

DARYL FOX: Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to today's webinar, "Update on the NCVS Instrument Redesign: Results from a National Field Test," hosted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. At this time, it's my pleasure to introduce Dr. Jenna Truman, Statistician with the Bureau of Justice Statistics, for some welcoming remarks and to begin the presentation. Jenna?

JENNA TRUMAN: Thank you, Daryl. Welcome, everyone, to the first webinar regarding updates on the NCVS Instrument Redesign, specifically discussing results from a national field test today. Thank you all so much for attending. As Daryl said, my name is Jenna Truman, and I'm a Statistician in the Victimization Statistics here at BJS. And I'm currently the project manager for the NCVS Instrument Redesign work.

I'm happy to be joined by two of my colleagues at Westat. First, Dr. David Cantor, who's Co-Principal Investigator for the NCVS Instrument Redesign Project. He has a doctorate in sociology and is a Vice President and Senior Fellow in the Statistics unit at Westat. He has more than 40 years of experience in designing surveys and evaluating the impact on social policy in the areas of crime and population, risks of victimization, unemployment and crime, and drug use and offending. He's been part of the redesign and development of NCVS since the first redesign in 1992, and over the last 10 years, his NCVS-related research has been on using alternative modes and methods to improve the collection of rape and sexual assault data for the NCVS.

And we're also joined by Sherm Edwards, who is the Project Director and then Co-Principal Investigator for the NCVS Instrument Redesign Project. He is a Survey Methodologist and Manager at Westat with 45 years' experience in the design, conduct, and analysis of social science surveys. Sherm has conducted methodological research on many of the nation's large federal government surveys, including the Decennial Census, Current Population Survey, and National Health Interview Survey, Medical Expenditure Panel Survey, and the NCVS. He's also led and developed testing of the companion survey to the NCVS and preparation of the NCVS local area crime survey code.

Today, our agenda will cover the overview of the NCVS, for the National Crime Victimization Survey, for anyone who's not familiar. We'll also be discussing the Instrument Redesign decisions that BJS has made on the new survey, and then I'll pass it over to our colleagues at Westat to discuss findings from a large-scale national field test that was conducted and kind of deep dive into the comparison of the current and new NCVS instruments. And finally, I'll wrap things up for next steps for the NCVS Instrument Redesign and where we're going in the future.

So, in terms of the NCVS, we've been collecting data annually since 1973, and the NCVS is the nation's primary source of information on criminal victimization. The NCVS is administered to persons ages 12 or older from a nationally representative sample of U.S. households. Respondents are interviewed in person or by telephone, with new households interviewed in person. Those selected households remain in the sample for 3-1/2 years, and eligible persons, so, those age 12 or older, in those households are interviewed every 6 months. The NCVS collects information on both nonfatal violent and property crimes reported and not reported to the police. For more detailed information, you can see the NCVS page on the BJS website.

Just wanted to give everyone a quick overview of the NCVS larger timeline. As I mentioned, the first full year of data collection was in 1973, and there have been multiple methodological improvements over time, including introducing telephone mode in the eighties; replacing paper and pencil interviewing with computer-assisted personal interviewing; and then discontinuing some of the CATI interviewing; introducing different weighting adjustments, including a bounding adjustment; and most recently adjustments to moderate outlier weights. And then every 10 years, since this is our data collector, we update or refresh our sample based on the Decennial Census, so, you'll see in the dark blue there the phase-in designs most recently. The phase-in of the 2010 Decennial Census was in 2015 to 2016. And over time, we've also introduced multiple supplements in the NCVS, including the police-public contact; the Supplemental Victimization Survey, which focuses on stalking; the identity theft supplement; and the Supplemental Fraud Survey. Most recently, in 2020, we've had some field operations modified due to the COVID-19 pandemic. And we've also done some things to improve the data release, including, most recently, the NCVS Dashboard, which is an interactive tool that's available on our webpage.

So, why are we redesigning the NCVS instrument? As I just showed in the timeline, the last redesign was back in 1992, and really, the current instrument flow is not as efficient or responsive to response—or, excuse me, respondent answers as it could be, and limitations have been identified over the years in both measurement and classification of certain crimes. We also want to look to engage nonvictim respondents, and particularly collect more contextual information by adding questions on police performance and community safety.

Some of the key updates to the new instrument is that it maintains the two-stage measurement approach in screening and classifying crime. So, we are screening for crimes and then asking more details in the crime incident report, or CIR. It features updated crime screening questions, which improve the quality of information collected, and allow for more efficient flow through the crime incident report. The instrument also collects expanded information on victimization incidents and victim help-seeking, and it introduces noncrime questions on police performance and community safety.

In terms of the flow of the new NCVS instrument, it still will begin with a household roster, rostering everyone in the household, which will lead into some person characteristics, and from there, a rotation of either the police performance or community safety measure. After those measures are completed, they will go into the victimization screener, and if the respondent reports any incidents, they will go into the crime incident report. If there are multiple incidents that they've reported, they will circle back through to the crime incident report, and once that's completed, they will then move on to the additional person and household characteristics at the end of the instrument. If they didn't have any incidents reports, the respondent will go straight into the additional household and person characteristics.

So, the victimization screener flow, we made some changes to that. So, there are multiple screeners similar to the current instrument, which includes theft, motor vehicle theft, break-in, vandalism, attack, unwanted sexual contact, and a catch-all to identify any crimes that they may not have already reported. If they said "yes" to the screener, it asks, "How many times?" If it was

6 or more times, which is similar to a series victimization, we're measuring high-frequency repeat victimization, it would ask whether or not those incidents were similar, and if they were similar incidents, whether or not the respondent had enough details to distinguish them. And this is similar to something like an intimate partner violence attack. If the respondent experienced multiple attacks, they may not be able to identify or have details about each of those to distinguish and answer about each of them in the CIR. So, this is to decrease burden and only answer about the most recent incident.

