at all? Please mention it even if you are not certain it was a crime.*<br><br>*Incidents involving forced or unwanted sexual acts are often difficult to talk about. Have you been forced or coerced to engage in unwanted sexual activity by:*<br>*a. Someone you didn't know before*<br>*b. A casual acquaintance?*<br>*c. Someone you know well?*<br>If respondents reply yes to one of these questions, they are asked in the subsequent incident report, *"Do you mean forced or coerced sexual intercourse?"*To be classified as rape victims, respondents must reply affirmative. All other sexual attacks are classified as other sexual assaults.<br><br>In addition, after these "short cue" screening questions, respondents will be classified as rape victims if they answer they were raped to any of the follow-up probes in the incident report including, "*Did the offender hit you, know you down, or actually attack you in any way?"* OR "*Did offender TRY to attack you?*" OR "*Did the offender THREATEN you with harm in any way?"* OR "*What were the injuries you suffered?"* [viii] |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS) – sponsored by NIJ and CDC | Conducted in 1995 through 1996, the NVAWS relied on a nationally representative random sample of 8,000 women aged **18 and older** drawn by random-digit dialing from households with a telephone in the 50 US states and DC. Respondents age 18 and older were interviewed using a computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) system. The response rate for females was 72%. | -Rape Screening Questions: very behavior-specific questions that are intended to measure both completed and attempted rapes, but not other forms of sexual assault. Respondents were asked both about their victimization experiences in the "previous 12 months," and those that occurred "during their lifetime."<br>*1[ix]) Has a man or boy ever made you have sex by using force or threatening to harm you or someone close to you? Just so there is no mistake by sex we mean putting a penis in your vagina.*<br>*2) Has anyone, male or female, ever made you have oral sex by using force or threat of force? Just so there is no mistake, by oral sex we mean that a man or boy put his penis in your mouth or someone, male or female, penetrated your vagina or anus with their mouth.*<br>*3) Has anyone ever made you have anal sex by using force or threat of harm? Just so there is no mistake, by anal sex we mean that a man or boy put his penis in your anus.*<br>*4) Has anyone, male or female, ever put fingers or objects in your vagina or anus against your will or by using force or threats?*<br>*5) Has anyone, male or female, ever attempted to make you have vaginal, oral, or anal sex against your will, but intercourse or penetration did not occur?*<br><br>If respondent responds "yes" to any, they are classified as a victim of completed or attempted rape. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS), Sponsored by CDC (partnered with NIJ and Dept. of Defense) | Conducted in 2010; Stratified RDD, dual-frame design where both landline and cell phone frames were sampled. The design used proportionate allocation across states to provide state-level estimates as well as national estimates. Sample includes non-institutionalized English and/or Spanish speaking residents aged **18 or older.** Respondents in Phase One were offered $10 to participate, and nonresponse units in Phase Two were offered $40. Separate subsamples of American Indian or Alaska Natives (AIAN), and active duty military and female spouses thereof. Weighted cooperation rate was 81.3%.<br><br>Measures lifetime and past 12 month prevalence rates. | Preamble: Women and men may experience unwanted and uninvited sexual situations by strangers or people they know well, such as a romantic partner, friend, teacher, coworker, supervisor, or family member. Your answers will help us learn how often these things happen. Remember, your answers are confidential, and you can skip questions you don't want to answer.<br><br>Lifetime and 12 month prevalence rates for:<br>*How many people have ever….*<br>**exposed their sexual body parts to you, flashed you, or masturbated in front of you?*<br>** made you show your sexual body parts to them? Remember, we are only asking about things that you didn't want to happen.*<br>** made you look at or participate in sexual photos or movies?*<br>**harassed you while you were in a public place in a way that made you feel unsafe?*<br>** kissed you in sexual way? Remember, we are only asking about things that you didn't want to happen.*<br>** fondles or grabbed your sexual body parts?*<br><br>Next Preamble: Sometimes sex happens when a person is unable to consent to it or stop it from happening because they were drunk, high, drugged, or passed out from alcohol, drugs, or medications. This can include times when they voluntarily consumed alcohol or drugs or they were given drugs or alcohol without their knowledge or consent.<br><br>*When you were drunk, high, drugged, or passed out and unable to consent, how many people ever….*<br>** had vaginal sex with you? By vaginal sex, we mean that {if female: a man or boy put his penis in your vagina} {if male: a women or girl made you put your penis in her vagina}*<br>** {if male} made you perform anal sex, meaning that they made you put your penis into their anus?*<br>** made you receive anal sex, meaning they put their penis into your anus?*<br>** made you perform oral sex, meaning that they put their penis in your mouth or made you penetrate their vagina or anus with your mouth?*<br>** made you receive oral sex, meaning that they put their mouth on your {if male: penis} {if female: vagina} or anus?