



JANUARY 2014

SPECIAL REPORT

NCJ 243904


Sexual Victimization Reported by Adult Correctional Authorities, 2009–11

Allen J. Beck, Ph.D., and Ramona R. Rantala, *BJS Statisticians*, and Jessica Rexroat, *BJS Intern*

In 2011, correctional administrators reported 8,763 allegations of sexual victimization in prisons, jails, and other adult correctional facilities (figure 1). About half (51%) involved allegations of nonconsensual sexual acts or abusive sexual contacts of inmates with other inmates, and half (49%) involved staff sexual misconduct or sexual harassment directed toward inmates. About 10% of the allegations (902) were substantiated based on follow-up investigation. While the number of allegations has risen since 2005 (6,241), the number substantiated has remained nearly unchanged (885 in 2005).

The Survey of Sexual Violence (SSV) is an annual collection based on official records that the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) has conducted since 2004. It is one of a number of BJS data collections that are conducted to meet the mandates of the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (PREA).

FIGURE 1
National estimates of total allegations and substantiated incidents of sexual victimization, 2005–11



Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2005–11.

HIGHLIGHTS

- Correctional administrators reported 8,763 allegations of sexual victimization in 2011, a statistically significant increase over the 8,404 allegations reported in 2010 and 7,855 in 2009.
- Total allegations of sexual victimization rose significantly between 2005 (6,241) and 2011 (8,763).
- The increase in allegations of sexual victimization between 2005 and 2011 was largely due to prisons, where allegations increased from 4,791 allegations to 6,660 (up 39%).
- In 2011, 902 allegations of sexual victimization (10%) were substantiated (i.e., determined to have occurred upon investigation).
- State prison administrators reported 537 substantiated incidents of sexual victimization in 2011, up 17% from 459 substantiated incidents reported in 2005.
- About 52% of substantiated incidents of sexual victimization in 2011 involved only inmates, while 48% of substantiated incidents involved staff with inmates.
- About 44% of victims of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization experienced physical force or threat of force; 12% had been talked into it; and 5% had been bribed, blackmailed, or given drugs or alcohol to engage in the sexual activity.
- Approximately 18% of substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization involved physical injury; 7% resulted in a major injury.
- About two-thirds of victims of nonconsensual sexual acts by other inmates were given a medical examination; a third were administered a rape kit.
- Between 2009 and 2011, females represented about 7% of all state and federal prison inmates, but accounted for 22% of inmate-on-inmate victims and 33% of staff-on-inmate victims.
- More than half of all substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct and a quarter of all incidents of staff sexual harassment were committed by females.

Continued on next page.

HIGHLIGHTS (continued)

- Among all substantiated incidents between 2009 and 2011, 84% of those perpetrated by female staff, compared to 37% of those perpetrated by male staff, involved a sexual relationship that “appeared to be willing.”
- Physical force and pressure or abuse of power were identified in 20% of incidents involving male staff, compared to 1% of incidents involving female staff.
- The most commonly imposed sanctions for staff sexual misconduct were loss of job (in 85% of incidents) and arrest or prosecution (56%).
- More than half of the staff (52%) involved in sexual harassment of inmates lost their jobs, while 43% were reprimanded, disciplined, demoted or transferred, and 6% were arrested or prosecuted.

On behalf of BJS, staff of the U.S. Census Bureau mailed survey forms to correctional administrators in the Federal Bureau of Prisons, state prison systems, public and private jails, private prisons, jails in Indian country, and facilities operated by the U.S. military and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Administrators were given the option of mailing back a completed form or completing it on the internet. Data collection forms can be accessed on the BJS website.

Each sexual act, as defined by BJS, is classified by the perpetrator who carried it out (i.e., inmate or staff) and the type of act. Administrators provided counts for each of the four types of sexual victimization that occurred during the prior calendar year: inmate-on-inmate nonconsensual sexual acts, inmate-on-inmate abusive sexual contacts, staff sexual misconduct, and staff sexual harassment. (See text box, *Defining sexual victimization*.)

Defining sexual victimization

To define sexual victimization under the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003, BJS uses uniform definitions that classify each sexual act by the perpetrator who carried it out (i.e., inmate or staff) and the type of act.

Inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization involves sexual contact with a victim without his or her consent or with a victim who cannot consent or refuse.

Nonconsensual sexual acts are the most serious victimizations, and include—

- contact between the penis and the vagina or the penis and the anus, including penetration, however slight
- contact between the mouth and the penis, vagina, or anus
- penetration of the anal or genital opening of another person by a hand, finger, or other object.

Abusive sexual contacts are less serious victimizations, and include—

- intentional touching, either directly or through clothing, of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks of any person
- incidents in which the intent was to sexually exploit (rather than to harm or debilitate).

Staff-on-inmate sexual victimization includes both consensual and nonconsensual acts perpetrated on an inmate by staff. Staff includes an employee, volunteer, contractor, official visitor, or other agency representative. Family, friends, and other visitors are excluded.

Staff sexual misconduct includes any act or behavior of a sexual nature directed toward an inmate by staff, including romantic relationships. Such acts include—

- intentional touching of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks with the intent to abuse, arouse, or gratify sexual desire
- completed, attempted, threatened, or requested sexual acts
- occurrences of indecent exposure, invasion of privacy, or staff voyeurism for sexual gratification.

Staff sexual harassment includes repeated verbal statements or comments of a sexual nature to an inmate by staff. Such statements include—

- demeaning references to an inmate's sex or derogatory comments about his or her body or clothing
- repeated profane or obscene language or gestures.

For each type of victimization, correctional administrators indicated how many of the allegations were substantiated (determined to have occurred), unsubstantiated (insufficient evidence to make a final determination), unfounded (determined to have not occurred), and still under investigation.

The administrators then completed a separate form for each substantiated incident, providing details about the victim, perpetrator, and circumstances surrounding the incident.

The 2009, 2010, and 2011 surveys included all federal and state prisons, facilities operated by the U.S. military and ICE, and a representative sample of jail jurisdictions, privately operated jails and prisons, and jails holding adults in Indian country. In total, data were collected from facilities containing 1.99 million inmates in 2009, 1.98 million inmates in 2010, and 1.97 million inmates in 2011. (See *Methodology* for more information about the systems and facilities from which data were collected.)

Responses were weighted to provide national-level estimates for jails and privately operated facilities. Because the estimates for jails and privately operated facilities are based on a sample rather than a complete enumeration, they are subject to sampling error. (See *Methodology* for description of sampling procedures.)

Detailed tabulations of the survey results, grouped by system and sampled facility, are presented in *Survey of Sexual Violence in Adult Correctional Facilities, 2009–11 - Statistical Tables* (NCJ 244227).

The 2011 SSV recorded 773 substantiated incidents of sexual victimization—incidents that were investigated and determined to have occurred. Weighting this total to account for the sampling of local jail jurisdictions, private prisons, and private jails, the estimated total number of substantiated

incidents in the nation in 2011 was 902. The 2010 SSV recorded 743 substantiated incidents of sexual victimization, which when weighted represented 856 incidents nationwide. The 2009 SSV recorded 711 substantiated incidents, representing 851 incidents nationwide.

For each substantiated incident of sexual victimization, correctional administrators were asked to provide details on the circumstances surrounding each incident, characteristics of victims and perpetrators, type of pressure or physical force used, sanctions imposed, and what type of victim assistance was administered, if any. They provided detail on 94% of reported substantiated incidents. These data are displayed in tables 8–13 and appendix tables 8–19.

Summary-level findings

Allegations of sexual victimization

Allegations of sexual victimization increased every year between 2005 and 2011

Correctional administrators reported 8,763 allegations of sexual victimization in 2011, a significant increase over the 8,404 allegations reported in 2010 and 7,855 in 2009 (**table 1**). Total allegations of sexual victimization also increased significantly between 2005 (6,241 allegations) and 2011. This increase was largely the result of a 39% increase in allegations of sexual victimization in prisons, from 4,791 allegations in 2005 to 6,660 allegations in 2011, although the number of allegations in prisons in 2011 was slightly less than in 2010 (6,648). The number of allegations of sexual victimization in local and private jails also increased between 2005 (1,406) and 2011 (2,042). During 2011, the number of allegations rose sharply, up 20% from 2010. The number of allegations reported by authorities responsible for ICE facilities increased from 4 in 2005 to 17 in 2009 and to 50 in 2011.

TABLE 1
National estimates of total allegations of sexual victimization, by type of facility, 2005–11

Facility type	2011*	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
Total	8,763	8,404**	7,855**	7,457**	7,374**	6,528**	6,241**
Prisons^a	6,660	6,648	6,379**	5,798**	5,535**	4,958**	4,791**
Public-federal ^b	488	479**	405**	368**	309**	242**	268**
Public-state	5,765	5,812**	5,692**	5,194**	4,940**	4,516**	4,341**
Jails^c	2,042	1,700**	1,458**	1,645	1,823	1,533**	1,406**
Other adult facilities							
Military-operated	4	6**	1**	6**	3**	3**	8**
ICE-operated	50	46**	17**	6**	4**	5**	4**
Indian country jails ^d	7	4	0	2	9	29	32**

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. See appendix table 1 for standard errors.

*Comparison group.

**Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

^aIncludes federal, state, and private prisons.

^bEstimates for 2006 are not comparable to those in 2005 due to a change in reporting.

^cIncludes local and private jails.

^dExcludes facilities housing juveniles only.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2005–11.

The increase in the total number of reported allegations of sexual victimization corresponds with an increase in the rate of reported allegations over time, from 2.83 allegations per 1,000 inmates in 2005 to 3.90 per 1,000 in 2011 (table 2). As with total allegations, this trend resulted from an increase in the rate of reported allegations in prisons, from 3.33 allegations per 1,000 inmates in 2005 to 4.49 in 2011. The rate of reported allegations of sexual victimization in jails also increased significantly between 2005 and 2011, from 1.86 per 1,000 to 2.73 per 1,000.

In each year between 2009 and 2011, the rates of alleged sexual victimization were consistently higher in prisons than in jails. In 2011, facilities operated by the U.S. military had a victimization rate of 2.63 per 1,000, similar to the rates in jails (2.73 per 1,000) and federal prisons (2.77), but lower than the rate in state prisons (4.81). The rate of reported allegations of sexual victimization in ICE-operated facilities (3.41 per 1,000 detainees) was higher than the rate in jails, federal prisons, and military facilities, but lower than the rate in state prisons.

Inmate-on-inmate victimizations accounted for two-thirds of the total increase in allegations of sexual victimization between 2005 and 2011

The number of allegations of sexual victimization rose by 2,520 allegations between 2005 and 2011 (table 3). This increase was due primarily to a rise in reported inmate-on-inmate sexual victimizations, which accounted for 67% of the overall increase. Inmate-on-inmate abusive sexual contacts more than doubled from 611 allegations in 2005 to 1,479 in 2011, while inmate-on-inmate nonconsensual sexual acts increased from 2,160 to 2,984.

In 2011, about 32% of reported allegations of sexual victimization involved staff sexual misconduct and 17% involved staff sexual harassment. These percentages remained nearly unchanged from those reported in 2009 (not shown). Correctional authorities reported 4,298 allegations of staff sexual misconduct and harassment during 2011, compared to 4,167 in 2009 and 3,470 in 2005.

