Supporting Statement
For OMB Information Collection Request

Part A

OMB# 0920-0822

4/16/2013

The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS)

Supported by:

Department of Health and Human Services
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
National Center for Injury Prevention and Control
Division of Violence Prevention

Project Officer:
Mikel L. Walters, PhD
Behavioral Scientist
Contact Information:
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
National Center for Injury Prevention and Control
4770 Buford Highway NE MS F-64
Atlanta, GA 30341-3724
phone: 770-488-1361
fax: 770-488-4349
email: wai6@cdc.gov

CONTENTS

List of Tables

List of Attachments

Abstract

CDC proposes an additional 3 years of data collection for this revision request, which is currently approved under OMB# 0920-0822 – expiration date: 11/30/2013. The proposed revision to the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) involves testing a newly revised data collection instrument during the calendar year of 2013. The changes to the instrument are twofold: first, the current NISVS survey instrument has been shortened in efforts to reduce the burden on respondents and to develop a core instrument that will be administered on an annual basis. Second, topic specific modules contain questions to produce data that are needed on a regular basis but are not needed annually. Since CDC is proposing to pilot test the newly revised instrument for the first year of data collection and to not produce national prevalence rates or publish these findings, the number of respondents surveyed is less than in previous years. After the first year pilot test is complete, the instrument will be adopted and an OMB revision request will be submitted with the final instrument. If the revision is granted, the final instrument will be used to collect data for publication for the remaining two years of OMB approval.

The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) is an ongoing, nationally representative random digit dial telephone survey that collects information about experiences of sexual violence, stalking and intimate partner violence among non-institutionalized English and Spanish speaking women and men aged 18 or older in the United States. NISVS provides detailed information on the magnitude and characteristics of these forms of violence for the nation and for individual states.

.

A. JUSTIFICATION

A.1. Circumstances Making the Collection of Information Necessary

This is a revision request for the currently approved National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (0920-0822) expiration date 11/30/2013.

Background

Intimate partner violence (IPV), sexual violence (SV), and stalking endanger the health and well-being of women and men across the United States. As described below, more than two decades of research demonstrate that IPV, SV, and stalking are major public health problems with serious long-term health consequences and significant social and public health costs (Basile, Black, Simon, Arias, Brener & Saltzman, 2006; Black and Breiding, 2008; Breiding, Black, & Ryan, 2008; CDC, 2003; Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998). Extensive literature provides evidence indicating IPV, SV, and stalking substantially contribute to negative mental health outcomes, including depression, chronic mental illness, and post-traumatic stress disorder (e.g., Breiding, Black, & Ryan, 2008, Bonomi, Thompson, Anderson, Reid, Carrell, et al., 2006; Vos, Astbury, Piers, Magnus, Heenan, et al., 2006).

Intimate Partner Violence IPV is violence committed by a spouse, ex-spouse, current or former boyfriend or girlfriend; includes physical violence, sexual violence, and emotional abuse and has an estimated annual cost of $5.8 billion for medical care and lost productivity (National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, 2003). Both men and women are victims of IPV; it can occur among heterosexual and same-sex couples. In 2011, the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) estimated that 1 in 3 women and 1 in 4 men reported experiencing IPV (rape, physical violence and/or stalking) during their lifetime (Black, Basile, Breiding, Smith, Walters, Merrick, Chen & Stevens, 2011). This translates into approximately 42.4 million women and 32.2 million men who experienced rape, physical violence and/or stalking by an intimate partner during their lifetime in the United States. In addition, approximately 7 million women and 5.7 million men experienced these types of violence by an intimate partner within the 12 months prior to the survey.

Both women and men have increased risk for long term health problems (Black and Breiding, 2008). However, women are much more likely than men to suffer physical injuries or psychological trauma from IPV (Brush 1990; Gelles, 1997). Women are also significantly more likely than men to be killed by an intimate partner (Puzone et al. 2000).

Studies have also shown that abused women experience more physical and functional health problems and have a higher occurrence of depression, drug and alcohol abuse, and suicide attempts than do women who are not abused (Campbell, et al., 1995; Golding, 1996; Kaslow et al., 1998; Kessler et al., 1994; Krug et al., 2002). Psychological consequences include posttraumatic stress disorder, depression, substance abuse, and suicidal behaviors and ideation (Caetano and Cunradi 2003; Campbell 2002; Coker et al. 2000; Kaslow et al. 1998, 2002; Koss et al. 2003; Mechanic et al. 2000.)

Sexual Violence SV has a profound and long-term impact on the physical and mental health of the victim. In addition to injury, SV is associated with an immediate and long term increased risk of sexual and reproductive problems (Krug et al., 2002.) The annual cost of rape committed by intimate partners alone exceeds $319 million (Max, Rice, Finkelstein, Bardwell, & Leadbetter, 2004). According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, rape is one of the most underreported crimes (Bachar and Koss, 2001), due in large part to the high level of social stigma and shame associated with rape. Approximately 84% of rapes and sexual assaults are not reported to police (Kilpatrick et al., 1992).

Stalking In 2010, The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey found that 16.2% of women and 5.2% of men in the United States had experienced stalking during their lifetime in which they felt very fearful or believe that they or someone close to them would be harmed or killed (Black, et al., 2011). This translates into approximately 19.3 million women and 5.8 million men in the United States.

Stalking can result in severe and even fatal outcomes for victims because it often co-occurs with other kinds of partner violence; 81% of women who were stalked by a current or former intimate partner were also physically assaulted by that partner and 31% were sexually assaulted by that partner (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Evidence also suggests that women who are stalked by ex-partners may be at high risk for being killed (Crowell and Burgess, 1996). The estimated economic cost of stalking of women in 1995 was $342 million (Max, et al., 2004). Adjusted for inflation, this cost was $438 million in 2005 (Sahr, 2006).

The need for an ongoing surveillance system is evident in the fact that prior to NISVS the lack of regular, ongoing surveillance, using uniform definitions and consistent survey methods over time has made it nearly impossible to evaluate trends in IPV, SV, and stalking. The lack of comparable state-specific prevalence data has limited the ability of national and state public health officials to measure the impact of IPV, SV, and stalking in individual states. Improved surveillance helps guide the most effective use of limited prevention resources. More detailed and frequent information informs intervention and prevention strategies at both the national and state levels.

Documenting and monitoring the incidence and prevalence of IPV, SV, and stalking is critical to improving the health status of individuals, making communities safer, and reducing the social and healthcare costs currently burdening state and federal governments and programs. NISVS data helps inform public policies and prevention strategies and helps to guide and evaluate progress towards reducing the substantial health and social burden associated with IPV, SV, and stalking.

The CDC is the lead federal agency for public health objectives related to injury and violence. The *Healthy People 2020* report (U.S. DHHS, 2010) lists several objectives that pertain directly to IPV, SV, and stalking. Applicable objectives include objectives IVP39: "reduce the rate of physical assault by current or former intimate partners"; "reduce sexual violence by a current or former intimate partner"; "reduce psychological violence by a current or former intimate partner"; "reduce stalking by a current or former intimate partner." Also applicable are objective IPV40 "reduce the annual rate of rape or attempted rape"; "reduce sexual assault other than

rape." The legal justification/legislative authority for this survey may be found in Section 301 of the Public Health Service Act (42 USC 241) in Attachment A.

1.1 Privacy Impact Assessment

(i) Overview of Data Collection System

The CDC's NCIPC, in collaboration with National Institute of Justice and Department of Defense developed the NISVS in 2009 and it was implemented in 2010. The survey has been conducted annually by RTI International since 2010. The sample is selected using a random digit dialing (RDD) landline and cell phone survey of English and/or Spanish speaking female and male adults (18 years and older) living in the United States. NISVS provides population-based prevalence estimates at the national and state level for IPV, SV, and stalking victimization.