*<br>**made you receive oral sex, meaning that they put their mouth on your {if male: penis} {if female: vagina} or anus?* |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| NISVS continued | | How many people have ever used physical force or threats to physically harm you to make you…<br>* *have vaginal sex?*<br>* *{if male} perform anal sex?*<br>* *receive anal sex?*<br>* *make you perform oral sex?*<br>* *make you receive oral sex?*<br>* *put their fingers or an object in your {if female: vagina or} anus?*<br><br>How many people have ever used physical force or threats of physical harm to….<br>**{if male} try to make you have vaginal sex with them, but sex did not happen?*<br>* *try to have {if female: vaginal} oral, or anal sex with you, but sex did not happen?*<br><br>How many people have you had vaginal, oral, or anal sex with after they pressured you by…..<br>**doing things like telling you lies, making promises about the future they knew were untrue, threatening to end your relationship, or threatening to spread rumors about you?*<br>**wearing you down by repeatedly asking for sex, or showing they were unhappy?*<br>**using their authority over you, for example, your boss or your teacher?*<br><br>If respondents reply affirmative, they are also asked how many times this happened in the past 12 months. However, sample sizes were too small to estimate 12 month prevalence rates of rape in 2010 report (Table 2.2).[x]<br><br>The NISVS measures rape, which includes completed or attempted unwanted vaginal, oral, or anal penetration through the use of force or threats to physical harm AND includes times when the victim was drunk, high, drugged, or passed out and unable to consent. Also measured are **being made to penetrate someone else, sexual coercion** (pressured in nonphysical way), **unwanted sexual contact,** and **non-contact unwanted sexual experiences.** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| National Women's Study (NWS) - | 3 year longitudinal study; wave 1 in 1990, wave 2 in 1991, and wave 3 in 1992; RDD probability sample of women **18 and over** with over sample of women 18 to 34; 85% response rate in wave 1, 81 in wave 200; year 1 captures lifetime prevalence rates and year 2 year estimates were bounded by first interview to estimate annual prevalence rates | Preamble: …."Women do not always report such experiences to police or discuss them with family or friends. The person making the advances isn't always a stranger, but can be a friend, boyfriend, or even a family member. Such experiences can occur anytime in a woman's life, even as a child. Regardless of how long ago it happened or who made the advances…."<br>*1) Has a man or boy ever made you have sex by using force or threatening to harm you to someone close to you? Just so there is no mistake, by sex we mean putting a penis in your vagina?*<br>*2) Has anyone ever made you have oral sex by using force or threat of harm? Just so there is no mistake, by oral sex, we mean that a man or boy put his penis in your mouth or somebody penetrated your vagina or anus with his mouth or tongue.*<br>*3) Has anyone ever made you have anal sex by force or threat of harm?*<br>*4) Has anyone ever put fingers or objects in your vagina or anus against your will by using force or threat?*<br><br>If respondent responds "yes" to any question, they are classified as a victim of completed or attempted rape. 12 month estimates are bounded using first interview. |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Violence and Victimization Experiences of Indian Women Living in Tribal Communities (VVEIWLTC), Sponsored by CDC | Currently being field tested; CAPI given for personal victimization questions | Preamble: Women and men may experience unwanted and uninvited sexual situations by strangers or people they know well, such as a romantic or sexual partner, friend, teacher, coworker, supervisor, or family member. Your answers will help us learn how often these things happen. Some of the language we use is explicit, but it is important that we ask the questions this way so that you are clear about what we mean. The questions we are detailed and some people may find them upsetting. The information you are providing will be kept private. You can skip questions you don't want to answer and you can stop at any time.<br><br>We are going to ask you about different types of unwanted sexual situations. In general, these are: unwanted sexual situations that did NOT involve touching and situations that DID involve touching. I will also ask about situations in which you were unable to provide consent to sex because of alcohol or drugs, situations where you were sleeping and unable to provide consent to sex, and about your experiences with unwanted sex that happened when someone used physical force or verbal pressures.<br><br>*1) In your lifetime, how many people have ever exposed their sexual body parts to you, flashed you, or masturbated in front of you when you didn't want it to happen?*<br>*2) In your lifetime, how many people have ever made you show your sexual body parts to them when you didn't want it to happen?*<br>*3) How many people have ever made you look at or participate in sexual photos or movies?*<br>*4) In your lifetime, how many people have ever verbally harassed you while you were in a public place in a way that made you feel unsafe?*<br>*5) In your lifetime, how many people have ever kissed you in a sexual way when you didn't want it to happen?*<br>*6) In your lifetime, how many people have ever fondled, groped, or touched you in a way that made you feel unsafe?*<br><br>Some people are threatened with harm or physically forced to have sex when they don't want to, for example, by being pinned or held down or by the use of violence. