

Revision of the Kentucky Statewide Victimization Survey

R. Renee Setari*, Shannon O. Sampson*, Kelly D. Bradley*, and Marjorie L. Stanek**

*University of Kentucky

** Kentucky Justice and Public Safety Cabinet's Statistical Analysis Center

The project was supported by Grant Number 2014-BJ-CX-K035 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, conclusions, and recommendations expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Department of Justice

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the revision of a Kentucky-specific crime victimization survey, the Kentucky Statewide Victimization Survey (KSVS). Using input from law enforcement, the KSVS now includes new items measuring police effectiveness. An item matrix was utilized to assure that the survey revisions were relevant to research goals and residents' experiences. Further, the KSVS expanded its response matrices to offer more choices for describing crimes in a concise and cost effective manner. The current 2016 version of the KSVS stands out from preceding drafts because it was systematically created with attention to research-based survey design, and considers commonly overlooked groups. Thus, the 2016 KSVS illustrates how previous instruments can be progressively improved to better serve the community and fulfill research objectives.

Revision of the Kentucky Statewide Victimization Survey

Introduction

Beginning in the 1980s, five projects have attempted to survey victimization in Kentucky, but these efforts did not involve the systematic creation of a research-based instrument (Johnson, Sykes, & Snow, 1985; Fields, 1999). The Kentucky Statewide Victimization Survey (KSVS), which began development in 2015, is regional crime victimization survey instrument that has undergone several stages of revision. As the instrument is continually revisited and revised, it is the hope of the stakeholders that the KSVS will become increasingly able to measure the impact of crime upon the residents within Kentucky. This paper discusses the most recent revision of the KSVS, which was intended to address many of the remaining limitations from the previous stages of development. The creation and revision of the KSVS demonstrates the use of the best practices in survey design, and can serve as an example of how organizations can continue to improve upon previous tools rather than abandon original designs and goals.

Crime victimization surveys like the KSVS originated in the late 1960s when the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), then known as the National Crime Survey, was created to supplement police statistics (Rand, 2009). National survey instruments like the NCVS were developed to provide a more accurate account of crime by capturing data from those who did not make reports to police, or instances where officers misidentified a crime (Block & Block, 1984; Lynch, 2006). Respondents were anticipated to be more forthcoming on victimization surveys than with police, and thus the information collected by victimization surveys are thought to be less vulnerable to underreporting (Booth, Johnson, & Choldin, 1977). The NCVS and other similar surveys were also described as better measures of crime because they define victimization in terms recognizable to the average citizen, rather than law enforcement

professionals (Cantor & Lynch, 2000). When used with the police statistics, national-level instruments provide policymakers with a better assessment of the overall safety of their constituency (Cantor & Lynch, 2000; Levine, 1976). When the NCVS is administered, for example, it uncovered thousands more incidents of crime than those reported by the police (Lauritsen & Rezey, 2013).

States and local communities have benefited from national victimization surveys because they help communities collect crime statistics in instances when they do not have the resources to collect them regionally. Many states have attempted to collect their own data by replicating the NCVS and its methods on a regional scale, and have administered the NCVS or NCVS-derived surveys to their citizenry (Kamisar, 1972; Rand, 2009). However, NCVS and other large scale surveys do not accurately measure crime victimization when used on a regional level because these surveys were not designed for a small scale (Cantor & Lynch, 2000). For example, the NCVS often is not adequate to collect responses on a state level due to differences in laws and classifications of crime (Kamisar, 1972). Federally preferred terms for crimes, such as rape, tend to be vague and open for misinterpretation by the survey respondents (Koss, 1996). Misunderstanding produced by national surveys have likely led to an overestimate of violent crime, which causes regions to seem more dangerous than they really are, and prompt unnecessary interventions and media attention (Booth, Johnson, & Choldin, 1977; Tunnell, 2005). The sampling of national surveys is also typically based on interviewing residents in their homes or selecting participants based on home address (Cantor & Lynch, 2000). This created that problem of transient individuals and families being overlooked in the sample. Therefore, the NCVS and other similar survey consistently miss the experiences of many vulnerable subpopulations (Wenzel, Koegel, & Gelberg, 2000).

Due to issues with using the data from and replicating national surveys like the NCVS, Kentucky officials chose to develop a state-specific survey instrument. The Kentucky Justice and Public Safety Cabinet's Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) was interested in gathering precise local estimates of crime victimization that would supplement the data collected by the Uniform Crime Report (UCR), National Incident Based Reporting Systems (NIBRS), and other official sources of police statistics. By doing so, the Kentucky SAC officials hoped to address concerns regarding unreported crime in the state. Developing a new crime survey instrument also gave officials the opportunity to avoid the construct and methodological limitations of other surveys by following best survey design practices from the inception.