From there, we would date the incidents, collecting the month and the year. And then ask about whether or not the incident was part of any other, and if it was part of another incident, which one? From there, we would be collecting a short incident description, and that short incident description helps the interviewer identify that incident as they go through CIR.

One of the things that we tested in the field test was a different version of the instrument, and the screener in particular. So, in the current NCVS, the screeners were asked one after another. In this example on the screen, the respondent was reporting that an item was stolen during a break-in. In the current NCVS, they would answer "yes" to the items stolen screener, and then the break-in screener specifically says that other than any incidents already mentioned, was there a break-in, and they would answer no, because they've already reported it in the theft screener. So, going into the CIR, we only know that something was stolen. In the field test, in the redesigned NCVS instrument, we tested two versions, interleaved and noninterleaved. In the interleaved version, they reported that an item was stolen, and directly after that, we would ask whether or not that there was a break-in as a part of that incident, which they would respond "yes." And as a part of that incident, was there an attack, which they would have responded "no." In the noninterleaved version, similarly, they would have reported the items stolen in the theft screener and then would have said "yes" to the break-in screener, and then the items were—or, excuse me, the incidents were then duplicated together, so, was this a part of another incident, and they would have said "yes," that it was the same incident. So, in the redesigned instrument going into the CIR, we know that something was stolen and that there was a break-in.

Other updates to the victimization screener include separating screening probes into shorter examples with "yes"/"no" responses in each screener series, revising additional probe contents for each of the screeners, and using more behaviorally specific language and expanding the screening probes specifically for rape or sexual assault. As I mentioned earlier, we also are adding vandalism as a crime screener.

So, the example of the "yes"/"no" here on the screen is the current attack screener, and so, on the left is the current version and on the right is the redesigned version. And so, you'll see in the current version, the question reads, essentially, "Has anyone attacked or threatened you in any of these ways?" and then reads all the cues. So, with any weapon, with anything like a baseball bat, by something thrown, so on and so forth, and then the interviewer collects a "yes"/"no" at the end of that entire screener, whereas in the redesigned version, it asks about physical attacks and then if anyone attacked or tried to attack you with a weapon, for instance, a gun or knife. And then the interviewer will pause and collect a "yes"/"no" right there. So, again, rather

than reading a whole list of the cues and maybe the respondent forgetting, we're collecting that "yes"/"no" and kind of slowing the interview down and getting a "yes"/"no" at each of them.

In terms of updates to the crime incident report, the new instrument is improving the use, as I mentioned, of the victimization screener, really to drive the questions asked in the CIR. So, in the current NCVS, the majority, if not all, of the CIR questions are asked of all respondents, and so, the redesigned instrument really tries to use the detailed information that we're already collecting in the screener to only ask the questions that we really need to know, to use to classify the types of crimes that respondents may have experienced.

The new instrument also revised items to improve the measurement of some key NCVS concepts, which includes incident location and presence of a respondent during the incident. And similar to the screener, we're also increasing information collected about rape or sexual assault incidents and expanding measures of victim experiences, including use of victim services, satisfaction with police response, and consequences of victimization.

As I mentioned, one of our other key things that we're implementing is engaging respondents who have no crimes to report, and so, we will be adding two new periodic modules, one on police performance, which will measure contact with police and opinions about police performance, and another module on community safety, which will measure indicators of community issues related to crime and neighborhood safety. These questions will be asked of all respondents and we'll rotate the administration of the questions, so, the police questions would be asked in January and June and the community questions would be asked in July through December. So, this allows us to collect this annually and ideally report on an annual basis. The items, again, are meant to engage respondents who have no crimes to report, 'cause something we hear pretty frequently, especially because it is a panel survey, from respondents who don't have any crimes to report is that they may not want to participate, so, these questions are meant to engage and give them additional questions to answer. And the measures also will have utility for small area estimation and really understanding the patterns of reporting to police.

So, now I'm going to turn it over to my colleague Sherm at Westat to talk about the key field test findings.

SHERM EDWARDS: Thanks, Jenna. So, the first set of slides that we're going to show here are findings that are available on the BJS website in what we call the Top Line Report, and the full title is at the bottom of the screen.

When we did the field test starting in October of 2019 and going through March of 2020, we had a national sample of households in the contiguous United States, and we essentially replicated the time in sample one interview pattern for the NCVS. There was only one wave of interviewing. The household roster and most of the person interviews were conducted in person. In a few cases, we did telephone interviews with respondents other than the household respondent. We increased the reference period from 6 months, which is in the current NCVS, to the last 12 months, so we would have more incidents for our analysis. As Jenna mentioned, we assigned households to 1 of 3 treatments. The current NCVS, where we used the census Blaise program. We had a couple of updates, for example, to change the reference period. And then

two versions of the redesigned questionnaire, which we called Condition 2, the interleaved and the noninterleaved versions, as Jenna described.

So, here are the response rates in the sample sizes for the field test. The person interview response rates given are conditional on completion of the household roster. These are somewhat lower than we would normally expect from an in-person interview. There were a couple of reasons for this. One is that we did not offer any financial incentive to respondents and most household surveys conducted in person outside the Census Bureau these days do offer incentives. And as I mentioned, we completed the field work in March of 2020, which you may recall was the beginning of the pandemic. So, our field period was actually cut short a bit.

The Condition 1 response rates were a little higher than the Condition 2 response rates. The interviewing staffs were largely separate, and the difference in response rate was probably due to the difference in the interviewing staff. So, overall, the Condition 2 victimization screener yielded about 50% more “yes” responses than the Condition 1 screener. There were about .2 “yes” responses per respondent in Condition 1 and about .3 in Condition 2. But once somebody said “yes,” they reported almost the same number of incidents between Condition 1 and Condition 2 – 1.81 versus 1.81 for the IL and 1.78 for the NIL. So, the reason for more responses, more “yes” responses to the probes, number one is that we asked more individual questions, as Jenna pointed out in her introduction. And it may also be that the periodic modules, which preceded the victimization screener, helped to jog recall and increased respondent motivation.