TABLE 2
Rates per 1,000 inmates of allegations of sexual victimization, by type of facility, 2005–11

Facility type	2011*	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
Total	3.90	3.65**	3.40**	3.18**	2.95**	2.91**	2.83**
Prisons ^a	4.49	4.40**	4.21**	3.82**	3.62**	3.37**	3.33**
Public-federal ^b	2.77	2.77**	2.43**	2.22**	1.86**	1.50**	1.71**
Public-state	4.81	4.74**	4.63**	4.20**	3.98**	3.75**	3.68**
Jails ^c	2.73	2.20**	1.88**	2.04**	1.89**	2.02**	1.86**
Other adult facilities							
Military-operated	2.63	3.95**	0.63**	3.34**	1.63**	1.62**	3.08**
ICE-operated	3.41	2.67**	1.16**	0.49**	0.61**	0.62**	0.61**
Indian country jails ^d	∧	∧	∧	∧	3.33	∧	∧

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. See appendix table 2 for standard errors.

∧ Too few cases to provide a reliable rate.

*Comparison group.

**Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

^aIncludes federal, state, and private prisons.

^bEstimates for 2006 are not comparable to those in 2005 due to a change in reporting.

^cIncludes local and private jails.

^dExcludes facilities housing juveniles only.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2005–11.

TABLE 3
National estimates of total allegations of sexual victimization, by type of incident, 2005–11

Type of incident	2011*	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
Total	8,763	8,404**	7,855**	7,457**	7,374**	6,528**	6,241**
Inmate-on-inmate nonconsensual sexual acts	2,984	2,660**	2,147**	2,343**	2,421**	2,205**	2,160**
Inmate-on-inmate abusive sexual contacts	1,479	1,360	1,542**	1,417	1,220**	834**	611**
Staff sexual misconduct	2,800	2,692	2,650**	2,528	2,436**	2,371**	2,386**
Staff sexual harassment	1,500	1,692**	1,517	1,169**	1,298	1,118**	1,084**

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to missing data. See appendix table 3 for standard errors.

*Comparison group.

**Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2005–11.

Upon investigation, most allegations were unsubstantiated

The most common outcome of investigations was a determination that the evidence was insufficient to show whether the alleged incident occurred, i.e., the allegation was unsubstantiated. Based on completed investigations between 2009 and 2011, allegations of staff sexual harassment and inmate-on-inmate nonconsensual acts were less likely to have been substantiated than other types of allegations (table 4). During the 3-year period, 6% of allegations of staff sexual harassment and 9% of inmate-on-inmate nonconsensual acts were substantiated, compared to 15% of the allegations of staff sexual misconduct and 16% of the allegations of inmate-on-inmate abusive sexual contacts.

The outcomes of investigations differed significantly between prisons and jails. For every type of allegation, the percentage substantiated was higher in local jails than in prisons, with

the largest differences reported for allegations involving staff. An estimated 21% of allegations of staff sexual misconduct and 15% of allegations of staff sexual harassment in jail were substantiated, compared to 12% of allegations of staff sexual misconduct and 4% of allegations of staff sexual harassment in prison.

Federal and state prison administrators reported that a significantly greater percentage of allegations of all types of sexual victimization were found to be unsubstantiated than did local jail administrators. In prisons, 66% of alleged nonconsensual sexual acts and 55% of staff sexual misconduct were unsubstantiated, while 48% of nonconsensual sexual acts and 33% of staff sexual misconduct were unsubstantiated in jails.

TABLE 4
National estimates of outcomes of investigations into allegations of sexual victimization, by type of facility, 2009–11

Type of incident	Number of allegations			Percent by outcome ^a		
	All facilities ^b	Federal and state prisons	Local jails	All facilities ^b	Federal and state prisons*	Local jails
Inmate-on-inmate nonconsensual sexual acts	7,791	5,254	2,175	100%	100%	100%
Substantiated	624	347	255	9.0	7.7	12.3**
Unsubstantiated	4,195	2,973	995	60.4	65.9	48.1**
Unfounded	2,125	1,191	821	30.6	26.4	39.6**
Investigation ongoing	862	743	104			
Inmate-on-inmate abusive sexual contacts	4,381	3,282	844	100%	100%	100%
Substantiated	684	477	165	16.1	15.0	20.3**
Unsubstantiated	2,732	2,238	342	64.4	70.3	42.1**
Unfounded	827	467	306	19.5	14.7	37.6**
Investigation ongoing	139	100	32			
Staff sexual misconduct	8,142	6,063	1,604	100%	100%	100%
Substantiated	1,034	641	307	14.7	12.4	21.1**
Unsubstantiated	3,556	2,844	484	50.4	55.1	33.2**
Unfounded	2,464	1,680	667	34.9	32.5	45.7**
Investigation ongoing	1,088	899	146			
Staff sexual harassment	4,708	4,042	450	100%	100%	100%
Substantiated	267	156	67	6.1	4.2	15.5**
Unsubstantiated	2,810	2,519	162	64.5	67.9	37.6**
Unfounded	1,282	1,037	202	29.4	27.9	46.9**
Investigation ongoing	359	330	20			

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to missing information. See appendix table 4 for standard errors.

*Comparison group.

**Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

^aPercents based on allegations for which investigations have been completed.

^bIncludes private prisons and jails, jails in Indian country, and facilities operated by the U.S. military and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2009–11.

Substantiated incidents of sexual victimization

The total number of substantiated incidents did not change significantly between 2005 and 2011

Administrators of all categories of correctional facilities reported 902 substantiated incidents of sexual victimization in 2011 (table 5). They reported 856 incidents in 2010 and 851 substantiated incidents in 2009. These changes in substantiated incidents for all categories of facilities were not statistically significant, nor was the increase in substantiated incidents between 2005 (885 incidents) and 2011.

State prisons experienced a significant increase (17%) in substantiated incidents between 2005 (459 incidents) and

2011 (537). Public and private jails saw no statistically significant change during the same period.

The overall rate of substantiated incidents of sexual victimization per 1,000 inmates follows the same pattern as the total number of substantiated incidents. While the rate for all categories of facilities did not change significantly between 2005 and 2011 (0.40 substantiated incidents per 1,000 inmates for both years), the rate of substantiated incidents in prisons increased from 0.36 incidents per 1,000 inmates in 2005 to 0.41 incidents per 1,000 in 2011 (table 6). The rate of substantiated incidents in jails in 2005 (0.46) was not statistically different from the rate in 2011 (0.38). (See *Methodology* for discussion of significance tests and appendix table 6 for standard errors for each rate.)

TABLE 5
National estimates of substantiated incidents of sexual victimization, by type of facility, 2005–11

Facility type	2011*	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
Total	902	856	851	931	1,001	967	885
Prisons ^a	605	603	562**	651**	613	563**	524**
Public-federal ^b	9	16**	8**	21**	14**	5**	41**
Public-state	537	541**	510**	589**	570**	549**	459**
Jails ^c	284	244	286	271	380	393	348
Other adult facilities							
Military-operated	2	2	0**	5**	1**	2	2
ICE-operated	5	2**	4**	1**	1**	2**	1**
Indian country jails ^d	6	4	0	2	6	7	10

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. See appendix table 5 for standard errors.

*Comparison group.

**Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

^aIncludes federal, state, and private prisons.

^bEstimates from 2005 are not comparable to those in 2006 to 2011 due to a change in reporting.

^cIncludes local and private jails.

^dExcludes facilities housing juveniles only.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2005–11.

TABLE 6
Rates per 1,000 inmates of substantiated incidents of sexual victimization, by type of facility, 2005–11

Facility type	2011*	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
Total	0.40	0.37	0.37	0.40	0.40	0.43	0.40
Prisons ^a	0.41	0.40	0.37**	0.43	0.40	0.38**	0.36**
Public-federal ^b	0.05	0.09**	0.05	0.13**	0.08**	0.03**	0.26**
Public-state	0.45	0.44**	0.42**	0.47**	0.46**	0.46**	0.39**
Jails ^c	0.38	0.32	0.37	0.34	0.39	0.52	0.46
Other adult facilities							
Military-operated	1.31	1.32	0.00**	2.78**	0.54**	1.08**	0.77**
ICE-operated	0.34	0.12**	0.27**	0.08**	0.15**	0.25**	0.15
Indian country jails ^d	^	^	^	^	2.22	^	^

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. See appendix table 6 for standard errors.

^Too few cases to provide a reliable rate.

*Comparison group.

**Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

^aIncludes federal, state, and private prisons.

^bEstimates from 2005 are not comparable to those in 2006 to 2011 due to a change in reporting.

^cIncludes local and private jails.

^dExcludes facilities housing juveniles only.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2005–11.

Substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate abusive sexual contact and staff sexual harassment increased between 2005 and 2011

Between 2005 and 2011, the number of substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate abusive sexual contact rose from 173 to 250, and the number of incidents of staff sexual harassment rose from 48 to 102 (table 7). Substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate nonconsensual sexual acts dropped from 326 in 2005 to 224 in 2011; however, this drop was not statistically significant. At the same time, the number of substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct was statistically unchanged (338 in 2005 and 327 in 2011).

Among all substantiated incidents in 2011, nearly half (48%) involved staff sexual misconduct or harassment. The percentage of incidents involving staff has fluctuated, with the lowest in 2005 (44%) and the highest in 2006 (56%) and 2009 (53%) (not shown).

Incident-level findings

Administrators were asked to provide detailed information on a separate form for each substantiated incident of sexual victimization. Authorities reported on the circumstances of each incident, characteristics of victims and perpetrators, type of pressure or physical force used, impact on victims, and sanctions imposed on the perpetrators. These reports provide a profile of victims and perpetrators and show consistent patterns of victimization by type of incident across types of correctional facilities.

Inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization

Correctional authorities reported detailed data on substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimizations, including nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive contacts. Taking into account weights for sampled facilities, detailed data were provided on 1,124 incidents that occurred between 2009 and 2011. These incidents involved an estimated 1,194 inmate victims and 1,285 inmate perpetrators.

TABLE 7
National estimates of total substantiated incidents of sexual victimization, by type of incident, 2005–11

Type of incident	2011*	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
Total	902	856	851	931	1001	967	885
Inmate-on-inmate nonconsensual sexual acts	224	198	202	235	268**	262	326
Inmate-on-inmate abusive sexual contacts	250	239	195**	272	218**	158**	173**
Staff sexual misconduct	327	319	388**	361	452**	471**	338
Staff sexual harassment	102	99	66**	63**	63**	70**	48**

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. See appendix table 7 for standard errors.

*Comparison group.

**Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2005–11.

Force was used in about two-thirds of substantiated incidents of nonconsensual sexual acts

Force or threat of force was more common among incidents of nonconsensual sexual acts (66%) than among incidents of abusive sexual contact (27%) (table 8). An estimated 15% of victims of nonconsensual acts with other inmates said they were persuaded or talked into it; 7% said they were bribed, blackmailed, or given drugs or alcohol. More than half (52%) of victims of abusive sexual contacts reported an absence of any force or threat, persuasion, bribery, or other types of pressure. About 1 in 8 of the victims of abusive sexual

contacts said they had been grabbed, groped, or attacked while asleep, or had been masturbated on or in front of against their will (not shown).

Prison and jail inmates reported similar levels of force and coercion in substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization. Overall, 44% of the victims reported experiencing physical force or threat of force. About 12% of the victims had been talked into it, while 5% had been bribed, blackmailed or given drugs or alcohol to engage in the sexual activity. In more than a third (37%) of the incidents, there was no indication of any force or pressure.