This paper discusses how previous drafts created by the Kentucky SAC were revised to develop the 2016 KSVS, a survey intended to capture the experiences of crime victims within Kentucky. The revised instrument consists of additional closed-ended questions and redesigned response matrices, which allow for efficient responding and simplified coding protocols. The new survey also incorporates respondents' perceptions of law enforcement, a factor that was overlooked by previous versions of the KSVS. With the changes that will be detailed in this paper, the KSVS is better able to collect information about crime across a broad spectrum of situations and circumstances.

The Need for a Kentucky-specific Victimization Survey

Like many other states, Kentucky relied on the NCVS and other federally-created surveys to provide its policymakers with more accurate data than that offered by police report statistics (Rand, 2009). Given that many citizens are hesitant to have contact with the police due to widespread involvement with drugs (Tunnell, 2005), these national-level victimization surveys were considered better references because they were administered without police involvement

(Block & Block, 1984; Booth, Johnson, & Choldin, 1977; Kaushik, 2001; Lynch, 2006).

Although, the national-level instruments allowed researchers and policymakers to gain some annual figures regarding crime, their usage was hampered because the NCVS and other federal surveys do not give the state ownership of the data derived from their citizens (Cantor & Lynch, 2000). To have crime victimization data owned by Kentucky, the Kentucky Justice and Public Safety Cabinet's Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) considered replicating the NCVS and administer the survey on their own terms.

While replicating the NCVS would provide Kentucky with valuable data, the state was limited in its ability to replicate the survey on the state-level because of the cost. The methodology of the NCVS requires that a survey proctor visit the sampled households in-person semi-annually for three and a half years, and the households are compensated for their time (Cantor & Lynch, 2000). The cost of this method has become increasingly difficult for the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics to manage, and it is nearly out the question for most states (Rand, 2009). Another issue with replicating a national survey in Kentucky is the instruments are typically not created with consideration for the needs of the state's citizens nor the region's laws. Different police departments vary in procedure, and crimes are not classified consistently (Booth et al., 2015). The various protocols make comparing crime statistics across the nation erroneous (Kamisar, 1972). New methodologies for the NCVS will rely on computer-assisted interviews, which will not be accessible in much of Appalachia or other secluded rural areas (Rand, 2009). Further, the crimes described on the NCVS instrument were written for a national audience, and are not specific to the laws of the commonwealth, nor the types of crimes that residents are more likely to experience in rural communities (Trickett, Ellingworth, Hope, & Pease, 1995). Finally, the protocols for national crime surveys usually do not address homeless or transient populations,

so the experiences of these individuals are not captured (Trickett et al., 1995). This oversight is not acceptable for the Kentucky SAC research goals, and thus, they sought to develop a new regional survey.

Purpose

This paper discusses the development and revision the Kentucky Statewide Victimization Survey (KSVS). Given the difficulty of relying on national survey results, the Kentucky Justice and Public Safety Cabinet's Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) developed the KSVS to provide policymakers with statistics and information about the yearly the impact of crime in Kentucky. In pursuing this endeavor, the Kentucky SAC intended for the survey to meet the following objectives:

- 1) Accurately measure the criminal victimization experiences of Kentucky residents.
- 2) Help determine the reliability and validity of official sources of data within Kentucky.
- 3) Determine the risk factors that may influence the likelihood of criminal victimization within Kentucky.
- 4) Help clarify the criminal victimization experiences of those overlooked by national estimates.

This paper outlines the need for a state-specific instrument, and how this survey was improved with a pilot administration and research-based survey design practices. Thereby, this paper acts a guide into the revision process for a locality-specific survey.

Methods

Developing the KSVS

The development of the Kentucky Statewide Victimization Survey (KSVS) began in 2015, when officials from the Kentucky SAC selected items from the NCVS and other

previously-used instruments. A preliminary survey was created with items representing most of the major types of criminal offenses, which resulted in an 82-item instrument. These items were very wordy, and several prompted respondents to provide additional information about perpetrators and the circumstances surrounding incidences. The length of this initial survey was prohibitive to mailing the survey to respondents cost-effectively, and reduced the likelihood that respondents' would complete the entire instrument (Connelly, 2009; Nardi, 2006). Also, many of the selected items were not unidimensional, meaning that they could elicit a response regarding more than one concept and lead to inaccurate data analysis. Additionally, many of the items found on the initial draft had little theoretical precedent to justify their presence on the survey. Survey development standardly requires each item have a research precedent so to support their relevance to certain latent concepts (Nardi, 2006). Several KSVS items lacked the literary evidence needed to show that they would measure crime victimization as expected. Although this preliminary draft was relevant to the project's research interests, the survey was not yet ideal for effective distribution throughout the state.