In 2010 16,507 interviews were conducted. In 2011, 12,500 interviews were conducted and in 2012, a total of 11,500 were conducted. Public use data sets will be archived and made accessible to state and national researchers and practitioners. Unidentifiable information contained in these files will be maintained for use in the foreseeable future.

(ii) Items of Information to be Collected

Information is collected in a one-time anonymous random digit dialed telephone interview (Attachment G). Questions are asked about all forms of IPV victimization (including physical aggression, and sexual violence); all forms of SV victimization by any perpetrator (including unwanted sexual situations, abusive sexual contact, and forced/nonconsensual sex [completed and attempted]); and stalking victimization by any perpetrator. NISVS gathers information regarding experiences that occurred across respondents' lifespan and in the 12 months preceding the survey.

An improved measure of the impact of violence is also included. For example, questions are included regarding the level of fear, perceived risk of harm, the respondent's well being, injuries, and services used (police, shelter, medical care).

In addition, health related questions and demographic questions are asked (including race/ethnicity, income, and age).

A financial incentive of $10 is offered to respondents to participate in the study. In an effort to increase the response rate and to reduce the potential for nonresponse bias, a nonresponse phase has been incorporated in the NISVS design. A subsample of the nonrespondents is selected and offered an incentive of $40. If respondents chose to receive the financial incentive, then personal identifying information including name and address is collected. If a respondent wishes to donate the financial incentive offered, then personal identifying information is not collected.

Although personal identifiable information is collected, the data is stored in a separate data base and is not transmitted to CDC. As outlined in the Privacy Act Checklist (Attachment J), the incentive PII is stored in the database no more than 24 hours. All incentive PII collected during the day is deleted nightly from the database after it is entered into an Excel file for incentive processing (printing and mailing the check). There is no case ID in the incentive file. Incentives files are processed once a week (for printing and mailing). The Excel incentive files are saved for approximately 2 months after the end of data collection year to allow for RTI to respond to inquiries from respondents about the status of their check.

A.2. Purpose and Use of Information Collection

The specific aims of NISVS are to collect consistent and reliable data on the incidence, prevalence, and nature of IPV, SV, and stalking at the state and national level among U.S. women and men on a annual basis. These data are currently being used by CDC, the National Institute of Justice and the Department of Defense to understand the prevalence of these types of violence in the general population as well as in the American Indian/Alaska Native population and the military population. Developing a public use data set to promote the use of these data by researchers is underway.

Ongoing surveillance is critical in the further development of prevention and intervention programs to reduce the prevalence and incidence of IPV, SV, and stalking. Stable and precise annual prevalence estimates were produced at the national level in 2011 from the 2010 data. Stable and precise state-level prevalence estimates were also produced in 2011 using the 2010 data and will be available in subsequent years as interviews accrue over time. Currently, for the vast majority of states, the data provided by NISVS is the only population-based information regarding the prevalence of IPV, SV, or stalking.

The need for an ongoing surveillance system is reflected in the fact that prior to NISVS the lack of regular, ongoing surveillance, using uniform definitions and consistent survey methods over time has made it nearly impossible to evaluate trends in IPV, SV, and stalking. The lack of comparable state-specific prevalence data has limited the ability of national and state public health officials to measure the impact of IPV, SV, and stalking in individual states. Improved surveillance helps guide the most effective use of limited prevention resources. More detailed and frequent information informs intervention and prevention strategies at both the national and state levels.

Documenting and monitoring the incidence and prevalence of IPV, SV, and stalking is a critical first step to improving the health status of individuals, making communities safer, and reducing the social and healthcare costs currently burdening state and federal governments and programs. NISVS data helps inform public policies and prevention strategies and helps to guide and evaluate progress towards reducing the substantial health and social burden associated with IPV, SV, and stalking.

2.1 Privacy Impact Assessment

Provide the following:
1. A description of how the information will be shared and for what purpose
The specific aims of NISVS are to generate consistent and reliable data on the incidence, prevalence, and nature of IPV, SV, and stalking at the state and national level among U.S. women and men. These data are currently being used by CDC, the National Institute of Justice and the Department of Defense to understand the prevalence of these types of violence in the general population as well as in the American Indian/Alaska Native population and the military population. Developing a public use data set to promote the use of these data by researchers is underway.

These data are used by State Health Departments, State Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Coalitions to influence and inform policy and practice in their states. Also Researchers and providers across the country are utilizing the much needed data that this surveillance system provides. In the coming years, NISVS will also provide the critical trend data that have not until recently been available and are essential to design and evaluate prevention efforts.

2. A statement detailing the impact the proposed collection will have on the respondent's privacy
At no time does CDC have access to or receive potentially identifiable information. During data collection, the contractor collects names and addresses of those respondents who wish to be mailed a promised $10.00 or $40.00 incentive. At no time is this information linked or linkable to survey information. Only limited demographic information is requested (e.g., race, zip code, year of birth). Once the interview is completed, the telephone number is eliminated from the database in an overnight batch process.

All data are maintained in a secure manner throughout the data collection and data processing phases. Only RTI International personnel who are conducting the study and have a study-specific need to know have access to the temporary information that could potentially be used to identify a respondent (i.e., the telephone number and address), and all project staff have signed the RTI International confidentiality agreement (Attachment H). While under review, data resides on directories that only the project director can give permission to access. All computers reside in a building with electronic security and are ID and password protected.
Upon completion of the survey, respondents may choose to receive a $10 check or to have a similar contribution sent to the United Way. In 2011, 54.29% of respondents chose to make a contribution to the United Way rather than receive the offered incentive (unpublished data). This finding suggests that some people are motivated to participate by financial gains and others are motivated by altruism. If the respondent chooses to receive the incentive, then their name and address is collected upon survey completion and stored in the data base for no more than 24 hours. Names and addresses are added to an Excel file on a nightly basis. Information in this file is used to create and mail incentive checks to those respondents wishing to receive them. The Excel file with respondents name and address is deleted approximately two months after the end of data collection year to allow for the contractor to respond to inquiries from respondents about the status of their check. The respondent is informed that this information is being collected for the sole purpose of sending the incentive and that it will not be stored with their survey responses. If the respondent is not comfortable giving this information to the interviewer, the interviewer then offers to have the respondent give the information to the interviewer's

supervisor. If the interviewer thinks that further reassurance is needed, she can offer that her supervisor will not know how the respondent answered any of the questions. If the respondent is still not comfortable with giving their contact information to a call center supervisor, the interviewer will offer to transfer the respondent to a voice mail box to leave their information. The toll-free project hotline number is also offered to respondents so they can call if they had problems leaving their information. In addition to these options, offering to contribute to the United Way provides an alternate option for respondents who do not wish to provide the information needed to mail the promised incentive.

A.3. Use of Improved Information Technology and Burden Reduction

All interviews are conducted over the telephone, using computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) software. The use of CATI reduces respondent burden, reduce coding errors, and increase efficiency and data quality. The CATI program involves a computer-based sample management and reporting system that incorporates sample information, creates an automatic record of all dialings, tracks the outcome of each interviewing attempt, documents sources of ineligibility, records the reasons for refusals, and locates mid-questionnaire termination.

The CATI system also includes the actual interview program (including the question text, response options, interviewer instructions, and interviewer probes). The CATI's data quality and control program includes skip patterns, rotations, range checks and other on-line consistency checks and procedures during the interview, assuring that only relevant and applicable questions are asked of each respondent. Data collection and data entry occur simultaneously with the CATI data entry system. The quality of the data is also improved because the CATI system automatically detects errors and ensures that there is no variation in the order in which questions are asked. Data can be extracted and analyzed using existing statistical packages directly from the system, which significantly decreases the amount of time required to process, analyze, and report the data.

