Transcript of the December 14, 2021 webinar:
Updates from the Bureau of Justice Statistics on the
National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS)

DARYL FOX: Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to today's webinar, Updates from the Bureau of Justice Statistics on the National Crime Victimization Survey, hosted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. At this time, it's my pleasure to introduce Heather Brotsos, Chief, Victimization Statistics Unit within the Bureau of Justice Statistics for some welcoming remarks and introductions. Heather?

HEATHER BROTSOS: Good afternoon, and thank you for joining today's webinar, Updates on the National Crime Victimization Survey. My name is Heather Brotsos, and I am chief of Victimization Statistics at the Bureau of Justice Statistics. We've put together an exciting lineup of content for you today. So I'll just briefly walk through that and then I'll introduce our first speaker. First up, we have Jenna (Dr. Jennifer L. Truman), who's going to talk a little bit about some of the updates related to the COVID-19 pandemic and how we continue to measure crimes during this period of time. She'll also present some updates on what BJS is doing to modernize the NCVS. Next up, Grace is going to talk about the transition from the NVAT tool to the stunning new dashboard, the N-DASH. She'll also provide a short, a short demo of the dashboard. After that Rachel, is going to present findings from the 2017 supplemental Fraud Survey, and Erika is going to present findings from the 2018 Identity Theft Supplement. After that, we'll open it up for a moderated Q&A session. So make sure to put your questions into the Q&A throughout the presentation. Also indicate which panelist your question is for so we can get them all queued up for the moderated session.

So with that, I will introduce our first speaker. Dr. Jennifer L. Truman is a statistician in the Victimization Statistics Unit at the Bureau of Justice Statistics. Her current research interests and work focus on victimization patterns and trends, stalking victimization, the measurement of demographic characteristics, and the redesign of the National Crime Victimization Survey. Dr. Truman has coauthored many BJS statistical reports including Criminal Victimization 2019, Stalking Victimization 2016, Socioemotional Impact of Violent Crime, and Firearm Violence 1993 to 2011. She holds a Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Central Florida. Please join me in welcoming Jenna.

JENNIFER TRUMAN: Thank you, Heather, and thank you, everyone, for being here today. We're excited to present this information to you, as Heather said. Next slide, please, Daryl. Thanks. I'm going to be talking about the National Crime Victimization Survey. I'm going to do a quick overview for anyone in the audience who's not familiar, and then I'm going to talk about the impact of COVID-19 on the NCVS. And then I'm going to talk about the NCVS redesign and updates from there from all the work that we've been doing so far. Next slide. So the NCVS is administered annually. So from January through the end of December, we interviewed persons age 12 or older from a nationally representative sample of U.S. households. Respondents are interviewed generally in person or by the telephone and typically new households are interviewed in person. The households that we sample, and again, we sample households, remain in

our sample for three and a half years. So it is a panel survey. And eligible persons in those households, so everyone 12 or older, are interviewed every 6 months. So they're in the sample for three and a half years for a total of seven interviews. In the NCVS, we collect information about nonfatal violent and property crimes, both reported and not reported to police. Next slide. So as all household surveys and all survey data collections, and the, you know, everyone has been impacted by COVID-19. So this, we just wanted to kind of provide a little overview of the impact that this had on our data collection. So as I mentioned, field operations are annual. And so we had to make decisions with our colleagues at the Census Bureau about what to do when the pandemic hit. And so we ended up having to suspend in-person interviews, similar to how, when the, everything shut down during the pandemic. And so we made the decision to suspend in-person interviews for everyone, and then particularly suspend interviews for incoming sample. For the incoming sample, the new households that are sampled, who we would typically interview in person, we suspended those during this timeframe. So this was from the April to October timeframe. For where we were able to, for the returning sample, so those that were already in the sample, we moved to phone-only interviews. So from April to July. And then when we were able to—again, these were decisions we made with the Census Bureau, and Census Bureau was making decisions at the enterprise level for their data collections overall as well—in July, we were able to move over to modified personal visits for those that were in the returning sample. So that, those that were already in the sample, we were able to go to the households interview if possible, and if they didn't want to interview, interviewers were able to then do it over the phone, or some, in some cases, you know, they could've went to the household and then the household member told them that they didn't want them in their household, you know, they could have gone outside, or the interviewer could have called from their phone outside, and, you know, so we kind of modified as we could. And then we were able to then start interviewing all samples again in October. So that was for both incoming and returning samples.

Next slide. So as you can imagine, this did have an impact on response rates. Thankfully, not as large of an impact as we might have anticipated. So you can kind of see in this chart here, these are typical responses, these are household response rates, and this is for 2019 to 2020, just so you can kind of see where they were at already in 2019. And that blue-shaded area is during the impact of the pandemic, when we were suspending incoming, or excuse me, suspending interviews for incoming sample, and then doing telephone-only operations for returning sample. And you'll see that the response rates dropped to the low 60s. And then when, in July, when we were able to return to those kind of modified personal visits that I talked to, for those that were in the returning sample, they jumped up a bit to the high 60%s and up into 72% in October. And then for the rest of the year, so for when we were able to do personal visits for all households. They are, they remain kind of 70% to high 60%s. And that's typical for this time of year. So we tend to see a little bit of a drop in our monthly response rates over the holidays. And the next slide. So in doing so, knowing that we would have an impact from the pandemic, BJS and the Census Bureau examined the 2020 data. And we made adjustments applying to the 2020 data in order to ensure that we have comparability between past and future estimates of NCVS data. So we still want to be

able to record our annual estimates. And we want to be able to compare to 2019. And then again record when we have eventually 2021 data. So in doing so, we made decisions for the weights. So the weights for the incoming sample for the first and fourth quarters of 2020, so that sample was suppressed, was doubled to compensate for that suppressed incoming sample in the second and third quarters. And then the household weights for the types of group quarters included in the NCVS were controlled to match historical values. And finally, household control weights were developed to weight household distributions by the sample type. And I know this was a lot of information on this one slide. So this is detailed a little bit more in the Criminal Victimization 2020 report, as well as a very detailed look at the weighting adjustments are in the source and accuracy statement that we release each year in the codebook. So you can find that in the NCVS 2020 codebook on the NACJD website, which is here. And also, as Daryl mentioned at the beginning, we'll have these slides available on the webpage, so you'll be able to access that as well.