The Kentucky SAC worked with the University of Kentucky Department of Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation (EPE) to improve suitability of the preliminary draft. These efforts created the initial 2015 version of the KSVS, which was unique from preceding national victimization surveys. Rather than relying on repetitive interview questions, the KSVS includes concise response matrices for easier self-administration. Furthermore, the survey collected data regarding residents' usage of public safety resources, as well as their perceived likelihood of future victimization. The 2015 KSVS was successful in many ways, specifically because it was a research-based unidimensional instrument capable of yielding accurate measurements of events. However, more work was required to ensure that the KSVS would be effective during regional

distribution. First, the 2015 version of the KSVS created from the edit of the initial draft had to be piloted. Second, a new item matrix had to be created for the 2015 version to prepare the 2016 iteration.

Piloting and Revising the KSVS

In an effort to ensure that the KSVS was understandable and reflected the state's research goals, the Kentucky SAC piloted the survey in 2016 with Kentucky state law enforcement officers undergoing annual training. As part of this pilot implementation, the respondents were asked to give suggestions for the improvement of the tool. The pilot of the survey found that the instrument was capable of collecting usable data from the respondents. Respondents answered the survey to completion, and appeared to understand the survey items presented. The Kentucky SAC did not receive feedback characterizing the instrument as difficult to understand. However, the pilot uncovered that the KSVS still faced limitations to being an ideal instrument for the state's research goals.

To begin, the piloted version did not ask respondents if their local police were effective and respectful, and the pilot sample identified this as an oversight. The state police were concerned that there were not enough answer choices available in the various response matrices. They also expressed that the response matrix for the threatening behavior items did not give respondents the opportunity to indicate if they knew the perpetrator or if they reported the incident to police. Furthermore, it was suggested that additional open-ended items be added to help officials probe into potential areas of concern.

The Kentucky SAC again partnered with the University of Kentucky's EPE to revise and develop an updated version of the KSVS. The process began with adding suggested items and writing the new items that addressed the gaps noticed by the criminal justice professionals. Five

new items were created to measure respondents' perceptions of law enforcement. The most significant changes were made to the items measuring the occurrence of violent crime, as these items were given additional response choices. In an effort to make the 2016 KSVS a briefer survey, most of the added items were included into response matrices. Ideally, this adjustment will prevent respondent fatigue and elicit more complete response data.

Constructing the Item Matrix

A new item matrix was created to assess the merit of the additions. An item matrix is a survey construction method used to identify the logic for each item and justify its presence in the instrument with research literature. As a survey development tool, an item matrix is crucial because it outlines the survey and allows the developers to bolster its validity before administration (Connelly, 2009). Validity is strengthened by using the tool to systemically confirm that each item in the instrument is relevant and informative. In addition, the item matrix provided guidance for categorizing and revising survey items to elicit superior response data.

KSVS item matrix was constructed as a multi-column graphic table, to maintain the breadth of information in an organized manner. The first column of the item matrix contains a listing of the survey stem items, which are the statements that are meant to generate a response (Connelly, 2009). In the second column, the measurement purpose of the corresponding item is documented. All the items on the survey must have a clearly defined measurement purpose that relates to the research goals of the survey. If no measurement purpose can be found while constructing the item matrix, then the item is considered spurious and later removed from the instrument. In the last column of the matrix, the description of the literary precedent for each item is provided. Any items found to lack a measurement purpose or suitable literary precedent were removed from the survey. The item matrix for the 2016 KSVS is displayed in the appendix.

Results

The 2016 KSVS

The 2016 version of the KSVS consists of 68 items and five response matrices developed to measure the incidence of victimization during the past 12 months. This length of time was chosen because the stakeholders desired the instrument to be cost-effective and provide year-to-year comparisons, and a year was considered short enough to not be hampered by inadequate recall (Czaja, Blair, Bickart, & Eastman, 1994). With annual survey data regarding the incidence of crime, researchers will be able to detect shifts in the victimization rate over the years and determine the effectiveness of current and future public safety efforts and policies.

To maintain item unidimensionality, the 2016 version continues to require respondents to report only one type of victimization at a time, thus reducing confusion. The items are also organized by crime classifications, and items are grouped according to whether they reflect property crimes, violent crimes, stalking, or other types of incidences. This method was chosen for the ease of coding like crimes together, and to reduce the cognitive load on respondents. A notable change included the addition of items related to the perceived effectiveness of law enforcement to the first section of the KSVS. These new items were added here as this portion of the survey concerns perceptions of safety, to determine law enforcement's contribution to citizens' feelings of safety.

The 2016 KSVS's response matrices have been improved with the addition of more response categories. Revising the response matrices was difficult because the edits increased the page length. However, the items were reformatted in a variety of ways to maintain the page length and the aesthetic of the survey. Including these changes will allow researchers to discern

more complete information about violent crime and threatening behaviors. Furthermore, the responses to these new items will enable researchers to determine if any offender or victim characteristics relate to the prevalence or the likelihood of reporting violent or threatening crime. An example of one of the 2016 KSVS is shown in Figure 1.