A.4. Efforts to Identify Duplication and Use of Similar Information

To ensure that NISVS was not duplicating the efforts of others, CDC consulted with other federal agencies (e.g., National Institute of Justice, Department of Defense) and other leading experts and stakeholders in the fields of IPV, SV, and stalking. NCIPC convened a workshop "Building Data Systems for Monitoring and Responding to Violence Against Women" (CDC, 2000). Recommendations provided by those in attendance are reflected in the design of NISVS.

As discussed in the Data Systems workshop, surveys that ask behaviorally specific questions that are couched in a public health context have much higher levels of disclosure than those couched within a crime context (as in the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics). In addition, NISVS increases disclosure through the use of multiple behaviorally specific questions (e.g., not asking about rape, but asking about unwanted or forced sex). NISVS also gathers much more detailed information (compared to the NCVS or other surveys) on the full range of: intimate partner violence, , physical violence, sexual violence and stalking; sexual violence, including non touch, touch, forced sex, coercive sex, and alcohol or

drug facilitated sex; and stalking behaviors, including technology assisted stalking (e.g., cell phone, Face Book). Information is also gathered with respect to frequency, time frame, relationship to perpetrator(s), patterns of abuse, impact of abuse, and service use.

Prior to NISVS, the most recent national health survey on IPV, SV, and stalking (National Violence Against Women Survey) was completed in 1995, more than a decade ago (Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998). Prior to NVAWS, there had been no similar national health surveys with a specific focus on IPV, SV, and stalking (which are also the types of outcomes that are least likely to be disclosed in crime surveys).

Although the BRFSS included optional IPV and SV modules in 2005, 2006, and 2007, fewer than half of the states administered the module during any one year. Furthermore, the information collected in the optional modules was limited to a small number of relatively simple IPV (n= 7) and SV (n=8) questions and limited to physical and sexual violence. Because of time constraints, there was no information collected on stalking or psychological abuse by an intimate partner. In addition, there was only one question that provided information on the impact of the violence that occurred - "were you injured during the most recent event?"

The BRFSS SV and IPV modules have provided useful, albeit limited, information to participating states regarding their prevalence of IPV and SV. Because consistent survey methods were used, participating states were able to make comparisons between their state and other states that administered the module (Breiding, Black, & Ryan, 2008). Except for NISVS, no other consistently collected state level data using similar questions and survey methods currently exist. An additional concern is that neither all states nor a statistically representative set of states collected IPV or SV data during the years that funding was available (2005, 2006, and 2007). Only three states have SV data across all three years and only five states have IPV data across all three years in which the optional module was offered. Because financial support from the Division of Violence Prevention no longer exists for the optional modules, few (if any) states continue to collect data IPV or SV data. Thus, the BRFSS does not provide national estimates of IPV or SV. Furthermore, to adequately monitor and evaluate trends, data must be collected more frequently, across all states, using consistent surveillance methods.

Because NISVS has been designed from the public health perspective and because it has multiple behaviorally specific questions on a wide range of intimate partner, sexual violence and stalking outcomes, it provides more accurate and frequent information at the state and national level. NISVS provides more data than are currently available at any level regarding the prevalence and incidence of IPV, SV, and stalking victimization.

A.5. Impact on Small Businesses or Other Small Entities

No small businesses will be involved in this data collection.

A.6. Consequences of Collecting the Information Less Frequently

Although NISVS is an ongoing surveillance system, the survey is a one-time request for individual respondents. The likelihood is extremely small (less than one in a million) that respondents will be included in more than one randomly selected sampling pool across the years of the surveillance system.

The need for an ongoing surveillance system is reflected in the fact that prior to NISVS the lack of regular, ongoing surveillance, using uniform definitions and consistent survey methods over time has made it nearly impossible to evaluate trends in IPV, SV, and stalking. The lack of comparable state-specific prevalence data has limited the ability of national and state public health officials to measure the impact of IPV, SV, and stalking in individual states. Improved surveillance helps guide the most effective use of limited prevention resources. More detailed and frequent information informs intervention and prevention strategies at both the national and state levels.

There are several consequences of not collecting NISVS data on an annual basis. First, there would not be timely national level data on the national prevalence of IPV, SV and stalking. Second, the ability to evaluate the effectiveness of prevention programs on a national scale directed at the prevention of these types of violence would be lost. Finally, the lack of a national surveillance system that collects these types of data and track trends over time would impede our ability to understand the magnitude of the problem or determine the impact these types of violence have on other health outcomes.

A.7. Special Circumstances Relating to the Guidelines of 5 CFR 1320.5

The request fully complies with the regulation 5 CFR 1320.5.

A.8. Comments in Response to the Federal Register Notice and Efforts to Consult Outside the Agency

A.8.a)

A 60-day Federal Register Notice was published in the *Federal Register* on December 19, 2012, vol. 77 No. 244, pp. 75165-75166 (Attachment B). One non-substantive public comment was received during this review time (Attachment C) and the standard CDC response was sent.

A.8.b)

CDC participates in a monthly conference call involving federal researchers involved in the study of violence against women (documentation included in Attachment D).

In 2008, staff within the Departments of Justice and Defense served as technical reviewers for the proposals submitted in response to CDC's Funding Opportunity Announcement for NISVS. As part of the review team, they participated in the selection of the contractor to do the work and approved the proposed statement of work. DOJ and DoD were also integrally involved in the design of the interview instrument as described below (and see interagency agreement included

in Attachment D). As described in Section A.4, CDC worked closely with DoD, NIJ, and other federal agencies in the development of the survey (NISVS). Documentation providing an example of the consultations between CDC, DoD, and DOJ/NIJ regarding NISVS is also included in Attachment D. In addition, CDC staff remains engaged in ongoing discussions with Federal colleagues from NIJ and DOD related to the analysis of 2010 special population data from American Indian/Alaska Natives and military personnel.

NISVS Expert Panel. As mentioned in Section A.4 and A.8, NCIPC invited a panel of experts to attend a meeting in November 2007 to discuss preliminary findings from the 2007 methodological study and to discuss the planned directions for NISVS. The review panel consisted of federal and non-federal subject matter experts with expertise in IPV, SV, and stalking. The following individuals participated in the meeting and provided input to the redevelopment of the survey during monthly conference calls in 2008.

Dr. Antonia (Toni) Abbey
Professor, Psychology Department
Wayne State University
55 Woodward Ave
Detroit, MI 48202
Phone : 313-577-6686
Fax : 313-577-7636
Email : Aabbey@wayne.edu

Mr. Bernard Auchter, M.S.W.
Senior Social Science Analyst and Acting Chief of the Violence and Victimization Research Division
National Institute of Justice
810 Seventh Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20531
Phone: 202-307-0154
Fax: 202-616-0275
Email: Bernie.Auchter@USDOJ.GOV

Dr. Elaine Cassidy
Program Officer, Research & Evaluation
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
Route 1 and College Road East
Princeton, NJ 08543
Phone: 609-627-7611
Fax: 609-514-5531
Email: ecassidy@rwjf.org

Dr. Sarah Cook
Associate Professor and Director of Undergraduate Studies Department of Psychology
P.O. Box 5010
Georgia State University

Atlanta, GA 30302-5010
Phone: 404- 413-6265
Fax: 404- 413-6207
Email: Scook@gsu.edu
Email: psyslc@langate.gsu.edu
Dr. Walter Dekeseredy
Director of the Observatory on Sustainable Cities and Urban Communities and Professor of Criminology, Justice and Policy
University of Ontario Institute of Technology
132 Bassett Blvd.
Whitby, Ontario,
Canada, L1N 8X5
Phone: 905-666-7774
Fax: 905-721-3372
Email: Walter.dekeseredy@uoit.ca