TABLE 8
Selected characteristics of substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization, by type of facility and incident, 2009–11

Characteristic	All facilities ^a	Facility type		Incident type	
		Federal and state prisons*	Local jails	Nonconsensual sexual acts*	Abusive sexual contacts
Incident characteristics					
Number of incidents	1,124	738	332	483	641
Type of pressure or force ^b					
None	36.7%	37.1%	34.4%	17.2%	51.6%**
Force/threat of force ^c	44.2	45.1	42.3	66.2	27.3**
Persuasion or talked into it	12.0	11.8	13.1	15.4	9.3**
Bribery/blackmail/given drugs or alcohol	5.3	5.9	4.2	7.0	3.9**
Offered protection	1.9	2.2	1.2**	3.3	0.8**
Other ^d	8.9	8.1	11.6	2.8	13.5**
Victim characteristics					
Number of victims	1,194	784	356	506	688
Sex					
Male	77.1%	77.9%	73.0%**	88.0%	69.1%**
Female	22.9	22.1	27.0**	12.0	30.9**
Age					
17 or younger	1.3%	0.4%	3.5%**	2.3%	0.6%**
18–24	36.5	34.5	41.5**	36.7	36.5
25–29	20.9	21.1	21.8	24.1	18.6**
30–34	13.5	13.0	13.8	11.1	15.3**
35–39	10.7	11.3	10.0	10.2	11.2
40–44	7.5	9.1	3.0**	6.9	8.0
45 or older	9.5	10.7	6.4**	8.8	10.0
Perpetrator characteristics					
Number of perpetrators	1,285	839	378	573	712
Sex					
Male	80.6%	80.1%	79.0%	88.5%	74.2%**
Female	19.4	19.9	21.0	11.5	25.8**
Age					
24 or younger	21.6%	18.2%	27.7%**	20.3%	22.6%
25–29	16.7	16.5	17.3	16.9	16.6
30–34	16.9	15.0	19.2	18.7	15.6
35–39	9.8	10.7	8.8	11.8	8.2**
40–44	13.0	13.3	13.4	11.6	14.2
45 or older	21.9	26.3	13.5**	20.7	22.9

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. For other characteristics of victims and perpetrators and circumstances surrounding incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization, see appendix tables 10 and 12. See appendix table 8 for standard errors.

*Comparison group.

**Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

^aIncludes private prisons and jails, jails in Indian country, and facilities operated by the U.S. military and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

^bDetail sums to more than 100% because multiple responses were allowed.

^cIncludes threatened with physical harm, physically held down or restrained in some way, physically harmed or injured, and threatened with a weapon.

^dIncludes unwanted grabbing, groping or touching; all sexual actions while the victim was asleep; masturbation on or in front of the victim; and verbal sexual harassment.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2009–11.

Female inmates were disproportionately victimized by other inmates

Between 2009 and 2011, females represented about 7% of sentenced prison inmates, but accounted for 22% of all victims of substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization in federal and state prisons.¹ Similarly, during these 3 years, females represented about 13% of inmates in local jails but 27% of all victims.²

Nearly 1 in 3 victims (31%) of abusive sexual contacts and 1 in 8 victims (12%) of nonconsensual acts were females. The proportion of male victims was significantly higher for nonconsensual sexual acts (88%) than for abusive sexual contacts (69%).

¹See *Prisoners in 2011*, NCJ 239808, BJS web, December 2012.

²See *Jail Inmates at Midyear 2011 - Statistical Tables*, NCJ 237961, BJS web, April 2012.

BJS Surveys of Sexual Victimization in Correctional Facilities

Section 4(a)(1) of the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (PREA) requires the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) to “carry out, for each calendar year, a comprehensive statistical review and analysis of the incidence and effects of prison rape” (P.L. 108–79).

BJS has developed a multiple-measure, multiple-mode data collection strategy to fully implement requirements under PREA, including three surveys relating to inmate sexual victimization. The Survey of Sexual Violence (SSV) collects administrative data annually on the incidence of sexual victimization in adult and juvenile correctional facilities. The National Inmate Survey (NIS) and the National Survey of Youth in Custody (NSYC) gather data on the incidence of sexual assault as reported by inmates in prisons and jails and by youth held in juvenile facilities.

Victims and perpetrators of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization in jails were younger than those in prisons

About 3.5% of jail inmate victims were age 17 or younger, compared to 0.4% of prison inmate victims. In addition, 42% of jail inmate victims were age 18 to 24, compared to 35% of prison inmate victims. Likewise, 9% of victims in local jails were age 40 or older, compared to 20% of victims in prisons.

On average, perpetrators of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimizations were older than their victims. About 45% of inmate perpetrators were age 35 or older, compared to 28% of their victims. A greater percentage of perpetrators in local jails were age 24 or younger, compared to perpetrators in prisons. Perpetrators of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization in local jails were more likely to be age 24 or younger (28%) than perpetrators in prisons (18%). Perpetrators in jails (14%) were less likely than perpetrators in prisons (26%) to be 45 or older.

Females represented about a quarter (26%) of perpetrators of abusive sexual contacts, compared to about an eighth (12%) of perpetrators of nonconsensual sexual acts. The percentage of male perpetrators was significantly higher for nonconsensual sexual acts (88%) than for abusive sexual contacts (74%).

Fewer than 1 in 5 substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization resulted in an injury

About 18% of substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization resulted in a physical injury (table 9). More than a third (6.6%) of these incidents involved a major injury, typically involving anal or vaginal tearing.

The percentage of inmate-on-inmate incidents resulting in an injury was nearly identical in prisons (18%) and local jails (17%). More than a quarter (28%) of the substantiated incidents of nonconsensual sexual acts resulted in injury, compared to a tenth (11%) of incidents of abusive sexual contacts. About 14% of the nonconsensual sexual acts involved a major injury.

TABLE 9
Impact on victims and perpetrators of substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization, by type of facility and incident, 2009–11

Impact	All facilities ^a	Facility type		Incident type	
		Federal and state prisons*	Local jails	Nonconsensual sexual acts*	Abusive sexual contacts
Victim injured					
No	81.8%	82.0%	82.6%	71.8%	89.4%**
Yes	18.2%	18.0%	17.4%	28.2%	10.6%**
Major injury ^b	6.6	6.2	7.1	13.9	1.1**
Other injury ^c	13.2	14.0	10.9	17.3	10.1
Medical follow-up for victim					
Given medical examination	51.5%	54.4%	41.1%**	62.2%	43.3%**
Administered rape kit	15.5	15.0	17.3	32.3	2.6**
Tested for HIV/AIDS	9.6	10.5	8.2	19.7	1.8**
Tested for other STDs	9.4	10.9	6.9**	19.4	1.7**
Provided counseling or mental health treatment	43.2	49.9	29.0**	47.5	39.8**
None of the above	35.9	32.6	47.0**	26.6	43.0**
Change in housing/custody for victim					
Placed in administrative segregation or protective custody	34.2%	33.8%	33.3%	46.6%	24.9%**
Placed in medical unit, ward, or hospital	10.8	9.1	12.9**	17.0	6.0**
Confined to own cell/room	5.9	3.5	12.1**	7.9	4.4**
Given higher level of custody in facility	1.2	0.7	2.7**	0.8	1.5
Transferred to another facility	8.9	11.2	4.2**	12.3	6.3**
Other ^d	12.4	11.4	17.0**	12.9	12.1
None of the above	39.7	42.8	34.0**	23.1	52.3**
Sanctions imposed on perpetrator					
Solitary/disciplinary	72.5%	75.6%	62.9%**	73.8%	71.5%
Legal action	31.7%	27.0%	43.1%**	48.1%	19.0%**
Arrested	7.5	2.7	18.7**	12.0	4.0**
Referred for prosecution	27.0	22.4	37.8**	44.3	13.6**
Other ^e	4.1	5.1	2.4**	4.1	4.2
Confined to own cell/room	13.9%	13.4%	16.1%	16.0%	12.3%**
Placed in higher custody within same facility	17.5%	16.8%	18.3%	19.2%	16.2%
Extra work	2.6%	3.9%	0.0%**	0.6%	4.2%**
Loss of privileges	21.7%	22.4%	21.5%	17.9%	24.6%**
Transferred to another facility	16.3%	21.6%	5.4%**	18.3%	14.7%**
Loss of good time/increase in bad time	16.7%	21.8%	5.2%**	13.6%	19.0%**
Other ^f	9.7%	10.0%	10.2%	8.3%	10.9%
None ^g	2.5%	2.5%	3.0%	2.2%	2.8%

Note: Detail sums to more than 100% because multiple responses were allowed. See appendix table 9 for standard errors.

*Comparison group.

**Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

^aIncludes private prisons and jails, jails in Indian country, and facilities operated by the U.S. military and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

^bIncludes knife or stab wounds, broken bones, anal or vaginal tearing, chipped or knocked out teeth, internal injuries, and knocked unconscious.

^cIncludes bruises, black eye, sprains, cuts, scratches, swelling, and welts.

^dIncludes moved to different unit, disciplinary report issued, stayed in unit, already released, and other.

^eIncludes given new sentence, revocation of probation or parole, fined, and referred to state police or legal services.

^fIncludes verbal reprimand, separated from victim, and other.

^gIncludes nothing, not disciplined, victim refused to cooperate, and perpetrator not competent.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2009–11.

About two-thirds of victims of nonconsensual sexual acts were given a medical examination; a third were administered a rape kit

Medical treatment and services available to inmates after a sexual victimization include medical exams, rape kits, testing for HIV/AIDS or other sexually transmitted diseases, and counseling or mental health treatment. In 73% of the incidents of nonconsensual sexual acts, victims received one or more of these services (not shown). Victims in 62% of these incidents received a medical exam. Counseling (48% of incidents) and administering a rape kit (32%) were also common.

For victims of abusive sexual contacts, medical examinations (43%) and counseling services (40%) were the most common responses to victimization. However, in 43% of the incidents of abusive sexual contacts, no medical follow-up was provided.

Although victims were equally likely to have been injured in incidents in prisons and jails, victims were less likely to be given a medical examination in jails (41%) than in prisons (54%). In addition, while the percentage of incidents involving no force or threat of force in jail (42%) was nearly equal to that in prisons (45%), the percentage of incidents in which no medical follow-up was provided was substantially higher in jails (47%) than in prisons (33%).

Most victims experienced a change in their housing

The most common response in substantiated incidents of sexual victimization among inmates was to place the victim in administrative segregation or protective custody. Among incidents of nonconsensual sexual acts, 47% of the victims were placed in administrative segregation or protective custody, 17% were placed in a medical unit, and 12% were transferred to another facility. Among incidents of abusive sexual contacts, 25% were placed in administrative segregation or protective custody, 6% were placed in a medical unit, and 6% were transferred to another facility. Nearly a quarter (23%) of the victims of nonconsensual acts and about half (52%) of the victims of abusive sexual contacts experienced no change in housing or custody level.

Most inmate perpetrators were placed in solitary confinement

Solitary confinement was the most frequent sanction imposed on perpetrators of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization, but the type of sanctions imposed varied by facility and incident type. Perpetrators in prisons (76%) were more likely than perpetrators in local jails (63%) to be placed in solitary confinement, transferred to another facility (22% compared to 5%), and receive a loss of good time or increase in bad time (22% compared to 5%).