Next slide. So I, the next thing I want to do is talk about the redesign and the exciting work that we've been doing here. So kind of transitioning to the future. Thank you. So the work we've been doing is to modernize the survey instrument. So it's been a long time, since '92, '93, when the last redesign happened of the NCVS instruments. And so we've been working to modernize the instrument, the design, the methodology, and all with the goal of generating better and more comprehensive measures of crime. In particular, also we want to work to engage nonvictim respondents and collect additional information that we may not be collecting now. So in engaging respondents, because the majority of our respondents haven't experienced a crime and so a lot, you know, we sometimes have that resistance, especially with a panel interview where someone's like, well, "I didn't experience crime. I don't, you know, I don't need to talk to you." So we want to engage those respondents. And so in doing so, we plan to add some questions, asking about citizens' perception of safety, disorder, police legitim, sorry, legitimacy and satisfaction with police. In addition, as I mentioned, we want to expand some information collected particularly on victims' experiences. So things about victim service use, their satisfaction with police, that they reported to police, and understanding more about consequences of their victimization.

Next slide. So some of the key changes that we're doing in the instrument is using more behaviorally specific language. We're increasing yes/no responses in the screener. And I'll talk a little bit more about this. But right now, the screener, if anyone's familiar with it, you're kind of walked through several Qs. And then, you know, there'll be like 5 Qs asking about different types of stuff. And then we'll engage for one yes or no at the end of that series of Qs. So the redesign is working to do yes/no to each type of Q. So for, like let's say there were five Qs in the current, there would be 5 yeses/noes in the redesigned version. We're also adding vandalism to the types of crimes we're collecting. And in addition, one of the things in terms of how the instrument is working is we're actually trying to use the information that we're collecting in the screener to better guide the crime incident report. So we're measuring as a two-stage measurement in the NCVS. So we asked about whether or not the respondent experienced any victimization. And if they did, then we asked them about each of those victimizations in

the crime incident report. And so we're trying to use information that we're already collecting to kind of better guide the crime incident report and not ask every question if we don't need to. In addition, we want to expand information collected from victims. So again, consequences of victimization, better understanding those, addressing knowledge and gap, gaps in knowledge that we have currently. So victim services is one of those main areas where we're expanding the questions that we're asking them, measuring reactions to victimization, and the encounters with police, they did report to the police, and also just enhancing collection of reactions by victims.

Next slide. So one of the things that we tested in the redesign was what we call the interleaving approach. So if you take an example of someone who experienced a break-in and something was stolen during that break-in, in the current NCVS, we would ask them about items, whether or not items were stolen, and they would have said yes. And then in the next question, we specify other than incidents that they've already told us about, was there a break-in? They would say no because they've already told us about that one incident. And then again, other than incidents they already mentioned, were, was there, you know, were they attacked? And they would say no. So in the current NCVS, we only know that something was stolen when we're going into the crime incident report. So the redesigned NCVS, we tested two methods, interleaving and non-interleaving. And for both, we would know when the screener about theft that something was, in fact, stolen. But we then asked, as a part of that incident, was there a break-in and we would then get a yes there. So we then know that we can then link those two incidents together, or those two things together and know that it was one incident. So at the end of the redesign screener, we actually know that something was stolen, and there was a break-in and it was one incident and not separate incidents. So again, trying to guide information from the screener to then better use that information to ask the questions that we need to know in the crime incident report.

Next slide. So in terms of the screener flow for the redesign, we intend to ask the screeners. So as I mentioned, we added vandalism so it will be theft, motor vehicle theft, break-in, vandalism, attack, unwanted sexual contact, and a catch-all, so the catch-all screener's meant to kind of engage folks that, you know, if there was anything else that, you know, they may have, didn't tell us about, if they want to tell us now, that they didn't think about or something jogs their memory. From there, assuming they say yes, they experienced one of those things, then we would ask them how many times. If they then tell us that it happened six or more times, it goes into what we're calling series victimizations, which is the same as to what we do now. So asking whether or not the incidents were similar, and if they were similar, if they can tell us enough details to distinguish. If they can't tell us enough detail to distinguish, so, for example, if someone experienced intimate partner violence, and they had said yes to an attack, and when they told us about the attack, they said it happened 10 times but they couldn't distinguish them, from there, we would only ask them the most, about the most recent. So rather than trying to ask them about the 10 separate times that it happened when they all kind of blend together and they can't tell us that information, we would then just ask them about the most recent. So after we ask them about how many times and then date the incident, the month and year. And then from there, we work to do some

duplication. So trying to figure out if there was, excuse me, if it was part of another incident. So what I had just said on the previous slide about the theft and the break-in, so tying those two pieces together. And then from there getting a short incident description, again, just another piece of information that the interviewer can use to refer back to that incident as they go through the crime incident report and ask for more details.

Next slide. So as I mentioned, we want to engage those respondents who haven't experienced crime as well as all respondents. And so we're going to be adding some non, what we're calling non-crime questions at the beginning of instruments. So these will ask about police performance. So things like contact with the police, views of police, respect, effectiveness, trust, and community measures. So things like if they worry about crime, if there are issues in their neighborhood, like graffiti or abandoned buildings. The questions are going to be asked of all respondents, and they'll be rotated. So the police questions would be asked in January and June, and then the community questions would be asked in July through December. And again, the items are working to engage the majority of respondents who really have no crimes to report. So we will still have questions, you know, to ask them and engage them. And the measures are also going to be important for things like small area estimation, and just understanding patterns of reporting to police. So these are things that we can--once we start collecting these data, we can then report, you know, on an annual basis and start tracking these things over time.

Next slide. Another thing that we're working on doing is refreshing some respondent communications. So, one of the things that we also tested in the field test is letters, difference of letters. So our letters right now are kind of your standard letter where it's like paragraphs of text and information. And so we are working to kind of update that and then like an easier view. So we're, we are calling this kind of like an icon version. So it will kind of cover everything that will be in like a paragraph form, but make it easier for respondents to actually see and kind of easily answer their questions to, like, what should I expect? And they can kind of go to that bulleted information and then answer things like, what do I do now? And then on the, another kind of question on the back of this additional communication would be an FAQ: so what is the NCVS? You know, why should I be participating? How do you protect my information? So all that kind of information for them. And this would be mailed to them, and interviewers would have it as well for backup information. And the next slide. This is another example that we've done for, particularly for all respondents of our brochure. So right, we also have, we call it a fact sheet, so we have kind of a fact sheet that goes out with respondent communication, and again interviewers carry. So just kind of refreshing this information again, trying to, you know, make it easy if someone, you know, wants to know the type of information, they can kind of go right to that question. And showing how, you know, not only why it's important for them to respond, but also how we use the data and, you know, you know, show them that we use and we actually publish reports and that's why everything is important to participate. And then give them information about how to contact us if they have questions from there as well. Next slide. We also talked to--this is, in particular, for youth respondents or for parents of youth respondents. So, you

know, some of the kind of resistance we get, we have parents refusing for, you know, their younger kids or youth, you know, older youth maybe not being around or not understanding why it is important for them to participate as well. So this was, this brochure was kind of designed to address some of those issues, in particular, kind of any concerns with parents for, you know, their child's safety or their privacy, how that data will be used. So similar to, you know, what we're addressing for all respondents but being particular about, you know, what it is that we're asking their child to respond to, and the questions that we're asking from there. And again, kind of pointing this out was a little, you know, a little bit more targeted where we point to things like better specifics on youth victimization from, like, Indicators of School Crime and Safety, or the School Crime Supplement and the reports that we do there. And we also tested out things like QR codes on here, so someone could use their phones and easily kind of access information there as well.

