UMD NCVS Research Forum, Session Two: NCVS Research Highlights — Webinar Transcript
Webinar date: April 28, 2022

MIN XIE: Good afternoon, everyone. And today we are at the session two of the UMD NCVS Research Forum. And today we are joined by BJS staff and external researchers. And we're lucky to have Grace Kena, from the BJS to be today's moderator. And without further ado, I want to thank Grace for hosting today's meeting and thank you, Grace.

GRACE KENA: Thanks, Min, for starting us off, and thank you everyone for joining us today. Today's session will highlight research using data from BJS's National Crime Victimization Survey, or NCVS. And in this session, we are particularly interested in illustrating various uses of the NCVS, including its uses for studying crime types that aren't easily studied by police data. So, we have a great panel of experts lined up for you today as Min said, but I did want to just start off with the few housekeeping items. So, as you saw when joining the meeting, this session is being recorded, just so that everyone is aware. And the plan is to post the video afterward. Please stay muted if you aren't speaking, and finally, please use the chat to post any questions or comments as we go along.

Okay. Starting this off to discuss BJS's Stalking Data Collection and some recent findings on stalking victimization are BJS statisticians, Jenna Truman and Rachel Morgan. In addition to her work in the area of stalking, Dr. Truman has a varied research portfolio, including victimization patterns and trends, the measurement of demographic characteristics, and firearm violence. Jenna also leads the NCVS instrument redesign work. Similarly, Dr. Morgan's research interest and work cover a range of topics, such as financial fraud, victim service providers, and the intersection of race and crime. Both Jenna and Rachel hold PhDs in sociology from the University of Central Florida. Rachel?

RACHEL MORGAN: Thank you, Grace. And Min's going to transition to those slides so we'll just give it a second here. All right. So today we are going to be talking about *Stalking Victimization: Results from a National Survey of Victims* in this first presentation. Next slide, please.

And this presentation is going to give a quick overview of the Bureau of Justice Statistics. For the folks that are not familiar, a discussion of the National Crime Victimization Survey, or the NCVS, and its supplemental surveys, specifically the supplemental victimization survey, which we call the Stalking Supplement as well, and its methodology and our components of the stalking definition. And then I'm going to turn it over to Jenna to talk about findings from a recent BJS statistical report *Stalking Victimization 2019*. Next slide.

Thank you. Okay. So BJS. Next slide.

So BJS is the United States' primary source for criminal justice statistics. It is a statistical agency within the Department of Justice. And is one of 13 principal statistical agencies throughout the executive branch of the U.S. government. So many agencies within the government collect data and produce statistics, however,

the 13 principal statistical agencies are primarily focused on the collection, compilation, processing, or analysis of information for statistical purposes. So BJS's mission is to collect, analyze, publish, and disseminate information on crime, criminal offenders, victims of crime, and the operation of the justice system at all levels of the government. And BJS was first established in December of 1979 under the Justice Systems Improvement Act of 1979. Next slide, please.

So the NCVS and its supplements. So the NCVS is currently sponsored and directed by BJS. The first full year of data collection was in 1973 and it was called the National Crime Survey at that time. And then in 1992, it was redesigned and renamed the National Crime Victimization Survey. It's one of two of the nation's primary sources of information on criminal victimization along with the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting program, or UCR program. And the NCVS was developed to complement the UCR program and measure crimes that were not reported to the police. So, the goals of the NCVS, of course, the first being to measure crimes not reported to the police, to provide an independent calibration for the UCR program, to provide an indicator of crime outside of these indicators generated by police, to provide a measure of victim risk, and to serve as an index of changes in police reporting overtime in the population. Next slide.

Thank you. The NCVS is administered by the U.S. Census Bureau's field representatives or interviewers to persons ages 12 or older from a nationally representative sample of households in the United States. It's a panel designed survey, so seven interviews are conducted over a course of three and a half years, or every six months. So for example, if your family left your address or your household, we would still go back to that same household and interview the new family that moved in. So it's address based. It's a self-report survey, persons are asked about criminal victimizations experienced during the prior six months. And it's incident based, it collects information about each victimization incident. And then the mode, it's typically the first interview is done in person. And then subsequent interviews are conducted either in person or on the phone, depending on the preference of the respondent. Next slide.

So what data are collected in the NCVS? We collect data on non-fatal violent crimes, so rape and sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault, and simple assault. We're interviewing people, so we let the FBI collect data on murder and we don't do that. We collect data on personal larceny, so this is purse snatching and pocket-picking. And then the property crimes of burglary and trespassing, motor vehicle theft, and other types of household theft. The NCVS provides data on characteristics of the victims in crimes for the population and for subgroups within the population. So we collect demographic information of persons, including age, race, Hispanic origin, sex, marital status. So we can disaggregate data by those characteristics. It's the main source of national data on topics including reporting to police, hate crimes, intimate partner violence, crimes against persons with disabilities, injury, non-fatal firearm violence, and the cost or consequences of crime to victims. More information is available on the BJS website. And then next slide.

So in addition to the core NCVS, or what I was just talking about, we call that the core survey. Short topical surveys or supplements are administered at the end of NCVS interviews to eligible respondents. These supplements are typically in the field

for six months, so either from January through June or July to December of a given year. And they allow BJS to capture the changing landscape of crime or collect data on new or emerging crime types, without interfering with the core NCVS and the crimes collected within that survey. So the current supplements include the identity theft supplement, the police public contact survey, the school crime supplement, the supplemental fraud survey, and then the supplemental victimization survey or the stalking supplement. Next slide.

So to date, there have been three administrations of the SVS, so the Supplemental Victimization Survey: 2006, 2016, and 2019. And we purposely left the term stalking out of the supplement name in order to minimize respondent bias. There are many definitions of stalking, some people may not know what stalking means, and so it was easier and made more sense to just call it something else at that point. The SVS was administered to NCVS eligible respondents, so this is persons that completed an NCVS core interview, 18 or older, in the 2006 administration. And then, in the 2016 and 2019 administrations, we lowered the age range to 16 because there were no national level data collections on stalking for 16 and 17-year-olds. Next slide.

So the instrument was redesigned for the 2016 administration. It was redesigned to include updates from the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Acts that occurred in 2005 and 2013. So specifically, elements of presence or whether the stalking occurred within U.S. waters or U.S. territories, elements of intimidation, emotional distress, and then cyberstalking. The 2019 instrument was largely the same as the 2016 but there were some minor modifications we made based on the 2016, and then also on feedback we received from the Census Bureau interviewers. So we tweaked some wording to questions, we didn't change the meaning of questions or, you know, wholesale change question items, but we changed some wording. And then also we added some explicit "don't know" response options to some of the questions, because it was clear that there are situations where stalking victims don't know if something has occurred. So for example, they don't know that someone's monitoring their social media activity, so it was a valid response option. For the 2016 and 2019 stalking data, those data are comparable to each other. However, because the instrument was so different in 2006, those data are not comparable. Next slide.

So for our stalking definition, it includes five elements, the first being unwanted contacts or behaviors. So these can be traditional behaviors, like being followed or watched by someone or cyber behaviors, like having your social media activities monitored. Second is a repeated course of conduct. So this is experiencing the same behavior or contact more than one time, or experiencing two or more different behaviors one time. So as long as it's repeated. And then actual fear. So fear for your safety or the safety of someone you know. Substantial emotional distress, and then last is reasonable fear. So this is that a reasonable person would be fearful because of the threat of harm or actual harm that the offender has caused to them or someone close to them. So our definition--yeah, one more second, our stalking definition, in order to be classified as a stalking victim in the SVS, you had to experience these unwanted contacts or behaviors repeatedly and then one or more of the components of actual fear, reasonable fear or substantial emotional distress. So next slide.

And then this is our definition. So a repeated course of conduct that either caused the person substantial emotional distress or to fear for their safety, or the safety of someone else, or that would cause a reasonable person to fear for their safety or the safety of someone they know. Next slide.

And now, I'm going to turn it over to Jenna to talk about some of the specific findings from our report that came out a couple of months ago. Thank you.

JENNA TRUMAN: Thank you, Rachel. Thank you, Grace. And like Rachel said, we're talking about the 2019 recent report that came out on the 2019 SVS. And so in terms of stalking, we examined three types of stalking: traditional only, which includes behaviors like watching, showing up at places; stalking with technology only, that includes the monitoring on social media; and then those victims that experience both types of stalking. And I'll talk a little bit more in detail about the behaviors on the next couple of slides. In 2019, about 1.3 percent or 3.4 million persons age 16 or older were victims of stalking. And since we did keep the measurements similar in 2016 and 2019, we were able to compare across years. In comparing 2016 and 2019, we found that the percentage of persons who experienced stalking declined from 1.5 percent in 2016 to 1.3 percent in 2019. Next slide.