The KSVS is a beneficial survey because it is capable of accomplishing the commonwealth's research objectives. To address the first objective, "*Accurately measure the criminal victimization experiences of Kentucky residents*", the instrument defines crimes based on the state's guidelines, allowing for the accurate measurement of victimization experiences. To address the second objective, "*Help determine the reliability and validity of official sources of data within Kentucky*", this instrument is mindful of the state's homeless and impoverished population, and includes response choices targeted toward such individuals. Therefore, this survey will more accurately collect victimization statistics, and can be used to assess if police data is overlooking vulnerable groups. For the third objective, "*Determine the risk factors that may influence the likelihood of criminal victimization within Kentucky*", the KSVS includes several demographic items which will inform the Kentucky SAC if certain groups are at increased victimization risk compared to others. As to the final objective, "*Help clarify the criminal victimization experiences of those overlooked by national estimates*", the 2016 KSVS is self-administered and contained within four front-and-back printed pages, allowing officials to distribute it by mail throughout the state within the limits budget constraints. Therefore, this survey will be able to reach individuals who usually cannot access computer-assisted surveys, like the NCVS.

The updated survey was administered in Winter of 2017. The target population of the state-wide distribution includes adults who are 18 or older and currently reside within the commonwealth. The sampling is being conducted in two phases. The first involved mailing the KSVS to Kentucky registered voters. The second phase involved administering the survey to adults that reside in shelters for homeless individuals and those seeking temporary housing. A mailed survey will provide respondents with greater amounts of privacy, and may increase the likelihood of participation (Dillman, 1991).

Based on Kentucky's population in the 2010 U.S, the target response rate for this survey is 8,000. Respondents will submit their responses in pre-coded, self-addressed and postage paid envelopes which will correspond to the individual's contact information on the survey roster. When surveys are returned the envelope, codes will be checked off to ensure that no follow-up correspondence is directed to that individual's address. The anonymous surveys will then be separated from the coded envelope for entry into the data management software. Data will be collected in several waves to illicit the highest possible response rate, and follow-up requests will be submitted to those in the sampling frame that did not return a completed survey. Those who do not return a survey after repeated follow-up contact will be considered non-respondents when they do not respond to a final request via registered mail.

Next Steps

The latest version of the KSVS will be validated by again for use in specific contexts. Instead of conducting the survey with law enforcement officials, it will be piloted with a lay sample of university students living in Kentucky. The results of this pilot administration will again be used to revise the instrument to be appropriate for use on a college campus. Focus groups and structured interviews will be conducted with leaders of non-profit and community

organizations, to identify items that would be germane to their setting as well. Items may be added or altered, but certain items will be selected as anchors, or items common to various instruments, so that results can be compared across subpopulations.

Conclusion

The revision of the KSVS can serve as a vital example for other states and communities that desire to collect their own crime victimization data. Firstly, the development of the instrument shows that original draft of instruments can be revitalized using best survey design practiced and edited into appropriate tools. For example, an item matrix can help identify the items that will threaten the validity of the survey, and those that align to the research objectives. Thus, the original tool is not entirely disregarded. Second, it shows how the feedback from a pilot administrator can be incorporated into an instrument. Suggestions from the 2015 pilot of the KSVS led to the creation of a new section of the survey to measure respondents' views of law enforcement. This new addition is expected to yield valuable data regarding the effectiveness of police because the suggested items were justified by the new item matrix. The response matrices were also improved with ongoing input, which identified the need for more response categories. Without the new response choices, the administration of the KSVS would have likely not have captured the experiences of many respondents. Thus, using the input from the pilot, as well as from the partners working on this project, the KSVS has become better able to fulfill its purpose. By following the KSVS process for revision (i.e. piloting, adding and removing items, and protecting validity with an item matrix), other states and communities can improve on previously-created surveys, and accomplish objectives that were previously out of reach.

Contribution to Education

Accurately measuring the impact of crime is increasingly crucial not only for state justice departments, but also for school districts and university campuses concerned with the highly-publicized problems of bullying and sexual assault. However, traditional data sources like police statistics may not be appropriate for these unique settings. The KSVS serves as a practical example of how a locality-specific victimization survey can be developed to achieve specific goals. The 2016 KSVS is distinct largely because it considers populations and events that are often overlooked by commonly referenced national surveys. For example, the KSVS includes items targeted toward those with limited possessions and living in shelters. This survey will not miss the unique victimization experiences of these individuals (Wenzel, Koegel, & Gelberg, 2000). Therefore, the KSVS illustrates how other tools can be written and administered to hard-to-reach groups, such as transient, homeless, or undocumented students.