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | *7) In your lifetime, how many people have ever used physical force or threats to physically harm you to make you have vaginal sex? By vaginal sex, we mean that a man or boy put his penis in your vagina?*<br>*8) "" "" to make you receive anal sex, mean they put their penis into your anus?*<br>*9) "" "" to make you to put their mouth on your vagina?*<br>*10) "" "" to make you put their mouth on your anus?*<br>*11) "" "" to make you put your mouth on their vagina or anus?*<br>*12) "" "" to make you put your mouth on their penis?*<br>*13) "" "" to put their fingers or an object in your vagina or anus?*<br>*14) "" "" TRY to make you have vaginal sex with them, but sex DID NOT HAPPEN?*<br>*15) "" ""TRY to make you have oral or anal sex with them, but sex DID NOT HAPPEN?*<br>*16) "" "" TRY to make you have vaginal sex with them, but sex DID NOT HAPPEN?* |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Sometimes sex happens when a person is unable to consent to it or stop it from happening because the person is drug, high, drugged, or passed out from alcohol, drugs, or medications. This can include times when the person voluntarily consumed alcohol or drugs or was given drugs or alcohol without their knowledge or consent. Please remember that even if someone uses alcohol or drugs, what happens to the person is not their fault.<br>*17) In your lifetime, how many people have ever had vaginal sex with you when you were drunk, high, drugged or passed out and unable to consent?*<br>*18) """ receive anal sex"""?*<br>*19) """ put their mouth on your vagina"""?*<br>*20) """ put their mouth on your anus"""?*<br>*21) """put your mouth on their vagina or anus"""?*<br>*22) """put your mouth on their penis"""?*<br>*23) """put their fingers or an object in your vagina"""?*<br>*24) In your lifetime, how many people have had vaginal, oral, or anal sex with you when you were sleeping and unable to consent?*<br>Sometimes unwanted sexual contact happens after a person is pressured in a nonphysical way.<br>*25) In your lifetime, how many people have had vaginal, oral, or anal sex with you after they pressured you by doing things like telling you lies, making promises about the future they knew were untrue, threatening to end your relationship, or threatening to spread rumors about you?*<br>*26) In your lifetime, how many people have you had vaginal, oral, or anal sex with after they pressured you by wearing you down by repeatedly asking for sex or showing they were unhappy?*<br>*27) In your lifetime, how many people have you had vaginal, oral, or anal sex with after they pressured you by using their influence or authority over you, for example, your boss or your teacher, clergy, medicine man or woman?*<br><br>All affirmative responses to screeners are then asked how many people have done this to respondents in the past 12 months. An incident report is also filled out for victimizations that includes age at fist and most recent event, perpetrator characteristics, service needs, and service utilization including medical and law enforcement. |
| PROBABILITY SURVEY OF COLLEGE WOMEN | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| National College Women Sexual Victimization (NCWSV) Study (Fisher, Daigle, & Cullen 2010) | During the 1996-97 academic year, 4,446 women aged 18 and older at 2 and 4-year colleges randomly selected, CATI phone interviews, 84.6% response rate. Reference period, "since school began in the Fall of 1996," which was approximately 7 months | Preamble: Women may experience a wide range of unwanted sexual experiences in college. Women do not always report unwanted sexual experiences to the police or discuss them with family and friends. The person making the advances is not always a stranger, but can be a friend, boyfriend, fellow students, professor, teaching assistant, supervisor, coworker, somebody you meet off campus, or even a family member. The experience could occur anywhere: on-or off-campus, in your residence, in your place of employment, or in a public place. You could be awake, or you could be asleep, unconscious, drunk, or otherwise incapacitated. P lease keep this in mind as you answer the questions. Now I'm going to ask you about different types of unwanted sexual experiences you may have experienced since school began in the Fall 1996. Because of the nature of unwanted sexual experiences, the language may seem graphic to you. However, this is the only way to assess accurately whether or not the women in this study have had such experiences. You only have to answer yes or no.<br><br>*1. Since school began in the Fall 1996, has anyone made you have sexual intercourse by using force or threatening to harm you or someone close to you? Just so there is no mistake, by intercourse I mean putting a penis in your vagina.*<br>*2. "" "", has anyone made you have oral sex by force or threat of harm? By oral sex, I mean did someone's mouth or tongue make contact with your vagina or anus or did your mouth or tongue make contact with someone else's genitals or anus.*<br>*3. "" "", has anyone made you have anal sex by force or threat of harm? By anal sex, I mean putting a penis in your anus or rectum?*<br>*4. "" "", has anyone ever used force or threat of harm to sexually penetrate you with a foreign object? By this, I mean, for example, placing a bottle or finger in your vagina or anus?* |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| NCWSV cont. | | *5. "" "", has anyone attempted but not successed in making you take part in any of the unwanted sexual experiences that I have just asked about? This would include threats that were not followed through. For example, did anyone threaten or try but not succeed to have vaginal, oral, or anal sex with you or try unsuccessfully to penetrate your vagina or anus with a foreign object or finger?