Dr. Diane Follingstad
Women's Circle Endowed Chair and Professor in the Center for Research on Violence against Women
Department of Psychiatry University of Kentucky College of Medicine
3470 Blazer Pkwy
Lexington, KY 40509
Phone (859) 323-5281
Email: dfollingstad@uky.edu

Dr. Sherry L. Hamby
Research Associate Professor, Department of Psychology
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
12780 Stratford Drive
Laurinburg, NC 28352-2044
Phone: 910-276-7298
Email: sherry.hamby@unc.edu

Mr. David Lloyd , J.D.
Director, Family Advocacy Program
ODUSD (P&R/MC&FP)
4000 Defense Pentagon, Room 5A726
Washington, DC 20301-4000
Phone: 703)602-4990 ext. 2
Fax: 703)-602-4977
Email: david.lloyd@osd.mil

Ms. Rebecca Odor, M.S.W.
Director of Sexual & Domestic Violence Prevention
Division of Injury and Violence Prevention
Virginia Department of Health
109 Governor St. #815G
Richmond, VA 23219
Phone: 804-864-7740
Fax: 804-864-7748
Email: Becky.odor@vdh.virginia.gov

Dr. K. Dan O'Leary
Distinguished Professor of Psychology
SUNY-Stoney Brook University
236 Christian Avenue
Stony Brook, NY 11790
Phone: 631-632-7852
Email: doleary@notes.cc.sunysb.edu

Dr. Angela Moore-Parmley
Associate Deputy Director for Research and Evaluation
National Institute of Justice
810 7th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20531
Phone: 202-307-0145
Fax: 202-354-4191
Email: angela.moore.parmley@usdoj.gov

Dr. Brian Spitzberg
Professor, School of Communication
San Diego State University
5500 Campanile Drive
San Diego, CA 92182-4560
Phone: 619-594-7097
Email: spitz@mail.sdsu.edu

The contractor, RTI, also sought input through a subcontract with one of the leading researchers in the field - Jacquelyn Campbell, Ph.D., R.N., F.A.A.N.

Dr. Jacquelyn Campbell, Ph.D., R.N., F.A.A.N.
Anna D. Wolf Chair
Professor and Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs
Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing
The Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing
525 N. Wolfe St. RM 436
Baltimore, MD 21205-2110
Phone: 410-955-2778
FAX: 410-614-8285
email: jcampbel@son.jhmi.edu

Numerous presentations were made in 2008, 2009 and 2010 to vet the proposed NISVS among a range of interested stakeholders, including victim advocates, family advocacy programs, Title IX Task Force authorized under the 2005 VAWA, and a number of other conferences and public meetings.

In 2011, prior to the release of the first summary report, several federal agencies and partners were briefed on the initial findings of the survey. These agencies include Administration of Children and Families, Office of the Vice President, and the Office of Violence Against Women in Department of Justice.

A.9. Explanation of Any Payment or Gift to Respondents

A wide variety of research has shown that incentives improve response rates (Armstrong, 1975; Yu and Cooper, 1983; Church, 1993; Singer, 2002; Cantor, O'Hare, and O'Connor, 2007). Incentives can help gain cooperation through fewer calls, which can help make their use cost effective. Additionally, studies have shown that modest incentives are not coercive (Singer & Bossarte, 2006).Thus, implementing an incentive plan can be a cost effective way for surveys to improve response rates and lower refusal rates, and could, over the course of data collection, actually reduce costs and burden to respondents by reducing the need for additional calls to potential respondents.

Increasing the response rate also increase the likelihood that information provided by survey participants are representative of the sample and maximize the utility of all information provided by study participants. However, it is most cost effective for survey researchers to offer the lowest possible amount for incentive payments to respondents while still achieving the "boost" to response rates. Following a protocol similar to the IRB and OMB approved National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) (OMB # 0920-0724); respondents were offered a $10 incentive for completing the interview. The study offered either a $10 or a $20 incentive (as randomly assigned). The study demonstrated a 2% increase in response rates using a $20 incentive. However, a $10 incentive is offered because the boost in the study was slight and because of budgetary constraints. However, to further increase the response rate and to reduce the potential for nonresponse bias, a nonresponse phase has been incorporated in the NISVS design. A subsample of the nonrespondents is selected and offered an incentive of $40. The nonresponse phase is described in more detail in section B.3.c.

A.10. Assurance of Confidentiality Provided to Respondents

At no time does CDC have access to or receive potentially identifiable information. During data collection, the contractor collects names and addresses of those respondents who wish to be mailed a promised $10.00 or $40.00 incentive. At no time is this information linked or linkable to survey information. Only limited demographic information is requested (e.g., race, zip code, year of birth). Once the interview is completed, the telephone number is eliminated from the database in an overnight batch process.

The data are collected anonymously. The measures used to insure confidentiality in the approved IRB protocol (Attachment F) closely follows the IRB and OMB approved National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) (OMB # 0920-0724). The CDC Privacy Act Officer reviewed the NISVS Pilot OMB application and determined that the Privacy Act was not applicable.

<u>IRB Approval</u>

The CDC/NCIPC Human Subject Contact has determined that CDC is not engaged in this study Local IRB approval has been obtained through the study contractor, Research Triangle International (RTI). CDC will not have contact with study participants, nor will CDC have access to PII. See Attachment F for a copy of the local IRB approval letter.

10.1 Privacy Impact Assessment Information

1. Informing Respondents of the Voluntary Nature of Survey Participation

During the verbal informed consent process and throughout the interviews the respondents are informed that their participation is completely voluntary and reminded that they can stop the interview at any time. They are also informed and reminded that they can skip any question that they do not want to answer (for example pp. 7, 15, 36, Attachment G).

2. Opportunities to consent, if any, to sharing and submission of information

Following recommended guidelines (Sullivan & Cain, 2004; WHO, 2001) a graduates verbal informed consent protocol is used. Specifically, to ensure respondent safety and privacy, the initial person who answers the telephone is provided general non-specific information about the survey topic. The specific topic of the survey is only revealed to the individual respondent selected. After a single adult respondent in the household is randomly selected to participate, the interviewer administers the IRB-approved verbal informed consent, which provides information on the voluntary and confidential nature of the survey, the benefits and risks of participation, the survey topic and the telephone numbers to speak with staff from the CDC or project staff from RTI (Attachment G, page 8). Potential respondents are informed 1) of the purpose for the data collection; 2) that their data will be treated in a secure manner and will not be disclosed; and 3) that all information collected will be pooled with responses from other participants. Literature regarding the ethical and safe collection of research data on IPV offers many reasons for obtaining verbal informed consent in a graduated manner (WHO, 1993; Sullivan & Cain, 2004). In addition to safety and ethical considerations, a graduated consent process allows the interviewer to build rapport and increases the likelihood of gaining the participant's trust, the key to minimizing non-participation and under-reporting. Carefully conducted studies with well-trained interviewers who are able to build rapport and trust with potential participants are essential both to the collection of valid data and the well-being of respondents.

3. How the information is secured

All data are maintained in a secure manner throughout the data collection and data processing phases. Only RTI International personnel, who are conducting the study, have study-specific access to the temporary information that could potentially be used to identify a respondent (i.e., the telephone number and address). All project staff have signed the RTI International confidentiality agreement (Attachment H). While under review, data resides on directories that only the project director can give permission to access. All computers reside in a building with electronic security and are ID and password protected.

Although some sensitive questions on social behaviors and victimization are asked using a RDD telephone survey, respondents' first name or initials only are used for the interview process. The name "resident" is used to send the advanced informational letter prior to the interview and the incentive check is addressed as the respondent specifies after his/her participation. To maximize human subject protection, the letter has been carefully written to provide only general information about the survey. The lack of detailed study information in the advance letter is intentional for the protection of the prospective study participant. If the prospective study

participant is in a relationship where IPV is present, we do not want the advance letter to raise suspicion or incite potential perpetrators.