So for the next steps for the NCVS instrument redesign, the first reports I'm very excited to report will be coming very soon. And we have additional, kind of more detailed reports planned, as well. And the next step, we had been working kind of up to this point with our colleagues at Westat to do the field test and to get us to this point to have kind of a final instrument. So the next step is the implementation of that instrument with the Census Bureau, which is our data collector. So we're now kind of moving over to working with our Census colleagues, instruments, the programming, and testing. We plan for a small pilot test of the redesign instrument and protocols within the Census. And then ultimately, we want to do a split sample test with the old and the new designs so that we can bridge the two estimates together. Next slide. And this was a very preliminary schedule for what this kind of looks like. So we've been working on instrument programming. We plan to do testing next year, the pilot test that I mentioned, and then moving into a split sample with the old and the new instrument again so that we can bridge those two together and make sure that we're able, you know, to report annually, and kind of continue those measures with the goal to be, for completely new instrument by 2025. And next slide should just be my contact information. So thank you all again for participating today. We're very excited to share this information, and do let us know of any questions. Thank you.

HEATHER BROTSOS: Thank you so much, Jenna, for packing so many updates into that presentation. Next up, we have Grace Kena. Grace is a statistician at the Bureau of Justice Statistics and her work and areas of interest include patterns and trends of crime victimization, education, and labor force outcomes, as well as hate crimes, firearm violence, police-public contact, subnational estimation, survey development, and methodological work in planning for the National Crime Victimization Survey. Among Ms. Kena's interests are facilitating the use of data to inform decisions and making research accessible to general audiences. She holds a bachelor's degree from the University of Chicago and a master's degree in public policy from Duke University. Take it away, Grace.

GRACE KENA: Thank you, Heather. Thanks, everyone for joining us today. So I'll be talking about our exciting new data tool, the N-DASH, and the process that we took to

develop it. So just by way of a little bit of background, some of you may be familiar with our former tool, the National Victimization Analysis Tool or the NVAT. So that has been kind of like our old faithful. It's been very effective and widely used. We use it to check things for work that we're doing or to just answer quick questions. And I do just want to say that it was very revolutionary at the time that it was developed because before that, people only had access to reports and to the data files, which depending on what you're looking for, it may not be the easiest way to meet any data needs that people had. So the NVAT has been great. But by 2019, when we first started considering this, there had been a number of advancements in technology, of course, and the tool had become dated. So our main consideration at that point was just to come up with something that was more modern and visually engaging. So we started on this work, a small team of us in the unit through a cooperative agreement with RTI International, one of our grantees. So for anyone who isn't familiar, these are just a couple of quick screens of the NVAT and what it looked like, so very basic information, easy to access, but just not really cutting edge. So I just wanted to kind of give it a refresh. Thank you. So here's an example of some output from the NVAT. And this is-was,-a pet peeve of some of us that you see that you have to scroll down and across to see the full content of the table. So those were among the issues that we just wanted to troubleshoot. So, in thinking about developing a new tool, we had a couple of key goals. So as I mentioned, the NVAT was working very well, so we really wanted to stick with what was working, but just trying to make it better. We wanted to make it faster and just enhance the capability of what one is able to do with the tool to be able to access these nearly 30 years of NCVS data. We wanted to make it more visually appealing and engaging, and also broaden the reach of not only the tool, but, you know, the survey, generally speaking, and be able to engage a wider set of users. And another key thing that we wanted to do was to make the tool easier to use and easier to find certain pieces of information that were not always front and center.

So our development process started with a very unglamorous set of meetings in a conference room with our computers just doing a lot of brainstorming to really think about what we wanted to see with this tool. To think about, as I said, what was working well, and what we wanted to maintain, and instead just build upon thinking about who was likely to use the tool, who was using it now, how we could expand. So we looked at some of the metrics we had about what people were accessing from the NVAT, some basic information on, you know, most commonly downloaded tables, et cetera. So just looking at all of those things and putting all of those together, and also looking at other websites and other data tools to see what we could learn and pick up from what other people were doing both in government and outside that was working well. So we started in earnest in about January of 2020, and we worked throughout this period of several months with RTI to build a concept for the dashboard, and then to finalize the content and the layout and different design options. So we met as a larger team probably every other week for several months, and then we had other ad hoc meetings as needed and email. There was a lot of conversation and thought that went into this. So RTI's team included data scientists, web and software developers, senior researchers, and research statisticians who were very familiar with NCVS, as well as the data visualization specialists, so it really made for a very strong team. With those of us at

BJS as well, with different skillsets and areas of knowledge and expertise just pulling all of that information and talent, I'll say, together to build this dashboard.

Next slide. So we had to consider a lot of different areas, how much of the data would we include, what kinds of measures, how would we present the information, how can we make sure that we're staying true to the data but being as clear as possible and as interesting as possible. And looking at things like content—we didn't want to overwhelm our graphics, so that there was more, you know, footnotes than the actual graphic, but saying enough to make sure that we were being clear, so just kind of a variety of different issues that we had to work through as we were developing the tool. So just a little quick visual on this. So we had to keep all of the big-picture goals in mind that we were trying to accomplish, but also get down into the very nitty-gritty about how do we word this particular footnote or, you know, this other note, where do we put it on this page or on that, on all of them, so a lot of different considerations that went into the development. So this slide is just a quick comparison of what the content was on the NVAT versus the N-DASH. So you see that there are a lot of similarities, but a lot of what we did was just pulling to the top some of the elements that we thought were important that it could be easy to gloss over. So just on the middle right of the slide, the user's guide is one example. That was in the NVAT but it was kind of buried, and so if you didn't click on the supporting documents link, you wouldn't necessarily know it was there. Terms and definitions is another example. And then just including a link to the main NCVS page, also just set a high level so that it'll be easily accessible for anyone who wants to know more about the NCVS as a whole and not just the data tool.