*<br>*6. Not counting the types of sexual contact already mentioned, have you experienced any unwanted or uninvited touching of a sexual nature since school began in the Fall 1996? This includes forced kissing, touching of private parts, grabbing, and fondling, even if it is over your clothes. Remember this could include anyone from strangers to people you know well. Have any incidents of unwanted or uninvited touching of a sexual nature happened to you since school began in the Fall 1996?*<br>*7. Since school began in Fall 1996, has anyone attempted or threatened but not succeeded in unwanted or uninvited touching of a sexual nature?*<br>*8. I have been asking you about unwanted sexual contact that involved force or threats of force against you or someone else. Sometimes unwanted sexual contact may be attempted using threats of nonphysical punishment, promises of rewards if you complied sexually, or simply continual verbal pressure. Since school began in Fall 1996, has anyone made or tried to make you have sexual intercourse or sexual contact when you did not want to by making threats of nonphysical punishment such as lowering a grade, being demoted or fired from a job, damaging your reputation, or being excluded from a group for failure to comply with requires for any type of sexual activity?*<br>*9. Since school began in the fall 1996, has anyone made or tried to make you have sexual intercourse or sexual contact when you did not want to by making promises of rewards such as raising a grade, being hired or promoted, being given a ride or class notes, or getting help with course work from a fellow students if you complied sexually?*<br>*10. Since school begin in the Fall 1996, has anyone made or tried to make you have sexual intercourse or sexual contact when you did not want to by simply being overwhelmed by someone's continual pestering and verbal pressure?*<br>*10. Not counting any incidents we have already discussed, have you experienced any other type of unwanted or uninvited sexual contact since school began in the Fall? Remember, this could include sexual experiences that may or may not have been reported to the police or other officials, which were with strangers or people you know, in a variety of locations both on and off-campus, and while you were awake, or when you were asleep, drunk, or otherwise incapacitated.*<br><br>2-stage coding process used similar to NCVS; specific types of victimization were coded after respondents were asked to clarify what type of incident occurred after they responded affirmative to screening questions. Coded crimes included attempted and completed rape, sexual coercion, and unwanted sexual contact. They also may have been coded as victims of one of these based on their response to any screening question including stalking if they responded that what "actually happened" was rape.[xi] |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Sexual Experiences Survey (SES) (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987) | Surveys conducted in 1984-85; 6,159 students aged 18 and older enrolled in 32 institutions of higher education completed self-administered surveys given in classrooms; 98.5% response rate | Title of survey was "National Survey of Inter-Gender Relationships. Question working was slightly different for women and men. Female wording:<br><br>Since Age 14:<br><br>*1) Have you given in to sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting but not intercourse) when you didn't want to because you were overwhelmed by a man's continual arguments and pressure?*<br>*2) Have you had sex play ((fondling, kissing, or petting but not intercourse) when you didn't want to because a man threatened or used his position of authority (boss, teacher, camp counselor, supervisor) to make you?*<br>*3) Have you had sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting but not intercourse) when you didn't want to because a man threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to make you?*<br>*4) Have you had a man attempt sexual intercourse (get on top of you, attempt to insert his penis) when you didn't want to by threatening or using some degree of force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) but intercourse did not occur?*<br>*5) Have you had a man attempt sexual intercourse (get on top of you, attempt to insert his penis) when you didn't want to by giving you alcohol or drugs, but intercourse did not occur?*<br>*6) Have you given in to sexual intercourse when you didn't want to because you were overwhelmed by a man's continual arguments and pressure?*<br>*7) Have you had sexual intercourse when you didn't want to because a man used his position of authority (boss, teacher, camp counselor, supervisor) to make you?*<br>*8) Have you had sexual intercourse when you didn't want to because a man gave you alcohol or drugs?*<br>*9) Have you had sexual intercourse when you didn't want to because a man threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to make you?*<br>*10) Have you had sex acts (anal or oral intercourse or penetration by objects other than the penis) when you didn't want to because a man threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to make you?* |
| | | Completed rape was measured by affirmative responses to questions 8, 9, or 10 (and any lower numbered questions), attempted rape was yes to questions 4 or 5 but not to any higher numbered questions, sexual coercion was yes to questions 6 or 7, but not to any higher numbered questions, and sexual contact was yes to questions 1, 2, or 3 but not to any higher numbered items. |
| | | |