So, here are the estimates from the field test for violent crime. Condition 1 is the lightest color on top, and then Condition 2 IL and Condition 2 NIL, the darkest on the bottom. Overall, both Condition 1 treatments had higher estimate of rates than did Condition 1, but only the noninterleaved was statistically significant. And there were some differences also at the type of crime level. More robberies in the NIL and more simple assaults in the IL versus both the NIL and Condition 1. There is one significance flag here missing.

So, to summarize what happened with violent crime, Condition 2, the rates were generally higher than Condition 1 and some were statistically significant. The RSA, rape and sexual assault, rates were much higher in Condition 2, as expected. These differences were not significant because of the relatively small number of such incidents. The robbery rates were much higher in the NIL treatment than in either Condition 1 or Condition 2 IL, interleaved, and this is due to the extra follow-up probes in the NIL version. Jenna described how the probes were structured within the screener, but at the beginning of the CIR, the NIL included a series of follow-up probes for each of the incidents that was reported in the screener. And there were more of them overall than there were in Condition 2 IL.

So, the simple assault rate, being higher in Condition 2 than in Condition 1, this was really with the interleaved, and there were a couple of reasons for this. First of all, it seemed that the Condition 2 respondents were reporting less memorable or less serious incidents than those in Condition 1. And in the noninterleaved version, because of the extra probes, there were more sort of complex crimes like robbery, which involve both an attack and a theft or an attempted theft.

Here are the rates for the property crimes. And again, the total is higher for both Condition 2 treatments and significantly higher in both cases than Condition 1. It's largely driven by differences in other theft, which is anything other than motor vehicle theft or burglary. And also, in motor vehicle theft. So, there were a couple of reasons for the motor vehicle theft difference, which includes both completed and attempted motor vehicle theft. It turns out that the specifications for assigning type of crime codes were somewhat different than what actually happened in the Condition 1 questionnaire. So, if somebody reported something stolen in the CIR, there was no follow-up for an attempted theft. But in the specifications for assigning type of crime codes, attempted motor vehicle theft would have higher priority than a theft. So, that was one of the reasons that motor vehicle theft had a higher reporting rate in Condition 2. Another reason was that there were some ambiguous incidents of attempted motor vehicle theft that might have been something else, where there was some evidence of tampering but the motivation of the offender was not known.

So, overall, in property crime rates, burglary was much higher in Condition 2 NIL than either of the other two conditions. Attempted motor vehicle theft much higher in Condition 2 than Condition 1. And other theft also much higher in Condition 2 than Condition 1.

So, our takeaways. The redesigned questionnaire produced higher rates of both violent and property crime than the current NCVS, largely because there were more positive responses to the screener series because we asked more questions. If you ask more questions, you get more answers. The differences were most pronounced in less memorable events, such as simple assault and other theft. Between the Condition 2 IL and NIL, the NIL yielded higher rates of complex crimes, such as robbery and burglary, than either Condition 1 or Condition 2 IL, and again, attributed to there being more follow-up probes to identify these more complex crimes.

So, as Jenna mentioned, BJS is going forward with the Condition 2 NIL version. Condition 2 outperformed Condition 1. Not only were there more incidents reported, but the incidents that were reported proved to be NCVS crimes at a comparable rate. And the NIL outperformed the Condition 2 IL because of these higher rates of robbery and burglary, and again, review of both the micro data and interview recordings indicates that the coding was accurate. So, these are real differences in these rates.

Couple of problems with Condition 2 in the field test that we've recommended fixes for. One was the high rate of attempted motor vehicle theft, partly because of ambiguous incidences, and attempted theft, identified in the screener, wasn't followed up in the CIR, and we've recommended that that be done.

I've already pretty much covered this. The recommendations are to continue with the NIL treatment. We do recommend changing the order of the screener series to more closely resemble the current NCVS so that theft is asked before motor vehicle theft. This was another of the reasons, perhaps, for the higher rate of motor vehicle theft in Condition 2. Recommend adding questions to assess ambiguous incidents involving vehicles. Were they trying to steal the car or were they trying to steal something inside the car? Was it just vandalism or does the respondent really have no idea? We recommend adding some questions for vandalism incidents that were fairly minimal in the field test, again, to try to get a handle on the

respondents' perception of the offender intent. And there are also recommendations for fine-tuning some of the complex CIR sections. And as Jenna mentioned, we recommended adding an incident-level brief description to the screener. The current NCVS has one brief—such brief description that covers all of the incidents reported in one particular screener section.

We'll talk about some of the differences between the current and redesigned questionnaire, starting with the Victimization Screener. The current NCVS has 9 screener series, and these are partly arranged by the type of crime, but some include both. For example, attack and theft. Each of the series has 3 questions. Essentially, did any of the incidents of this type happen to you? How many times and what happened? This is the brief description.

There are a total of 39 cues across all of these screener series, and each of these cues has multiple examples. I'll show you in a minute what I mean by cues, and Jenna gave an example earlier.

So, here it is. This is the current NCVS theft item. And each of these is a separate cue, and as you can see, each has multiple examples. Things you carry, like luggage, a wallet, purse, briefcase, or book. But this is one question that's answered "yes" or "no." In the redesign, we cut back to 8 screener series and made each one specific to a broad type of crime. Theft, motor vehicle theft, motor vehicle parts or gas theft, break-in, vandalism—a new NCVS crime, attack, sexual attack, and a sort of catch-all for anything that might have been missed. In these 8 screener series, there are a total of 33 cues, which is fewer than in the current NCVS, and each one is asked as a separate question. "How many times?" is asked once per screener series, and as Jenna mentioned, we moved questions about series crimes and the date of the month and year to the screener. In the current NCVS, it's in the CIR. And we added an explicit de-duplication process to help interviewers when respondents report the same incident in more than one case. In the current NCVS, the interviewer has to sort of do that on the fly.