In terms of the types of behaviors that we measure, the ones that we're calling the traditional stalking, include the things like following, watching, showing up, harassing, you know, friends or family for info, leaving things or sending items, and sneaking into places. And from these behaviors, the most frequently reported in 2019 for traditional stalking included the offender following and watching the victim. That was about 58 percent. Showing up or riding by or driving by places where the offender had no business being there, which was at 49 percent. So those are the most reported of the traditional stalking behaviors. Next slide.

So for stalking with technology, these behaviors included things like phone calls, text messages, email messages, monitoring on social media, posting information online, or spying and monitoring using text or tracking like with GPS. And based on the SVS data, we found that two thirds of victims of stalking with technology had received unwanted phone calls, voice messages or text messages in 2019, and 22 percent of these victims have said that the offender spied on them or monitored their activities using technology. Next slide.

As Rachel mentioned, one of the strengths of the SVS, like the NCVS, is being able to measure stalking both reported and not reported to the police. And in 2019, about a third, 29 percent, of all stalking victims had reported their victimization to police. And just for some added context in 2019, 41 percent of all violent victimization was reported to police, so just kind of giving you that context. And when comparing reporting to police by stalking type, victims who experienced both types of stalking reported more often than victims who experienced stalking with technology only. And again, looking at comparison over time, so from the 2016 administration to the 2019 administration of the SVS, reporting to police declined among traditional stalking victims. So it went from 39 percent to 30 percent. And then reporting to police increased for those amongst stalking with technology victims. So that went from 16 percent to 23 percent from 2016 to 2019. Next slide.

In addition, we're able to look at demographic characteristics of stalking victims. And these findings, in particular, are from table four in the report. So in 2019, and many of these are similar to what we saw in 2016 too, females were stalked more than twice as often as males. And persons ages 20 to 24 were stalked more often than persons older than 35 or older. And then when looking at race and Hispanic origin compared to white persons, stalking prevalence was higher among persons of two or more races, and persons who were American Indian or Alaska Native. And then looking at income, persons living in households earning less than $25,000 annually were stalked more often than persons living in households earning $25,000 or more annually. Next slide.

And looking at stalking by the victim offender relationship, you can see that most, 67 percent, of stalking victims knew their stalker in some way. And victims were more likely to be stalked by a well-known or casual acquaintance, so that's 38 percent, or a current or ex-intimate partner at 25 percent, then by some other relatives, about 5 percent for them. And then victims of those types of stalking in 2019 were three times as likely to be stalked by an intimate partner, so that's at 35 percent on the right-hand side, as victims of only traditional stalking, which was 11 percent, and two times as likely as victims of stalking with technology, which was 18 percent. And then in 2019, we found that about 18 percent of victims were stalked by a stranger and 14 percent were unable to identify their relationships to the offender. So this either means that they just didn't know the offender or they didn't know, because we did ask how many offenders there were, they may not have known the number of offenders or the offender at all. And similar to what Rachel had mentioned too about the unknown, especially that was just stalking with technology online, if they didn't necessarily know that someone was monitoring them or they knew someone was doing something online but they had no idea who it was, so that's kind of where that ends up. Next slide.

So the SVS also asked about a variety of actions respondents took to protect themselves from the offender. And these things included changing activities, blocking calls or messages, taking self-defensive actions, or changing personal information, and then applying for a restraining, protection, or no-contact order. And in 2019, about 24 percent of victims changed their day-to-day activities to protect themselves or stop the unwanted contacts or behaviors. And victims of both types of stalking were more than twice as likely to have applied for a restraining, protection, or no-contact order as victims of traditional or stalking with technology only. Next slide.

In addition, the SVS asked about stalking victims' use of victim services, and this is one of the sections that was expanded specifically in the 2016, and then continued in, the 2019 data collection. And when we say victim service providers, we mean and define this as public or private organizations that provide assistance to crime victims. And in 2019, about one in six stalking victims sought victim services. And victims of both types of stalking were more likely to have sought services than victims of traditional or stalking with technology only. And then, of those victims who did seek services, about 74 percent received them, and then of those who sought services and received them, more than 60 percent of those stalking victims who received services obtained counseling or therapy. Next slide.

So we just highlighted today in the presentation a few findings from the report, but you can find the actual additional findings from the 2019 SVS data and some of the 2016 findings available in the report on our BJS web page. And then also the 2019 SVS public use data file is available at the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data for public download and analyses. Next slide.

And next slide. So we just want to thank you all for your time today. And we will look forward to answering any questions after all these presentations, and we have our contact information up if anyone has questions. Thank you. And I'll turn it back to Grace.

GRACE KENA: Thanks so much, Jenna and Rachel. And then I'll give you a minute to pull up the next set of slides. And just a reminder to everyone to place any questions or comments in the chat, and we will engage in a discussion after all the presentations. So next up, to talk about *Criminal Victimization*, the NCVS's flagship publication, we have BJS statistician, Lexi Thompson. Ms. Thompson's portfolio of work currently focuses on school crime and youth victimizations, hate crime and victim service providers. Lexi holds a BS in statistics and economics from the George Washington University. Lexi.

ALEXANDRA THOMPSON: Thank you, Grace, for that introduction. And thank you everyone for attending the presentation today. So as Grace mentioned, I'll be talking about what happened with crime in 2020 according to the NCVS. And the findings from this presentation stemmed from the two criminal victimization 2020 reports that I coauthored with my colleague, Rachel Morgan. Next slide.

I'll do a brief overview of NCVS, since Rachel gave a great overview in the previous presentation. I'll also discuss the impact of COVID-19 on NCVS field operations. I'll also talk about adjustments and how we approached the data after data collection. And then finally, findings from the two criminal victimization 2020 reports. Next slide.

So you've heard most of this already. The NCVS is the nation's primary source of information on criminal victimization. It covers a variety of crime types and has been ongoing since 1973. What also makes it unique is that it collects information on crimes, both reported and not reported, to the police. Next slide.

COVID-19 had an impact on a lot of different things in 2020, including the NCVS. So before I talk about what we changed, I'll talk about what happens in a typical year. Typically, NCVS interviews are occurring from January 1st to December 31st, all year round, through either in-person interviews or over the telephone. And for the purposes of this presentation, I'm going to talk about incoming sample versus returning sample. The NCVS is a panel survey. And so incoming sample refers to households who are entering the panel for the first time, and returning sample are those who are already in the panel. And so, for incoming sample, it's particularly

important that these interviews, for the first time, happened in person, because it's their first time being interviewed with the NCVS. And that's the typical year. And that's what was happening from January 1st of 2020 to about mid-March of 2020. And of course, in mid-March of 2020, that's when the lockdown orders came, and everything was starting to shut down. And so BJS, in collaboration with the Census Bureau, decided to modify field operations and actually suspend all incoming sample interviews. So no in-person interviews, and then all the interviews for the returning sample were happening over telephone. And this continued up until about July of 2020, where modified in-person visits were starting to be allowed. But again, this is only for returning sample. Interviews were still suspended for incoming sample households. And so from July of 2020 to October of 2020, there were some modified personal visits based on state and local guidance of that area in the United States. And what was really helpful about this was this did allow field representatives to go to properties that maybe were not responding and confirm if the house was vacant or if anyone lived there. And so that helped us classify certain households more accurately, rather than just overall non-response. In October of 2020, we brought the incoming sample back into the mix. And we continued to have modified personal visits again based on state and local guidance of the area. Even though modified in-person visits were allowed during this time period, most interviews were still conducted over the phone. Next slide.

This chart here showcases household response rates for the NCVS from January 2019 through December of 2020. And the average response rate in 2019 was 71 percent. And then the average response rate in 2020 was about 67 percent. The lowest it reached during 2020 was in May, with a household response rate of 63 percent. But it did rise again to 72 percent in September in 2020. And it's worth noting for that time period between mid-March and October, that dotted line on the chart, that response rate is only measured for the returning sample, rather than including the incoming sample because those interviews were suspended during this time period. Next slide.