Upon completion of the survey, respondents may choose to receive a $10 check or to have a similar contribution sent to the United Way. In 2011, 54.29% of respondents chose to make a contribution to the United Way rather than receive the offered incentive (unpublished data). This finding suggests that some people are motivated to participate by financial gains and others are motivated by altruism. If the respondent does choose to receive the incentive, it is to their specified mailing address. Following survey completion, the interviewer asks for the respondent's name and mailing address. The respondent is informed that this information is being collected for the sole purpose of sending the incentive and that it will not be stored with their survey responses. If the respondent is not comfortable giving this information to the interviewer, the interviewer then offers to have the respondent give the information to her supervisor. If the interviewer thinks that further reassurance is needed, she can offer that her supervisor will not know how the respondent answered any of the questions. If the respondent is still not comfortable with giving their contact information to a call center supervisor, the interviewer will offer to transfer the respondent to a voice mail box to leave their information. The toll-free project hotline number is also offered to respondents so they can call if they experience problems leaving their information. In addition to these options, offering to contribute to the United Way provides an alternate option for respondents who do not wish to provide the information needed to mail the promised incentive.

The mailing contact information is initially recorded in the case management database, a database separate from the survey data. The phone number, address, and name information are subsequently removed from the database during an overnight batch process. By utilizing a two step process, identifying information that is potentially linkable is removed quickly and respondent privacy is maintained.

RTI International has procedures in place to protect against data loss and down time in the event of equipment failure. These include regularly scheduled back up of data, redundant services in case of server failure, and uninterruptible power supplies to bridge a temporary loss of power. Under normal operating conditions, a complete backup of all files on every disk are written to tape weekly. Every business day, a differential backup is performed of all files created or modified since the last complete backup. In the event of a hardware or software failure, files can be restored to their status as of the time of the last differential backup, usually the evening of the previous business day. Tapes from complete backups are kept for approximately 3 months. Tapes or CD-R drives are used for long-term data archiving.

Several additional measures have been implemented to ensure data security. The address files used to send the letters of introduction are destroyed as soon as the letters are mailed. The CATI system includes a compartmentalized data structure, in which personally identifying information are maintained separately from the actual questionnaire responses. Once an individual has completed his/her survey, all identifying information including first name, and telephone number are transferred to an Excel file, stripped from the data files and destroyed in an overnight batch

process. These measures safeguard the privacy of participants – once their interview has been completed, it does not have any personal identifiers.

Before any data are released (e.g. in disseminated reports), all demographic information that could potentially lead to identification of an individual are stripped and the information destroyed. The database is configured so that it is not possible to retrieve individual responses or potentially identifying information.

4. System of records is being created under the privacy act.

No system of records is being created under the privacy act. The original OMB submission was reviewed by ICRO in 2009, who determined that the Privacy Act does not apply.

A.11. Justification for Sensitive Questions

Because very few people report IPV, SV, or stalking to officials and very few injuries are reported to health care providers, survey data provide the best source of information regarding the prevalence of IPV, SV, and stalking. Until recently, questions about IPV, SV, and stalking were considered by some to be "too sensitive" to ask in an RDD telephone survey. However, CDC evaluated respondent reactions to questions about violence in three large telephone surveys: 1) National and State Surveys on Violence Against Women and the Evaluation of Measurement Tools for IPV (OMB # 0990-0115); 2) Injury Control and Risk Survey (ICARIS-2 Phase 2) (OMB # 0920-0513); and 3) National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) (OMB # 0920-0724).

In all three surveys, results consistently demonstrated that the vast majority of telephone survey respondents: 1) believe that an RDD telephone survey should ask questions about interpersonal violence; 2) are willing to answer such questions during a telephone interview; and 3) are not upset or afraid as a result of being asked about their experiences with violence (Black, Kresnow, Simon, Arias and Shelley, 2006).

In all three surveys, it was consistently found that between 88.0% and 98.4% of participants felt such questions should be asked, regardless of their experience with or their history of interpersonal violence. Victims were as likely as non-victims to believe that such questions should be asked. In addition, responses were consistent, regardless of the respondent's victimization experience; those with different types of victimizations, those victimized within the past 12 months, and those victimized by an intimate partner all reported that the questions should be asked. Importantly, even among victims who reported that being asked these questions made them feel upset or afraid, the majority felt that such questions should be asked in a telephone survey.

These results suggest that commonly held beliefs and assumptions regarding participants' reactions to questions about interpersonal violence may be unfounded. Given that issues related to confidentiality, safety, and providing resources are adequately addressed, these findings provide important information for researchers and offer some assurance to those concerned with the ethical collection of data on victimization (Black and Black, 2007).

Still, it is critical that respondent safety remains the primary concern for any data collection asking about violence, particularly IPV, SV, and stalking. Such measures have been well described (Sullivan & Cain, 2004) and are addressed in the interviewer training.

Additional information regarding the potential benefits of participation were gathered in the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS)conducted in early 2007 (OMB # 0920-0724). The overall purpose of the 2007 study was to evaluate several methodological issues and to inform the design of NISVS. One of the issues evaluated was the degree to which respondents reported experiencing benefits as a result of participation. More than 70% of respondents reported that they gained something positive from participating (National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS), unpublished data). Nearly 70% reported that they felt someone cared about issues that were important to them and over 90% reported the perceived benefit of helping others (National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS), unpublished data). When researchers focus solely on the potential for negative impact, such perceived positive responses to participation by respondents may often be overlooked.

Attachment G contains the NISVS survey instrument. The questions that are included in NISVS are closely modeled after questions that were used in the NVAWS, the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS)or other recent studies regarding IPV, SV, and stalking.

A.12. Estimates of Annualized Burden Hours and Costs

A.12.a)

CDC is requesting an additional 3 years of data collection for this revision request. There are two types of households included in the burden table: the non-participating households that are screened and are not eligible or do not wish to participate and the households that are eligible and agree to participate. The estimated number of non-participating screen households is 44,896. It will take approximately 3 minutes to determine their eligibility and participation status. We estimate that the total burden to for this group to be 2,245 hours.

The number of participating households will be 9,200. It is anticipated that most respondents will take approximately 25 minutes to complete the survey. The additional respondent burden associated with reviewing the advance letter is negligible. We estimate the total burden for this group to be 3,833 hours.

The total burden for this study is estimated at 6,078 hours. This is derived from the total burden hours for non-participating households and eligible households based on an average response of 3 minutes for screened households and 25 minutes for respondents that complete the survey.

Table 1. Estimated Annualized Burden Hours

Type of Respondents	Form Name	Number of Respondents	Number of Responses	Average Burden per	Total Burden (in hours)

			per Respondent	Response (in hours)	
Non-Participating Household (Screened)	NISVS Survey Instrument (Attachment G)	44,896	1	3/60	2,245
Eligible Household (Completes Survey)	NISVS Survey Instrument (Attachment G)	9,200	1	25/60	3,833
				Total	6,078

A.12.b) _

The annual burden cost of $120,164.70 for 9,200 completed interviews was estimated using 44,896 as the expected number of households containing an eligible respondent ages 18 and older; and 9,200 of these eligible households completing the survey.

The estimates of individual annualized costs are based on the number of respondents interviewed and the amount of time required from individuals who were reached by telephone and agreed to the one time interview. The average hourly wage obtained from the 2012 U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. It takes up to 3 minutes to determine whether a household is eligible and to complete the verbal informed consent. For those who agree to participate, the total time required is approximately 25 minutes, on average, including screening and verbal informed consent. The average hourly earnings for those in private, non-farm positions are $ 19.77 (http://www.bls.gov/news.release/empsit.t24.htm).