And here's the comparable screener item in the redesign. The examples are fairly similar between the two. There's some updates, like adding cell phone or backpack to the first list of things you carry. And as I said, each of these is a separate "yes" or "no" question.

So, the vandalism cues are completely new in the redesign. The first cue was from the vandalism supplement from 2007. And then we also added a second cue. "In the past 6 months, did somebody deliberately injure or kill an animal, such as a pet or livestock, that belonged to you or someone you lived with?" This first cue—well, these two cues together essentially provide the definition of vandalism.

All right, at this point, I'm going to turn it over to David.

DAVID CANTOR: Thank you, Sherm. So, I'll talk a little bit about the rape and sexual assault screener items, which, as Sherm mentioned, were explicitly subject to some redesign. This is the current redesigned question. So, "Incidents involving forced or unwanted sexual acts are often difficult to talk about. Have you been forced or coerced to engage in unwanted sexual activity by..." and then it lists various people. You know, there's been a lot of research on measuring rape and sexual assault, and a lot of the research points towards trying to be a bit

more explicit about what types of behaviors and tactics are involved in unwanted sexual contact, and do those behaviors and tactics rise to the level of a rape or sexual assault as the law defines and as BJS would define it. So, for BJS' purposes, rape or sexual assault have to involve two things. One is the behavior, which is the unwanted sexual contact, and that could be in the form of penetration or some other kind of unwanted contact of a sexual area, and it also would involve some sort of tactic, and the tactics would involve physical force, threat of physical force, or threat of physical force to someone else. And whether someone is under the influence of alcohol or drugs. Were they blacked out or unconscious? So, this last criteria, this last tactic, had not been included in the NCVS in the past, and laws have been changing since the NCVS had last redesigned. So, these were also incorporated into the definition of rape and sexual assault in the screener. So, for purposes of the screener, we used some of the research that BJS has been doing over the last 20 years on this topic. And so, we gave an explicit definition of what we mean by unwanted sexual contact at the beginning, and this is that introduction. So, sexual contact includes touching of your sexual body parts or any type of sexual penetration with a body part or object. It also includes making you touch or penetrate someone else. And then it goes on to list who could do this, and it could be basically anybody, to emphasize the fact that it could be a stranger or a nonstranger. So, after that introduction, the screener asks 4 questions. One is just on basic touching, grabbing, or kissing, and then it goes into several different types of tactics that might have been included when someone experienced some sort of unwanted sexual contact. So, this second question has to do with force. It defines what force means. Whether someone threatened to physically hurt you or someone close to you if you did not have sexual contact. And then the last one has to do with while you were passed out, unconscious, asleep, or unable to consent because you were drunk or high. So, these provide a much more explicit definition of what is intended for the collection. And as it turns out, some of the results from the field test, this did have an effect on how many incidents were eventually classified as a rape or a sexual assault. We'll talk about it in a minute on how these definitions were more explicitly asked about on the crime incident report. So, once someone said "yes" to one of these questions in the screener, they went to the section on rape and sexual assault in the crime incident report, and a series of questions were asked to see exactly what happened and whether it meets the definition of what BJS want to classify as an RSA.

So, that's the screener. There were several—as Jenna mentioned, there were several other questions that were added to the beginning of the interview and even at the end of the interview that were asked of everybody. So, there are these new periodic modules that are going to be administered, and as Jenna mentioned, the modules were put there for a couple of different reasons, one of which was to collect more data that's of interest to users and to policymakers. That data could be in the form of looking at overall trends as well as maybe collecting small area estimates, generating small area estimates, and then the second was to also pique—or to get respondent interest in the survey. So, especially as a panel survey, most people don't report a crime, as you can see, from Sherm's numbers from the field test. You know, 20% of the people, or 30% of the people, depending on the version, said "yes" to a screener question, and the other 70% or 80% are done. And so, the goal of these modules is to try to get people's interest, something that people would be interested in answering.

So, the first set of questions were on police performance, and this is from a recommendation from the Crime Indicators Work Group that BJS convened of different policymakers a number of years ago. They recommended trying to collect data on police performance. And as I said before, the goal here was to track these measures over time as well as generate some small area estimates. So, the redesign worked with a technical review panel, and the technical review panel had a number of experts in different areas of crime and criminology, and the TRP helped sort of forge these measures. Wes Skogan from Northwestern University was one of the main contributors to this. And so, the police performance questions had basically two pieces, one of which is contacts with the police and the other are measures of police efficacy. So, the contacts with the police were asked and were based partly on the police/public contact supplement that BJS administers on a periodic basis. And then once they—and so, this would include have they called the police in the last 12 months? Have they been stopped by the police, maybe as part of a traffic stop? There are 5 or 6 questions like this, and then once they're administered those questions, there are questions about police efficacy, and these questions are based on a couple of different dimensions based on procedural justice and overall evaluation of the police, things like the quality of decision making. So, for example, the time and attention police pay when they stop a citizen. Neutrality. Do they treat people fairly? Quality of interpersonal treatment, such as respect and trust. And something called distributive fairness, or how effective are the police at crime prevention? And then overall, how effective you feel the police are in your local area.

The second piece, the second module is on community safety, and again, this was based on recommendations from the work group and a literature review, and the community safety questions are based on 3 basic ideas. One is fear of crime, where we ask people about being mugged or robbed in their local area or having something stolen from them inside your home, among other things. Community disorder, which asks about whether there's vandalism and graffiti in their area, burned or abandoned or boarded-up buildings, people using or dealing drugs illegally, and then, collective efficacy, which has to do with social control. So, if something bad is happening in your area, how likely is it that someone's going to point this out?

And again, the whole idea behind these measures is to track these measures over time as well as—especially the community safety measures—is provide an additional set of predictors that people can use in looking at victimization risk. And it provides some of those context variables that Jenna mentioned at the very beginning.