So once data collection was complete, we needed to talk with Census about any adjustments to the data to account for these modified field operations. And one of our goals of these discussions was to make sure that the 2020 data was still comparable to previous years and for future years of the NCVS. We still wanted to see, did crime increase or decrease compared to 2019 rather than looking at 2020 on its own. And so to do this, there were a series of simulations run with the 2019 data, conducted by the Census Bureau, to piece together how estimates could have been affected by the difference in the field operations. And so once all these simulations were complete, we made several different adjustments to the 2020 NCVS data. One of those adjustments was doubling the weights for incoming sample households, specifically in Q1 and Q4 to account for the fact that they were suspended during the second and third quarters of the calendar year. We also introduced controls for the group quarter household weight. We controlled those to

match for historical values. It was a little bit harder to interview different group quarter households during the pandemic so those weights were adjusted. And then there were other households control weights developed to weight household distributions by sample type because of how the incoming sample households were suspended. Next slide.

Unrelated to the pandemic, there were also some other adjustments made to the 2020 file for the NCVS in relation to outlier weights for certain respondents. Throughout the course of 2020 and 2021, BJS was conducting research to better understand the impact of these outlier weights or these weights that were kind of significantly larger than maybe other respondents. And throughout this research, BJS found that a small number of individual cases sometimes accounted for 10 to 15 percent of the weighted annual, [clears throat], sorry, excuse me, of the weighted annual victimization estimates for person level crimes, and 5 percent for household crimes in some years. And so to mitigate the impact of these cases, BJS again, working with the Census Bureau, developed a method for addressing these cases, identifying them, and then applying various adjustments to reallocate some of that excess weight to other non-outlier cases. This approach results in a minor reduction in annual victimization estimates and standard errors, but does not have a discernible effect of just overall trends and victimization estimates over time. And to clarify, the pandemic weighting that I discussed in the previous slide, that's just for 2020. That's not going to continue into 2021. But this adjustment for outlier weights started in 2020 and will continue into 2021 and onward. Next slide.

All right, this brings me to the best section of discussing findings from the 2020 reports. Again, one of the big questions coming out of 2020 was did crime stay the same, did it increase or decrease. And we found with the NCVS that both rates of violent victimization and property victimization decreased from 2019 to 2020. You can see the different crime types available in this figure here. The decrease in the rate of violent crime was mainly driven by decreases in the assault victimization rate, both aggravated and simple assault. And then for property crime, the decrease was mainly driven by decreases in burglary and trespassing. We also looked at reporting to police, since this is the NCVS. And those are not displayed in this chart, but they are available in the report. In 2020, we found that around 40 percent of violent victimizations were reported to the police, and about 33 percent of property victimizations were reported to the police. And these percentages are not statistically different compared to what they were in 2020 [Correction: 2019]. When looking at certain subtypes of crime, we did find that the percent of intimate partner violent victimizations reported to police did decrease from 58 percent in 2019 to 41 percent in 2020. We also found that the percent of burglaries reported to police also decreased from 51 percent in 2019 to 44 percent in 2020. And again, these are in the report but they're not displayed on the slide currently. Next slide.

We also looked at the violent victimization rate by different victim demographic groups. We found that across the different demographic groups that we analyzed, violent crime rates either decreased for certain groups or did not change significantly from 2019 to 2020. I won't go through all this slide, but I'll start with maybe the top three demographics. We're looking at victim sex, the violent crime rate did decrease for both males and females. We're looking at victim race and ethnicity. The violence victimization rate did decrease for white persons and Hispanic persons. When looking at victim's age, the youth violence victimization rate declined actually 51 percent from 2019 to 2020. And then, also when looking at those ages 50 to 64, the violent crime rate for that age group declined as well. Again, these are all in the report, if you'd like to take a look further. And then when looking at violent crime excluding simple assault, we found sort of a general trend that for certain demographic groups, the rate did decrease from 2019 to 2020 or it did not change significantly. Next slide.

We also looked at firearm violence or violent victimizations where a firearm was involved, and we found that the number and rate of firearm victimizations declined from 2019 to 2020. When looking at the percentage of firearm victimizations that were reported to the police, that was about 60 percent of firearm victimizations reported to police. But that percentage did not change between 2019 and 2020. Next slide.

We also looked at the percentage of victims that accessed victim services. And in 2020, that was 6 percent of violent victimizations. That percentage did not change significantly from 2019 to 2020. When looking at, again, sort of subtypes of violent crime, we did find that when looking at intimate partner violence and violent crime involving an injury, the percentage of those victimizations where the victim accessed victim services did decline from 2019 to 2020. Next slide.

We also looked at incidents by different victim and offender demographics, and the cross section between those two, both by victim sex and by victim race and ethnicity. Starting with the table on the left, we found that a majority of incidents involved a male offender or the victim identified the offender as male. And that's not exactly how the testing looks in the table, but that was confirmed by us at BJS. And then that also holds true across for incidents where there was a male victim and a female victim. When looking at just female victims, even though a majority of the incidents were identified to have a male offender by the victim, the percentage where the female offender--whereas female victim and female offender was higher than male victim, female offender even though again, majority is still male offender. When looking at the table by race and ethnicity on the right, the comparison groups are interracial incidents where the offender and the victim were of the same race and ethnicity. And so for both cases where the victim was white or the victim was black, a majority of those incidents were interracial about 65 percent to 70 percent, and then when looking at Hispanic victim, about 41 percent of those incidents were identified to

have a Hispanic offender, again, by the victim accounts, which was not statistically different than the percentage of incidents where the offender was white. Next slide.

In addition to victimization estimates, we also looked at prevalence of violent crime or percent of unique persons who were a victim of violent crime or a victim of violent crime excluding simple assault. And both these percentages decreased from 2019 to 2020. Next slide.

I think we're doing questions at the end. So on the next slide, I have my email and information along with Rachel Morgan, my coauthor's information. Feel free to contact us if you have any questions and looking forward to answering some questions at the end of this presentation.

GRACE KENA: Thank you, Lexi. Reminder to everyone to continue placing questions in the chat. Next, we have our resident expert on crime against persons with disabilities, Dr. Erika Harrell, who will share with us findings from her recent report on the topic. Erika's work also centers around identity theft and workplace violence, and she's authored many BJS reports on these and other topics during her tenure at the agency. Erika was also a key member of the BJS team, along with Lexi and myself, that created the N-DASH, an interactive data visualization tool using NCVS data. Erika holds a PhD in criminology from the University of Delaware. Erika.

ERIKA HARRELL: Good afternoon. As Grace mentioned, my name is Erika Harrell. I am with the Bureau of Justice Statistics. I'm a statistician. And today I'm going to talk about a report that I wrote that was released in November of 2021 on the topic of crime against persons with disabilities. First, I'm going to give some background information and then I'll give some results from those reports. Next slide.

BJS has been under a federal mandate to collect and report information on violent crime against persons with disabilities, and we annually have to provide that information. We have been providing it via our public youth files, but we have also created a series of reports focused on crime against persons with disabilities. Another reason for researching this topic is because a lot of research on crime against persons with disabilities usually focuses on a particular setting, a certain— like a couple of nursing homes or just one nursing home, and is not really generalizable to the nation. And they usually do not look at people who are in noninstitutional settings, which is what the NCVS does. And we actually provide the only national survey devoted to crime against persons with disabilities. So we're really filling in a research gap in doing these studies. Next slide.

There are six types of disabilities: hearing, vision, cognitive, ambulatory, self-care, and independent living, that are collected in the NCVS. These are based on the disability questions for the ACS, and we also have the same age restrictions for these questions that the ACS does. For persons aged 12 to 14, they get questions one through three. People who are aged 15 and over, they get all the questions that you see on the slide. This is similar to the age restrictions for the ACS, and any "yes"

response to any of these questions will classify that person as a person having disabilities. Next slide.

We've had some change with our disability questions over time from 2007 to 2016. We use the ACS disability questions on our incident form, where we're asking crime victims about their disability status. But as a result of that, we, in order to generate rates of victimization, we have to incorporate population data from the ACS. That was from 2007 to June of 2016. From July 2016 to the present, the questions have been moved to the screener questionnaire. So they're given to all NCVS respondents. And now we're able to produce population estimates by disability status and type using only NCVS data. And we're actually able to produce rates with just NCVS data so that we don't have to go outside of BJS to get another data source for our population data. Next slide.

Here are the age distributions for the populations of persons with and without disabilities. And this is taken right from the NCVS data. This is from 2017 to 2019, because 2017 was the first full year that we had our population data in the NCVS by disability types and status, so that's the year that we started. And as you can see, the population of persons with disabilities has a much higher percentage of older persons than a population without disabilities, with 47.5 percent of persons with disabilities being aged 65 or older compared to 14.5 percent of persons without disabilities being 65 or older. This, combined with the knowledge that the risk of victimization changes as one ages, it caused us to turn to what we call age-adjusted rates in order to put the two populations on an even playing field in terms of comparing rates of violent victimization by disability type and disability status. Next slide.