| INTERNATIONAL SURVEYS | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Canadian Social Survey, 2009 | CATI telephone survey of a random sample of households using RDD; approximately 25,000 persons **aged 15 or older** are interviewed, response rate of 75%. Although done annually, different core content modules are covered, with victimization modules being used approximately every 5 years. [xii] | Preamble: Now I'm going to ask you about being attacked in the past 12 months…. Remember that all information provided is strictly confidential.<br><br>*1) Has anyone forced you or attempted to force you into any unwanted sexual activity, by threatening you, holding you down or hurting you in some way? This includes acts by family and non-family but excludes a current spouse/a current common-law partner/previous spouse or common-law partner?*<br>*2) Excluding incidents already mentioned, During the past 12 months, has anyone ever touched you against your will in any sexual way? By this I mean anything from unwanted touching or grabbing, to kissing or fondling. Again, please exclude acts by a current spouse/a current common-law partner/previous spouse or common-law partner?*<br><br>Questions about sexual violence by Spouse/Partner<br><br>Preamble: I'm going to ask ten short questions concerning the serious problem of violence in the home. I'd like you to tell me if, in the past 5 years, your current spouse/partner has done any of the following to you. Your responses are important whether or not you have had any of these experiences. Remember that all information provided is strictly confidential.<br><br>*1) During the past 5 years, has he/she forced you into any unwanted sexual activity, by threatening you, holding you down, or hurting you in some way?*<br><br>This question is also asked regarding previous spouse/partners.<br><br>If respondents answer affirmative to this or to any other act of violence, they are further queried, *"In how many of these incidents (during the past 12 months) did he/she force you into any unwanted sexual activity, but threatening you, holding you down, or hurting you in some way?* |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW), sponsored by the British Home Office (formerly called the *British Crime Survey*) | Random cluster sample of 42,000 residents of England and Wales aged 16 and older. In 2009-2010, the survey included a subsample of 4,000 interviews with 10 to 15 year olds as well (this group, however, does not appear to be asked sexual assault screening questions). Interviews are conducted in person (CAPI). | Alternative questions tested in 2012 that will be adopted by the survey in the future: *Preamble*: The next few questions are about sexual offences, which can affect both men and women. Although the questions may seem quite intrusive they are important in helping the Home Office understand more about these types of crime. If the questions upset you in any way you can either ask the interviewer fro help or pass over them by pressing 'don't wish to answer.' However, we hope you will continue to the end. Please remember that all your answers are strictly confidential and your information will be groups with others in a way that does not identify individuals.<br>*1) Since you were 16, has **anyone** indecently exposed themselves to you (i.e. flashing)? This may have been a partner, a family member, someone you knew casually or a stranger.*<br>*2) Since you were 16, has a **partner or ex-partner "" "'** Remember by a partner we mean boyfriend, girlfriend, husband, wife or civil partner.*<br>*3) Since you were 16, has a **member of your family** (other than a partner) "" "" Remember a family member might include your parents, your children, your brother or sisters or any other relatives.*<br>*4) Since you were 16, has **anyone** ever touched you in a sexual way (e.g. touching, grabbing, kissing, or fondling), when you did not want it? it (such as unwanted touching, grabbing, kissing, or fondling)?*<br>*5) Since you were 16, has **partner or ex-partner** " "".*<br>*6) Since you were 16, has a **member of your family** (other than a partner) "" "".*<br><br>If respondents reply yes to any questions, they are asked if specific offender "has done this to you in the last 12 months?" |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW), continued | | *Preamble to "rape" questions:* The next questions are about sexual assaults such as rape and attempted rape or being forced into some other sexual act when you were not capable of consent or when you made it clear you did not want to.<br><br>*1) Since you were 16, has **anyone** ever forced you to have sexual intercourse or take part in some other sexual act, when you were not capable of consent or when you made it clear you did not want to? By sexual intercourse we mean vaginal, anal, or oral penetration. This may have been a partner, a family member, a friend or work colleague, someone you knew casually, or a stranger.*<br>2) *Since you were 16, has **a partner or ex-partner** "" ""?*<br>*3) Since you were 16, has **a member of your family** (other than a partner)"" ""?*<br><br>If respondents reply yes to any questions, they are asked whether each type of offender had done this to them in the past 12 months.<br>They are also asked to clarify event:<br><br>*4) You said that someone has forced you to have sexual intercourse or take part in some other sexual act when you were not capable of consent or when you made it clear you did not want to in the last 12 months. What did they do to you? If this has happened to you more than once in the last 12 months, please select all those that apply. We need this level of detail to allow us to classify the exact type of sexual assault experienced.