In addition to these, we also added a few new predictor items. One of the big comments that BJS gets on the NCVS is that, you know, there aren't any predictors, you know. We can't—there's a lot of data here, but we don't have a lot to predict. So, we did add a few. Among those that we added at the individual level had to do with periods of homelessness. We're collecting more details on employment and periods of unemployment. Disabilities, physical and emotional limitations, and cohabitation. So, not only asking about if you're married, but if you're living with someone you're not married to, and that can be especially important for things like assault and sexual assault. And then at the household level, we're asking about receipt of public assistance and income insecurity.

OK, so those are the questions that all respondents are asked. And as many of you I'm sure are familiar with the NCVS, the two-state measurement, if they say yes to a screener question about a particular incident, then they are asked to answer questions about that incident in what we call the Crime Incident Report. So if someone reports 3 incidents, they're going to get to administer questions on it 3 times using the Crime Incident Report.

And as both Jenna and Sherm mentioned, the Crime Incident Report is now a little bit more targeted than it used to be. So, based on what they reported on the screener, they get certain questions on the CIR. But if they don't mention a theft, for example, in the screener, then they're not asked the theft questions because that was always seen as very redundant for people. They've already said they didn't have anything stolen, so why are you asking us this again on the CIR? So the CIR is a bit more targeted.

And I'll talk a little bit about the rape and sexual assault section. So in the old NCVS, there really wasn't a section specifically on rape and sexual assault. To be classified as a rape or sexual assault, you had to answer a series of open-ended questions, which ask things like, what actually happened? How were you threatened? And how were you attacked? And in order to be classified as a rape or sexual assault, the respondent would need to describe it in response to these questions and go into one of the precoded categories that the interviewer was filling out when they're filling out--these are open-ended questions, but these have a list of categories that the interviewers coding into as they're getting a response. If the respondent reported something like rape, tried to rape, verbal threat of rape, or unwanted sexual contact, then they're asked some follow-up questions, one of which is, you know, you mentioned some type of unwanted sexual contact with force. Do you mean forced or coerced sexual intercourse, including attempts? And if they say no to this, then it's not--at least it's not classified as a rape.

The redesigned version of this is first to have a separate section on this. And in this section, we asked some very detailed and explicit questions about the offenders' behavior, such as the type and direction of the penetration and what other kinds of unwanted sexual contact occurred. And once the type of behavior is established in answering those questions, then they're asked specific questions about the tactics. So they're asked about the use of the threat of force, actual force, whether the person was blacked out or unconscious or unable to consent while drunk or high. And then it also asks about other forms of coercion. So this could be someone threatening you because you're an employee. If you don't have sex with me, I'm going to fire you, that kind of thing. Or a student in a class or some other kind of nonphysical threat of force. And there could be other kinds of things that people might threaten and try to force someone to have sexual contact.

The NCVS is now collecting that information, but it only rises to the level of a rape or sexual assault if the criteria I mentioned before come into play, meaning it had to involve some sort of physical force or there was some sort of facilitation issue so that someone was drunk or high and they said they couldn't give consent or they were unconscious or blacked out. OK, and I think I'm going to turn it back over to Sherm at this point. Talk about vandalism.

SHERM EDWARDS: Thanks, David. So, the vandalism questions in the CIR were entirely new in the sense that they're not in the current NCVS. The questions in the field tests were just

about what was damaged and in what way they were damaged. And since then, we have recommended adding questions to distinguish vandalism from other types of crime.

And the poster example of this is one I referred to earlier was somebody sees some damage to their car and they don't really know what the offender's intent was. And depending on how they hear the screener questions, they might report it as vandalism, they might report it as attempted theft, they might report it as attempted motor vehicle theft.

So in the type of crime coding hierarchy, vandalism has the lowest priority. If an incident qualifies as any other type of NCVS crime, then it will not get the vandalism type code. So these questions we hope will help to sort out some of these ambiguous situations. Ultimately, it's up to the respondents' perception as to what the intent of the offender was. There were a few changes to questions about presence of a weapon and injury.

The redesign collects more information about the type of weapon used and how it was used. For example, it asks specifically whether the victim was shot or stabbed. The current NCVS asks one question to determine the type of injury, how the victim was injured, if at all. The redesign has split that into two questions. One, was the victim injured? And then a second question of how.

Several response categories were added--include a concussion and injury from sexual intercourse. These would be considered among the major, in quotes, injuries, again, for the purpose of type of crime coding. Since gunshot and stabbing and rape were collected in other places, those were dropped from the list that is in the current NCVS. And then the category and the current NCVS minor injuries is expanded to include specific kinds of minor injuries.

So there were a few changes, fairly minor, to the victim-offender relationship. The most important was to try to collect a little more detail on what kind of intimate partner was involved in this incident. And then there were some new questions added. For the question about your connection to the person, was asked if the respondent might be able to recognize the offender or said that they knew them by sight only, which don't currently get the relationship question. Then, "Had you ever lived with this person?" was asked if the victim knew the offender and the relationship that was identified was not one of obvious cohabitation.

In self-protection, we've added a new question to try to get a little more detail about the victim's reaction when they say they didn't do anything to protect themselves or do anything else about the incident. So these are separate categories in this new question. Did you do nothing? Freeze? Do what the offender told you to do? Or do something else while the incident was going on?

And then we added some response categories to the follow-up question if they did say they did something to protect themselves or something else about the incident, just to provide a little more detail. This was partly based on the other specified responses in the field test and also, again, to get more information about these situations where the respondent may have frozen or just said no or done something passive.

In the police involvement section, there were added questions and dropped questions. The added questions focus on how the victim felt about the way the police handled the incident. And the dropped questions meant that there was less emphasis on what might have happened after the police took an initial report or did whatever they did on the scene. So, these are the added questions about the respondents' perceptions of how the police handled the incident. Also, did you tell the police that you believed that the incident was a hate crime? How did you notify the police? Did you call them? Did you go to the police station? And so on. And how long during the incident or how long after the incident were the police first contacted? Then the opinion questions start with satisfaction with the phone report. If the police didn't come when they were contacted, did the respondent believe they should have come? How satisfied were they with the time it took the police to get there? That replaced a question about actually how long did it take. Did the police tell you how long it would take to get there? For youth respondents, did anyone report the incident to a school official or school resource officer? And then, these questions are sort of tied to the periodic module that David talked about. How respectfully did the police treat you? And so on.

