OCVS Overview and Introductions

• Welcome and introductions
  • ICF and Oregon Criminal Justice Commission collaboration
  • OCVS and potential uses of crime victimization surveys
  • OCVS development overview

• Key methodological issues for consideration
  • Use of “dual-frame” random digit dialing (RDD) approaches
  • Phone-based (RDD/Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing or CATI) versus address-based sampling (ABS)
  • Web-based and mobile data collections, including SMS (i.e., text) and “push-to-web”
Goals of OCVS

• “Hidden figure of crime”
• Public perceptions of safety
• Police interactions
• Victim services
• Represent both Oregon and key groups within the state

Contracting (2019)
Survey development and fielding (2020)
Data finalization and reporting (2021)
Polling Question #1

What knowledge gaps could a victimization survey fill in your work?
Developing the OCVS Methods
Three Major Goals of All Survey Designs

• Goal #1: What to ask
  • Topics
  • Questions

• Goal #2: How to ask it
  • Mode of recruitment and data collection
  • Phone interviews versus mailed questionnaires versus web questionnaires

• Goal #3: How to reach (sample) people to be representative of the population (i.e., Oregon)
Measuring Crime Experiences Among Oregonians

Key questions informed by:

- Extant state victimization surveys and state priorities (including state statutes)
- Oregon National Incident-Based Reporting System (O-IBRS)
- National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS)

Instrument modules:

- Demographic characteristics and informed consent
- Screening questions to determine eligibility
- Non-crime questions related to neighborhood disorder, fear of crime, contact with law enforcement, and the availability and use of victim services
- Index crimes, including physical violence, robbery, burglary, theft, sexual assault, and rape
- Non-index crimes, including physical, mental, and emotional abuse; hate crimes; fraud; phishing; and harassment
- Follow-up questions for select crime victimizations

Approximately 15-minute interview and questionnaire
Crime victimization is a sensitive topic for those who have experienced it.

- Privacy and anonymity get more honest responses.\(^1\)
- All else being equal, self-administration (e.g., a web or paper questionnaire) would be best.

All else is never equal.

- Phone surveys are increasingly expensive and less effective at reaching the entire population.
- Mode must match the sampling frame.
  - ABS: Mail with web response
  - RDD: Phone interview and text-to-web

Mode Choices and Tradeoffs—Reviewing Current Practices

• Comprehensive review of other state-based, probability crime victimization surveys

• Goal to compare multiple methods and modes

• Eight surveys very similar to the intended OCVS design
  • Five used phone only.
  • Three used a combination of modes.
    • One phone and web
    • Two mail and web
Modes Selected for OCVS and Implementation Details

Phone (RDD)
- Six contact attempts
- Final attempt was a text invitation to cell phone numbers
- Offer to call back or provide link to web questionnaire

Web (ABS)
- Invitation letter with $2 incentive and login instructions and QR code (push-to-web)
- Reminder letter to nonrespondents
- Final reminder letter to all nonrespondents

Interviewer Training
- OCVS-specific training manual tailored to the questionnaire protocol and population
- Victim- and trauma-informed module to help prevent and deal with respondent distress
- Frequently asked questions document

Web Questionnaire
- Programmed for both mobile and desktop applications
- Unique PIN so only the same survey respondent can access
Sampling Households to Represent Oregon

• Multi-frame
  • Dual-frame landline and cell phone random digit dialing
    • Landline: Landline only, dual-users (landline and cell)
    • Cell: Cell only, dual-users
    • 75% cell, 25% landline
  • Address-based sample
    • USPS Computerized Delivery Sequence (CDS) File

• Analytic goals
  • Statewide
  • Regions of the state
  • Black and Hispanic populations

Compare RDD versus ABS
✓ Population coverage
✓ Ease of use
✓ Regional stratification
✓ Race/ethnicity oversampling
Stratification and Oversampling for Geographic and Racial/Ethnic Representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oregon Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>1,425,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coast</td>
<td>355,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>804,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>452,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>223,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>345,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Black</td>
<td>55,703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample size targets:
- 400+ per region
- 100+ Black respondents
- 400+ Hispanic respondents

ZIP Codes ≥ 5% Black population
ZIP Codes ≥ 10% Hispanic population
### Exceeded Regional and Overall Sampling Targets

(With Very High Geographic Accuracy in ABS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>2,155 (47%)</td>
<td>1,701 (49%)</td>
<td>454 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coast</td>
<td>471 (10%)</td>
<td>438 (13%)</td>
<td>33 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>737 (16%)</td>
<td>485 (14%)</td>
<td>252 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>568 (12%)</td>
<td>436 (12%)</td>
<td>132 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>559 (12%)</td>
<td>440 (13%)</td>
<td>119 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know/Refused</td>
<td>126 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>126 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,616 (100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,500 (100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,116 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table percentages may not total 100 due to rounding*

**Regional Stratification**
- RDD: Metro 85%, North Coast 70%, Central Valley 73%, South 89%, East 83%
- ABS: Metro 99%, North Coast 96%, Central Valley 98%, South 98%, East 98%