Next slide. So through all of our discussions, RTI created a draft version of the N-DASH, which we called it on their development site. And they also did some user testing to kind of inform what we were doing and make sure that the tool was understood by people outside of our team who had been involved in all of the nuts and bolts. And once we had a draft version to work with, we then did multiple rounds of testing within our unit. Many of the presenters today were involved as well as some other people on our team, and just discussed all of the different types of things that I mentioned: the features, the functionality, the structure. And we also had a lot of discussion with the BJS technical team, just to make sure that from a technological standpoint, we were meeting different requirements for compatibility within our environment. And then we also, of course, shared the tool and discussed our plans with BJS leadership who were very supportive and gave us approval to continue moving forward with this work. So in September or so of last year, an initial version of the N-DASH was complete. So that was just step one.

Next slide. So here's an example. This is mostly what it looks like today still, but just an initial look at the dashboard and the presentation of it. I'll do a demo, as Heather mentioned, so I won't spend too much time on these slides. Next slide. These are some examples of the quick graphics. So here we just transformed the quick table that existed on the NVAT into graphics and added some other elements that I'll discuss more in a bit. Next slide. So here's an example of a custom graphic also modeled after the custom table from the NVAT, but where you can sort of customize what you want to see, what particular variables you're looking for, years, et cetera, where you can make all of those

selections yourself. Next slide. So for the launch, to prepare for that, we continued making improvements, and then we began to expand our user testing outside of just our unit, so we worked with other colleagues at BJS across the unit, including colleagues who are not statisticians, people who were not familiar with NCVS really at all, some people who were newer to BJS, so just really wanting to, and people who have been here for a long time, get a wide range, as much as we could, within the agency of people to give us feedback on the tool and how to make it better. And we got a lot of really great feedback out of that, not all of which we were able to incorporate into this initial launch, but we're still working, so we plan to continue with improvements. And we also had a lot of good feedback out of our usability testing session with Verint, another contractor who gave us some good feedback as well on the tool. And so with that, we continued to go through multiple rounds of revision and testing and making decisions. Some suggestions people made were good but not easy to implement or et cetera, so we had to make some decisions around that. And then another factor was around that time BJS released a new agency website, and so we had to just do some work to make sure that what we were doing was compatible with the overall BJS website redesign. So as we got closer to actually launching the tool, we worked, continued working with RTI, and with the technical team here at BJS, as well as the Office of the Chief Information Officer, the publication team, and others to make changes that were necessary to continue to review and test, so that if we tweak something here, it doesn't break something there. And then just confirm that everything was in good shape to be able to have a successful deployment on the BJS website.

Next slide. And in November, we did it. The N-DASH was launched, so it's up and available for everyone to take a look and play around with. Next slide. Okay. So I will just take a couple of minutes to show you a little bit about the tool. Okay. So as I mentioned, we pulled quite a lot from the NVAT but just really wanted to work on some of the presentation and layout and your ability to access the data. So you see here that we have these buttons at the top where you can access your quick and custom graphics. And here's a dropdown to get you to whatever type of custom graphic you're looking for, supporting materials with that clear visual that you need to click, and there's something there that you may want to look at. And then scrolling down a bit further, we have the user's guide, and terms and definitions, and the main NCVS page, all linkable, as well as additional buttons to access the quick and custom graphics. So this tool overview is kind of our landing page, and here is just a high-level description of access of the tool that might be helpful to know. If you don't need this, you can certainly skip it, but it's there for anyone who does need it. On the quick graphics page, you see quick graphics. These are the ones that are preset already. So this one at the top here is the rate of violent victimizations. I will say that these are broken up by sections that you can click to go. If you have a particular section you're interested in, you can just go straight to that one or you can just kind of go in order and look through all of them. I will go to reporting to police as an example. So here you see data for the percent of violent victimizations that were reported to police across the, all the available data years at this point, 1993 to 2020. So a lot of these elements are the same across all of the graphics. I'll just use this one as an example. You can scroll across, and then these tooltips here at the top will give you the year and the data point as well as confidence intervals and

standard errors for each data year. Depending on which part of the graphic you're on for these small multiples, for example. So these give a comparison across categories within a certain variable. But if you have just, for example, like, overall violent victimization, there would just be the single graph, but then this allows you to compare across people who did and did not report to police, and then those who don't know whether the crime was reported.

So I will scroll back up to just show some quick examples of how to use the custom graphics. So here you have to select which one you're interested in. So we have multi-year trends, single-year comparison, excuse me, and then year-to-year comparisons. So, and then you can select by crime type. So a particular type of crime, for example, motor vehicle theft that you might be interested in, or a characteristic whether that'd be a characteristic of an incident such as whether a weapon was involved or a personal characteristic of the victims, whether that be a person or a household. So here it defaults, it has certain defaults that it goes to. I had preselected these already. But just to note that these can be manipulated. Here, I turned on confidence intervals, so you can see these little shaded parts around the line of the graphic. I've also turned on reference lines where you can compare the overall rate or number or whatever you're looking at to one for specific subareas. So for example, this reference line would represent the rate of property victimization overall for this period. And then you see each of these different graphics by region, Northeast to Midwest, South, and West. So you can change this to number, for example, and that will make that change as well. So I'll just do one more quick example, just in the interest of time. Oh, and one thing that I wanted to point out as well for all of the figures for custom and quick graphics, you can have these different selections. You can show the table. I won't do that now, just in the interest of time. You can download the table itself. And then you can also download an image which will give you pretty much what you're looking at including all of the notes, et cetera. So going to single years, so here it's defaulted to person, the confidence intervals, and reference lines are off. It's defaulted to rate, so just with this default, you see this basic information on all personal violent, personal victimization rates for 2020, since that's the year selected. But you can also manipulate, you could do victim sex, for example, and that will add in male and female here. So you can make those different comparisons according to what you're interested in. So that is just a quick overview to just preview a little bit of the dashboard. Next slide. The website here for the dashboard is available to you, and here's also a link for other BJS data tools that you may be interested in. If you have any feedback on the tools, please send comments to AskBJS or to any of us on the next slide. Thank you for your interest today.

HEATHER BROTSOS: Thank you, Grace, for walking us through that demonstration and telling us all about the dashboard. Maybe we can put the link in the chat, too, if anybody's interested in checking it out, too. So our next speaker is Rachel Morgan, to talk about financial fraud. So Dr. Rachel E. Morgan is a statistician in the Victimization Statistics Unit at the Bureau of Justice Statistics. Dr. Morgan's research interests and work focus on criminal victimization, stalking, financial fraud, and the intersection of race and crime using data from the National Crime Victimization Survey. During her tenure at BJS, she has authored many BJS statistical reports, including Criminal Victimization

2020, Services for Crime Victims 2019, Race and Hispanic Origin of Victims and Offenders 2012 to 2015, and Financial Fraud in the United States 2017. She holds a Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Central Florida. Okay, Rachel. Over to you to talk about financial fraud.