And then two final questions. At the time, did you consider this incident to be a crime? And now looking back, do you consider this incident to be a crime? I think here I'm turning it back to David.

DAVID CANTOR: OK. Thanks, Sherm. So I'll go over the Victim Services module and the socio-emotional consequences questions. The victim--as Jenna mentioned, the Victim Services module was modified quite a bit. We did drop a few questions, but we added a number of questions to get a lot more specific on the kinds of services people received, their opinions about those services, and why they didn't get services if they didn't get those services.

So, we did drop these two questions about asking whether they got any advice from an officer, agency other than police that deals with crimes. And was that a government or private agency? We added questions about who they might have told about the incident. And then we also added questions about who else they might have told, in terms of a position of authority, to get more information about who else was involved in this network of reporting the incident. There were a number of--so these are the questions that were added with respect to victim services. So these questions asked about a large number of possible services they might have received. Hotline counseling, legal help, or assistance. You can see in these parenthetical or bracketed are contingent on whether they had reported something in the prior part of the interview that would indicate that they might have gone to one of these things.

We asked about their satisfaction—if they reported something, that they did get one of those particular services, we asked about their satisfaction with that particular service. And if they said they didn't get any services, then we asked them if they wanted services, but couldn't get it. And if they did want it, we indicate, you know, whether or not—the list of reasons. There's a list of 10 reasons why they did not get any services. In terms of socio-emotional consequences, we changed these questions. We were looking to try to cut some information.

I think for those of you familiar with the NCVS, you'll see we didn't cut as much as I think we wanted to, but some of the questions we cut had to do with socio-emotional consequences

because we didn't see them being used as extensively as merited on the questionnaire. There's quite a bit of space for them. So we replaced this question about, "Did you feel any of the following ways for a month or more?" with a similar question with a slightly different set of symptoms or reactions. And we also made the reference period a bit more refined. So this one asked for a month or more, and this divides it into less than a month or a month or longer. So it gives more precise information. We dropped these questions about, "Did you seek any professional help?" or "What kind of professional help did you seek?" And then just asked one question about, "Did you talk to a psychologist, psychiatrist, counselor, or other mental health professional about the incident?" And then we simplified some of the wording for these questions. So, "Did a victim of this crime lead you to have significant problems with your job, school, work or whatever?" We replaced it with this question, as well as this initial NCVS question with 36B where we simplified it as worded here in the last question on the slide. This is one of the ones where we did cut to a large degree asking about these particular types of symptoms, and we just replaced it with one question, "Did you have difficulty sleeping because of the incident?" We added these questions about other kinds of consequences and expenses in particular. OK, I think I'll turn it over to Jenna.

JENNA TRUMAN: OK. Thanks, Sherm. Thanks, David. As I mentioned, I'm just going to wrap us up here talking about the next steps for where we're headed with the NCVS Instrument Redesign. In addition to the instrument, which we talked about extensively here today, one other thing we're looking at is how we're communicating with respondents and with those household samples. And so, we've tested a couple things in the field test that Sherm and David just talked about. We did a letter experiment. Traditionally, the advance letter that goes out to households in our sample is kind of what you would think of, where it's a multi-paragraph letter and, you know, kind of a lot to read.

And so one of the things that you can see here on the right side that we tested was what we're calling this icon version. And so it's just a little bit easier and quicker to read. So if someone just wants to know, OK, what is this NCVS? What are you talking about? What am I supposed to do? They can kind of find that question and find the detailed information over to the right on the letter. And so we've tested out that version and those two versions.

And then another thing is the brochure that's handed out that has detailed information about the NCVS, and we did some testing. The example on the left-hand side is for youth participation in particular. And I'll take this moment to plug our next webinar about some juvenile research that we have done on the NCVS redesign, and that'll be on Thursday, this Thursday, at 1 p.m.

So we did some testing there with the different brochures, in particular this one trying to show the parents and trying to make them understand kind of why their child's participation is important and give them the information that's needed. So that's the other piece of this that we're doing is trying to kind of refresh and update our communication as well.

The other piece of this, as part of the field test, we did have a web mode as part of a third condition. Unfortunately, due to the pandemic, that data collection was cut short because we were still rostering the households in person. So because of that, though, we are doing additional testing again with our colleagues at Westat to test the self-administered web-based

mode for a third mode for the future. Specifically, we're looking, trying to understand if respondents are actually willing to complete the NCVS on the web, what proportion of them are exhibiting signs of inattention or satisficing and then, importantly, you know, how do victimization rate estimates estimated from a self-administered survey compare to those from an interviewer-administered survey. We did this using the two-sample design with an address-based sample and a probability-based online panel in the U.S. The household roster was completed for the ABS on web or paper. And person level surveys were all completed on the web. The data collection we just finished. We ran from January through May of this year.

And again, this is looking for the future as a third mode. So Census continues to be our data collector and expects to have technology in place for updating kind of a web survey mode by 2027. So in anticipation of this, BJS is preparing to do more research and testing to determine how and if a web mode will be able to be used in the future for the NCVS.

In terms of the new NCVS instrument that we just talked about here today, the field test version, so the one that was tested during this work, is currently available in the NCVS Redesign Field Test Topline Report that Sherm had mentioned earlier, and the link is here, and I think they'll put the link in the chat as well. In terms of the Post Field Test version, so the changes that we've made since the field test based on recommendations from Westat, and those are things that both David and Sherm talked about here today, will be released during the next phase of testing. So keep a lookout for that. And then we're working with Westat and Census to develop a crosswalk of NCVS instrument comparison of the old to the new so that data users are able to understand the changes that we made over time. And ultimately, this would be posted both on our website and eventually in the code books as well. So for more information about these updates, see the NCVS instrument redesign webpage. So the Top Line Report is there, some general information that we covered in a BJS summary report about the decisions that I talked about earlier today, as well as the juvenile work that I mentioned that is going to be in that webinar on Thursday. Those reports are available there as well. And any updates as we continue to go through this progress in the future will be there as well.