These are the steps that we use to create the age-adjusted rates. We only adjust the rate for persons without disabilities. We did not touch the rates of persons with disabilities. The rates of persons without disabilities, basically, what this process does is it creates rate that would occur if this population of persons without disabilities have the same age distribution as the population of persons with disabilities. And I will show on the next slide exactly how that's done, but here, it's just basically saying we created a rate by age group for people without disabilities, just how we normally do it, and we multiply by—multiply the division of incident by population by a thousand, which is how we do most of our rates with the NCVS, to create a weight for each age group by dividing the number of persons with disabilities by the total number of persons with disabilities for that age group. And that's creating a weight. And for each age group, we multiply their age group-specific rate by its weight. We take the product and we sum all of the products across all age groups, and there we get our age-adjusted violent victimization rate for persons without disabilities. We leave the rate for persons with disabilities unadjusted. Next slide.

Here, we have the age-adjusted rates for persons without disabilities being calculated. Here we have the weighted number of violent victimizations for persons without disabilities. You click--here are the populations for persons without disabilities. This is the age-specific rate, which is basically just dividing the two and multiplying by a thousand. Next is the weight of persons with disabilities divided by the total number of persons with disabilities. Just the weight proportion. Next is

multiplying column three and four for each age group. And then we sum all of them at the bottom: 12.27. That is the age-adjusted rate for persons without disabilities. This is how we calculate that rate for total violent crimes and other types of violent crimes that are presented in this report. Next slide.

Now, I'm turning to the report findings. Here, we have trends of violent victimization rates by disability status. As you can see, the longer lines are rates that were calculated with ACS population data. And the bolded lines going from 2018 to 2019 are rates that were calculated just with NCVS data. And the reason why it starts at 2018 is that these rates are two-year rolling averages. When you're looking at, say, the 2018 rate, it's actually the combination of 2017 and 2018. So we do have both years of data incorporated there. Keep in mind the entire report is all based on the noninstitutionalized U.S. population aged 12 or older. And basically from this, what we found was that no matter what type of population data we use, persons with disabilities had a higher rate of violent victimization, a much higher rate than the age-adjusted rate for persons without disabilities. These are all age-adjusted rates that you find in that lower gray dotted line and that green bolded line. Next slide.

Here we have rates by types of crime. And essentially, again, it just shows that persons with disabilities have a much higher rate of each type of violent victimization compared to the age-adjusted rates for persons without disabilities. Usually, it was several times, the rate for persons with disabilities was several times that of the age-adjusted rate for persons without disabilities. Next slide.

Overall, people with disabilities are overrepresented among violent crime victims compared to their percentage in the population. They are 12 percent of the U.S. population, but were found to be victims of 26 percent of violent crime, 29 percent of violent crime excluding simple assault, and 25 percent of simple assaults. Not shown here but also in the report, they were also found to be victims of about 33 percent of robberies. So, yes, they are very much overrepresented in the percentage of victims of crime compared to their percentage in the population.

But we also looked at a couple of demographic groups. Looking at sex and race, we found, again, people with disabilities have a much higher rate than those without disabilities. That was true among male, females in each racial and ethnic group. Now, when we look at age, those aged 65 and younger, they still follow that pattern of having rates that were several times that of persons without disabilities. However, for persons that are aged 65 or over, there was no difference in the rates by disability status. Next slide.

This slide, we looked at unadjusted rates of violent victimization by the type of disability. As you recall, I said earlier, there were six disability types, but no matter what type of crime we looked at, persons with cognitive disabilities have the highest rate. As you can see 83.3 per 1,000 persons aged 12 or over as the violent victimization rate for each type. They had the highest rate. And, also, we found— it's not shown here, but we do mention it in the report, is that those with hearing disabilities have the lowest rates of violent victimization and also the lowest rate of violent crime excluding simple assault, among the six types. Next slide.

In the report, we also looked at a few crime incident characteristics and what we generally found was that people with disabilities are more likely to know their attacker. It's shown as being less likely to be attacked by a stranger. They're more likely to be attacked by a relative other than an intimate partner. And, also, they're less likely to have their crimes reported to the police, particularly with rape and sexual assault, with only 19 percent of their rape and sexual assault being reported to the police compared to 36 percent of rapes and sexual assaults against persons without disabilities. So they are more likely to know their attacker and less likely to have their violent crimes reported to the police. And that concludes the findings that we have from this report. You can go to the next slide.

Here are links to the report itself and also to the NCVS page. There, you can download the questionnaires which do have the disability questions on there.

And I think the next slide, yes, has my contact information. And I'll be looking forward to questions at the end. Thank you.

GRACE KENA: Thanks so much, Erika. Switching gears again, we are now going to hear about research on hate crime from Dr. Frank Pezzella, who is associate professor at John Jay College of Criminal Justice and the Program of Doctoral Studies in Criminal Justice at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. He has done extensive work in the area of hate crime, including authoring and co-authoring numerous publications, providing testimony before the United States Civil Rights Commission, along with serving as a member of the National Association to Enhance the Response to Hate Crimes with the IACP and Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law. Frank received his master's and doctorate degrees in criminal justice and criminology from the State University of New York at Albany. Frank.

FRANK PEZZELLA: Good afternoon. I just realized that myself and the next presenter are probably the only two people who don't work for BJS. So, you know, delighted to have been called to do this presentation. Let me start by saying hate crimes are probably one of the most significantly underreported offenses that you can possibly have, and I'll explain that in a couple of minutes. First got involved with the National Crime Victimization Survey because my colleagues and I, Matthew Fetzer of Shippensburg University, we wrote a paper entitled *The Likelihood of Injury* that just kind of compare biased crime injuries and non-biased crime injuries. And one of the reviewers, and I could tell they were from the UK, they said, "Okay. Fine. You're going to revise and rewrite but you need to put some limitations in there about the limitations of using official data." You know, they talked about this significant underreporting. As a result, we wrote another paper that looked at some of the other injuries, including psychological injuries that you can't tap from using official data, and found more or less the same thing. So since then, we've been using victimization data, and this has been very, very helpful. Next slide.

So we begin this idea that the hate crimes are significantly underreported. And remember former FBI Director James B. Comey in a presentation to the Anti-Defamation League, this is what he said, "We need to do a better job of tracking and reporting hate crimes to fully understand what is happening in our communities and how to stop it. There are jurisdictions that fail to report crime statistics. Other

jurisdictions claim there were no hate crimes in their community, a fact that would be welcome if true. We must impress upon our state and local counterparts the need to track and report hate crimes. It's not something we can ignore or sweep under the rug." So there is a significant dark figure of hate crime underreporting and a major discrepancy between hate crimes as reported by police statistics and, as you'll see, as reported by victims. Next slide.

So Hate Crime Reporting Program began in 1992. Police agency—this is a voluntary participation program, the Hate Crime Reporting Program. It increased from 2,771 in 1992 to 14,500 in 2013. And, mind you, the 14,500 are just those police agencies that actually reported. That's only 75 percent of the number of police agencies we had at the time. So what I say to the press when they called me is I say, "We start with a statistical disability. Twenty-five percent of police agencies don't even report. And of those who report, you'll see, they report zero hate crimes." So between 2004 and 2012, UCR Annual Hate Crime reported a mean of about 8,770 single bias incidents per year. During that same period, NCVS reported a mean of 269,000 hate crime victimizations per year of which 106,000 victims claim to have reported. Now, you know, let's be clear, we're talking, in some sense, apples and oranges. We're talking incidents versus victimizations. To give you a sense of that, if you remember the Pulse nightclub shooting about five or six years ago wherein 54 people died, I think Orlando reported three hate crimes. But to them, that was an incident. But yet we know that there were 54 victims. So what are some of the reasons why that explained the difference between the UCR and the NCVS estimates? Well, two categories of reasons, victims underreport and police misclassify. Why do victims underreport? Well, there's a notorious African-American strained relationships with police, LGBT community and Muslims fear secondary victimizations, undocumented individuals fear deportation, language barriers, cultural differences, you know, including stigma. You know, in some cultures, there's a stigma to be a victim. And in reference to the previous presentation, there's almost a normalization of hate crimes by disability victims who may not even know that they've been a victim of a hate crime. And then there's fear of retaliation. Second category of reasons. Police misclassify hate crimes. Of the, let's say—and I've been tracking this all the way up until this year. Of the, let's say, of the number of police agencies that participate in Hate Crime Reporting Program, almost 89, 90 percent report zero hate crimes every year. And that kind of got our attention and kind of made us want to, you know, look at this analysis and look at this dark figure of hate crime underreporting. So what are some of the reasons? Both individual officers and police agency factors encourage and discourage reporting, ambiguity in legal definitions of hate crimes, absence of training, ineffective documentation of top-down hate crime policy. One of the things I talk about when I talk with police agencies is that you have to be very, very clear about what your policy is. There's a lot of—believe it or not, something like paperwork will deter a police officer for when to class [INDISTINCT]. Next slide.