RACHEL MORGAN: Thank you, Heather. And thank you all for joining us today. So now we're going to take another direction on this webinar, and Erika and I are going to talk about two of the NCVS supplements that we have. So I'm going to talk about the Supplemental Fraud Survey. So presentation overview. Quickly discuss BJS and the collection of victimization statistics, the unique utility of NCVS for measuring a crime like fraud, the development of the Supplemental Fraud Survey, what is fraud, how is it different than identity theft, the elements necessary to be fraud, types of fraud, some details on the screener and incident form instrument development, and then finally statistical estimates produced from the data.

Next slide. Thank you. So BJS is authorized to collect statistics on victimization under the Justice Systems Improvement Act of 1979. In the 2016 report, Modernizing Crime Statistics, that was released by the National Academy of Sciences, it recommended that BJS focus on measuring new and emerging crime types and not just current street crimes that are included in the NCVS. So one strength of the NCVS is its ability to capture hard-to-measure and personally sensitive crimes that may have a low likelihood of being reported to the police or to other agencies. Next slide. Thank you. So the NCVS utility for measuring fraud. The NCVS, as we know, is nationally representative, so it has good coverage across the country and high response rates compared to other surveys for populations that are most at risk and key subpopulations within the population. And also by asking respondents about their personal experiences with fraud, we're either able to capture information about the response and impact and consequences on the victim. We're able to measure fraud reported and not reported to the police or reported to consumer complaints. And then also we're able to really see the true magnitude of the fraud problem which may not be represented when just looking at official police statistics, because we know not everyone reports to the police. The NCVS's large sample sizes that allow for disaggregation of estimates by key characteristics and subpopulations, and then finally the routine administration of NCVS supplements allow for the assessment of changes in fraud estimates over time.

Next slide. So what is the difference between financial fraud and identity theft? You know, these terms are often used interchangeably, but they do measure and are defined as different things according to BJS, and therefore we have separate NCVS supplemental surveys. So fraud is defined as acts that intentionally and knowingly deceive the victim by misrepresenting, concealing, or omitting facts about promised goods, services, or other benefits and consequences that are nonexistent, unnecessary, never intended to be provided, or deliberately distorted for the purposes of monetary gain. So this is the definition from the Financial Fraud Research Center taxonomy, which is a part of Stanford University and was released in 2015. So in a fraud, a victim must lose money and must be intentionally and knowingly deceived by the offender or the fraudster, if you will. Identity theft is defined as a misuse or attempted misuse of an

existing account, or misuse or attempted misuse of personal information to open a new account, or for other fraudulent purposes such as getting medical care or providing false information to the police during an arrest. So identity theft is really similar to other types of personal theft. The knowledge and information, the theft of information, excuse me, typically occurs beyond the victim's consent, knowledge, and control. Whereas for fraud, the victims are actively participating in a transaction but are being deceived about the outcome of that transaction.

Next slide. So what is the SFS? It is the supplement to the NCVS that was administered to NCVS respondents age 18 or older from October through December of 2017. About 51,000 persons age 18 or older completed the interview. And it's the first nationally representative data examining seven types of personal financial fraud, which I'll talk about later. Respondents were asked about their experiences with these fraud types during the 12 months preceding the interview. And then more details about this supplement can be found on the BJS website. Next slide. So when developing the instrument, we came back to that Financial Fraud Research Center fraud taxonomy and the seven types of fraud they included. And the FFRC also, along with the FINRA Foundation, did some pilot testing that also informed our final instrument, along with a lot of cognitive testing that we did with our contractor, RTI. The final instrument was designed to measure the key categories of fraud that could be summed into a comprehensive measure of financial fraud, and it also included key attributes of each type of fraud. So these seven types are listed on the screen. I'm not going to go through details of each one of them, but they are charity fraud, consumer investment fraud, consumer products and services fraud, employment fraud, phantom debt collection, prize and grants, and then relationship and trust. Next slide. So the instrument was separated into a screener instrument and then an incident instrument. And for the screener, each eligible person age 18 or older was asked about, asked screener questions about these seven types of fraud. And the seven fraud types are mutually exclusive, so they do not overlap and can be summed to calculate a comprehensive estimate of personal financial fraud, as I said before. So look, when looking at the incident form or incident instrument, if a respondent indicated that they experienced a type of fraud based on their answers to the screener questions, they then receive an incident instrument that's focused on that specific type of fraud. If they experienced two types of fraud based on the screener, they receive two incident forms focused on those two types, and so on. If they experienced two incidents of the same fraud type, we're, we ask them to think about the most recent incident of that fraud type. So the incident forms have questions that are specific to the fraud type, but then also some general questions that are included on all the incident forms, things like reporting to the police, socioemotional consequences of fraud, and other things like that.

Next slide. So now I'm going to get into some details about the report that was released in April 2021. It is the first release of data from the 2017 fraud Supplement and can be found on the BJS website. And also in April, we archived the public-use data file and codebook through the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data. So anyone who is interested in this topic, please download these data and conduct your own analyses, because not everything is included in this report. Next slide. So in 2017, about 3 million

persons age18 or older, or about 1.25% of the population, were victims of personal financial fraud. And about 2 million of these 3 million persons experienced consumer products and services fraud. Next slide. And the majority of fraud victims experienced one type of fraud. So we can see about 95% of victims experience one type compared to two or more. Next slide. And looking at demographic characteristics of fraud victims, nearly 1.7 million females experienced fraud compared to 1.4 million males. A smaller percentage of white persons were victims of financial fraud than Black persons and persons who are Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, American Indian, or Alaska Native, or persons with two or more races, which are all included in that Other category because their sample sizes alone were not enough to have us release those statistics on their own. So we had to combine them. We do try to disaggregate when we can, but we can't always do that. So there were no statistically significant differences in the rate of victimization when looking at victim age. Next slide. And then when looking at marital status, the prevalence of never-married persons who experienced fraud was higher than the percentage for married persons but lower than the percentage for divorced persons. And then persons in households that earn between $50,000 and $99,999 annually experienced lower rates of fraud than households that earn less than $50,000 or between $100,000 and $199,999.