So in terms of a timeline, what are we looking like? So we've completed phase 1 of research and testing to get us to this point where we have a final instrument. We are now moving over into what we're calling phase 2, the implementation phase, with our colleagues at Census Bureau. As you see, we're right in this instrument programming phase. That's kind of where we're at right now. So the next step from there, once the instrument is fully programmed and ready to go in the Census environment, we'll be doing extensive testing of the instrument. And then we'll be planning for a small-scale pilot test in the field and a small-scale detailed data collection, with ultimately the goal to have a split sample between the new and old instruments by 2024 so that we can then bridge the estimates and maintain that trend line. Because we do know, as you saw from the field test, that we anticipate that some victimization estimates may be different, so we want to try to maintain that trend and figure out how to bridge those estimates together. And ultimately, with the goal of having full implementation of the new instrument by 2025. Because again, if you think back to the long-term NCVS timeline I showed you earlier, 2026 will be our next sample redesign based on the 2020 decennial census. So we

really are trying to work towards making sure that we have the new instrument fully implemented before that time frame.

So that is all we have for you today. I'm going to pause here and take a look at the Q&A session. I know there are some questions that have come in already. If you have additional questions, please type them in the Q&A window and make sure to send them to all panelists so that we can see them. So I will go ahead and start some of the first questions that we got.

So Elizabeth asked about our sampling, so whether or not the NCVS relies on landlines to sample and conduct the survey, recognizing that many people are using cell phones. So we aren't sampling on phones, we're sampling on addresses. So the addresses are the master address file from the Census Bureau. So we're actually sampling addresses, and then we're getting or collecting their contact information, which would include both their—if they have a landline or cell phone number. I will also say one of the things that we are thinking of for the future is other information to contact. So are there other pieces like an email? Or if we can, you know, text them when they're contacting them again or trying to remind them to get to a response. There are other things we are thinking of as we move forward with this kind of larger redesign.

All right. So then the next question. Axton asks, "Does a catch-all, so the catch-all screener, include financial crimes?" And I'll take a stab at this one, and then, David or Sherm, if you can address if any of this may have come up during the field test. So it's not meant to include financial crimes. So the screener, the core NCVS, is meant to collect violent and property crimes that we report on now, so rape, sexual assault, simple assault, aggravated assault, robbery, theft, motor vehicle theft, new vandalism. We are collecting financial crimes in our supplement. So we have the identity theft supplement, and then we have most recently, the supplemental fraud survey as well. David or Sherm, do you have anything to add from what we may have saw on the field test if anything like that came up?

SHERM EDWARDS: So in the field test, anything that was reported in the catch-all screener series at the end, we actually didn't complete a CIR. We just collected a description of the incident. And my recollection is that the majority of them would not, from what we could tell from the description, would not have been NCVS crimes as Jenna described, but I'm sure there were at least some representations of other kinds of financial crimes you're talking about.

JENNA TRUMAN: Great. Thanks. OK, so Andrea asked about when do the changes for the NCVS instrument take effect, which I think I answered in the last one. So our goal is to have-- we'll plan to be in the field with a split sample in 2024. So about half the sample would receive the new instrument and about half the sample would receive the old, with ultimately the goal to have all the changes fully implemented by 2025.

OK, Alisha asked, and, David, I'm going to throw this one to you. "When providing the prompt for distinguishing force versus coercion, what is the working definition provided to samples to determine if coercion was present? Could both co-occur?"

DAVID CANTOR: Yeah, they could co-occur. And so the questions are just very specific. So one question is, did they use physical force to do this? And the coercion question is specifically asking about, did they use some sort of nonphysical force to do this, such as written in your job or offering you rewards to get good grades? So they're two separate questions that ask about two different types of activities, and that's how it distinguishes it.

JENNA TRUMAN: OK, thank you.

DAVID CANTOR: They could answer both questions, so they could say yes to both. But if they say yes to both, it would be defined as physical force.

JENNA TRUMAN: Great. Thanks. OK, and Axton asked, "Are changes being planned for the ITS, which is the Identity Theft Supplement?" At this moment, no. It was most recently collected. I will say, and I did not mention this in the timeline, there will--during the full redesign--let me back up to this. So when we're moving forward here with the split sample on this pilot test, we will not have supplements in the field. That is not the plan. We'll have kind of a blackout period until we get through the redesign and the full implementation. So that is one plan in terms of there won't be any supplements collected. But at this moment, there aren't any changes planned for the ITS.

OK, next question from Sharon. I'll kick this to David or Sherm. "Were there any differences among the instruments by gender, either gender of respondent or gender of offender?"

DAVID CANTOR: I don't know if we looked at carefully the rates by particular personal characteristics, but Sherm might remember those tables better than I do.

SHERM EDWARDS: Yeah, what's in the Topline, I think that we looked at the achieved sample to look for sources of bias and did not find any issues with gender representation. And we're currently working on some analyses that will be published before too long that will look at some of these issues in a little more detail, including by person characteristics.

JENNA TRUMAN: Great. Thanks. OK. So Grace asks, "Will the questionnaire crosswalk include changes to how crimes are classified in the NCVS?" And I'll take that one, and Sherm or David, feel free to jump in. But yeah, the crosswalk's planned to track not only the questions, but then the classifications over--well, not necessarily over time, but you'd be able to compare the old to the new type of crime classification. And in the Topline Report that we've mentioned here and that's linked in these slides, and I believe they put it in the chat as well, there is a type of crime hierarchy is in one of the appendices. Sherm or David, if you remember. I want to say it's Appendix 5. And it has both what is Condition 1 for the current NCVS versus Condition 2 in the redesigned NCVS. As we're looking at the data, we are analyzing that, and we'll have additional recommendations, but that'll eventually be available on that NCVS instrument redesigned webpage as well.