So this gives you an indication of what I'm talking about. You see, in 1991, total bias incidents and the number of police agencies that have participated in Hate Crime Reporting Program has grown, and I've since extended this up to 2019. And as you can see, it has grown significantly, up to 14,500. But look at what has happened with total bias incidents. It has actually shrunk. So there's a major discrepancy between the number of police agencies that are participating and the number of bias crimes that they report. And this is what I call that dark figure. Next slide.

So we've formed two hypotheses. Hate crime victims in comparison to their ordinary crime counterparts are less likely to report their victimizations to law enforcement. You know, consistent with that idea of two reasons. You know, that victims don't report. And the second one is misperception of police legitimacy increases the likelihood that hate crime victims would not report their victimizations to police. Next slide.

Research questions. Are bias crime victimizations less likely to be reported to law enforcement than non-bias crime victimizations? What are the most prevalent reasons? So we think it's important. It's one thing to know whether bias crime victims are less likely to report but why don't they report and why do they report? And so next slide.

We used the National Crime Victimization collection of incident and extract files. For research question one, we used the 2014 NCVS incident-level extract files. And for the research questions two and three, we concocted and devised a five-year average between 2010 and 2014 to assess the reasons why victims report and why victims do not report. Next slide.

And so we are talking about violent victimizations only. We're talking about rape and sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault, and simple assault.

Bias motivations include race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, gender, disability, association, and perceived characteristics. Next slide.

And so a dependent variable for this analysis is whether or not a victim reported to police. A dichotomous variable. Next slide.

And so independent variables was whether it was a bias motivated victimization. Situational factors. Any weapons used? Any physical injuries? Any psychological injuries? These situational factors, we kind of look at as the seriousness of the injury. Offender variables include multiple offenders, whether the offender was a stranger, perceived drug/alcohol use. And then finally victim characteristics, including gender, race, ethnicity, educational attainment, and age. Next slide.

So analysis includes both—provided some descriptive statistics and logistic regression, uses step-wise model, you know, victims reported to the police or not. Next slide.

And so here, what we see is this is descriptive information. Now, this is not just bias. This is overall for 2014 NCVS violent victimizations. We could see that, overall, just about half reported and half didn't report it. But only 9 percent these overall victimizations were bias motivated. The majority of them did not use a weapon. Majority also had no physical injuries, interesting, any psychological trauma. This is one of the unique aspects of the NCVS is because it asks psychological trauma questions, unlike the UCR. And it's interesting that almost 75 percent of these overall victims said that there were some psychological trauma. Most of the number of offenders, most of the time, there was only one offender and, interestingly enough, the offender was more likely known. No perceived drug use. And as you could see,

the gender was split in half, 50 to 49. Most of these victimizations were white. Almost 76 percent. Hispanic, non-Hispanic, 84 percent. And half of these victims had more than high school education, and most were single and between the age of 12 and 24 represented about 54.8 percent of the victims. Next slide.

So, interestingly enough, just looking at this bivariate analysis, we see that the likelihood of reporting, if it was a bias-motivated victimization, is almost 6 percent less than it would be than if it was a non-bias motivation. Interesting. When we add in the next—in equation two, when we add the seriousness and variables, any weapons used, any physical injuries, any psychological injuries, you know, we see the likelihood of reporting if it was a bias-motivated victimization. Almost remains the same. Minus 5.28 compared to non-bias motivations. But as you can see, the situational variables that we have there, any weapons used, 93.2 percent more likely to report. Any physical injuries, 83.2 percent. Any psychological injuries, 84.1 percent. Now, these variables are reasons that we included that non-bias victims were more likely to report. But for bias victims, again, you know, it remains somewhat flat. Look at what happens when we step in offender variables where there is more than one offender. The likelihood of reporting is increased by a likelihood of 48 percent. Offenders are strangers, 6 percent. Perceived drug use, 7.8 percent. But look at what happens when it's through bias-motivated accounts. It actually suppresses the reporting to the tune of about -14.1 percent. Then we look at victim characteristics. You know, again, if it's male, male is the least likely to report. Hispanics more likely to report. Education, more likely to report, 21 percent. Education more than high school, 38 percent. Age 12 to 34, least likely to report. But look at what happens to the bias-motivated victimizations. So, again, what we see is this increasing propensity for bias victims not to report when you add in situational offender and victim characteristics to the tune of about 17.7 percent. So this begs the question of, well, why do victims report and why don't they report? Next slide.

So, generally, when we wrote this paper in a publication called the American Behavioral Scientist, we generally put the reasons for not reporting first but I'll talk about this. So why don't people report? Well, almost 50 percent of the time you're reporting to stop the incident, to prevent future incidents against myself, or prevent future incidents against others. That's why people report. Next slide.

Importantly, well, why don't people report? Interestingly enough, we were intrigued by the idea that almost 70 percent of the victims, and this is a five-year average, said that they didn't report because it wasn't important to police. Police inefficient, 7.5 percent. Police biased, 5 percent. That's almost 30 percent of the reasons why victims don't report has to do with their belief in the legitimacy of police. And then if you notice something up there, they report it to a different official, that's a whole different analysis there on why people might report to a different official. Next slide.

So, I mean, clearly, you know, all analysis have limitations. Some crimes are overlooked by the NCVS, vandalism and intimidation offenses. Here we're talking about the victim's perception of victim as to a bias motivation. Specific bias types cannot be addressed with the data. You know, we wrote this then. Maybe some of these things can be addressed right now. That's one of the questions I have for BJS now, particularly as it relates to gender and gender identity. Next slide.

So as a wrap-up, victims of bias crimes were significantly less likely to report victimization to police. Again, 30 percent of the reasons bias crime victims do not report concern issues of police legitimacy. Fifty-two percent of the reasons why victims did report was to stop the incident or prevent future incidents against themselves or others. And one of the things that we talked about in the paper is the need to enhance police community relations and engagement. Next slide.

Further research. So we've looked at injury but we haven't looked at injury by bias motivations. So that's what we expect to do in the future. Study for psychological trauma from property victimizations that were bias motivated, and to look at patterns and relationships to victim characteristics, you know, such as juveniles. And I believe--next slide.

I believe that's it. Thank you.

GRACE KENA: So we're eager to greet our final presenters today. They will be sharing about their work on relationships between psychological distress, help seeking, and victims services. Dr. Tasha Youstin is an assistant professor at Western Carolina University and is a graduate of John Jay College. Tasha has published research on a variety of topics. Her current interest focus on victimization, particularly sexual victimization and mental health issues within the criminal justice system. Dr. Julie Siddique is an associate professor of criminal justice at the University of North Texas at Dallas. Her research interest includes sexual assault, violent victimization, and racial/ethnic disparities in crime and justice. Tasha and Julie.

JULIE SIDDIQUE: Hi, everyone. Good afternoon. Thank you for having us here today. Tasha and I are here to share some of our findings from a research study that we published a few years ago. And both Tasha and I had used the NCVS previously for other studies and had found some of the variables related to post-victimization experiences really interesting and underutilized, and so we decided to kind of take a look at some of the experiences of victims post-victimization and particularly with regards to mental health and emotional health. And so that is how this project got started. So the title of our project is *Psychological Distress, Formal Help-Seeking Behavior and The Role of Victim Services among Violent Crime Victims*. Next slide please.

So as an introduction, though we've seen significant crime declines, significant number of Americans continue to experience violent victimization. And we know from other research that victims of violent crime like robbery, aggravated assault, simple assault, and rape and sexual assault experience serious harms. They can be physical harms, they can financial harms, but also emotional distress as well. And so while physical harms are more easily recognized and measured, as well as financial, sometimes the extensive mental and emotional health consequences can be a lot more difficult to calculate, and so we were interested in investigating that aspect of the victimization experience more. Next slide please.

So when we're looking at the phrase "psychological distress," that term is often used for a wide range of different mental health experiences so there's not really an exact construct to that concept. However, it really includes anything from experiencing

depression or anxiety or other negative emotions, sadness, fear, sometimes it can include anger. Just a whole host of different types of emotional feelings that are negative emotions. And they can also result in functional disabilities, behavioral issues, and a number of other things. What we know is that current research has found a consistent relationship between being the victim of a crime and experiencing psychological distress. Next slide please.