Table 2. Estimated Annualized Burden Costs

Type of Respondent	Form Name	Number of Respondents	Number of Responses per Respondent	Average Burden per Responses	Average Hourly Wage Rate (in dollars)	Total Respondent Cost
Non-Participating Individuals (Screened)	NISVS Survey Instrument (Attachment G)	44,896	1	3/60	$19.77	$44,379.70
Eligible Individuals (Surveyed)	NISVS Survey Instrument (Attachment G)	9,200	1	25/60	$19.77	$75,785.00

		Total	$120,164.70

A.13. Estimates of Other Total Annual Cost Burden to Respondents or Record Keepers

This data collection activity does not include any other annual cost burden to respondents, nor to any record keepers.

A.14. Annualized Cost to the Government

The contract to conduct the survey was awarded to RTI International through competitive bid. The total annualized cost is $2,552,004, including $2,480,895 in annual contractor costs and $71,109 in annual costs incurred directly by the federal government (Table 3).

Costs for this study include personnel for designing the study, developing, programming, and testing the survey instrument; drawing the sample; training the recruiters/interviewers; collecting and analyzing the data; and reporting the study results. The government costs include personnel costs for federal staff involved in the oversight, study design, and analysis, which include approximately 40% of a GS-13 Behavioral Scientist, 15% of a GS-13 Behavioral Scientist, 15% of an O-4 Commissioned Corps Officer, 10% of a GS-13 Public Health Advisor, and 15% for Government Statistician.

Table 3. Estimated Annualized Cost to the Government

Type of Cost	Description of Services	Annual Cost
Government Behavioral Scientist (40%)	Project oversight, study and survey design, sample selection, data analysis, and consultation	$32,649.00
Government Behavioral Scientist (15%)	Provide consultation and input for study and survey content, sample selection, and data analysis	$6,372.50
Government Behavioral Scientist (15%) 0-4 Commissioned Corps Officer	Provide consultation and input for study and survey content, sample selection, and data analysis	$12,557.10
Government Public Health Advisor (10%)	Project management including oversight of budget and administration	$9,208.60
Government Statistician (15%)	Provide statistical input and database analysis	$10,322.00
	Subtotal, Government Personnel	$71,109.20
Contracted Personnel and Services[1]	Study design, interviewer/recruiter training, data collection and analysis	$2,567,037.00
	Total Annual Estimated Costs	**$2,709,255.20**

[1]Contracted personnel and services cost estimates are based on bids provided by contractor and was based on estimated funds available during the base year (18 months, August 20, 2008 – February 19, 2010). Since the original contract was awarded, the targeted number of completed interviews has been increased to 35,000 to provide stable annual national estimates for women by age group and by race/ethnicity. The government expects that this task order will be incrementally funded; based upon satisfactory performance and availability of funds, the contract may be renewed for the third option year.

A.15. Explanation for Program Changes or Adjustments

CDC proposes a revision to the currently approved data collection instrument. The changes to the instrument are twofold: first, the current NISVSS survey instrument has been shortened in efforts to decrease the burden on respondents and to develop a core instrument that is approximately 20 minutes in length and that will be administered on an annual basis. Second, topic specific modules contain questions to produce data that are needed on a regular basis but are not needed annually. Each individual topic specific modules will be approximately 5 minutes in length and administered in addition to the core survey on a revolving annual schedule. The goals of the revised data collection instrument are to: (1) improve NISVSS data quality, (2) increase response rates, (3) decrease the breakoff rates, (4) and to reduce the burden on the respondents, 5) confirm the timing of the instrument (core and modules) are as predicted. Since CDC proposes to test the newly revised instrument to meet the goals above, the number of respondents surveyed is less than in previous years. After the first year pilot test is complete, the instrument will be adopted and an OMB revision request will be submitted with the final instrument. If the revision is granted, the final instrument will be used to collect data for publication for the remaining two years of OMB approval.

A.16. Plans for Tabulation and Publication, and Project Time Schedule

Table 4. Project Time Schedule

1st year of data collection - activities	**Time Schedule**
Letters sent to respondents	Beginning immediately after OMB approval
Initiate telephone contact	Beginning immediately after OMB approval
Clean and edit data set	5 month after OMB approval
Conduct analyses	5-6 months after OMB approval
Prepare and distribute reports	7 month after OMB approval

2nd year of data collection - activities	**Time Schedule**
Letters sent to respondents	Beginning 7 months after OMB approval
Initiate telephone contact	Beginning 7 months after OMB approval
Clean and edit 2nd year data set	19 months after OMB approval
Conduct analyses	20-21 months after OMB approval
Prepare and distribute	23 months after OMB approval

3rd year of data collection - activities	**Time Schedule**
Letters sent to respondents	Beginning 19 months after OMB approval
Initiate telephone contact	Beginning 19 months after OMB approval
Clean and edit 3rd year data set	33 months after OMB approval
Conduct analyses	34-35 months after OMB approval
Prepare and distribute reports	36 months after OMB approval

To determine the prevalence of IPV, SV, and stalking among women and men bivariate analyses are conducted using SUDAAN, version 9.0.Weighted estimates of 12-month and lifetime victimization prevalence are calculated annually. Separate estimates have been produced for population subgroups (e.g., sex, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation and age groups) and will continue to be produced on a regular basis. Chi square tests have been performed on weighted percentages to formally test for statistically significant differences between proportions and will be produced on a regular basis. Additional multivariable logistic regression analyses have been used to adjust the data and further evaluate associations between the outcomes and potential risk factors.

Data from each consecutive survey year will be combined with previous years and remain in password protected files. Various summary and special topic reports will be distributed to stakeholders. Public use data sets will also be made available to state and national researchers and practitioners.

After years 2 and 3 of the annual survey, data will be combined across years and trend analyses will be conducted using data collected through NISVS to aid our understanding of the burden of intimate partner and sexual violence. It can be used to assess prevalence change over time, discern rate of change, and compare patterns of change across different geographic regions. The impact of prevention strategies may potentially be estimated by analyzing prevalence findings before and after the implementation of such strategies. Depending on the data to be collected, a number of mathematical modeling and analytical approaches (e.g., transformation, regression, etc.) could be used to conduct the anticipated trend analyses. Analysis software will be appropriately selected and applied.

A.17. Reason(s) Display of OMB Expiration Date is Inappropriate

The display of the OMB expiration date is not inappropriate.

A.18. Exceptions to Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

There are no exceptions to the certification.

REFERENCES

American Association for Public Opinion Research (2008). *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys*, 5th edition. Lenexa, Kansas: AAPOR.

Armstrong, J.S. (1975). Monetary Incentives in Mail Surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 39, 111-116.

Bachar K, Koss MP. (2001). From prevalence to prevention: Closing the gap between what we know about rape and what we do. In: Renzetti C, Edleson J, Bergen RK, editors. Sourcebook on Violence Against Women. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications.

Basile KC, Black MC, Simon TR, Arias I, Brener ND & Saltzman LE. (2006). The Association between self reported lifetime history of forced sexual intercourse and recent health risk behaviors: findings from the 2003 National Youth Risk Behavior Survey. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 39, 752.

Basile KC, Chen J, Black MC, & Saltzman LE. (2007). Prevalence and characteristics of sexual violence victimization among U.S. Adults 2001-2003. *Violence and Victims,* 22, 437-448.

Basile KC & Saltzman LE. (2002). Sexual violence surveillance: uniform definitions and recommended data elements. Version 1.0. Atlanta, GA: *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control.*

Basile KC, Swahn MH, Chen J & Saltzman LE. (2006). Stalking in the United States: Recent National Prevalence Estimates. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine,* 31, 172-175.

Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System Summary Data Quality Report: http://www.cdc.gov/brfss/technical_infodata/pdf/2002SummaryDataQualityReport.pdf

Black MC & Black RS. (2007). A public health perspective on the ethics of asking and not asking about abuse. *American Psychologist,* 62, 328.

Black MC & Breiding, MJ. (2008) Adverse health conditions and health risk behaviors associated with intimate partner violence – United States, 2005. *MMWR*, 57, 113-117.

Blumberg S J & Luke JV. (2008). Wireless Substitution: Early Release of Estimates Based on Data from the National Health Interview Survey, July-December 2007. Retrieved May 13, 2008, from http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis.htm.

Blumberg, S. J., & Luke, J. V. (2012). Wireless Substitution: Early Release of Estimates Based on Data from the National Health Interview Survey, July-December 2011 Retrieved June 28, 2012, from http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis.htm

Bonomi AE, Thompson RS & Anderson Ml. (2006). Intimate partner violence and women's physical, mental, and social functioning. *Am J Prev Med,* 30, 458-466

Breiding MJ, Black MC & Ryan GW. (2008). Prevalence and risk factors of intimate partner violence in Eighteen U.S. States/Territories, 2005. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine,* 34, 112-118.

Brick, J. M., Cervantes, I. F., Lee, S., & Norman, G. (2011). Nonsampling errors in dual frame telephone surveys. *Survey Methodology, 37*(1), 1-12.

Brush LD. (1990). Violent acts and injurious outcomes in married couples: methodological issues in the National Survey of Families and Households. *Gender and Society,* 4, 56-67.

Caetano R & Cunradi C. (2003). Intimate partner violence and depression among whites, blacks, and Hispanics. *Annals of Epidemiology,* 13, 661–5.

Campbell J, Sullivan CM & Davidson WD. (1995). Women who use domestic violence shelters: changes in depression over time. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 19, 237-55.

Campbell JC. (2002). Health consequences of intimate partner violence. *Lancet*, 359, 1331–6.

Cantor D, O'Hare, BC & O'Connor KS. (2007). The Use of Monetary Incentives to Reduce Non-Response in Random Digit Dial Telephone Surveys. Pp. 471-498 in Advances in Telephone Survey Methodology, edited by J.M. Lepkowski, C. Tucker, J.M. Brick, E. de Leeuw, L. Japec, P.J. Lavrakas, M.W. Link, and R.L. Sangester. New York: Wiley.

Cantor D, Wang K & Abi-Habib N. (2003). Comparing Promised and Pre-Paid Incentives for an Extended Interview on a Random Digit Dial Survey. *Proceedings of the Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA.*

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2009). Building data systems for monitoring and responding to violence against women: recommendations from a workshop. *MMWR* 49, No. RR-11).

Church AH. (1993). Estimating the Effect of Incentives on Mail Survey Response Rates: A Meta-Analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 57, 62-79.

Coker AL, Smith PH, Bethea L, King MR & McKeown RE. (2000). Physical health consequences of physical and psychological intimate partner violence. *Archives of Family Medicine,* 9, 451-7.

Corso PS, Mercy JA, Simon TR, Finkelstein EA & Miller TR. (2007). Medical Costs and Productivity Losses Due to Interpersonal and Self-Directed Violence in the United States. *American Journal of Prevention Medicine,* 32, 474-482.

Crowell NA, Burgess AW, eds. Understanding Violence Against Women. Washington, D.C.; National Academy Press; 1996.

Dailey R & Claus RE. (2001). The relationship between interviewer characteristics and physical and sexual abuse disclosures among substance users: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Drug Issues,* 31, 867-88.

Defense Manpower Data Center. (2008). "August 2007 Status of Services Survey of Active Duty Members: Tabulations and Responses." DMDC Report No. 2007–049.

Deming W E. (1953). On a Probability Mechanism to Attain an Economic Balance between the Resultant Error of Nonresponse and the Bias of Nonresponse. *Journal of the American Statistical Association,* 48, 743-772.

Dillman D. (2000) Mail and Internet Surveys. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Evans-Campbell T, Lindhorst T, Huang B & Walters KL. (2006). Interpersonal Violence in the Lives of Urban American Indian and Alaska Native Women: Implications for Health, Mental Health, and Help-Seeking. *American Journal of Public Health,* 96, 1416-1422.

Fahimi M, Kulp D, & Brick JM. (2008). Bias in List-Assisted 100-Series RDD Sampling. Survey Practice. September 2008.

Fisher BJ. (2004). Measuring Rape Against Women: The Significance of Survey Questions. U.S. Department of Justice.

Fowler Jr FJ & Mangione TW. (1990). Standardized Survey Interviewing. Newbury Park: Sage publications.

Gelles RJ. (1997). Intimate Violence in Families. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications.

Golding JM. (1996). Sexual assault history and limitations in physical functioning in two general population samples. *Research in Nursing and Health,* 9, 33-44.

Gondolf EW & Heckert DA. (2003). Determinants of women's perceptions of risk in battering relationships. *Violence & Victims,* 18, 371-386.

Grossman, S. F., & Lundy, M. (2003). Use of domestic violence services across race and ethnicity by women aged 55 and older. *Violence Against Women,* 9(12), 2003.

Groves, R. M. (2006). Nonresponse rates and nonresponse bias in household surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 70(5): 646-675.

Groves R M, Couper MP, Presser S, Singer E, Tourangeau R, Acosta GP & Nelson L. (2006). Experiments in Producing Nonresponse Bias. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 70, 720-736.

Groves RM & Heeringa S. (2006). Responsive Design for Household Surveys: Tools for Actively Controlling Survey Errors and Costs. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society* 169, 439-457.

Groves R M & McGonagle KA. (2001). A Theory-Guided Interviewer Training Protocol Regarding Survey Participation. *Journal of Official Statistics* 17, 249-265.

Groves R M, Singer E & Corning A.(2000). Leverage-Saliency Theory of Survey Participation - Description and an Illustration. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 64, 299-308.

Heyman RE, Schaffer R, Gimbel C & Kemer-Hoeg S. (1996). A Comparison of the Prevalence of Army and Civilian Spouse Violence. Prepared by Caliber Associates and Behavioral Science Associates for U.S. Army Community and Family Support Center, September, 1996.

Health Information National Trends Study. (http://cancercontrol.cancer.gov/hints/docs/HINTS_refusal_incentive_abstract.pdf).

Johnson H. (1996). Dangerous Domains: Violence Against Women in Canada. Scarborough, ON: Nelson Canada; 1996.

Kaslow N, Thompson MP, Meadows L, Jacobs D, Chance S & Gibb B. (1998). Factors that mediate or moderate the link between partner abuse and suicidal behavior in African American Women. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*; 66, 533-40.

Kennedy C. (2007). Constructing Weights for Landline and Cell Phone RDD Surveys. Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research*, May 17-20, Anaheim, CA.

Kessler RC, McGoangle KA, Zhao S, Nelson CB, Hughes M, & Eshleman S. (1994). Lifetime and 12-month prevalence of DSM-II-R psychiatric disorders in the United States: results from the National Comorbidity Survey. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 51, 8-19.

Kilpatrick DG, Edmunds CN, Seymour AK. (1992). Rape in America: A Report to the Nation. Arlington,VA: National Victim Center & Medical University of South Carolina.

Kish L. Survey Sampling. John Wiley and Sons, Inc. New York; 1965.

Koss MP, Bailey JA, Yuan NP, Herrera VM & Lichter EL. (2003). Depression and PTSD in survivors of male violence: research and training initiatives to facilitate recovery. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 27, 130–42.

Krug et al., eds. (2002). World Report on Violence and Health. Geneva, World Health Organization; 2002.