Perpetrators of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization in local jails were more likely to be sanctioned with legal action (43%) than were perpetrators in prisons (27%). These legal actions included arrest (19% in jails compared to 3% in prisons) and referral for prosecution (38% compared to 22%).

Sanctions were more severe for nonconsensual sexual acts than for abusive sexual contacts

Perpetrators were subjected to legal action for 48% of substantiated incidents of nonconsensual sexual acts, compared to 19% of abusive sexual contacts. Perpetrators were referred for prosecution in 44% of the substantiated nonconsensual sexual acts, compared to 14% of abusive sexual contacts.

Almost all perpetrators, regardless of type of victimization, received a sanction (98%). Other sanctions included loss of privileges (22%), placement in a higher custody level (18%), loss of good time or increase in bad time (17%), and transfer to another facility (16%).

Staff-on-inmate sexual victimization

Correctional authorities also reported detailed data on substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct and harassment. Taking into account weights for sampled facilities, detailed data were provided on 1,257 incidents that occurred between 2009 and 2011. These incidents involved an estimated 1,393 inmate victims and 1,286 staff perpetrators.

Females were disproportionately victimized by staff in state and federal prisons and local jails

Following the same pattern as inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization, females account for a greater proportion of victims of staff-on-inmate victimization than they do in

the overall inmate population. Females account for 7% of sentenced prison inmates, but represent 33% of all victims of staff-on-inmate sexual victimization in federal and state prisons (table 10). Similarly, females represent only 13% of inmates in local jails, but 67% of all victims of staff-on-inmate victimization.

TABLE 10
Selected characteristics of victims and staff involved in substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct and harassment, by type of facility and incident, 2009–11

Characteristic	All facilities ^a	Facility type		Incident type	
		Federal and state prisons*	Local jails	Staff sexual misconduct*	Staff sexual harassment
Victim characteristics					
Number of victims	1,393	895	380	1,076	317
Sex					
Male	58.8%	67.4%	32.8%**	59.2%	57.5%
Female	41.2	32.6	67.2%**	40.8	42.5
Age					
17 or younger	0.5%	0.2%	1.4%**	0.4%	1.0%**
18–24	17.5	14.8	22.6%**	17.0	19.8
25–29	26.5	24.3	31.5	27.0	25.0
30–34	23.9	24.9	20.7	24.7	21.2
35–39	14.6	16.5	9.5	15.2	12.6
40–44	10.0	10.6	11.3	10.5	8.2
45 or older	6.9	8.7	3.0%**	5.3	12.3%**
Staff characteristics					
Number of staff	1,286	798	360	1,005	281
Sex					
Male	51.9%	41.9%	80.0%**	45.7%	73.9%**
Female	48.1	58.1	20.0%**	54.3	26.1%**
Age					
24 or younger	7.7%	6.5%	10.6%	8.2%	6.0%
25–29	18.2	15.3	23.2	20.7	9.0%**
30–34	16.2	17.0	16.2	14.6	21.9%**
35–39	15.2	14.6	15.0	15.4	14.6
40–44	14.9	15.0	15.4	16.0	11.0
45–54	19.8	22.3	14.4	17.9	26.5%**
55 or older	7.9	9.3	5.3%**	7.1	10.9%**
Type of staff involved					
Full/part-time employee	88.5%	85.4%	93.6%**	87.1%	93.7%**
Contract employee/vendor	9.7	12.0	5.5%**	10.4	6.7%**
Volunteer/intern	0.8	1.1	0.3%**	0.9	0.4%**
Other ^b	1.4	1.5	1.7	1.6	0.8%**
Position of staff involved ^e					
Administrator	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%	0.6%	0.8%
Correctional officer	68.6	61.9	87.5%**	66.6	76.2%**
Clerical	3.8	2.7	1.2	4.3	1.5%**
Maintenance/other facility support	10.4	12.5	4.3%**	9.9	12.3%**
Medical or other health care	10.4	12.8	5.7%**	11.4	6.5%**
Education staff	2.2	3.3	0.0%**	2.5	0.8%**
Other program staff ^c	4.4	6.3	1.2%**	4.5	3.8%**
Other ^d	1.1	0.5	3.0%**	1.3	0.4

Note: For other characteristics of victims and staff involved in substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct and harassment, see appendix table 15. See appendix table 14 for standard errors.

*Comparison group.

**Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

^aIncludes private prisons and jails, jails in Indian country, and facilities operated by the U.S. military and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

^bIncludes employees at victim's worksite, employees of other agencies, public defenders, and public health service employees.

^cIncludes chaplains, religious services volunteers, public defenders, employees in correctional industries, and employees at off-site work.

^dIncludes bus drivers, other transportation employees, detectives, unspecified contractors, and other unspecified staff.

^eDetail sums to more than 100% because multiple responses were allowed.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2009–11.

Female staff were more frequently implicated in sexual misconduct in prisons; male staff in local jails

About 54% of incidents of staff sexual misconduct and 26% of incidents of staff sexual harassment were perpetrated by females. Males perpetrated 46% of incidents of staff sexual misconduct and 74% of incidents of staff sexual harassment. In state and federal prisons, 67% of inmate victims of staff sexual misconduct or harassment were male, while 58% of staff perpetrators were female. In local jails, 67% of victims were female, while 80% of perpetrators were male.

Staff members involved in sexual misconduct were younger than those involved in sexual harassment

Nearly 30% of staff members in substantiated incidents of sexual misconduct were age 29 or younger, compared to 15% of those in incidents of sexual harassment. Conversely, staff members were age 45 or older in 37% of sexual harassment incidents and 25% of sexual misconduct incidents.

Correctional officers were implicated in two-thirds of substantiated incidents

A correctional officer was identified as the perpetrator in 62% of the incidents in prisons and in 88% of incidents in jails. A correctional officer was the perpetrator in 76% of the incidents of staff sexual harassment and 67% of the incidents of staff sexual harassment. Overall, 69% of the incidents involved a correctional officer.

Among all substantiated incidents in prisons, 13% involved medical or other health care staff and 12% involved maintenance or other facility support staff. Among substantiated incidents in jails, 6% involved staff in medical or health care and 4% involved maintenance or other facility support.

BJS reports on sexual victimization in correctional facilities

Sexual Victimization in Juvenile Facilities Reported by Youth, 2012 (NCJ 241708)

Sexual Victimization in Prisons and Jails Reported by Inmates, 2011–12 (NCJ 241399)

Sexual Victimization Reported by Former State Prisoners, 2008 (NCJ 237363)

Sexual Victimization in Juvenile Facilities Reported by Youth, 2008–09 (NCJ 228416)

Sexual Victimization Reported by Adult Correctional Authorities, 2007–2008 (NCJ 231172)

Sexual Victimization in Prisons and Jails Reported by Inmates, 2008–09 (NCJ 231169)

Sexual Victimization in Local Jails Reported by Inmates, 2007 (NCJ 221946)

Sexual Victimization in State and Federal Prisons Reported by Inmates, 2007 (NCJ 219414)

Sexual Violence Reported by Correctional Authorities, 2006 (NCJ 218914)

Sexual Violence Reported by Juvenile Correctional Authorities, 2005–06 (NCJ 215337)

Sexual Violence Reported by Correctional Authorities, 2005 (NCJ 214646)

Sexual Violence Reported by Correctional Authorities, 2004 (NCJ 210333)

The sexual relationship “appeared to be willing” in nearly three-quarters of incidents of staff sexual misconduct

Correctional authorities reported that the sexual contact between the inmate and staff “appeared to be willing” in 59% of substantiated incidents (table 11). However, few incidents of staff sexual harassment were determined to be willing (2%). When limited to incidents of staff sexual misconduct only, nearly three-quarters (74%) were classified as “appeared to be willing.” Any sexual contact between inmates and staff is illegal, regardless of whether it “appeared to be willing.”

Physical force, abuse of power, or pressure was involved in 13% of incidents of staff sexual misconduct. An estimated

10% of the incidents of staff sexual misconduct involved unwanted touching for sexual gratification, and 9% involved indecent exposure, invasion of privacy, or voyeurism.

The nature of staff-on-inmate sexual victimizations also differed by type of facility. Pressure or abuse of power was more common among substantiated incidents in jails (23%) than in prisons (4%), as was indecent exposure or voyeurism (18% of incidents in jails, compared to 4% in prisons). Relationships that appeared to be willing were reported in 66% of substantiated incidents in prisons and in 44% of incidents in jails.

TABLE 11
Characteristics of substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct and harassment, by type of facility and incident, 2009–11

Characteristic	Facility type			Incident type	
	All facilities ^a	Federal and state prisons*	Local jails	Staff sexual misconduct*	Staff sexual harassment
Number of incidents	1,247	786	344	989	258
Nature of incidents					
Physical force resulting in a nonconsensual sexual act	1.0%	1.1%	0.6%**	1.2%	0.0%**
Pressure or abuse of power resulting in a nonconsensual sexual act	9.6	4.3	22.9**	12.0	0.4**
Indecent exposure, invasion of privacy, or voyeurism	7.6	3.7	18.1**	9.0	2.3**
Unwanted touching for sexual gratification	8.8	6.7	11.8	9.9	4.6
Sexual harassment or repeated verbal statements of a sexual nature by staff	22.4	20.8	21.6	5.5	87.3**
Sexual relationships between inmate and staff that “appeared to be willing”	58.7	66.0	44.5**	73.5	1.9**
Inappropriate sexual and other contacts – willing ^b	4.0	4.4	3.8	2.7	8.9**
Unknown level of coercion	4.9	5.3	5.2	5.8	1.2**
Location of incident					
Victim’s cell/room	16.0%	12.6%	23.2%**	16.0%	16.2%
Dormitory	11.9	11.3	15.2	10.2	18.0**
Common area	13.9	12.7	17.5	12.8	18.2**
Program service area ^c	48.1	51.8	35.6**	48.5	46.8
Staff area ^d	9.0	7.4	5.7	8.8	9.4
Infirmary/medical	4.5	4.5	5.8	3.9	6.8
Outside/yard	16.4	17.8	13.6	18.2	9.7**
Other ^e	3.6	4.1	3.1	3.5	3.7
Time of day					
6 a.m. to noon	38.2%	43.0%	29.8%**	39.8%	31.9%**
Noon to 6 p.m.	47.6	55.0	33.3**	46.7	50.9
6 p.m. to midnight	37.9	34.7	44.9**	37.9	38.1
Midnight to 6 a.m.	21.1	15.5	35.8**	21.8	18.6
Who reported the incident					
Victim	40.1%	36.3%	50.1%**	32.8%	68.2%**
Another inmate (non-victim)	18.4	17.2	22.8	20.1	11.8**
Family of victim	1.2	1.2	1.8	1.4	0.4**
Correctional officer/frontline staff	24.7	25.2	21.1	28.0	12.1**
Other facility staff	13.0	13.4	11.3	13.5	11.3
Anonymous	4.3	5.0	3.8	4.3	4.5
During investigation or monitoring	4.1	4.4	3.8	4.8	1.2**
Other	3.8	5.2	2.1**	4.7	0.4**

Note: Detail sums to more than 100% because multiple responses were allowed. See appendix table 17 for standard errors.

*Comparison group.

**Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

^aIncludes private prisons and jails, jails in Indian country, and facilities operated by the U.S. military and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

^bIncludes kissing, hugging, sharing of phone numbers, exchange of love letters, phone sex, and romantic relationships with no sexual contact.