The KSVS models for school and campus victimization surveys the use of uncommon, but vital, items for measuring the occurrence of crime. Specifically, the KSVS measures more ubiquitous forms of crime such as stalking, which are often underreported types of victimization (Sparks, 1981). Such crimes are often overlooked by victimization surveys because they are difficult to define. However, by working with state justice officials and making several modifications, concise items were developed that clearly describe such threatening behaviors in a manner respondents can understand. Similarly, schools may struggle to measure threatening events because of the difficulty of defining bullying or stalking. The KSVS may act as a template for how to ask about specific incidences of bullying and stalking without the measurement being clouded by misunderstandings of these terms.

Developing the KSVS also illustrates the challenges of designing a survey concerning a sensitive topic. Crime is a major concern for many communities; however, measuring its impact

can be difficult when the survey tools do not match the context. For colleges, universities, and schools, the development of the KSVS shows that a survey can be made specific to their students' and campus' environment. Rather than settling for the items used by external entities, schools and colleges can create surveys targeted toward their major victimization concerns, define crime according to their norms, and consider their own research goals. Furthermore, by developing their own surveys, educational institutions can use methods that are more sensitive to their respondents' situations. The KSVS shows that, though careful development and revisions, crime victimization surveys can be prolific and helpful tools.

References

- Block, C. R., & Block, R. L. (1984). Crime definition, crime measurement, and victim surveys. *Journal of Social Issues, 40*, 137-159.
- Block, R., & Skogan, W. G. (1986). Resistance and nonfatal outcomes in stranger-to-stranger predatory crime. *Violence and Victims, 1*(4), 241-253.
- Booth, A., Johnson, D. R., & Choldin, H. M. (1977). Correlates of city crime rate: Victimization surveys versus official statistics. *Social Problems, 25*(2), 187-197.
- Brewster, M. P. (2000). Stalking by former intimates: Verbal threats and other predictors of physical violence. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 41-56.
- Cantor, D., & Lynch, J. P. (2000). Self report surveys as measures of crime and criminal victimization. *Measurement and Analysis of Crime and Justice, 4*, 85-138.
- Connelly, L. M. (2009). Survey methods. *MedSurg Nursing, 18*(2), 114-115.
- Czaja, R., Blair, J., Bickart, B. & Eastman, E. (1994). Respondent strategies for recall of crime victimization incidents. *Journal of Official Statistics, 10*(3), 257-276.
- Dillman, D. A. (1991). The design and administration of mail surveys. *Annual review of sociology, 17*(1), 225-249.
- Fields, C. (1999). *1999 Kentucky crime victimization survey*. Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Statistical Analysis Center.
- Jasinski, J. L., & Mustaine, E. E. (2001). Police response to physical assault and stalking victimization: A comparison of influential factors. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 26*(1), 23-41.
- Johnson, K.W., Norris, F.H., & Burgess, L. (1986). *Criminal victimization in Kentucky: A longitudinal study*. Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Statistical Analysis Center.

- Johnson, K.W., Sykes, G.W., & Snow, E.F. (1985). *The aftermath of criminal victimization: A statewide survey*. Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Statistical Analysis Center.
- Kamisar, Y. (1972). How to use, abuse--and fight back with--crime statistics. *Oklahoma Law Review*, 25, 239-258.
- Koss, M. P. (1996). The measurement of rape victimization in crime surveys. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 23(1), 55-69.
- Lauritsen, J. L., & Rezey, M. L. (2013). Measuring the prevalence of crime with the national crime victimization survey. Bureau of Justice Statistics, US Department of Justice, Washington DC.
- Lemieux, A. M., & Felson, M. (2012). Risk of violent crime victimization during major daily activities. *Violence and victims*, 27(5), 635-655.
- Levine, J. P. (1976). The potential for crime overreporting in criminal victimization surveys. *Criminology*, 14(3), 307-330.
- Lynch, J. P. (2006). Problems and promise of victimization surveys for cross-national research. *Crime and justice*, 34, 229-287.
- Rand, M. R. (2009). Redesigning the national crime victimization survey. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from https://fcsml.sites.usa.gov/files/2014/05/2009FCSM_Rand_X-B.pdf
- Sparks, R. F. (1981). Surveys of victimization- An optimistic assessment. *Crime and Justice*, 3, 1-60.
- Trickett, A., Ellingworth, D., Hope, T., & Pease, K. (1995). Crime victimization in the eighties: Changes in area and regional inequality. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 35(3), 343-359.