Lundy M & Grossman SF. (2004). Elder abuse: spouse/intimate partner abuse and family abuse among elders. *Journal of Elder Abuse & Neglect,* 16, 85-102.

Malcoe LH, Duran BM & Montgomery JM. (2004). Socioeconomic Disparities in Intimate Partner Violence Against Native American Women: A Cross-Sectional Study. *BMC Medicine*, 2, 20.

Marshall A, Panuzioa J & Taft CT. (2005). Intimate Partner Violence Among Military Veterans and Active Duty Servicemen. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 25, 862-876.

Martin SL, Gibbs DA, Johnson RE, Rentz ED, Clinton-Sherrod AM & Hardison J. (In Press). Spouse Abuse and Child Abuse by Army Soldiers. *Journal of Family Violence*.

Max W, Rice DP, Finkelstein E, Bardwell RA, Leadbetter S. The economic toll of intimate partner violence against women in the United States. Violence Vict. 2004;19(3):259-72.

McCarroll JE, Newby JH, Thayer LE, Norwood AE, Fullerton CS & Ursano RJ. (1999). Reports of Spouse Abuse in the U.S. Army Central Registry (1989-1997). *Military Medicine,* 164, 77–84.

McCarty C. (2003) Differences in Response Rates Using Most Recent Versus Final Dispositions in Telephone Surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 67, 396-406.

Mechanic MB, Uhlmansiek MH, Weaver TL & Resick PA. (2000). The impact of severe stalking experienced by acutely battered women: an examination of violence, psychological symptoms and strategic responding. *Violence and Victims*, 15, 443–58.

Merrill LL, Newell CE, Milner JS, Koss MP, Hervig LK, Gold SR, Rosswork SG & Thornton SR. (1998). Prevalence of premilitary adult sexual victimization and aggression in a Navy recruit sample. *Military Medicine*, 163, 209-212.

Mouton CP, Rovi S, Furniss K & Lasser NL. (1999). The associations between health and domestic violence in older women: results of a pilot study. *Journal of Women's Health & Gender-Based Medicine*, 8, 1173-1179.

National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. (2008). CDC Injury Research Agenda, 2009–2018. Atlanta, GA: US Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Available at: http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc.

National Center for Injury Prevention and Control (NCIPC). (2003). Costs of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in the United States. Atlanta (GA): Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

National Household Education Survey.
(http://www.amstat.org/sections/srms/Proceedings/papers/1997_181.pdf).

National Research Council. (2003). Elder Mistreatment: Abuse, Neglect, and Exploitation in an Aging America. Panel to Review Risk and Prevalence of Elder Abuse and Neglect. Richard J. Bonnie and Robert B. Wallace, Editors. Committee on National Statistics and Committee on Law and Justice, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Oetzel J & Duran B. (2004). Intimate Partner Violence in American Indian and/or Alaska Native Communities: A Social Ecological Framework of Determinants and Interventions. *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research*, 11, 49-68.

O'Muircheartaigh C & Campanelli P. (1999). A Multilevel Exploration of the Role of Interviewers in Survey Non-Response. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society,* 162, 437-446.

Peytchev, A., R. Baxter and L. R. Carley-Baxter (in press). Not All Survey Effort is Equal: Reduction of Nonresponse Bias and Nonresponse Error. *Public Opinion Quarterly*.

Pollner M. (1998). The effects of interviewer gender in mental health interviews. *Journal of Nervous & Mental Disease,* 186, 369-73.

Puzone CA, Saltzman LE, Kresnow MJ, Thompson MP & Mercy JA. (2000). National trends in intimate partner homicide. *Violence Against Women,* 6, 409–26.

Rennison C & Rand M. (2003). Non-lethal intimate partner violence: women age 55 or older. *Violence Against Women*, 12, 1417-1428.

Robin RW, Chester B, Rasmussen JK, Jaranson JM & Goldman JK. (1997). Prevalence and Characteristics of Trauma and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder in a Southwestern American Indian Community. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 154, 1582-1588.

Sadler AG, Booth BM & Doebbeling BN. (2005). Gang and Multiple Rapes During Military Service: Health Consequences and Health Care. *Journal of the American Medical Women's Association,* 60, 33-41

Sahr, R. Consumer Price Index (CPI) Conversion Factors 1800 to Estimated 2015 to Convert Dollars of 2005. (Revised January, 18, 2006). Available: http://oregonstate.edu/Dept/pol_sci/fac/sahr/cv2005.xls (Accessibility Verified January 23, 2006).

Singer E. (2002). The Use of Incentives to Reduce Nonresponse in Household Surveys. Pp. 163-178 in Survey Nonresponse, edited by R.M. Groves, D.A. Dillman, J.L. Eltinge, and R. J.A. Little. New York: Wiley.

Singer E & Bossarte RM. (2006). Incentives for survey participation: when are they coercive? *Am J Prev Med* 31, 411-418.

Sullivan CM & Cain D. (2004). Ethical and safety considerations when obtaining information from or about battered women for research purposes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19, 603-18.

Teaster, P.A. (2002). A response to the abuse of vulnerable adults: the 2000 survey of state adult protective services. Washington, D.C.: National Center on Elder Abuse.

Thompson M, Arias I, Basile KC, & Desai S. (2002). The Association Between Childhood Physical and Sexual Victimization and Health Problems in Adulthood in a Nationally Representative Sample of Women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17, 1115-1129.

Thornberry O, Massey J. (1998). Trends in United States Telephone Coverage Across Time and Subgroups. In R.M. Groves, P.P. Biemer, L.E. Lyberg, J.T. Massey, W.L. Nicholls, II, & J. Wakesberg (Eds.), Telephone Survey Methodology. New York: Wiley.

Tjaden P & Thoennes N. (1998). Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence against Women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Washington, DC, Report No. NCJ 172837.

Tjaden P & Thoennes N. (1998). Stalking in America: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey: research brief. U.S. Department of Justice; 1998.

Tjaden P & Thoennes N. (2000). Full Report on the Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women. NCJ Publication # 183781, Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Tjaden P & Thoennes N. (2006). Extent, Nature, and Consequences of Rape Victimization: Findings From the National Violence Against Women Survey. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Washington, DC, Report No. NCJ 210346.

Traugott MW, Groves RM & Lepkowski J. (1987). Using Dual Frame Designs to Reduce Nonresponse in Telephone Surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly,* 51, 522-539.

Tucker C, Brick JM, Meekins B, Morganstein D. (2004). Household Telephone Service and Usage Patterns in the U.S. in 2004. Proceedings of the Section on Survey Research Methods, American Statistical Association, pp. 4528 -4534.

U.S. Bureau of Statistics. http://www.dol.gov/dol/topic/statistics/index.htm).

U.S. Census. http://www.census.gov/popest/national/asrh/NC-EST2004/NC-EST2004-01.xls

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). Healthy People 2010. 2nd ed. With Understanding and Improving Health and Objectives for Improving Health 2 vols. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office; 2000.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Report from the Secretaries Task Force on Elder Abuse. Feb 1992. http://aspe.hhs.gov/daltcp/reports/elderab.htm

Vos T, Astbury J, Piers LS, Magnus A, Heenan M, Stanley L, Walker L & Webster K. (2006). Measuring the Impact of Intimate Partner Violence on the Health of Women in Victoria, Australia. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 84, 9.

Waksberg J (1978). Sampling Methods for Random Digit Dialing. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 73, 40-46.

Watts C, Heise L, Ellsberg M & Moreno, G. (2001). Putting women first: ethical and safety recommendations for research on domestic violence against women. (Document WHO/EIP/GPE/01.1). Geneva: World Health Organization, Global Programme on Evidence for Health Policy.

Yu J & Cooper H. (1983). Quantitative Review of Research Design Effects on Response Rates to Questionnaires. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 20, 36-44.