As far as help-seeking behavior, help-seeking really refers to behavior in which individuals actively seek help from others. So this is about communicating with others in terms of understanding, obtaining advice, getting additional information, seeking treatment, seeking general support, you know, reaching out to others essentially to get help to cope with whatever experience the individual is facing. There are two different types of help-seeking that we've identified, and that could be informal, so seeking help from your friends, your family, a coach, a pastor, some other person in your informal social network. And that's more of an informal help-seeking coping mechanism. But the more formal would be seeking help from a professional who has a legitimate or recognized professional role, you know, like a therapist, a doctor. Someone that's qualified to offer relevant advice, support, referrals, and treatment themselves. Next slide please.

So we know that prior research has established that victimization, particularly violent victimization, can cause significant distress. However, the relationship between victim demographics, the post-victimization level of psychological distress, and then help-seeking is a lot less clear. So the purpose of this study was to better specify that relationship between victim demographics, the level of psychological distress experienced as a result of victimization, and then formal help-seeking of victims in terms of coping with that distress. Next study--next slide, Sorry.

Our research questions. So we were interested in finding out which victims and what kinds of offense characteristics are most predictive of experiencing high levels of psychological distress. So who are the victims that are experiencing the most psychological distress? Is it victims of a particular crime type? Is it victims that have specific demographic characteristics? Who are the ones that are really feeling it in terms of psychological distress? Our second research question was what factors would predict formal help-seeking? So which victims are the ones that are actually going out and seeking formal help for their psychological distress? And, finally, as we were looking at these factors, we became interested in looking at the role of victim services and trying to see to what extent do victim services help victims access the resources they need in order to cope with their psychological distress. So these were the three main research questions that we were exploring in the study. Next slide please.

And the data and methods that we utilized came again from the National Crime Victimization Survey. We used 2015 data, and we looked at victims of violent crimes, including robbery, simple assault, aggravated assault, and sexual assault. We merged data that included the person-level—the victim-level information with their households and incident-level data. And our total sample size was 1,179 victims. And our primary method of analysis was binary logistic regression modeling. And I'm going to pass over to Tasha to talk more about the analysis.

TASHA YOUSTIN: Thank you, Julie. So when trying to answer these questions, we had a few dependent variables that we were interested in. First, the survey asked if the victims experienced any type of distress from the victimization, and so they could respond with no distress, mild distress, moderate distress, or severe distress. Of those who responded with moderate or severe distress, they were then asked additional questions regarding different types of psychological distress. So of those reporting moderate or severe distress, which was about 56 percent of our sample, they were asked questions like thinking about your distress associated with being a victim of this crime, did you feel worried for a month or more, angry for a month or more, sad for a month or more, et cetera? And it went through asking about vulnerability, feel violated, mistrust, or unsafe. Now, we decided to look at those experiencing just the highest level of psychological distress and sort of separating them out from the rest of the sample. And so, basically, all those victims who had recorded all seven indicators of psychological distress were coded as one and then we compared them against those that experienced less of those psychological distress symptoms. For looking at formal help-seeking behavior, we just looked at whether or not the victims had reported engaging or access to help from counseling or therapy, medication, visiting a doctor or nurse, visiting an ER, hospital, or clinic, or some other type of reported formal help-seeking behavior. So this is going to be separated from those informal types of help-seeking behavior, talking to a friend or family member or your spouse. And then because we began to see through our analysis that access to victim services and being in contact with victim services seems to be a big deal in terms of getting that formal help-seeking behavior, we also decided to sort of add in a third layer to our analysis where we looked to see, well, who is it that is actually getting connected with victim services and is receiving help from them. Next slide please.

So our independent variables involve a variety of victim characteristics such as sex, race, ethnicity, marital status, education, income, disability. It also included offense characteristics like the type of offense, whether it was aggravated assault, robbery, or sexual assault, whether it was perceived hate crime, whether the incident was reported to police. It also looked at harm—physical harm that was felt by the victim. Next slide.

And so what you'll see here is just a breakdown of what we saw from our sample. The majority of our sample was female. Average age was about 38 years old. Three quarters of the respondents were white. About 15 percent Hispanic. Most were not married, without a college degree. The medium income level was $25,000 to $35,000. About 25—or about a quarter reporting some type of disability. If we look at the breakdown of victimization type, we see predominantly that these were victims of simple assault, but we also saw about 20 percent victims of aggravated assault, about 12 percent victims of robbery, and about 6 percent victims of sexual assault. Multiple victimization included victims that had multiple cases within the dataset, and so they were coded as having multiple victimization. We then see those who identified as the victimization being a perceived hate crime, whether or not a weapon was used. About 31 percent said that there was weapon used. About 50 percent of the sample reported their victimization to the police, but what we see is that only about 8 percent actually had some type of contact with victim services. Breakdown of victim-offender relationship, we see that most people in the dataset knew their offender, that about 56 percent of them reported some type of moderate or severe

distress. And then we can see the breakdown of those reporting that moderate or severe distress, the types of distress that they experienced, followed by-about 15 percent of those were quoted as having the highest level of psychological distress. And then we see the different types of help-seeking behavior. About 25 percent reported engaging in formal help-seeking behavior through therapy, medication, doctor visit, ER, clinic, or other. And what we actually saw was that of those who experienced the highest levels of psychological distress, they actually had a higher level of formal help-seeking behavior, which was a good thing that we saw it in the analysis by just looking at the frequencies there. Next slide please.

So we have three basic models that we're looking at through basic analysis. Looking at who is it that is identified as having that highest level of psychological distress when they're victimized. The second was who is it that is actually getting that formal help-seeking behavior that's actually getting help for their victimization distress. And then, finally, who is it that is receiving help or contact from victim services. Next slide please.

So there's a number of variables that were, [coughs] excuse me, significant when looking at predicting the highest level of psychological distress. Overall, what we saw was that the most significant predictor was going to be sexual assault victims as compared with simple assault victims, followed by the victim being hurt by their intimate partner. And then we also saw it being a perceived hate crime as having a large influence on the victim's psychological distress. Some other variables that were significant. Females reported higher levels of psychological distress. Those who were older reported higher levels of psychological distress. Those who had reported a disability, had experienced physical harm, they were more likely to be in that highest level of psychological distress. And then we see household income was actually inversely related to our dependent variable, where those that were less affluent experienced more distress. Next slide.

When looking at that formal help-seeking behavior, what we see is, once again, females being more likely to engage in formal help-seeking behavior. Those with a college degree, those reporting a disability, those with the highest level of psychological distress were more likely to engage in formal help-seeking behavior. And, most importantly, those who had a victim services contact, that was our most salient variable when predicting who is engaging in formal help-seeking behavior. So having access or contact with victim services seemed to be a bridge for individuals in getting them towards formal help for their psychological distress. Inversely related to this was age. Younger people were less likely to—excuse me, younger people were more likely to engage in formal help-seeking behavior. And those who were unmarried were more likely to engage in formal help-seeking behavior. Next slide please.

Finally, our last model looks at victim services. We wanted to know, "Okay, well, are the people who are experiencing the highest levels of distress, are those the ones that are most likely to get paired up with victim services and have contact with victim services?" And what we see here is that those that were most likely to have contact with victim services were, not surprisingly, those who notified the police of their victimization. That was one of the largest predictors of involvement with victim services. And those who were victimized by their intimate partner were the most

likely to have some type of contact with victim services. Additionally, those experiencing physical harm or knowing their offender, those who were robbery victims and non-Black minorities were more likely to have some engagement with victim services. Surprisingly, those that experienced multiple victimization, were less likely to have contact with victim services. Next slide please.

So what's interesting about our findings is that there's a few things that stand out. The factors that predict high psychological distress do not necessarily all predict formal help-seeking behavior. Indeed, variables like gender, age, being a sexual assault or aggravated assault victim, having a disability, or perceiving the crime to be a hate crime, even though those were significant for predicting high levels of psychological distress, they were not significant in predicting victim service contact or predicting that formal help-seeking behavior. Some good findings though. Like I had mentioned, yes, the people who did report the highest levels of psychological distress were the ones that were more likely to actually be engaging in help-seeking behavior. Even though that was the case, it still was—not all of those victims, less than half of them actually, reported that they were engaging in some type of help-seeking behavior. Sexual assault victimization was the most salient predictor for identifying victims, with the highest level of psychological assault—excuse me, psychological distress. But those sexual assault victims, it was not a significant predictor for formal help-seeking behavior or for contact with victim services. That's not necessarily surprising considering that sexual assault victimization is one of the most underreported crimes that we know of. Finally, contact with victim services increased the odds of formal help-seeking behavior by 5.559 and was the most salient significant predictor for formal help-seeking behavior, illustrating the importance of those organizations and sort of a call to extend those services and make sure they're really getting to the people who need them. And then, finally, despite that being such a positive indicator for getting help for psychological distress, only 8.4 percent of the sample reported receiving help or advice from victim services. So still definitely a big need to try and connect the people who need it with victim services and then that subsequent help. Next slide please.