Next slide. So reporting fraud to the police. About 1 in 7 of the 3 million persons, or 14% who experienced fraud reported the fraud to police. And as we can see here, reporting to police varies by fraud type. So for relationship and trust fraud victims, about 37% of them reported the fraud to police. When then on the other end, for products and services and charity fraud, we have between 9% and 10% of victims. Next slide. We also asked about reporting fraud to other agencies or persons because we know that there are a lot of other local, state, and federal agencies that help victims of fraud, not just when they report to law enforcement. So about 77% of victims reported the fraud to a family or friend. We have about 12% reported to a state or local consumer agency, which includes things like states' attorneys general and the Better Business Bureau. And about 10% reported to a federal consumer agency, which includes the FCC, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, FINRA, the SEC, the IRS, etcetera. Next slide. And then remember that I said before a victim has to lose money in an incident for it to be classified as fraud based on our definition, so in total, victims lost more than $3.2 billion in 2017, about half of which was due to consumer products and services fraud, with about $1.9 billion. On average, victims of consumer products and services fraud lost about $880. And then on the high end, victims of relationship and trust fraud lost about $3,600. And if you remember that I mentioned just a couple of slides ago that the relationship and trust fraud victims reported to police most often, you know, it's hard not to think that because they lost so much money, that's why they're reporting to the police most often, compared to some of these other fraud types. Next slide. And then, finally, the socioemotional consequences of fraud. So this includes feelings of moderate to severe distress, significant problems with work or school such as trouble with a boss, coworkers, or peers, or significant problems with family members or friends. More than half, 53%, of all financial fraud victims reported experiencing socioemotional problems as a consequence of the victimization. And as we can see here, it varies by fraud type. So almost 70% of victims of phantom debt collection fraud, these are things like, you

know, those fake IRS schemes where, had socioemotional consequences. And then about 30% of charity fraud victims had socioemotional consequences.

Next slide. So that's all with the results from the report. And I just wanted to conclude with some post-data collection methodological work that we did. Based on other data sources and data collections before we conducted this one, we thought the prevalence estimates would be higher than that 1.25% that I reported. And so BJS conducted methodological work with one of our contractors to assess data quality and the statistical estimates before we publish the statistical report. Numerous data sources exist on the prevalence and nature of financial fraud, which is why we refer to those other ones before we collected the data. However, each of these sources uses different definitions of fraud, employs different methodologies, and also, as we know, with all data collections, have limitations to what they're collecting and how they're collecting. So other surveys may have more inclusive definitions of fraud. Our screener questions may have been too narrow or specific and inadvertently screened out fraud victims who met the definition of fraud but didn't think the questions addressed their experiences. The NCVS methodology may have played a part in it, with our mode of administration being face-to-face and on the phone, with the burden, so folks received this instrument after they received the full NCVS core instrument, and then finally in the context of a crime survey within this setting, or it could have been a combination of these factors or some other factors that we're not aware of. But, in the end, BJS concluded that there were legitimate reasons that the estimates were lower than anticipated based on all of these things that I just said and that the prevalence rates were valid. So next slide. I believe that is it. Thank you all very much. And I am open to any questions at the end, or feel free to email me later on down the road. So thank you. Turning it back to Heather.

HEATHER BROTSOS: Thank you, Rachel. As a reminder, if you have any questions, make sure to put them into the Q&A, and we will try to get to those during the Q&A session. So our last presenter for today is Erika Harrell. Dr. Erika Harrell is a statistician in the Victimization Statistics Unit of the Bureau of Justice Statistics. Dr. Harrell's work and interests include crime against persons with disabilities, workplace violence, identity theft, and other topics using data from the National Crime Victimization Survey. During her tenure at BJS, she has authored many BJS publications, including Crime Against Persons with Disabilities 2008 to 2019 and Victims of Identity Theft 2018. She was also a part of the BJS team that created the N-DASH, a new data visualization tool that analyzes NCVS data. She holds a Ph.D. in criminology from the University of Delaware. So welcome, Erika, to talk about the 2018 Identity Theft Supplement findings.

ERIKA HARRELL: Okay. Thank you, thank you, Heather. I want to thank everybody for participating in this webinar today. We're really happy about presenting our work. Today, I'm going to be talking about the Identity Theft Supplement and the 2018 results from that supplement. But first, I'm going to talk about the NCVS. What is the NCVS? As my colleagues have alluded to before, it's basically the, one of the two main sources of criminal victimization in the U.S. It started as the National Crime Survey in the '70s, redesigned and renamed in the '90s. It's administered by the U.S. Census Bureau,

given to people age 12 or older, and it collects information on nonfatal violent crime, personal larceny, and household property crime. And that web address there can provide you with a lot more information on our website about the NCVS. Supplements. Okay. The NCVS, in addition to what we call the core NCVS, we do have what are called NCVS supplements. These are, you've already heard about one. Rachel talked about the Supplemental Fraud Survey. But we have several. We have four others. These are short topical surveys that are administered at the end of an NCVS interview to eligible respondents. They're usually in the field for half a year, and they allow us to capture information that we can't capture in the core things that have emerged over time. And we have currently five active supplements: PPCS, SCS, the fraud survey, and the Supplemental Victimization Survey, which deals with stalking. But I'm going to talk about the Identity Theft Supplement. And we do have a page on our website that discusses each of these five supplements and, you know, their history. You can download data and reports on these supplements.

The Identity Theft Supplement. Next slide. The Identity Theft Supplement, or the ITS, was, is administered to people age 16 or older who completed an NCVS interview. It collects information on five types of identity theft, primarily that occurred prior to the past 12 months. That's the majority, what the majority of the ITS captures. We do, there is a small section that talks about identity theft that happened prior to the past 12 months, but the majority of the ITS focuses on the previous 12 months. Five types of identity theft, and each of these types, we include attempts as well as successful incidents of identity theft. We do not make a distinction. But there are five types: existing bank account, existing credit card account, misuse of another type of an existing account, the misuse of personal information to open a new account, and other misuses of personal information such as providing a driver's license to avoid identification during an arrest. And, as Rachel indicated, this is very different from fraud. This is usually done without the victim's knowledge, has, the victim has no idea until they have been victimized. So this is very, we have to keep our definitions very separate. This is very different from fraud. And again that's the webpage there for the Identity Theft Supplement, the ITS, where you can get information, questionnaires, previous questionnaires that have occurred.

Let's see. The ITS has actually been, it's been around since 2008. It's been administered five times. It is currently in the field through the end of the year. The 2018 ITS that I'm going to be talking about today was conducted in the first half of 2018. We had a sample of about 100,000 people, just over 100,000 people age 16 and over. We asked about identity theft that occurred prior to the past year and in the past year, but the emphasis is on the past year and, more specifically, the most recent incidents that occurred in the past year. We ask a number of questions, detailed questions about details focusing on that most recent incident, because we think it's better for respondents and easier for respondents to remember. There have been four previous reports on identity theft, one on each, one for each of the supplements that were administered. I'm going to talk about the 2018 report but these, all of these, have been released on our website and they can be found on the ITS webpage through the BJS website if you want information about the ITS--2018 ITS report and data file release. In

April of this year, we released a statistical report with the first findings of the 2018 ITS, which you can find there at that particular webpage on our website. The public data file that was used to generate estimates from this report was released through the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data, the NACJD, which is found at the University of Michigan. But it's available for public analysis. It was also released in April of this year. So it's there ready to be used. And our report is available right now on our website.