*<br>*a) Penetrated your [vagina or anus] with their penis*<br>*b) Penetrated your [vagina or anus] with an object (including fingers)*<br>*c) Penetrated your mouth with their penis*<br>*d) Did some other sex act not described above*<br>*e) Don't know*<br>*f) Don't want to answer*<br><br>Rape Attempts:<br>*1) [Apart from anything else you have already mentioned] since you were 16 has **anyone** ever **attempted** to force you to have sexual intercourse or take part in some other sexual act, when you were not capable of consent or when you made it clear you did not want to?*<br>*2)"" has **a partner or ex-partner** "" ""?*<br>3) *"" has **member of your family** "" ""?*<br>If respondents reply yes to any questions, they are asked whether each type of offender had done this to them in the past 12 months. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| International Crime Victims Survey, (ICVS), conducted by Dutch Ministry of Justice and the British Home Office. | Conducted in 1989, 1992, 1996, 2000, and 2004/05; EU ICS includes residents 16 years of age or older in 18 countries; time reference is "victimization in past 5 years."<br><br>European Survey included RDD samples for most countries for national and capital city estimates. Most surveys were conducted using WebCATI, but a few countries employed face-to-face interviews. Response rates ranged from 37% to 57%. | *First, a rather personal question. People sometimes grab, touch, or assault others for sexual reasons in a really offensive way. This can happen either at home or elsewhere, for instance in a pub, the street, at school, or public transport, in cinemas, on the beach or at one's workplace. Over the past five years has anyone done this to you? Pleases take your time to think about it.*<br><br>If yes, an incident report captures number of victimizations, and characteristics of the last event including place of occurrence, number of offenders, victim/offender relationship, police-reporting behavior, etc. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| WHO – Multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence against women | Conducted in 2005; Multistage cluster sample of 24,000 women between 15 and 49 years of age in 10 countries.<br><br>The measured overall sexual violence that was defined as *any sexual act, attempt to obtain a sexual act, unwanted sexual comments or advances, or acts to traffic, or otherwise directed against a person's sexuality using coercion, by any person regardless of their relationship with the victim, in any setting including but not limited to home and work. This include rape, defined as the physically forced or otherwise coerced penetration of the vulva or anus with a penis, other body part or object.* | Preamble: When two people marry or live together, they usually share both good and bad moments. I would now like to ask you some questions about your current or past relationships and how you husband/partner treats (treated) you. If anyone interrupts us I will change the topic of conversation. I would again like to assure you that your answer will be kept secret, and that you do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to. May I continue?<br><br>*1) Did your current husband/partner or any other partner ever physically force you to have sexual intercourse when you did not want to?*<br>*2) Did you ever have sexual intercourse you did not want to because you were afraid of what your partner or any other partner might do?*<br>*3) Did your partner or any other partner every force you to do something sexual that you found degrading or humiliating?*<br><br>If respondents answer yes, they are asked if it happened in the past 12 months.<br><br>Other sexual violence questions preamble: In their lives, many women experience different forms of violence from relatives, other people that they know and/or from strangers. If you don't' mind, I would like to briefly ask you about some of these situations.<br><br>*4) Since the age of 15, has anyone every forced you to have sex or to perform a sexual act when you did not want to?*<br><br>*PROBE: How about a relative? How about someone at school or work? How about a friend or neighbor? A stranger or anyone else?*<br><br>*5) Before the age of 15, do you remember if anyone in your family every touched you sexually, or made you do something sexual that you didn't want to do?*<br><br>*PROBE: How about a relative? How about someone at school or work? How about a friend or neighbor? Has anyone else done this to you?* |
| LOCAL SURVEYS USING PROBABILITY SAMPLING FOR AMERICAN INDIANS AND ALASKA NATIVES | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Harwell, Moore and Spence (2003) | The Montana Department of Health and Human Services conducted a **random sample telephone survey of 1,006 adult American Indians** living on or near Montana's seven reservations. | -An adapted Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) Survey was used<br>-To assess recent personal violence participants were asked, *"In the past 12 months, have you been hit, slapped, kicked, forced to have sex, or otherwise physically hurt by someone?"* |
| Yuan, Koss, Polacca and Goldman (2006) | Data used was from the Ten Tribes Study. **A random sample of 1,368 male and female respondents from six tribes** were interviewed. Participants were randomly selected from tribal enrollment lists, voter registers or health service registries. | -Interview questions were modeled after NVAW Survey questions<br>-*Rape*: *experiences that occurred without the victim's consent since age 18 years, involving actual or threatened physical force to penetrate the victim's vagina or anus by penis, tongue, fingers, or object, or the victim's mouth by penis, including attempts*. |