^cIncludes commissary, kitchen, storage, laundry, cafeteria, workshop, and hallway.

^dIncludes staff office, breakroom, counselors’ office, and administrative office.

^eIncludes vacant room or cell, while in transit, temporary holding cell, and other.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2009–11.

More than a third of incidents of staff-on-inmate victimization occurred in a program service area

The most common location for staff-on-inmate sexual victimization (48%) was in a program service area, such as the commissary, kitchen, storage area, laundry, cafeteria, workshop, and hallway. Other locations included outside or in the yard (16%) and the victim's cell or room (16%), followed by common areas within the cell block (14%), such as a bathroom or a shower.

In prisons, staff-on-inmate victimizations were more likely to occur in a program service area (52%). In jails, program service areas (36%) and the victim's cell (23%) were the most common locations.

Incidents of staff sexual misconduct (48%) were as likely as incidents of sexual harassment (47%) to occur in a program service area. However, incidents of staff sexual harassment were more likely to occur in common areas within the cell block (18%) or a dormitory (18%) than incidents of staff sexual misconduct (13% and 10%).

More incidents of staff sexual misconduct occurred during the daytime hours (6 a.m. to 6 p.m.) in prisons than in jails

Staff sexual victimization occurred at all times of the day, and in many incidents, multiple times. Noon to 6 p.m. was the peak time for both incidents of staff sexual misconduct (47%) and staff sexual harassment (51%).

A higher percentage of all incidents of staff sexual victimization occurred in prisons from 6 a.m. to noon (43%) than in jails (30%), and from noon to 6 p.m. (55%) than in local jails (33%). In jails, incidents were more common from 6 p.m. to midnight (45%) and from midnight to 6 a.m. (36%).

When reported, staff sexual victimization was typically reported by the victim or another inmate, not by a correctional officer or other staff

In more than half of the incidents of staff sexual victimization, either the victim (40%) or another inmate (18%) reported the incident to correctional authorities. In 25% of the incidents, a correctional officer or other frontline staff reported the incident.

The person reporting the incident to authorities differed depending on the type of incident. Significantly fewer incidents of staff sexual misconduct were reported by victims (33%), compared to staff sexual harassment (68%). A higher percentage of incidents of staff sexual misconduct (28%) than incidents of sexual harassment (12%) were reported by correctional officers or frontline staff. Incidents of staff sexual misconduct (5%) were also more likely than incidents of sexual harassment (1%) to have been discovered during an unrelated investigation or through routine monitoring.

Nearly a quarter of victims of staff sexual misconduct were given counseling or mental health treatment

The most frequent type of medical follow-up after an incident of staff-on-inmate sexual victimization was counseling or mental health treatment (22% overall), followed by medical examinations (16%) (table 12). Victims of more severe incidents received more follow-up (32% of staff sexual misconduct victims received at least one type of treatment, compared to 21% of staff sexual harassment

victims). An estimated 23% of victims of staff sexual misconduct received counseling, 19% were given a medical examination, and 5% had a rape kit administered.

Overall, victims in prison and jail received the same types of medical follow-up. The percentage receiving a medical exam, a rape kit, a test for HIV/AIDS or other STDs, or counseling or mental health treatment also did not differ whether the incident occurred in a prison or a jail.

TABLE 12
Impact on victim and staff in substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct and harassment, by type of facility and incident, 2009–11

Impact	All facilities ^a	Facility type		Incident type	
		Federal and state prisons*	Local jails	Staff sexual misconduct*	Staff sexual harassment
Victim injured					
No	99.4%	99.5%	98.9%	99.5%	99.0%
Yes	0.6	0.5	1.1	0.5	1.0
Medical follow-up for victim					
Given medical examination	16.3%	14.3%	15.4%	19.0%	5.5%**
Administered rape kit	3.7	2.3	7.4	4.6	0.0%**
Tested for HIV/AIDS	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.6	0.4%**
Tested for other STDs	1.8	1.7	2.5	2.2	0.4%**
Provided counseling or mental health treatment	22.3	24.6	18.4	23.3	18.5%**
None of the above	70.0	70.1	73.2	67.6	79.1%**
Change in housing/custody for victim					
Placed in administrative segregation or protective custody	23.0%	20.4%	26.0%	26.2%	10.7%**
Placed in medical unit, ward, or hospital	1.4	0.9	2.4	1.6	0.4%**
Confined to own cell/room	1.7	1.7	2.5	1.8	1.6
Given higher level of custody in facility	1.1	1.4	0.6**	1.4	0.0%**
Transferred to another facility	16.6	17.7	13.5	19.8	4.2%**
Other ^b	7.4	5.7	11.6**	8.7	2.4%**
None of the above	59.0	62.0	54.5	53.2	81.6%**
Sanction imposed on staff					
Legal action	45.4%	42.7%	50.9%	55.6%	6.5%**
Arrested	21.5	14.4	40.0**	27.1	0.0%**
Referred for prosecution	38.0	39.9	30.8	46.3	6.1%**
Convicted	0.9	1.1	0.3**	1.0	0.4%**
Loss of job	78.3%	78.7%	75.6%	85.2%	52.3%**
Discharged	41.5	34.7	49.3**	43.6	33.6%**
Staff resigned (prior to investigation)	27.4	33.8	16.5**	31.5	11.5%**
Staff resigned (after investigation)	10.2	10.4	11.7	11.1	6.8%**
Other sanction	16.6%	16.6%	17.8%	9.8%	42.5%**
Reprimanded/disciplined	11.9	9.7	16.9	5.5	35.9%**
Other ^c	7.6	9.2	4.9**	5.5	15.7%**

Note: Detail sums to more than 100% because multiple responses were allowed. See appendix table 18 for standard errors.

*Comparison group.

**Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

^aIncludes private prisons and jails, jails in Indian country, and facilities operated by the U.S. military and Immigration Customs Enforcement (ICE).

^bIncludes moved to different unit, disciplinary report issued, stayed in unit, already released, returned to segregation, and other.

^cIncludes demoted or diminished responsibilities, transferred to another facility, and other.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2009–11.

About 46% of inmates involved in staff sexual misconduct were transferred or placed in segregation

Correctional authorities indicated that the victims of staff sexual misconduct were often placed in administrative segregation or protective custody (26%) or transferred to another facility (20%). However, authorities reported that most victims of staff sexual harassment (82%) experienced no change in their housing or custody level. Placement of victims in a medical unit, ward, or hospital was uncommon, with 1.6% of victims in incidents of staff sexual misconduct receiving such placement.

Overall, 78% of staff perpetrators lost their jobs; 45% were arrested or referred for prosecution

Correctional authorities indicated that staff had been discharged or resigned in 78% of substantiated incidents of sexual misconduct or harassment. Staff had been arrested or referred to prosecution in 45% of incidents. Approximately 17% of the staff perpetrators had been reprimanded, disciplined, demoted, or transferred.

Significantly more staff in prisons (34%) resigned prior to investigation than in jails (17%). Incidents in jails were more likely to result in an arrest (40%) than those in prisons (14%).

Sanctions differed significantly depending on the type of incident. The most commonly imposed sanctions for staff sexual misconduct were loss of job (85% of incidents) and legal action (56%). Staff sexual harassment resulted in loss of job (52%) and other sanctions, such as a reprimand, discipline, demotion, or transfer (43%). Few perpetrators of sexual harassment experienced any legal action (6%).

Incidents of sexual victimization differed by the sex of staff involved

The nature of staff-on-inmate sexual victimizations was significantly different for male and female perpetrators. Among all substantiated incidents, 84% of those perpetrated by female staff “appeared to be willing,” compared to 37% of those perpetrated by male staff (**table 13**). Physical force and pressure or abuse of power were identified in 20% of incidents involving male staff, compared to 1% of incidents involving female staff. Among incidents of male staff

victimization, 35% involved sexual harassment or repeated verbal statements of a sexual nature, 14% involved unwanted touching for sexual gratification, and 13% involved indecent exposure, invasion of privacy, or voyeurism. Among incidents of female staff sexual victimization, 8% involved sexual harassment or repeated verbal statements of a sexual nature, 3% involved unwanted touching for sexual gratification, and 2% involved indecent exposure, invasion of privacy, or voyeurism.

Most staff sexual misconduct was cross-gender. An estimated 93% of the inmates victimized by female staff were males, while 69% of inmates victimized by male staff were females.

Most incidents perpetrated by a female staff member occurred in a program service area (57%), outside or in the yard (16%) or in a staff area (13%). Most incidents perpetrated by a male occurred in a program service area (39%), in the victim’s cell (21%), or in a common area (18%). Correctional officers comprised 83% of the male perpetrators, compared to 55% of the female perpetrators of staff-on-inmate incidents.

Substantiated incidents of male staff victimization (61%) were more likely than incidents of female staff victimization (16%) to have been reported by the victim. Incidents involving female staff (40%) were more likely than incidents involving male staff (12%) to have been reported by correctional officers and frontline staff. In addition, a higher percentage of incidents perpetrated by female staff (19%) than by male staff (8%) had been reported by other facility staff.

Female perpetrators (90%) were more likely than male perpetrators (67%) to lose their job as a result of the staff-on-inmate sexual victimization.

Female staff members (36%) were also significantly more likely than male staff members (20%) to resign prior to an investigation. A higher percentage of male perpetrators (27%) than female perpetrators (15%) had been arrested or received some other sanction, such as a reprimand, discipline, demotion, or transfer (26% of males compared to 7% of females).

TABLE 13**Selected characteristics of substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct and harassment, by sex of perpetrator, 2009–11**

Characteristic	Sex of perpetrator ^a		Characteristic	Sex of perpetrator ^a	
	Male staff*	Female staff		Male staff*	Female staff
Number of incidents	631	595	Age of staff		
Nature of incident^b			24 or younger	6.2%	9.7%**
Physical force resulting in a nonconsensual sexual act	1.7%	0.0%**	25–29	16.8	20.8
Pressure or abuse of power resulting in a nonconsensual sexual act	17.9	1.0**	30–34	14.1	18.1**
Indecent exposure, invasion of privacy, or voyeurism	13.3	1.5**	35–39	14.5	15.1
Unwanted touching for sexual gratification	13.7	3.2**	40–44	14.1	15.7
Sexual harassment or repeated verbal statements of a sexual nature by staff	35.0	7.9**	45–54	22.4	16.1**
Sexual relationships between inmate and staff that “appeared to be willing”	36.8	83.5**	55 or older	11.8	4.5**
Inappropriate sexual and other contacts – willing ^c	2.1	6.2**	Who reported the incident		
Unknown level of coercion	4.7	5.2	Victim	61.0%	15.9%**
Location of incident^b			Another inmate (non-victim)	20.8	15.5**
Victim’s cell/room	21.4%	10.5%**	Family of victim	1.9	0.5**
Dormitory	14.4	9.6	Correctional officer/frontline staff	11.6	39.6**
Common area	17.6	9.9**	Other facility staff	7.5	19.2**
Program service area ^d	38.9	56.9**	Anonymous	4.6	4.2
Staff area ^e	5.0	13.3**	During investigation or monitoring	2.1	6.4**
Infirmary/medical	5.5	3.6	Other	2.9	5.0**
Outside/yard	17.2	16.2	Sanctions imposed on staff^b		
Other ^f	3.7	3.6	Legal action	47.1%	44.4%
Sex of victim			Arrested	27.4	15.3**
Male	31.3%	92.7%**	Referred for prosecution	35.4	41.1
Female	68.7	7.3**	Convicted	1.1	0.7**
Position of staff involved			Loss of job	67.3%	90.0%**
Administrator	0.7%	0.7%	Discharged	38.0	43.9
Correctional officer	82.8	54.5**	Staff resigned (prior to investigation)	20.1	35.9**
Clerical	0.5	7.2**	Staff resigned (after investigation)	10.3	10.6
Maintenance/other facility support	6.1	13.6**	Other sanction	26.1%	6.7%**
Medical or other health care	5.1	15.2**	Reprimanded/disciplined	19.6	3.7**
Education staff	1.1	3.4**	Other ⁱ	11.8	3.4**
Other program staff ^g	3.5	5.5**			
Other ^h	1.6	0.7			

Note: See appendix table 19 for standard errors.