Okay. Prevalence of identity theft. In 2018, we found that an estimated 23 million persons, or about 9% of all residents, have reported they had been a victim of at least one type of identity theft in the month. And this chart is, has each of the five types of identity theft there. And if someone had multi, had experienced multiple times during the past year, they will be classified in multiple categories. That's how you could interpret this chart. And it shows that the majority of victims were victims of misuse or attempted misuse of an existing account, either credit card, bank, or some other kind of an account. Most, that constituted most of the victims. Let's see. Very few had opened and had a new account that was opened in their name or someone misused their personal information for other fraudulent purposes. In addition to asking about the past year, I mentioned we did talk, we do talk, ask about the most recent incident of identity theft that occurred prior, that occurred in the past year. In 2018, we found that the majority of victims, about 90%, their most recent incident involved only the misuse or attempted misuse of at least one type of existing account. That 90% can, comes from that 84.8% of victims, and the 5.6% under the misuse multiple types, the existing account only. So the majority of victims usually have an existing account that was misused. Yeah, 4.3% had a new account that was opened on them, and another, about 3% had their personal information used in another fraudulent purpose. We also discovered that 1.9 million victims, about 8% of the victims, experienced multiple types of identity theft during the most recent incident. That means that they experienced once, at least one, at least two or more of the five types of identity theft that I mentioned in a single incident.

Okay. Demographic characteristics. Gender. We usually, usually that we do see a gender difference, but this year, but in 2018, we did not. There was no difference by gender. However, there was a racial difference in the prevalence of identity theft, with whites not only taking up the majority of victims but also having a higher prevalence— 10% compared to 7% for Blacks, and 6% for Hispanics, and 8% for Asians—they were more likely to report being a victim of identity theft. In terms of age, persons ages 35 to 49 accounted for 24% of all U.S. residents age 16 and over and were almost 1 in 3 of all victims of identity theft. The most interesting finding that I found was about household income, where about half of identity theft victims lived in a household with an annual income of $75,000 or more, while accounting for 12% of the U.S. population. They accounted for a much larger percentage of victims than their portion of the U.S. population.

In the midst of talking about, asking victims about their most recent incident, we do ask them details about the incident, and one of them is how they discovered the incident. There are several ways that they could do it. There's several ways that they could be, that they could have discovered the theft. And we found that in 2018, 44% of victims

were contacted by a financial institution about suspicious activity, and about 1 in 5 noticed fraudulent charges on their account. However, this result did vary by type of identity theft. The existing account victims, their results were similar to the overall total because they accounted for most of the victims. However, victims of other types of identity theft, about 28%, they were much more likely to say that they were victims of, they were notified by a company or an agency that was not a financial institution or that they received a bill or were contacted by an unpaid bill.

Victims who knew how the offender got their personal information. For the most recent incident of identity theft, the majority of victims did not know how the offender got their personal information. Only about 25% knew. Now, this varied by type of identity theft, with people who were victims of multiple types of identity theft being the most likely to know how the offender obtained their information. I want, I wanted to show this chart. This chart is based on that 25% that I mentioned off of the previous slide, which is 5.8 million victims. This is not all victims. This is how the offender obtained personal information. And what we've noticed here was that 48% stated that they, that the offender got their information through a purchase or a transaction. Now, that's either in person or online. Those are combined in that category. However, that did vary by type of identity theft. Persons who had, who were victims of misuse of an existing credit card or bank account, over half of them stated that they, that the offender got their information through a purchase or transaction. However, victims of misuse of personal information for other fraudulent purposes, 64% reported that their information was stolen from files or misused by persons with access to their personal information. So there was a difference among the victims who knew how the offender obtained their personal information.

Police notification of identity theft. Most identity theft we found was not reported to the police. Only 7% of victims reported the incident in 2018. But we did find that persons who were, who are victims of new account misuse are more likely to report the crime to police than victims of only one type of an existing account, 25% versus less than 10% for each of those types of existing accounts. Financial loss. We do ask victims about three types of financial loss. One is what we call direct loss. Now that is the monetary amount of the money and goods that the offenders actually take. The direct loss which is nonreimb, which is not reimbursed is informat, is money that the victim has to pay out in order to get their credit straightened out, to get the problem resolved. That is money paid to notaries, money paid to maybe the DMV to get a new driver's license, things that are not reimbursed. An out-of-pocket loss is a combination of the indirect loss and any direct loss that was not reimbursed. Out-of-pocket is just what it says, when the victim loses out of their own pocket. And what we found here was that about 69% experienced any type of loss, and the direct loss is experienced by 68%. However, direct loss, only about 5% of victims experienced indirect loss with a main indirect loss of $160. And the total out-of-pocket loss for victims, the main was about $640 with 12% of victims experiencing an out-of-pocket loss.

In addition to asking about financial loss for the most recent incident, we also asked victims about financial loss for all incidents of identity theft that occurred throughout the

past 12 months. And we asked them to add them up, and we totaled, we totaled their amounts and came up with $15.1 billion that were lost to identity theft in the past, in the past 12 months in 2018. Seventy percent of victims reported experiencing any type of financial loss of a dollar or more during the past year based on all incidents of identity theft. Like Rachel's data with the fraud supplement, we also asked about, we asked about emotional distress due to identity theft. We asked about four different types, four levels of emotional distress. And we found that 8% of identity theft victims were severely distressed as a result of the crime. That did vary by type of identity theft, with victims of new account misuse and personal information misuse are more likely to report a severe emotional distress than victims of misuse of only one type of existing account at 7%. In addition to talking to victims about their experiences with identity theft, we asked all respondents about what behaviors that they took to prevent identity theft. We asked about seven or eight, we asked about seven actions that they could have taken, and we noticed that most people do take some, at least one of these actions during the past year for identity theft, to prevent identity theft. We found that a larger percentage of victims and nonvictims took at least one preventative action. Now, this doesn't mean that the preventive actions are not, are not working. We don't make any type of determination of that because we do not ask when they started taking these preventative measures in relation to timing of their victimization. It could have been before or, could have been before their victimization or after. So we really don't take, we don't have that information, so we really can't say which actually really came first with this. But we did find that most people did take at least one of these actions. And the majority of them do check their bank or credit card statements, or they shred their documents with personal information. And that should be it with my presentation. That is my information. If you want to email me, ask more questions, I'll be more than happy to answer.