## Endnotes

[i] This is calculated as the proportion who agreed to participate in the inteveiw among those who were contacted AND determined to be eligible.

[ii] No tests of significance were performed for this statement. "On their face" implies an eyeballing of the numbers.

[iii] World Health Organization/Long School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. 2010. Preventing Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence against Women: Taking Action and Generating Evidence. Geneva: WHO, p. 11.

[iv] Black, Basile, Breiding, Smith, Walter, Merrick, Chen, & Stevens. 2011. The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (): 2010 Summary Report. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Eisease Control and Prevention, p. 17.

[v] Bureau of Justice Statistics, Terms & Definitions: Victims. Downloaded in May, 2012 from http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=tdtp&tid=9.

[vi] The National Institute of Justice Violence Against American Indian and Alaska Native Women Program of Research. Downloaded on May 15, from http://www.nij.gov/topics/tribal-justice/vaw-research/welcome.htm.

[vii] Groves & Cork (2008).

[viii] For detailed discussion of these skip patterns, see Fisher, Daigle & Cullen (2010).

[ix] Question numbers do not correspond to original survey numbering; they are simply sequentially numbered here.

[x] Black, et al. (2011) The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (): 2010 Summary Report. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

[xi] Fisher, Daigle, & Cullen (2010), p. 54-59.

[xii] Statistics Canada. 2006. The General Social Survey: New Data Overview. Catalogue no. 89-631-X.