*Comparison group.

**Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

^aExcludes incidents involving both male and female staff.

^bDetail sums to more than 100% because multiple responses were allowed.

^cIncludes kissing, hugging, sharing of phone numbers, exchange of love letters, phone sex, and romantic relationships with no sexual contact.

^dIncludes commissary, kitchen, storage, laundry, cafeteria, workshop, and hallway.

^eIncludes staff office, breakroom, counselors’ office, and administrative office.

^fIncludes vacant room or cell, while in transit, temporary holding cell, and other.

^gIncludes chaplains, religious services volunteers, public defenders, employees in correctional industries, and employees at off-site work.

^hIncludes bus drivers, other transportation employees, detective, unspecified contractors, and other unspecified staff.

ⁱIncludes demoted or diminished responsibilities, transferred to another facility, and other.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2009–11.

Methodology

Sampling

The sampling designs for the Bureau of Justice Statistics' (BJS) 2009, 2010, and 2011 Survey of Sexual Violence (SSV) varied according to the different facilities covered under PREA.

Federal and state prisons

In each year, the survey included the Federal Bureau of Prisons and all 50 state adult prison systems. Prison administrators were directed to report only on allegations of sexual victimization that occurred within publicly operated adult prison facilities and to exclude allegations involving inmates held in local jails, privately operated facilities, and facilities in other jurisdictions.

Privately operated state and federal prisons

In each year, a sample of 125 privately operated state and federal prison facilities was drawn to produce a sample of the private prisons identified by the 2005 Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities. The sampling frame of privately operated prison facilities contained 417 facilities in 2009 and 2010 and 393 in 2011 (after removing prisons that had closed). Facilities were sorted by average daily population (ADP) in the 12-month period ending June 30, 2005. In 2009 and 2010, 71 facilities with ADPs of 488 or more were selected with certainty because of their size. In 2011, 69 facilities with ADPs of 445 or more were selected with certainty (i.e., given a 100% chance of selection in each sample because of their size).

The remaining facilities were sorted by region (i.e., the Northeast, Midwest, South, or West), state, and ADP, and sampled systematically with probabilities proportional to their size. Fifty-four facilities were selected in 2009 and 2010, and 56 in 2011.³

Among the privately operated prisons selected for the survey, 3 had closed prior to data collection in 2009, 14 in 2010, and 10 in 2011. Three facilities selected in 2009 were out-of-scope. Six privately operated prisons did not respond to the survey in 2009:

- Carver Correctional Center, Oklahoma City, OK
- Crossroads Adult Transitional Center, Chicago, IL
- Dismas Charities, El Paso, TX
- Dismas House, St. Louis, MO
- Joseph Coleman Center, Philadelphia, PA
- Stepping Stones (Community Alcohol Drug Center), Mitchell, SD.

³The chance that a facility would be selected was directly related to the size of the facility (i.e., within each stratum, facilities with larger ADPs had a greater chance of being selected than facilities with smaller ADPs).

All selected and active privately operated prisons in 2010 and 2011 participated in the survey.

Public jails

In each year, 700 publicly operated jail facilities were selected based on data reported in BJS's Deaths in Custody Reporting Program (DCRP). Based on the DCRP data in each year prior to the survey, the largest jail jurisdiction was selected in 45 states and the District of Columbia.⁴

Jail jurisdictions with ADPs greater than or equal to 1,000 inmates were also selected with certainty (128 in 2009, 131 in 2010, and 117 in 2011). The remaining jail jurisdictions on the frame were then grouped into three strata.

- In the 2009 sample, 99 jails (out of 1,489) with an ADP of 85 or fewer inmates were selected in the first stratum, 317 jails (out of 770) with an ADP of 86 to 268 inmates were selected from the second stratum, and 110 jails (out of 434) with an ADP of 269 to 999 inmates were selected from the third stratum.
- In the 2010 sample, 117 jails (out of 1,476) with an ADP of 85 or fewer inmates were selected in the first stratum, 247 jails (out of 762) with an ADP of 86 to 267 inmates were selected from the second stratum, and 159 jails (out of 436) with an ADP of 268 to 999 inmates were selected from the third stratum.
- In the 2011 sample, 197 jails (out of 1,489) with an ADP of 87 or fewer inmates were selected in the first stratum, 120 jails (out of 773) with an ADP of 88 to 273 inmates were selected from the second stratum, and 220 jails (out of 427) with an ADP of 274 to 999 inmates were selected from the third stratum.

During the three years, one publicly operated jail closed prior to data collection (in 2009). Among the remaining selected jail jurisdictions in 2009, six did not respond to the survey:

- Bessemer City Jail, Bessemer, AL
- Cooke County Justice Center, Gainesville, TX
- Marshall County Jail, Marshalltown, IA
- Oklahoma County Jail, Oklahoma City, OK
- Osage County Jail, Linn, MO
- Roberts County Jail, Sisseton, SD.

Among the 700 jail jurisdictions selected in 2010, 8 did not respond to the survey:

- Cumberland County Sheriff's Office, Portland, ME
- Erie County Holding Center, Buffalo, NY

⁴Five states with combined jail-prison systems had no public jails: Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

- Houston County Sheriff's Office, Dotham, AL
- Morgan County Sheriff's Office, Decatur, AL
- Pottawatomie County Sheriff's Office, Shawnee, OK
- Ray County Sheriff's Office, Henrietta, MO
- St. Louis Department of Public Safety, St. Louis, MO
- Wichita Falls County Sheriff's Office, Wichita Falls, TX.

Among the 700 selected in 2011, 4 did not respond to the survey:

- Cumberland County Sheriff's Office, Portland, ME
- Ostego County Jail, Gaylord, MI
- Tazewell County Jail, Pekin, IL
- Victoria County Jail, Victoria, TX.

Private jails

In each year, a sample of 15 privately operated jails was selected based on data reported in the DCRP files. The DCRP file listed 41 privately operated jails in 2008, 38 in 2009, and 34 in 2010. The facilities on the sampling frame were sorted by region, state, and ADP. Based on their large ADP, two facilities were selected with certainty in 2009, three in 2010, and four in 2011. The remaining private jails in each year were systematically sampled with probabilities proportional to size.

Among the sampled facilities, one had closed prior to data collection in 2009 and one had closed in 2010. All selected and active, privately operated jails in 2009, 2010, and 2011 participated in the survey.

Other correctional facilities

A sample of 15 adult jails in Indian country was selected each year. Based on BJS's Jails in Indian Country collection program, jails that held adults only or adults and juveniles were eligible for the sampling frame. Jails that held only juveniles were included in the juvenile SSV data collection.

Each year the sample was selected through probabilities proportionate to size, with ADP as the measure of size. For sampling purposes, jails with an ADP of less than one inmate were assigned 1 as their measure of size. Due to their relatively large size, two jails were selected with certainty in 2009, three in 2010, and three in 2011. There were 63 adult jails in Indian country in 2009, 61 in 2010, and 59 in 2011. The remaining jails were sorted by state and ADP and then selected with probability proportionate to size.

Of the adult jails selected in Indian country from 2009 through 2011, one closed prior to data collection:

- Truxton Canyon Adult Detention Center, AZ (closed in 2010).

Five Indian country jails did not respond to the survey:

- Choctaw Justice Complex Adult Division, MS (2011)
- Fort Peck Police Department and Adult Detention, MT (2009)
- Oglala Sioux Tribal Offenders Facility, SD (2010 and 2011)
- Rosebud Sioux Tribal Police Department and Adult Detention, SD (2009)
- Standing Rock Law Enforcement and Adult Detention Center, ND (2011).

Two additional censuses of other correctional facilities were conducted to represent—

- all facilities operated by the U.S. Air Force, U.S. Army, U.S. Navy, and the U.S. Marine Corps in the continental United States
- all facilities operated by or exclusively for Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).⁵

All of the facilities under active operation by the U.S. military and ICE participated in the 2009, 2010, and 2011 surveys.

Nonresponse adjustments

Survey responses were weighted to produce national estimates by type of correctional facility. Data from the Federal Bureau of Prisons, all state systems, and military and ICE facilities received a weight of 1.00 because they were all selected with certainty and had 100% survey participation.

Among public jails, private jails, Indian country jails, and private prisons, facilities were assigned an initial weight equal to the inverse of the probability that they would be selected. In each year, weights for responding public jail jurisdictions were adjusted for nonresponse by multiplying initial weights by the ratio of the sum of initial weights in each stratum to the sum of weights for participating jurisdictions. As a result, the sum of the final weights in each stratum equaled the sum of weights for active jails in each stratum.

Nonresponse adjustments for samples of private jails, private prisons, and Indian country jails were based on ratios of the sum of weights times the measure of size for each affected stratum. Within each stratum, the number of jails or prisons in operation was multiplied by the measure of size (ADP) for each facility and then summed. Within the same stratum, the number of jails or prisons responding to the survey was multiplied by the measure of size for each facility and then summed. The ratio of the first sum to the later sum equaled the nonresponse adjustment factor for the affected stratum. Overall, after adjusting for nonresponse, and summing across all strata, the sum of the measure of size times the adjusted weight equaled the total number of inmates held in private jails, private prisons, and Indian country jails.

⁵Based on information from the ICE integrated decision support system, 19 facilities were operating in 2009 and 2010, and 18 facilities in 2011. In 2011, Willacy Detention Center, TX, no longer operated as an ICE facility.

Reports of sexual victimization

Since BJS first developed uniform definitions of sexual victimization, correctional administrators have significantly enhanced their abilities to report uniform data on sexual victimization. In 2011, administrators in 47 state prison systems reported allegations of abusive sexual contacts separately from nonconsensual sexual acts, an increase of 5 systems since 2006. One state limited counts of nonconsensual sexual acts to completed (versus attempted and completed) acts. The majority of state prison systems reported data on staff sexual misconduct using survey definitions. Four systems were unable to separate staff sexual harassment from misconduct, and one system did not track allegations of staff sexual harassment in a central database.

Public jail administrators were less likely than prison administrators to report sexual victimization based on the definitions provided. More than a quarter (27%) of the 695 public jail jurisdictions selected in 2011 did not record abusive sexual contacts separately from the more serious nonconsensual sexual acts. This is an improvement over the 2006 SSV, in which a third (36%) of public jail jurisdictions did not record this information. Ten public jail jurisdictions did not record allegations of abusive sexual contacts, 10 based counts of nonconsensual sexual acts on completed acts only, and 22 based counts of nonconsensual sexual acts on substantiated incidents only. Finally, four public jail jurisdictions did not keep records on allegations of nonconsensual sexual acts.