- Far exceeded the target sample sizes in each region.
- As expected, geographic accuracy was better for ABS/Web (but pretty good for RDD/Phone, too).
Narrowly Missed Race/Ethnicity Sample Size Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>394 (9%)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic (NH) White</td>
<td>3,547 (77%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH Black</td>
<td>89 (2%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH Other</td>
<td>410 (9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Missing</td>
<td>176 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4,616 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

- Short of target despite much larger sample size.
- RDD resulted in a higher percentage of Hispanic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>RDD</th>
<th>ABS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>242 (9.3%)</td>
<td>152 (7.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH Black</td>
<td>52 (2.0%)</td>
<td>37 (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,591</td>
<td>2,025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Response Rates (RR) Higher and Cost Lower for ABS/Web

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>RR4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDD/Phone</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS/Web</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDD/Phone</th>
<th>ABS/Web</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer labor</td>
<td>Printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone charges</td>
<td>Postage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailroom labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RDD cost 2x the ABS

- Uses American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) guidance on estimating response rates.¹
- Both RRs are consistent with other surveys conducted using similar methods.
  - RDD response rate consistent with similar surveys: Pew Research finds RRs under 10% since 2013
  - No published studies specific to push-to-web response rates, but most studies range from 15-30%

---

Polling Question #2

What are the biggest obstacles you’ve seen in making crime victimization data more useful for informing practice?
Results...Sample Comparisons on Key Indicators
Educational Attainment of Respondents Compared to Oregon Population

*Results are regionally weighted to make state comparisons to Oregon population.

- Relative to Oregon population (American Community Survey)
  - ABS/Web underrepresents less than high school and high school graduates and overestimates college graduates.
  - RDD/Phone is better, but still underestimates less than high school.
Respondent Age Compared to Oregon Population

• Both ABS/Web and RDD/Phone underrepresents 18–24 and overrepresents 65–74.
• RDD/Phone underrepresents 25–34 and overrepresents 75+.

*Results regionally weighted to make state comparisons to Oregon population
After weighting, some Crime Rates Differed by Mode...Others Did Not

- Weighted estimates of crime victimization with 95% confidence intervals
- Significant differences for four out of eight estimates
  - RDD/Phone higher for aggravated assault and robbery
  - ABS/Web higher for burglary and car theft

* p < .05; ** p < .01
Mode Differences can be “Adjusted Out” of Final Statistics

• Mode differences are due to two things:
  • Some people are more likely to respond to one mode over another.
  • People respond differently due to the mode they are given.

• With no clear gold standard, what is the best “gold standard” for adjustment?
  • ABS/Web has higher overall response but is limited to internet users.
  • RDD/Phone seems to reach lower education populations, but overall has a low response.

• **Combining** RDD/Phone and ABS/Web instead of adjusting to one or the other may provide the best estimate.
No Substantial Difference in Break-Offs and Hang-Ups by Mode

- Sensitive questions could cause people to stop responding (i.e., hang up the phone or close the web survey).

- We didn’t see that.
  - Very similar break-off and hang-up rates in each mode
  - Slightly more hang-ups during phone consent (2.5% versus 0.7% in web) and in crime follow-up questions in web (3.3% versus 0.9% on phone)
  - No difference by geography

- Vast majority of nonresponse happens before starting the interview or questionnaire.
RDD (cell phone sample) nonrespondents texted and asked if they want a callback or a link to the web survey.
  • Last attempt

Overall success.
  • 7% of the respondents overall (13% of RDD respondents, n = 316) completed the web questionnaire after being texted.
  • Reduced phone cost per complete by 11%.
  • Only 15 respondents asked for a callback.

Vast majority of nonresponse happens before starting the interview or questionnaire.
Implications...What’s Next for Research, Practice, and Policy?
Lessons Learned From OCVS Data Collection

• Surveying the general population on sensitive crime victimization experiences topics isn’t just possible, it’s productive.

• Out of more than 2,000 interviews, there were only two reported "adverse events," but neither ended up causing psychological distress.

• ABS sampling (with a web questionnaire) was more cost-effective and produced a higher response rate.
  • RDD (with phone interview and texting) represented some education levels better than ABS.
  • Weighting can adjust for limitations of individual sampling frames/modes and differences between them.
Recommendations for Designing and Implementing a Crime Victimization Survey

• Consult survey methodology and statistical experts.
  • Design of contact materials and instrument(s) reduces (or increases) nonresponse.

• Work with a survey research center or company that has capacity for the work and expertise conducting surveys on sensitive topics.

• Use ABS…but consider supplemental RDD sampling and phone interviews.
  • Evaluate ABS and RDD weaknesses in your own state, city, or population.
  • Experiment with multiple modes to maximize the overall response and representativeness.

• Use text messaging with an invitation to a web questionnaire as (at least) a final attempt in RDD/Phone surveys.
Next Steps in Oregon

• First report: crime estimates
  • Of all 18+ Oregonians over the prior year:
    • 14% reported experiencing a person crime
    • 24% reported experiencing a property crime

• Some key groups tended to experience higher victimization:
  • Native American, Black, homosexual, bisexual, Metro region residents, and younger Oregonians, respectively
  • Challenging to address intersectionality

• Potential timeline/funding for second survey
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