- Tunnell, K. D. (2005). The OxyContin epidemic and crime panic in rural Kentucky. *Contemporary Drug Problems*, 32(2), 225-258.
- Wenzel, S. L., Koegel, P., & Gelberg, L. (2000). Antecedents of physical and sexual victimization among homeless women: A comparison to homeless men. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 28(3), 367-390.
- Wieclaw, J., Agerbo, E., Mortensen, P. B., Burr, H., Tüchsen, F., & Bonde, J. P. (2006). Work related violence and threats and the risk of depression and stress disorders. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 60(9), 771-775.

9. During the past 12 months, has someone....					
	Ye s	No	How often has this happened?	Who did this to you? <i>(check all that apply)</i>	How often was this reported to police?
a. Stolen something from you using force?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> One time <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple times	<input type="checkbox"/> Friend/acquainta nce <input type="checkbox"/> Significant other <input type="checkbox"/> Family member <input type="checkbox"/> A stranger	<input type="checkbox"/> No occasions <input type="checkbox"/> Some occasions <input type="checkbox"/> All occasions
b. Stolen something from you using a weapon?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> One time <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple times	<input type="checkbox"/> Friend/acquainta nce <input type="checkbox"/> Significant other <input type="checkbox"/> Family member <input type="checkbox"/> A stranger	<input type="checkbox"/> No occasions <input type="checkbox"/> Some occasions <input type="checkbox"/> All occasions
c. Physically attacked you?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> One time <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple times	<input type="checkbox"/> Friend/acquainta nce <input type="checkbox"/> Significant other <input type="checkbox"/> Family member <input type="checkbox"/> A stranger	<input type="checkbox"/> No occasions <input type="checkbox"/> Some occasions <input type="checkbox"/> All occasions
d. Physically attacked you with a weapon?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> One time <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple times	<input type="checkbox"/> Friend/acquainta nce <input type="checkbox"/> Significant other <input type="checkbox"/> Family member <input type="checkbox"/> A stranger	<input type="checkbox"/> No occasions <input type="checkbox"/> Some occasions <input type="checkbox"/> All occasions

Figure 1. Excerpt from 2016 KSVS Response Matrix for Violent Crime Items

Appendix: 2016 KSVS Item Matrix

Item	Purpose	Precedent in Literature
<p>In the past 12 months, did anyone... Threaten you?</p> <p>Break into the place you are staying?</p> <p>Steal your vehicle?</p> <p>Steal something from you using physical force?</p>	<p>Measures the incidence of verbal assault/intimidation, and differentiates these incidents from aggravated assault.</p> <p>Differentiates the burglaries from other types of theft-related crime.</p> <p>Measures the occurrence of auto theft.</p> <p>Measures the incidence of victimization by violent robbery, and differentiates these responses from those indicating victimization by non-violent theft.</p>	<p>Threats of violence (explicit, implicit, or conditional/coercive) can be predictors of family violence (Brewster, 2000). Threats have been shown to be better predictors of future violence than history of victimization. Threats are a risk factor for psychological disorders (Wieclaw et al., 2006). Not often supplied by data based on police reports (Cantor & Lynch, 2000). Nationally, 25.7% of households report that their homes were burglarized (NCVS, 2014). Homeless individuals are at great risk of having their living place broken into because they occupy space that are not secure (Fitzpatrick, La Gory, & Ritchey, 1993). Likelihood of auto theft is dependent on where the car is parked, and those who park in public lots may perceive the risk to be higher than those who park in a garage (Lemieux & Felson, 2012). Auto theft has a lower perceived risk than other crimes, and is considered one of the less serious property crimes (Warr & Stafford, 1983).</p> <p>Differentiates the victims of violent theft from the victims of non-violent theft. The majority of robbery victims are physically attacked in some way (Block & Skogan, 1986).</p>

Steal something from you without using physical force?	Measures occurrence of non-violent theft.	Differentiates the victims of violent theft from the victims of non-violent theft (NCVS, 2014). A minority of robbery victims are not physically attacked in some way (Block & Skogan, 1986).
Attack you with a weapon?	Measures the incidence of victimization by aggravated assault.	People commonly experience injury as the result of crime (Campbell et al., 2002).
Force you to have sexual intercourse?	Measures the incidence of forcible rape.	Thirteen to 25% of women experience forcible sexual assault or rape during their lifetime (Elliot, Mok, & Briere, 2004).
In my community, crime is...	Measures the perceived frequency of crime.	In areas where crime is more frequent, citizens perceive it to be more dangerous (Warr & Stafford, 1983).
Law enforcement is _____ at protecting those in my community.	Measures the respondent perception of the police.	Perceptions of the police differ based on law enforcement’s treatment of the citizens (Huq, Tyler, & Schulhofer, 2011).
Have you had any contact with law enforcement in your community?	Differentiates the attitudes of respondents that have interacted with police and have not interacted with police.	People with poor experiences dealing with police are more likely to perceive them negatively (Huq, Tyler, & Schulhofer, 2011).
During my contacts with law enforcement in my community I have been treated with respect?	Measures occurrence of possible and negative experiences with police.	Members of minority groups tend to receive poorer treatment from police (Huq, Tyler, & Schulhofer, 2011; Tyler and Fagan, 2008).
How would you describe the contacts that you have had with law enforcement in your community?	Allows respondents to further describe experiences with police.	Experiences with police can vary widely based on race or ethnicity or conflict (Tyler & Wakslak, 2004).
In the past 12 months, has anyone...		
Broken into a place where you were staying?	Measures burglary.	Differentiates the burglaries from other types of theft-related crime, which is information not