So some of the suggestions that, you know, we sort of had—and certainly we don't have all of the answers. This is for other people to kind of take the ball and run with it. But some ideas that we had. We know that there are screening tools that have been used for identifying which victims are at the highest risk for post-victimization psychological distress. Those are used more commonly with victims of intimate partner violence, but maybe extending the usage of those tools to other types of victims to try and identify who are those people that are really in need of some help and getting them connected to the people that can help them. Further coordination and communication, to connect victims to services, especially those who do not report their victimization to police. So as we saw, reporting your victimization to the police did significantly increase your contact with victim services, but there's a lot of people that don't report those crimes to police. So how can we make sure that those people who maybe are not ready to or don't desire to contact police, how do we make sure that they are getting connected with those victim services? And then, finally, like moving forward, trying to understand barriers that prevent access or desire to use available services or to seek help following victimization. So just trying to understand what are the barriers to people getting this help following their victimization. Next slide.

Yup. That's it.

GRACE KENA: Thanks so much, Julie and Tasha. So now we are transitioning to the discussion part of our session today. Thanks to those who have put questions in the chat. We'll go ahead and get started. And anyone else who has additional questions, please feel free to go ahead and place them in and we can jump into them. So the first question is for Rachel and Jenna. "Why do you believe victims of technological stalking report to the police more than traditional stalking?"

RACHEL MORGAN: So I can start with that one. And, actually, it is the opposite way. So traditional stalking victims are reporting to police more often. And I'm not going to hypothesize why, but on the flip side, we do have a table in the report--I'm just opening the report, one second, that talks about the reasons why they didn't report to police. So we can look at, it is table two in the report. So looking at stalking with technology victims, some of the common reasons for not reporting include that it was not important enough to report, they dealt with it another way, they felt police couldn't do anything to help or wouldn't help, and another reason would be that they fear the offender. So table two in the 2019 report has some more details but that's a quick overview.

GRACE KENA: Thank you. So another question. This would be for Erika. "What proportion of the victimization of disabled persons occurs in institutional settings, hospitals, and schools?" And, Erika, before you answer, I did just want to note that the presenter's responses are their own and they don't reflect the views, opinions, thoughts, policies of BJS.

ERIKA HARRELL: Thank you, Grace. We couldn't look at that percentage, because the information that we get is based on the NCVS, and the NCVS, it's a household survey. It's not based on information from institutions. So I can't really speculate as to how much, what proportion of crime against persons with disabilities occurs in institutions. In terms of hospitals and schools, we do have a location of incident variable on the file. We didn't look at it in the report but that is available in our data and you can actually go in and get that percentage. But in terms of the institutions, we can't really speculate.

GRACE KENA: Thank you. Question for Lexi. "When is the next criminal victimization report scheduled to be released?"

ALEXANDRA THOMPSON: Yeah. So the *Criminal Victimization 2021* is currently slated to be released in September of this year, 2022.

GRACE KENA: Okay. Fantastic. And this is a general question for the BJS presenters. "Are there any plans to collect data on victimization of the LGBTQ population?"

ALEXANDRA THOMPSON: Jen, I think you're on mute. Or, at least, I can't hear you.

DR. JENNIFER TRUMAN: I was double muted. Sorry. Thank you, Lexi.

ALEXANDRA THOMPSON: No problem.

JENNIFER TRUMAN: Anyhow, yes, we are actually currently collecting sexual orientation and gender identity on the NCVS. So we've been collecting those data since July of 2016. They have been on the public use file since 2017, since that was the first full year of data collection. So both sexual orientation and gender identity asked of persons ages 16 or older are currently on NCVS. And happy to answer other questions or feel free to reach out if you have more specifics.

GRACE KENA: Great. Another question for Rachel and Jenna from Sheena Gilbert, who studies Native crime and victimization and is intrigued by the finding regarding Natives and stalking. "Does this survey capture information as to potential causes or reasons for the high percentage of stalking victimization? Why do you think that Natives are more likely to be victims of stalking compared to whites? Did they have higher rates of traditional stalking, technology stalking, or both?"

JENNIFER TRUMAN: Thank you, Sheena, for that question. So the ACS doesn't necessarily collect reasons why, but there are potential other correlates I think that you could look at within the data files to determine why they might have been at a higher risk. You know, whether or not it was reported, whether it was a difference in victim-offender relationship. We didn't do any of that analysis so I don't think we can really speak to why, necessarily, they were at a higher risk based on the data. We didn't also look at the types of stalking so the demographic table is just for overall total stalking, and part of that is related to small sample sizes. So as you start to disaggregate the data, the sample sizes become a little bit smaller. So we have to kind of be careful about that and make sure that we're putting out the most reliable data. So for that table, in particular, it's just for total stalking.

GRACE KENA: Thank you. And one question for Frank. "What would you say are some of the most important findings from your research?"

FRANK PEZZELLA: One is that, significantly, victims do not report. Whatever policies, whatever statutes that we have are not based on empirical data because we know that most people don't report. I think we need to get an understanding, you know, of why people don't report as well as why people do report. I think that the contribution of our research basically is for practitioners. Efficacy agencies need to encourage victims to report. It's important because policy is made on the kinds of injuries, the kinds of things that happened to victims. As well as police. You know, they need to understand that there may or may not be certain groups who are least likely to report, you know, and to reach out to them and to really make that connection. But, clearly, when you have a situation where 89 percent of the participating police agencies report zero hate crimes, for the police agencies that do report, we really have a problem. So I think we need to both get police agencies, as well as advocacy agencies, to talk, as well as victims to report—as well as victims to be encouraged to report.

GRACE KENA: Thank you. Another question for the BJS presenters. "NCVS data is collected in languages other than English but it appears that the data available on ICPSR do not indicate which data are collected in which languages. Is this type of

data available to the public and perhaps I'm just overlooking something or is this data not available to the public?"

JENNIFER TRUMAN: I can take that one too. And so for others, feel free to jump in here as well. So the NCVS is fully translated into Spanish. So there is both an English and Spanish version of the instrument. And then for other languages, NCVS has conducted, as well, if there's someone who can translate or the interviewer can translate. So you're correct that the NCVS is conducted in multiple languages. And our 2016 technical documentation, that's available on our webpage. And I can put that in the chat here in a second. There is a little portion that talks about the percentage of the interviews that were conducted are not in English. And I need to double-check to see if that's available on the public use file, but regardless if the data were collected in English or Spanish or another language, all those data are in the public use file. But I need to double-check if that actual variable is on the file.

GRACE KENA: Okay. Great. Thank you. Question for Erika. "What are your thoughts on how the switch to using ACS population data has—I mean, using NCVS population data versus ACS, and whether that's been a good change for measuring crimes against persons with disabilities?"

ERIKA HARRELL: I think it's a good change, because there are differences in how the ACS and NCVS define noninstitutionalized settings. So you're not really getting an apples-to-apples match when we're using population data from the ACS. And NCVS crime data is close but it's not the exact same settings. I think the ACS uses more settings that the NCVS considers to be institutional or transitional, such as domestic violence shelters, homeless shelters, which the NCVS, we don't cover. So I think it's better to use the NCVS at this point. Using all the data from one data source, I think, it is a bit better because of the difference in the definitions of how noninstitutionalized settings, how the two sources are different how they define those settings.

GRACE KENA: Thank you. Question for Frank. "Is there any research on different police agencies and their different views on hate crime?"

FRANK PEZZELLA: Sorry. Do you hear me? Okay. Yes. There are some police agencies which we talk about as implementing best practices. You know, at this time, I'm going to shamelessly plug my book, *The Measurement of Hate Crimes*, in which the last chapter, I talked about best practices. The Oak Creek Police Department, Seattle, NYPD. Some of these police departments have distinct policies with respect to trying to unwind this phenomenon of hate crimes. But by and large, I would say outside of the larger police departments, and, as you know, most police departments, about half of the 18,500 police departments in the United States, have less than probably 10 officers do not have significant hate crime policies. But there are some. And most of the departments that have a significant engagement, you know, with this kind of offending really kind of get trying to engage the community, you know? So it kind of makes the argument, what I was talking about yesterday, about why we'd need subnational data to take a look at what are some of the regional differences, and those regional differences can often be broken out by police department. Thank you, Min.