Most public jail administrators reported staff sexual victimization based on the SSV definitions. However, 19% could not separate allegations of staff sexual harassment from allegations of staff sexual misconduct. Three did not record allegations of staff sexual misconduct, while 19 recorded substantiated incidents only. Seven did not record allegations of staff sexual harassment.

The published estimates are not adjusted to account for systems and facilities that did not meet the SSV reporting standards. However, these systems and facilities are noted in *Survey of Sexual Violence in Adult Correctional Facilities, 2009–11 - Statistical Tables* (NCJ 244227).

National estimates and accuracy

Estimated standard errors were calculated using SUDAAN.⁶ For summary statistics, the 2009, 2010, and 2011 data files were treated separately. For each file, the sampling information was retained by treating each facility-level sample as its own stratum (or multiple strata in the public jail sample). Each file contained 11 strata.

The 2009, 2010, and 2011 substantiated incident data files were combined and treated as one file. The sampling information for each year was retained by treating each facility-level sample as its own stratum (or multiple strata in the public jail samples), for a total of 33 strata across all three years. A finite population correction was used for both summary- and incident-level estimation.

Estimates of the standard errors are included in appendix tables 1–9, 11, 13–14, and 16–19. These standard errors may be used to construct confidence intervals around survey estimates (e.g., numbers, rates, and percentages), as well as differences between these estimates. For example, based on estimates in table 1 and standard errors in appendix table 1, the 95% confidence interval around the total number of allegations in 2011 is approximately 8,763 plus or minus 1.96 times 93, resulting in a confidence interval of 8,581 to 8,945.

Tests of statistical significance

To facilitate the analysis, differences in the estimates of sexual victimization for subgroups in these tables have been tested for significance at the 95% level of confidence. For example, the difference in the total number of allegations of sexual victimization in 2011 (8,763 allegations) compared to 2010 (8,404), is statistically significant at the 95% level of confidence (**table 1**). In all tables providing detailed comparisons, statistical differences at the 95% level of confidence have been designated with two asterisks (**). The comparison group has been designated with one asterisk (*).

Appendix tables

Appendix tables 10, 12, and 15 have more detailed information on the characteristics of substantiated inmate-on-inmate and staff-on-inmate sexual victimization. All appendix tables are available on the BJS website.

⁶See Research Triangle Institute (2013). SUDAAN Release 11.0.1. Research Triangle Park, NC.

APPENDIX TABLE 1**Standard errors for table 1: National estimates of total allegations of sexual victimization, by type of facility, 2005–11**

Facility type	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
Total	92.9	116.4	87.0	211.7	198.2	168.6	178.9
Prisons	27.9	58.2	25.0	62.8	65.9	49.2	51.7
Jails	88.4	100.5	83.3	202.2	187.0	160.0	170.7
Other adult facilities							
Indian country jails	5.6	3.7	0.0	2.0	0.0	20.7	13.1

Note: Federal prisons, state prisons, military facilities, and ICE facilities were complete enumerations not subject to sampling error.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2005–11.

APPENDIX TABLE 2**Standard errors for table 2: Rates per 1,000 inmates of allegations of sexual victimization, by type of facility, 2005–11**

Facility type	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
Total	0.04	0.06	0.04	0.09	0.14	0.07	0.09
Prisons	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03
Jails	0.12	0.14	0.11	0.25	0.27	0.19	0.23
Other adult facilities							
Indian country jails	^	^	^	^	0.0	^	^

Note: Federal prisons, state prisons, military facilities, and ICE facilities were complete enumerations not subject to sampling error.

^Too few cases to provide a reliable estimate.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2005–11.

APPENDIX TABLE 3**Standard errors for table 3: National estimates of total allegations of sexual victimization, by type of incident, 2005–11**

Type of incident	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
Total	92.9	116.4	87.0	211.7	198.2	168.6	178.9
Inmate-on-inmate nonconsensual sexual acts	46.6	50.1	56.3	127.6	54.1	93.1	136.5
Inmate-on-inmate abusive sexual contacts	33.9	37.5	20.0	37.5	42.1	23.5	44.1
Staff sexual misconduct	42.6	60.5	41.3	163.0	106.4	113.6	89.5
Staff sexual harassment	36.1	38.5	18.1	6.2	134.7	41.9	34.1

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2005–11.

APPENDIX TABLE 4**Standard errors for table 4: National estimates of outcomes of investigations into allegations of sexual violence, by type of facility, 2009–11**

Type of incident	Local jails
Inmate-on-inmate nonconsensual sexual acts	
Substantiated	1.5%
Unsubstantiated	1.6
Unfounded	1.5
Inmate-on-inmate abusive sexual contacts	
Substantiated	1.7%
Unsubstantiated	2.2
Investigation ongoing	2.2
Staff sexual misconduct	
Substantiated	2.0%
Unsubstantiated	2.0
Unfounded	2.3
Staff sexual harassment	
Substantiated	2.7%
Unsubstantiated	4.7
Unfounded	4.8

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2009–11.

APPENDIX TABLE 5**Standard errors for table 5: National estimates of substantiated incidents of sexual victimization, by type of facility, 2005–11**

Facility type	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
Total	30.4	29.6	39.5	37.5	57.0	75.5	90.0
Prisons	10.9	11.1	10.1	15.4	10.1	3.9	9.0
Jail	27.8	27.1	38.2	34.1	56.1	75.1	89.5
Other adult facilities							
Indian country jails	5.6	3.7	0.0	2.0	0.0	7.0	4.6

Note: Federal prisons, state prisons, military facilities, and ICE facilities were complete enumerations not subject to sampling error.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2005–11.

APPENDIX TABLE 6**Standard errors for table 6: Rates per 1,000 inmates of substantiated incidents of sexual victimization, by type of facility, 2005–11**

Facility type	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
Total	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.04
Prisons	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01
Jails	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.06	0.10	0.12
Other adult facilities							
Indian country jails	^	^	^	^	0.00	^	^

Note: Federal prisons, state prisons, military facilities, and ICE facilities were complete enumerations not subject to sampling error.

^Too few cases to provide a reliable estimate.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2005–11.

APPENDIX TABLE 7**Standard errors for table 7: National estimates of total substantiated incidents of sexual victimization, by type of incident, 2005–11**

Type of incident	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
Total	30.4	29.6	39.5	37.5	57.0	75.5	90.0
Inmate-on-inmate nonconsensual sexual acts	12.6	7.6	30.7	22.5	10.3	25.6	79.1
Inmate-on-inmate abusive sexual contacts	10.6	14.6	4.0	14.6	8.9	8.2	28.9
Staff sexual misconduct	17.2	19.7	24.3	27.2	54.7	69.8	30.0
Staff sexual harassment	12.6	11.1	6.4	3.0	4.0	9.1	4.8

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2005–11.

APPENDIX TABLE 8**Standard errors for table 8: Selected characteristics of substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization, by type of facility and incident, 2009–11**

Characteristic	All facilities	Local jails	Incident type	
			Nonconsensual sexual acts	Abusive sexual contacts
Incident characteristics				
Type of pressure or force				
None	0.9%	2.9%	1.4%	1.1%
Force/threat of force	1.0	3.4	1.7	0.8
Persuasion or talked into it	0.7	2.2	1.3	0.6
Bribery/blackmail/given drugs or alcohol	0.3	1.2	0.8	0.1
Offered protection	--	0.1	0.1	--
Other	0.8	2.8	0.8	1.3
Victim characteristics				
Sex				
Male	0.7%	2.4%	1.1%	1.0%
Female	0.7	2.4	1.1	1.0
Age				
17 or younger	0.2%	0.7%	0.5%	--
18–24	1.0	3.2	1.7	1.2%
25–29	0.8	2.7	1.7	0.7
30–34	0.8	2.5	1.5	0.8
35–39	0.6	2.1	1.1	0.8
40–44	0.3	0.7	0.5	0.3
45 or older	0.7	2.0	1.0	0.9
Perpetrator characteristics				
Sex				
Male	0.6%	2.1%	1.0%	0.8%
Female	0.6	2.1	1.0	0.8
Age				
24 or younger	0.9%	2.9%	1.1%	1.2%
25–29	0.7	2.5	1.5	0.6
30–34	0.8	2.6	1.4	1.0
35–39	0.5	1.8	0.9	0.6
40–44	0.6	2.1	1.1	0.7
45 or older	0.7	2.3	1.1	0.7

--Less than 0.05%.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2009–11.

APPENDIX TABLE 9

Standard errors for table 9: Impact on victims and perpetrators of substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization, type of facility and incident, 2009–11

Impact	All facilities	Local jails	Incident type	
			Nonconsensual sexual acts	Abusive sexual contacts
Victim injured				
No	0.6%	2.0%	1.3%	0.6%
Yes	0.6%	2.0%	1.3%	0.6%
Major injury	0.4	0.8	0.9	--
Other injury	0.5	1.6	0.9	0.6
Medical follow-up for victim				
Given medical examination	1.0%	3.0%	1.9%	1.1%
Administered rape kit	0.8	2.5	1.5	0.4
Tested for HIV/AIDS	0.5	1.7	1.1	0.4
Tested for other STDs	0.4	1.2	0.8	0.4
Provided counseling or mental health treatment	1.0	3.0	1.7	1.1
None of the above	1.1	3.4	1.8	1.2
Change in housing/custody for victim				
Placed in administrative segregation or protective custody	1.0%	3.3%	1.6%	1.2%
Placed in medical unit, ward, or hospital	0.5	1.5	0.8	0.5
Confined to own cell/room	0.7	2.4	0.9	1.1
Given higher level of custody in facility	0.2	0.8	--	0.4
Transferred to another facility	0.3	1.0	0.4	0.5
Other	0.7	2.3	1.1	0.9
None of the above	0.9	2.9	1.4	1.2
Sanctions imposed on perpetrator				
Solitary/disciplinary	0.9%	3.1%	1.3%	1.3%
Legal action	1.0%	3.3%	1.7%	1.2%
Arrested	0.9	2.7	1.8	0.4
Referred for prosecution	1.0	3.3	1.7	1.2
Other	0.3	1.1	0.7	0.2
Confined to own cell/room	0.7%	2.1%	1.2%	0.7%
Placed in higher custody within same facility	0.8%	2.7%	1.7%	0.6%
Extra work	--	0.0%	--	0.1%
Loss of privileges	0.8%	2.8%	1.1%	1.2%
Transferred to another facility	0.3%	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%
Loss of good time/increase in bad time	0.4%	1.1%	0.6%	0.5%
Other	0.5%	1.7%	0.6%	0.8%
None	0.2%	0.6%	0.4%	0.1%

--Less than 0.05%.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2009–11.

APPENDIX TABLE 10

Other characteristics of victims and perpetrators in substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization, by type of facility and incident, 2009–11

Characteristic	All facilities ^a	Facility type		Incident type	
		Federal and state prisons*	Local jails	Nonconsensual sexual acts*	Abusive sexual contacts
Victim characteristics					
Number of victims					
One	93.9%	94.3%	91.9%	95.0%	93.1%
Two or more	6.1	5.7	8.1	5.0	6.9
Race/Hispanic origin					
White ^b	70.2%	74.9%	61.2%**	66.5%	72.9%**
Black/African American ^b	18.1	16.5	22.9%**	17.7	18.5
Hispanic/Latino	8.9	5.6	14.7%**	11.6	6.9**
Other ^{b,c}	3.0	3.1	1.1**	4.2	2.1**
Perpetrator characteristics					
Number of perpetrators					
One	91.8%	92.0%	92.8%	90.2%	93.1%**
Two or more	8.2	8.0	7.2	9.8	6.9**
Race/Hispanic origin					
White ^b	42.9%	45.6%	35.6%**	35.9%	48.4%**
Black/African American ^b	44.5	44.4	48.1	51.3	39.2**
Hispanic/Latino	9.0	6.9	12.0**	8.2	9.6
Other ^{b,c}	3.8	3.2	4.6	4.9	3.0

Note: Excludes victims and perpetrators with unknown sex, age, race, or Hispanic origin. See appendix table 11 for standard errors.