		often supplied by data based on police reports (Cantor & Lynch, 2000). Nationally, 25.7% of households report that that their homes were burglarized (NCVS, 2014). Homeless individuals are at great risk of having their living place broken into because they occupy space that are not secure (Fitzpatrick, La Gory, & Ritchey, 1993).
Broken into your vehicle(s)?	Measures burglary of vehicles.	Differentiates motor vehicle-related theft from other types of theft-related crime, which is information not often supplied by data based on police reports (Cantor & Lynch, 2000).
Used your financial information (credit card number, bank account, etc.) without your permission?	Differentiates identity theft from other types of theft-related crime.	Identity theft is information not often supplied by data based on police reports, but is a growingly common crime (Cantor & Lynch, 2000).
In the past 12 months, were any of the following items stolen from you?	Measures the occurrence of robbery.	Ten percent of households reported being victims of theft in 2013(NCVS, 2014). Although homeless individuals tend to have limited possessions, they have a high probability of being victims of theft because they lack a protected space (Fitzpatrick, La Gory, & Ritchey, 1993).
During the past 12 months, has someone....		
Stolen something from you using force?	Measures violent robbery.	Differentiates the victims of violent theft from the victims of non-violent theft (NCVS, 2014). The majority of robbery victims are physically attacked in some way (Block & Skogan, 1986).
Stolen something from you using a weapon?	Measures the occurrence of robbery using a weapon	Theft and threat of theft is considered more serious if a weapon is involved (Lemieux & Felson, 2012; Jensen & Brownfield, 1986).

Physically attacked you?	Measures the occurrence of assault.	
Physically attacked you with a weapon?	Measures the occurrence of assault with a weapon.	The 2012 NCVS found that 5% of respondents were victims of crimes involving weapons (Truman, Langton, & Planty, 2012). Use of a weapon may indicate that the offender intended to do harm (Felson & Messner, 1996).
Threatened to physically harm you?	Measures the occurrence of threatening behavior.	Threats of violence (explicit, implicit, or conditional/coercive) can be predictors of violence in spousal and family relationships (Brewster, 2000). Threats have been shown to be better predictors of future violence than history of victimization. Threats are a risk factor for psychological disorders (Wieclaw et al, 2006).
Threatened to physically harm you using a weapon?	Measures the occurrence of severely threatening behavior.	Assaults and threats are considered more serious if a weapon is involved (Lemieux & Felson, 2012; Jensen & Brownfield, 1986).
Forced you into sexual intercourse?	Measures the occurrence of forcible rape and sexual assault.	Thirteen to 25% of women experience sexual assault or rape during their lifetime, (Elliot, Mok, & Briere, 2004). Homeless women have been shown to have at increased risk of experiencing sexual assault (D’Ercole & Struening, 1990).
Forced you into sexual intercourse using a weapon?	Measures the use of weapons to complete a rape.	Use of weapons is rare in sexual assaults (Elliot, Mok, & Briere, 2004). Other forms of physical violence, verbal threats, and drugs and alcohol tend to be used to coerce victims (Stermac et al, 1998). Weapon type may be irrelevant to offender’s intent (Felson & Messner, 1996).

<p>Forced you into sexual activity (e.g. kissing, fondling, touching)?</p>	<p>Measure occurrence of sexual assault.</p>	<p>Thirteen to 25% of women experience sexual assault or rape during their lifetime (Elliot, Mok, & Briere, 2004).</p>
<p>Forced you into sexual activity (e.g. kissing, fondling, touching) using a weapon?</p>	<p>Measures the use of weapons to complete a sexual assault.</p>	<p>Use of weapons is rare in sexual assaults (Elliot, Mok, & Briere, 2004).</p>
<p>In the past 12 months, did someone make you feel threatened by... Following/spying on you? Calling you on the telephone without your permission? Sending you messages without your permission (letters, e-mails, texts, etc.)? Standing outside your home, school, workplace, etc.? Showing up at the same places you were? Leaving you unwanted items? Making verbal threats? Physically threatening you? Threatening you in another way not mentioned? (please describe)_____</p>	<p>Measures stalking and other threatening forms of interpersonal violence.</p>	<p>Stalking and related crimes have grown in concern. Menacing behaviors have been linked to later sexual assaults, domestic abuse, and murder (Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1999).</p>
<p>Was the person who made you feel threatened your significant other (current or former spouse, partner, girlfriend/boyfriend, etc.)?</p>	<p>Differentiates stranger crime from intimate partner crime</p>	<p>Many incidences of threats and stalking are committed by current or former intimate partners, which places victims at a greater risk of being attacked in the future (Brewster, 2000).</p>
<p>Did you report any threatening behavior to the police?</p>	<p>Used to compare responses to police statistics.</p>	<p>Threats and stalking often involve persons known to the victim (Brewster, 2000). Victims are less likely to report crimes</p>