HEATHER BROTSOS: Thank you, Erika. So we got, we're running a little short on time. So let's just jump right into the Q&A session. We've got a lot of good questions coming in from the audience. So thank you so much for your active participation. I will tell you right now, we're not going to be able to get to all the questions, but we will do our best to get through as many as we can in the time that we have. So we're going to start out with a couple questions on fraud and identity theft, which we just heard about. So, Rachel, if you want to take this one. The first question asked is, "Is it possible to compare rates of fraud and identity theft over time?"

RACHEL MORGAN: So for the fraud supplement, we only collected in 2017, so we don't have any fraud estimates yet, but hopefully in the future, if we conduct this survey again, we will. And then for ID theft, I believe the answer is yes, but I'll let Erika answer.

ERIKA HARRELL: The short answer is yes, we have conducted this question, this supplement multiple times. However, we're sort of, right now, experiencing a bit of a break in series with the Identity Theft Supplement with our current administration of the ITS, the one that's in the field now. Due to some methodological concerns, we had to make a number of changes to the questionnaire over the past year. So much so that we couldn't administer it last year like we would normally do every 2 years. So in a way,

yes, we can, you can look at things over time, but it's a little bit tricky. It is a bit tricky to do that.

HEATHER BROTSOS: Great. Thank you, Erika. And I think that may be our new upcoming webinar that we can look forward to if we can, we can plan it on the identity theft changes and what we have to come in 2021. So we'll go back, huddle back about what we can say about that.

ERIKA HARRELL: Yeah. Yeah.

HEATHER BROTSOS: So a couple of questions about visualization and N-DASH. "For those users that love the NVAT, will they still be able to access this? And if you're getting used to the N-DASH, how do you get some help?"

GRACE KENA: The NVAT will be available until early next year. I think the first quarter of next year is when we're planning to phase it out. So get all your NVAT time in, if you are so inclined. If you need help with the N-DASH, you can contact AskBJS, or if you have general questions about the tool or anything like that, you contact myself or Erika or Lexy (Alexandra Thompson). All of our contact information is on the last slide for that presentation.

HEATHER BROTSOS: That's great. Okay. We've had several questions coming in about what BJS is doing to modernize the NCVS. So maybe just start off with Jenna. You can talk a little bit about how are we going to communicate updates on these improvements and what can people look out for as we start to make decisions and make progress against this.

JENNIFER TRUMAN: Yup. So we plan to, anything that we release in terms of reports will be through our JustStats notifications and on our webpage. So those will always be featured there. And then with the new website, we're also working on having, and to get the redesign a focused kind of a webpage, and that'll have, kind of house all the information. So when the reports start coming out, those will be where the reports are and any updates from there. So that's the plan for communication.

HEATHER BROTSOS: Great. Okay. And excited that we've got a couple of friends from across the pond that were able to join us today. And looks like they are also hard at work on their crime survey and exploring online data collections. Jenna, can you talk a little bit about the NCVS and modes and all of the things that we're thinking about over here?

JENNIFER TRUMAN: Yes. Yeah. Absolutely. And thank you for those great questions. They're really important. And we agree that that is very complex. Both instruments are incredibly complex in collecting crime data, in particular online. So we actually did, for the field test that I mentioned, we did do some online testing. Unfortunately, the way that we were planning on collecting was rostering the household and the person and then collecting online from individuals. And so that got cut short due to COVID because

that was when it started. So we had to cut that data collection short and, so we have limited data, but we are planning on doing some additional testing, some online web testing in the future again with our colleagues at Westat, so we have some of that planned. So kind of look out for that. And then as we move forward, we are working towards that, but we recognize that we need more testing for the web mode before we can kind of roll that out. So we want to get kind of the new instrument rolled out first and then kind of change, move to the mode with additional testing there as well. So that's kind of where we're at with that.

HEATHER BROTSOS: Great. Okay. A couple more questions about the N-DASH. "Are you, are you able to view supplement data through the N-DASH?"

GRACE KENA: Not at this time. So this is just for the core collection at this point. But those are certainly things that we're thinking very much about for future iterations and extensions of N-DASH.

HEATHER BROTSOS: Okay. And then we've got another question coming in, specifically about the emotional distress questions that Erika and Rachel both talked about. "Are those included on the core NCVS?" Can, maybe, Erika, you want to answer that one?

ERIKA HARRELL: Yes. Actually, that is where we got our, the questions from. They were originally on the core NCVS, and we pulled them over into the ICS.

RACHEL MORGAN: And we, just a follow-up. We haven't published on those with core data in a while, but Jenna and one of our former colleagues did publish a BJS report a number of years ago using those measures with the core data.

HEATHER BROTSOS: Right. Okay. Rachel, this one is for you. "What are the differences between the SFS data that we collect and other federal fraud data?"

RACHEL MORGAN: So, good question. I would say a couple of the major differences, some of the other federal data includes identity theft, whereas you all know now that we clearly keep those two concepts and crime types very separate. Another thing, some collections include attempted theft, and we're just focused on (or attempted theft) fraud, and we're focused on completed fraud. And then the other one would be probably how we are defining our fraud types. That definitely varies across some other collections.

HEATHER BROTSOS: Thank you, Rachel. Okay. I think we probably have time for one or two more questions. So here's another one back to the redesign. "What are the main differences between the current NCVS and this new redesigned instrument?"

JENNIFER TRUMAN: So I would say that the main differences are kind of the improvements to the screener, in particular for measuring. I mentioned where we're using more behaviorally specific language, and one of those, and particular screeners in regards to sexual assaults, we've changed those measures. That's one of the main

changes to the screeners, as well as the added measure of vandalism. And then the extended information that we're collecting and the CIR, or the Crime Incident Report. So you know, consequences, victim services was a huge change. We've added, we've gone from two questions to an entire module on victim services. So that's a real improvement there. And the nonprime questions about community and police, I think is a big change and another way for us to engage respondents. So those are the kind of key differences, but happy to discuss. Always feel free to reach out with questions. Thank you.

HEATHER BROTSOS: Great. Okay. Well, we are just about at time. So if you do have more questions or we didn't get to your questions, all of our contact information is in the chat. Feel free to reach out to us directly or you can always send an email to the monitored email box AskBJS@usdoj.gov. I want to thank all of our panelists for presenting such incredible and insightful information today and participating and then engaging in discussions. So thank you all so much. Thank you to our audience for attending today. And last but not least, thank you to Daryl and Tammy for the flawless execution of the technical and logistical details for this event. Last plug, our third webinar in this series is tomorrow, and that we will be covering the topic of measuring hate crime in the United States. So if you're available, please join us at 1:00 PM tomorrow for a lively discussion on that topic. Thank you so much and have a great afternoon.