GRACE KENA: Thank you. Another question that dovetails with what you were just talking about for the hate crime, "Is there any study on finding the spatial variation of different levels of hate crime, reporting issues over different scales of spatial units?"

FRANK PEZZELLA: Ah. To be continued. That's where we're at right now, you know, in research. Not that I know of, but that's what we're working on, because understanding that significant spatial variations, hate crimes are very regional. They're regionally nuanced. Hate crimes here in New York City are primarily anti-Semitic but they may be different than they are in Georgia, you know, or Florida, you know? So—and as well as variations in the—both the bias categories as well as bias types. We suspect that—one of my pet peeves with—there was a question about is—are there going to be any efforts to include LGBTQ victims. I don't think that we'd lump them all together. I think lesbian, gay, bisexual victimizations may be very well different than transgender and gender identity victims, so to the extent that we'll break those kinds of things out, you know? We have victims that are more likely—certain types of victims are more likely to be in certain places. You know, we need that kind of spatial analysis, I think.

GRACE KENA: Thank you. Question for Tasha and Julie. "Have you faced any multicollinearity issues with your data? Could you let me know if you encountered any issues with missing data?"

TASHA YOUSTIN: Yeah. So this research, we published it in 2019. So it is a few years old. So I'm trying to remember off the top of my head, but, I mean, obviously we went through any general data analysis as we were doing that, you know, checking for assumptions and checking for multicollinearity, and didn't have any issues. That would be problematic. I mean, obviously any variables that are going to be correlated, you're going to have variables correlated in order to have something that's significant, but nothing that was correlated to a level that would be problematic for the analysis that we ran. As far as missing data, you know, in this process of learning the NCVS, we were a little nervous at first when we saw our numbers drop from like 1,100 down to 650 or so, and then we realized, "Oh, well, that's because this supplement was only asked a few certain people," and we realized that sort of skip pattern to it. So there was one part of the analysis that looks at help-seeking behavior, and that one's only going to be including those people who reported moderate or severe levels of psychological distress. And so if you see a difference in the end, it's not missing data. It's just that that was a subset of the population that was asked those questions.

GRACE KENA: Great. Thank you. So I will ask a question of all of the presenters and then have a brief segue before you answer, but is there anything that you found striking or interesting or that you learned from the other presenters today during this session? So just one moment before you answer. I just wanted to share a few closing remarks.

So here are some NCVS resources that I wanted to point to, including some of the issues that came up today. Our homepage, where you can subscribe to our newsletter and any products that are forthcoming. More information about the NCVS, the questionnaires, links to where you can access the data and on specific topics, including the redesign, hate crime, the subnational program, and all of the

supplements. We have a new data tool that we mentioned, the N-DASH. A link for that is available. And then the plan is to post this recording at the BJS multimedia page once everything is finalized. And then I wanted to make a plug for the next session, the next and final session in this forum, the NCVS User Workshop, where my colleagues and I will be going over different aspects of the survey and how to use the data. And that will be next Thursday, May 4th, from 1:00 to 3:00. If you have more questions, please feel free to follow up on specific topics with the individual presenters. And if you have general questions about the NCVS specifically, please send them to us at AskBJS@usdoj.gov. We're also on social media. And that concludes my remarks. So I will turn it back to the presenters to answer the question about anything that you learned or found particularly interesting from the presentation today. And we can just go in order of presentations if that works for everyone. So Jen and Rachel.

RACHEL MORGAN: So I would say one of the interesting things that we found is how many victims are experiencing both technology stalking and traditional stalking. And there seems to be just with all the technology-based applications we have these days and things we're doing online, there's really like an interconnectedness with all these different behaviors. So I would say that was one thing I found most interesting. Jenna, anything else to add?

JENNIFER TRUMAN: No. I don't think so. I think the--just to kind of go off of like other presentations, I think Tasha and Julie in particular with the victim services, it shows, so in the stalking supplement, we expanded the questions that we were asking about victim services, and so I think your research points to how important those questions are and how they are correlates of both the victimization and then other correlates of those seeking services. And if I can just make a plug for the instrument redesign, in addition, kind of based off the work that we did in the stalking supplement, we're also expanding the victim services measures as we look forward with the ACS instrument redesign, including barriers to seeking services. So your work is really showing the importance of that. So I think that is a good thing. And I think it was interesting for us to be able to report those that sought services and why they may not have sought services or might not have received services and the stalking supplement as well.

GRACE KENA: Lexy?

ALEXANDRA THOMPSON: Yeah. I thought Erika's presentation was really interesting. I knew that persons with disabilities were generally more likely to be victims of a crime compared to someone without a disability, but it was interesting to see the breakdown and some of the specifics within her presentation, such as that they're less likely to be attacked by a stranger or some of the different offender or incident-specific differences between victims with disabilities and victims without disabilities.

GRACE KENA: Thank you. Erika, anything to share?

ERIKA HARRELL: I thought Frank's presentation with regards to hate crime was very interesting, talking about the reasons why people report and don't report. I think that's very important. And I found that just very interesting. And I do agree with him

about hate crime being more of a regional—a local issue, where a hate crime might be different from one area to another. So I just thought his whole presentation was very, very interesting.

GRACE KENA: Great. Frank?

FRANK PEZZELLA: Well, thank you, Erika. I appreciate that. It's always good to get some validation of your work. And I found that Tasha and, was it Julie? One of the things that they used—we use 2014 NCVS incident extract files. I think they used 2015. You know, we found that hate crime victimizations to the tune of about about 7 or 8 percent. They found it at about 6 percent. So that kind of verified, to me, between the two years, you know, that we were finding the same prevalence rates. But consistent with some of my work on looking at injuries, one of the things they found was the significant sub-psychological injuries associated with the hate crimes. And that's exactly what we found in our subsequent work after we used the NCVS data. We got the critique from the reviewers in the UK, and, you know, the UK reviewers were saying—they were using the British crime survey as an example. We said, "Okay, well, we have something like that. We'll use the NCVS." But we found basically the same thing, that psychological injuries were quite significant for hate crime victims. But, you know, in my presentation, we found it's psychological injuries. People—more than physical injuries, psychological injuries is really something that's characteristic of victimization generally. But them finding that psychological victimizations were significant, just validated some of our work.

GRACE KENA: Excellent. Julie and Tasha?

JULIE SIDDIQUE: I'll go first. So, of course, as a researcher, I'm listening to these amazing presentations, light bulbs are going off about things that I'd like to study more, so definitely with regards to disability, I mean, I look at sexual assault, and so I think I would be really interested in further studying that relationship between disability status and victimization risk for sexual assault, and I thought that was very interesting. And then also with regards to the stalking and cyberstalking or technological, looking at bullying and that relationship as well and maybe that adolescent population, what are they experiencing in terms of that kind of stalking behavior. I think those were really interesting to me.

TASHA YOUSTIN: I was gonna tie back my answer to Frank. So he kind of beat me to the punch there. But, absolutely, just noticing the overlap in some of these things and how we found that hate crimes was a big—or perceived hate crime, was a predictor of high levels of psychological distress. And then tying that into, you know, we know psychological distress is a predictor of revictimization. And so it really is sort of, thinking of the bigger picture of how all of these topics that we're looking at like interconnect. And I thought that that was kind of neat. Additionally, I was going through our paper that we had written, and I realized how many BJS authors that we cited. And so just like seeing all these reports from those of you working currently at BJS and doing this really important work, it's very valued amongst us in the field and us academics that are trying to do this research, you know? And I thought all the presentations today were great. And I was like, "Oh, there's a 2022. I'll have to look up that--I have to download that article and put it in my repertoire of things that I'm

going to, cite next time." I just thought everyone did such a great job and it was really interesting and diverse research.

GRACE KENA: Thanks so much for those reflections. Min, I will turn it back over to you to close us out.

MIN XIE: Thank you, Grace. I think I really enjoyed seeing all the exciting research out there. And, also, I want to thank the BJS for hosting today's event and also for you all participating in sharing your research. I hope this will be useful for people who participated. And, as Grace mentioned, we will post the recordings and also the slides. And I hope to see you next week on May the 4th, I think Wednesday. So that we'll be together and to see how to use the data if you could. Thank you all for participating today.