OK. Helen asks, "Can you speak to updates, if there are any, to how NCVS collects data on hate crime victimization?" Yes. So that is one area that we did focus and make edits to. We kind of kept--we didn't dig into all the details of the CIR in the session today, but I'll put two plugs in, one for the Topline Report that has kind of some discussion and the instrument that was tested

in the field. And then, two, we did some additional research with our colleagues at RTI, and the report specifically related on hate crime victimization. And that report is on that NCVS instrument redesign webpage. So it's available there as well. And that informed ultimately where we went with the instrument. And when the next version of the instrument is posted with our kind of next piece of the pilot test with our research that we're doing, you'll see kind of the final questions there.

OK, let's see. "What does the redesigned instrument mean for crime estimates?" And, David or Sherm, I don't know if you want to jump in here. I think from the field test we can see that potentially we anticipate there will be some differences between the estimates we're getting and currently getting now versus the estimates we would collect with the redesigned instrument, in particular for rape and sexual assault because we have made so many changes. I think part of that is why we're pushing to do the split sample so that we can bridge the two estimates and try to maintain that trend over time. I don't know, David or Sherm, if you have anything else to add there.

DAVID CANTOR: Yeah. I think if the field test is any indication, the rates are likely to go up. But the one thing we have to caveat it with, as Jenna was saying, you know, with the overlap, we'll see how this performs, you know, after the second and the third interview. So, you know, most of the NCVS interviews are done as part of the panel where people have already been visited at least once. And so, we don't have a good comparison of the instruments at that point. So stay tuned for that, I think.

SHERM EDWARDS: Another issue that might affect how it transfers from the field test to the production is what's called house effects. When these kinds of things have been done in the past, the rates that other organizations get tend to be different from what the Census gets. And that's really pretty much true of any survey that is done by different organizations that can be significant house effects.

JENNA TRUMAN: Right. Yep, and definitely why we're doing more testing with Census too before we go through full implementation. OK, thank you for all the great questions.

Andrea, your current field rep, thank you so much. And so, Andrea's asking if there's any opportunities to provide feedback on testing. And I certainly think yeah. I mean, feel free to reach out if anyone has kind of feedback or questions at--it's askbjs@usdoj.gov or directly to me. We are certainly thinking about, I think, as we go to the future thinking about how to engage both our kind of stakeholders, our gated user community, our fields representative, our Census community, engaging everyone, to kind of keep everyone informed and get feedback. In particular, you know, these things like the respondent communication. And I think that that's part of some of the changes that we've made to the instrument have been from listening to our field representatives at Census and understanding how the instrument works for them in the field and how to improve things. So those are all things that we're thinking about over the future. So, thank you, Andrea.

All right. So Rachel asked this question for the reasons why a victim may not receive services outside of the police. "Is lack of accommodations for individuals with disabilities 1 of the 10

options?" I don't have the—let's see if I can find the question. I think that might have been there, or if it's not, it would come up in the other. David or Sherm, do you remember off-hand? 'Cause I don't have it right in front of me.

DAVID CANTOR: You didn't know what help was available, you didn't have transportation or childcare, could not take time off from work or school. You didn't want to get the offender in trouble. You were worried about the consequences for yourself and your family. You didn't feel the services were appropriate to meet your needs. And you could not apply for or could not receive services because of a physical, mental, or emotional condition. The services were not available in your language. And then there's an "other" specified.

JENNA TRUMAN: OK. So, yeah, so it should be covered with not able to for physical, mental. Or if they want, there's the "other" specified. So they could write in that response or they could tell the interviewer, and then we would write in that response as well. So we are covering that. Thank you for checking, David.

Peter has a question about what if any qualitative research was conducted prior to the field test. For example, exploratory discovery work or cognitive question testing. And David or Sherm, I'll let you chime in here.

SHERM EDWARDS: Sure. We did a number of rounds of cognitive testing on several of the parts of the CIR that were significantly changed and also on the screener. We also did some usability testing for the self-administered version that Jenna mentioned. And then we did some formative research as well with web panels to, for example, to collect people's ideas about sort of what comes to mind when we ask you about crime. I'm not doing a very good job of representing that research, but it was that kind of exploratory work that we did as well.

JENNA TRUMAN: Yeah. And I will also--so in addition to the Topline Report that we released, we're also going to be releasing a methodology report that I'll talk more in detail about--those types of research that was done to get us to this point to the field test. So again, be on the lookout. Anything that is released will be posted on that NCVS instrument redesign webpage.

All right. One other question. Susannah asked, "Will it still be possible to compare rates of crime over time after the redesign?" That is certainly our hope and that is our goal is to be able to maintain that trend, as we've all kind of talked about here. You know, we know that there are likely going to be changes based on the edits that we've made to the instrument in terms of the level of victimization estimates we anticipate. But that is part of why we're doing what we can to work towards the split sample to be able to bridge the estimates when we do release after the full kind of redesign in 2025. That is the goal, to be able to compare estimates over time.

All right. I'm just checking through one last time. If anyone didn't get it, or if anyone has any other questions, you can email us at askBJS@usdoj.gov, and they can direct it to me directly. I'm looking, I don't see any other--I think we've got every other question answered. So if there aren't any other questions, again, I just want to thank everyone for attending today. We really appreciate you taking the time out of your day. We were very excited to be able to share this information with you. Again, if you have questions, please reach out. Continue to check our

webpage, as we'll post updates there. And be on the lookout for additional research as we release it. And as Tammy just posted in the chat, this was recorded, and the slides and the transcript and recording will all be posted on the BJS website once everything is up to date. So again, thank you so much for your time today. And everyone take good care.