		involving people that they know, or are non-violence (Lemieux & Felson, 2012; Wong & Van der Schoot, 2012).
In the past 12 months, did anything which you thought was a crime happen to you because of your...	Measures the occurrence of hate crimes.	Bias-motivated, or hate crimes are any crime that is motivated by the offender’s hatred of another’s race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, nationality, or disability (Rayburn, Earleywine, & Davison, 2003). These are differentiated from other crimes as they are considered to have a greater psychological impact than other crimes, and are motivated by different factors than non-bias-motivated crime (Dunbar, 2006).
In the past 12 months, did you do any of the following because you were the victim of a crime?	Measures the occurrence of bias-motivated crime.	Crime victims experience stress disorders that require psychological treatment (McCart, Smith, & Sawyer, 2010). Relatively few victims seek treatment from mental health professional (Jaycox, Marshall, & Schell, 2004; Norris, Kaniasty, & Sheer, 1990). People commonly experience injury and other health problems as the result of crime (Campbell et al., 2002). Crime victims display unique forms of traumatic stress that require various types of medical and psychological treatment (McCart, Smith, & Sawyer, 2010).
How often do you drink an alcoholic beverage?	Used to determine if alcohol is a predictor of being victimized.	Alcohol increases the chances of being victimized by crime (Bender, Thompson, Ferguson, & Langenderfer, 2014).
In the past 12 months, which of the following drugs have you used?	Used to determine if recreational drug use is a predictor of victimization.	Use of drugs has been found to correlate with the likelihood of reporting crime to the police (Thompson, Sitterle, Clay, & Kingree, 2010), and those who

		use illegal drugs are at a greater risk of victimization (Bender, Thompson, Ferguson, & Langenderfer, 2014).
Do you have a permanent residence?	To distinguish homeless respondents from residents.	Permanent residence is a factor that influences the likelihood of crime victimization, as homeless individual experience more crime and various types of crime (Wenzel, Koegel, & Gelberg, 2000). Opportunity theory of crime victimization holds that living situation contributes to the probability of experiencing crime (Fitzpatrick, La Gory, & Ritchey, 1993).
With which gender do you identify?	Measures the demographics of the respondents.	The occurrence and severity of victimization is usually impacted by gender. Women are more likely to be target for crimes such as stalking (Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1999).
In what year were you born?	Measures the demographics of the respondents.	For some crimes, risk of victimization is influenced by age (Asencio, Merrill, & Steiner, 2014).
With which race(s) do you identify?	Measures the demographics of the respondents.	Race is a factor influencing the likelihood of victimization (McCart, Smith, & Sawyer, 2010). Being a visible racial minority increases the risk of bias-motivated crime victimization (Rayburn, Earleywine, & Davison, 2003).
Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?	Measures the ethnicity of the respondents.	Being visibly ethnic increases the risk of bias-motivated crime victimization (Rayburn, Earleywine, & Davison, 2003).
As of today, what is your marital status?	Obtains the demographic information from respondents.	Marital and relationship status has an impact on the risk of victimization for certain crimes (Martin, Taft, & Resick, 2006). Unmarried persons are generally more likely to experience victimization through property

		crime and violent crime (Miethe, Stafford, & Long, 1987).
As of today, what is the highest degree or level of schooling you have completed?	Obtains the demographic information from respondents.	Educational level is positively related to crime victimization, possibly because more educated persons are more likely to recall and report crime on surveys (Tseloni, 2000).
As of today, you are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employed • Self-employed • Unemployed and currently looking for work • Unemployed and not currently looking for work • A student • Retired • Currently serving in the military • Unable to work 	Obtains the demographic information from respondents.	Employment status has been shown to be a factor in contributing the probability being victimized by crime and reporting to the police (Rennison, 2007).
What do you think your total household income will be this year (this includes any earnings, annuities, interest from investments, state or federal assistance, etc.)?	Obtains the demographic information from respondents.	Income is associated with the likelihood of reporting victimization (McCart, Smith, and Sawyer, 2010; Wong & Van der Schoot, 2012)