*Comparison group.

**Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

^aIncludes private prisons and jails, jails in Indian country, and facilities operated by the U.S. military and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

^bExcludes persons of Hispanic or Latino origin.

^cIncludes persons identified as American Indian, Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian, other Pacific Islander, and persons of two or more races.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2009–11. Note: Excludes victims and perpetrators with unknown sex, age, race, or Hispanic origin. See appendix table 11 for standard errors.

APPENDIX TABLE 11

Standard errors for appendix table 10: Other characteristics of victims and perpetrators in substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization, by type of facility and incident, 2009–11

Characteristic	All facilities	Local jails	Incident type	
			Nonconsensual sexual acts	Abusive sexual contacts
Victim characteristics				
Number of victims				
One	0.8%	2.5%	1.6%	0.6%
Two or more	0.8	2.5	1.6	0.6
Race/Hispanic origin				
White	1.1%	3.3%	1.8%	1.2%
Black/African American	0.7	2.5	1.0	1.0
Hispanic/Latino	0.9	2.8	1.7	0.8
Other	0.3	0.1	0.7	<0.01
Perpetrator characteristics				
Number of perpetrators				
One	0.5%	1.4%	0.8%	0.5%
Two or more	0.5	1.4	0.8	0.5
Race/Hispanic origin				
White	0.9%	2.9%	1.5%	1.1%
Black/African American	0.9	3.2	1.6	1.1
Hispanic/Latino	0.7	2.3	1.4	0.7
Other	0.7	2.1	0.9	0.9

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2009–11.

APPENDIX TABLE 12

Circumstances surrounding substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization, by type of facility and incident, 2009–11

Circumstance	All facilities ^a	Facility type		Incident type	
		Federal and state prisons*	Local jails	Nonconsensual sexual acts*	Abusive sexual contacts
Location of incident					
Victim's cell/room	50.4%	47.5%	56.0%**	61.8%	41.6%**
Dormitory	14.4	16.5	9.8**	8.4	19.0**
Common area	21.8	22.5	20.1	16.1	26.2**
Program service area	8.7	10.5	5.1**	4.8	11.7**
Other areas ^b	10.6	8.5	14.6**	13.4	8.5**
Time of day					
6 a.m. to noon	25.0%	26.7%	21.1%**	23.5%	26.1
Noon to 6 p.m.	31.8	33.5	30.4	27.6	35.0**
6 p.m. to midnight	43.3	43.1	43.7	46.0	41.3
Midnight to 6 a.m.	17.6	16.4	19.1	23.6	13.0**
Who reported the incident					
Victim	73.3%	73.9%	71.4%	72.2%	74.1%
Another inmate	14.0	13.0	17.4	12.9	14.9
Correctional officer	17.7	15.7	21.8**	19.2	16.5
Other staff/employees ^c	3.7	1.9	7.1**	4.8	2.9
Other ^d	4.6	3.9	6.5	6.3	3.2**

Note: Detail sums to more than 100% because multiple responses were allowed. See appendix table 13 for standard errors.

*Comparison group.

**Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

^aIncludes private prisons and jails, jails in Indian country, and facilities operated by the U.S. military and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

^bIncludes in the perpetrator's cell or room, in a temporary holding cell within the facility, outside the facility, while in transit, and other.

^cIncludes administrative staff, medical or healthcare staff, instructor or teacher, counselor, and chaplain or other religious official.

^dIncludes family of victim, anonymous caller, family of staff, family of perpetrator, on security camera, intercepted mail, and internal affairs.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2009–11.

APPENDIX TABLE 13

Standard errors for appendix table 12: Circumstances surrounding substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization, by type of facility and incident, 2009–11

Circumstance	All facilities	Local jails	Incident type	
			Nonconsensual sexual acts	Abusive sexual contacts
Location of incident				
Victim's cell/room	1.0%	3.4%	1.6%	1.2%
Dormitory	0.6	1.9	1.0	0.7
Common area	0.9	3.1	1.3	1.2
Program service area	0.4	1.3	0.2	0.6
Other areas	0.5	1.7	1.0	0.6
Time of day				
6 a.m. to noon	0.8%	2.4%	1.3%	0.9%
Noon to 6 p.m.	1.0	3.3	1.6	1.2
6 p.m. to midnight	1.1	3.5	1.9	1.2
Midnight to 6 a.m.	0.6	2.1	1.4	0.4
Who reported the incident				
Victim	1.0%	3.2%	1.5%	1.2%
Another inmate	0.9	3.0	1.2	1.3
Correctional officer	1.0	3.1	1.9	0.9
Other staff/employees	0.4	1.1	0.9	0.4
Other	0.5	1.6	0.9	0.4

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2009–11.

APPENDIX TABLE 14

Standard errors for table 10: Selected characteristics of victims and staff involved in substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct and harassment, by type of facility and incident, 2009–11

Characteristic	All facilities	Local jails	Incident type	
			Staff sexual misconduct	Staff sexual harassment
Victim characteristics				
Sex				
Male	1.6%	4.0%	1.7%	3.4%
Female	1.6	4.0	1.7	3.4
Age				
17 or younger	--	0.1%	--	0.1%
18–24	1.0%	3.2	1.2%	2.1
25–29	1.3	4.2	1.4	2.5
30–34	1.2	4.3	1.4	2.3
35–39	1.2	3.6	1.2	2.7
40–44	0.9	3.4	1.1	1.2
45 or older	0.3	1.2	0.4	1.0
Staff characteristics				
Sex				
Male	1.5%	3.3%	1.5%	4.5%
Female	1.5	3.3	1.5	4.5
Age				
24 or younger	0.8%	2.6%	0.9%	1.1%
25–29	1.4	4.8	1.7	1.5
30–34	0.9	3.1	0.6	3.2
35–39	1.4	3.3	1.1	5.0
40–44	1.2	3.7	1.4	2.5
45–54	1.4	4.2	1.5	4.0
55 or older	0.4	1.4	0.5	0.9
Type of staff involved				
Full/part-time employee	0.5%	1.5%	0.6%	0.9%
Contract employee/vendor	0.5	1.5	0.4	1.7
Volunteer/intern	--	--	--	--
Other	0.3	1.1	0.4	--
Position of staff involved				
Administrator	0.2%	0.7%	0.2%	--
Correctional officer	0.9	2.0	1.1	1.4%
Clerical	0.7	0.1	0.9	0.1
Maintenance/other facility support	0.4	1.1	0.4	1.0
Medical or other healthcare	0.5	1.7	0.5	1.4
Education staff	--	0.0	0.1	--
Other program staff	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2
Other	0.4	1.3	0.5	--

--Less than 0.05%.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2009–11.

APPENDIX TABLE 15

Other characteristics of victims and staff involved in substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct and harassment, by type of facility and incident, 2009–11

Characteristic	All facilities ^a	Facility type		Incident type	
		Federal and state prisons*	Local jails	Staff sexual misconduct*	Staff sexual harassment
Victim characteristics					
Number of victims					
One	91.3%	90.2%	91.3%	92.7%	85.9%**
Two or more	8.7	9.8	8.7	7.3	14.1%**
Race/Hispanic origin					
White ^b	54.2%	54.3%	62.3**	53.1%	57.8%
Black/African American ^b	34.2	36.5	24.0**	34.6	33.0
Hispanic/Latino	8.9	6.7	11.1	9.4	7.0
Other ^{b,c}	2.8	2.5	2.6	2.9	2.2
Staff characteristics					
Number of staff involved					
One	97.3%	98.9%	95.8%**	98.6%	92.1%**
Two or more	2.7	1.1	4.2**	1.4	7.9**
Race/Hispanic origin					
White ^b	65.7%	70.1%	65.0%	64.8%	68.9%
Black/African American ^b	27.1	24.4	28.0	27.6	25.1
Hispanic/Latino	5.7	4.2	5.9	6.2	3.8**
Other ^{b,c}	2.0	1.7	1.5	1.9	2.2

Note: See appendix table 16 for standard errors.

*Comparison group.

**Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

^aIncludes private prisons and jails, jails in Indian country, and facilities operated by the U.S. military and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

^bExcludes persons of Hispanic or Latino origin.

^cIncludes persons identified as American Indian, Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian, other Pacific Islander, and persons of two or more races.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2009–11.

APPENDIX TABLE 16

Standard errors for appendix table 15: Other characteristics of victims and staff involved in substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct and harassment, by type of facility and incident, 2009–11

Characteristic	All facilities	Local jails	Incident type	
			Staff sexual misconduct	Staff sexual harassment
Victim characteristics				
Number of victims				
One	0.7%	2.7%	0.9%	1.3%
Two or more	0.7	2.7	0.9	1.3
Race/Hispanic origin				
White	1.3%	4.0%	1.5%	3.3%
Black/African American	1.1	3.2	1.4	3.2
Hispanic/Latino	0.7	2.6	0.9	1.1
Other	0.4	1.3	0.5	0.1
Staff characteristics				
Number of staff involved				
One	0.4%	1.5%	0.3%	1.7%
Two or more	0.4	1.5	0.3	1.7
Race/Hispanic origin				
White	1.3%	3.8%	1.5%	3.7%
Black/African American	1.4	3.7	1.4	3.6
Hispanic/Latino	0.6	1.2	0.8	0.2
Other	0.4	1.1	0.5	0.1

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2009–11.

APPENDIX TABLE 17

Standard errors for table 11: Characteristics of substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct and harassment, by type of facility and incident, 2009–11

Characteristic	All facilities	Local jails	Incident type	
			Staff sexual misconduct	Staff sexual harassment
Nature of incident				
Physical force resulting in a nonconsensual sexual act	--	--	--	0.0%
Pressure or abuse of power resulting in a nonconsensual sexual act	1.7%	5.9%	2.1%	--
Indecent exposure, invasion of privacy, or voyeurism	1.4	4.8	1.8	0.1
Unwanted touching for sexual gratification	1.1	2.8	1.0	3.7
Sexual harassment or repeated verbal statements of a sexual nature by staff	1.1	3.6	0.6	1.1
Sexual relationships between inmate and staff that “appeared to be willing”	1.7	5.8	2.1	0.1
Inappropriate sexual and other contacts – willing	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.5
Unknown level of coercion	0.7	2.3	0.8	0.1
Location of incident				
Victim’s cell/room	1.2%	4.2%	1.3%	2.8%
Dormitory	1.3	4.6	1.5	1.8
Common area	1.3	4.6	1.5	1.8
Program service area	1.3	4.4	1.5	3.0
Staff area	1.1	2.7	1.3	2.3
Infirmiry/medical	0.7	2.5	0.3	3.0
Outside/yard	1.2	3.4	1.3	2.9
Other	0.3	1.0	0.4	0.2
Time of day				
6 a.m. to noon	1.5%	5.3%	1.8%	2.1%
Noon to 6 p.m.	1.1	3.4	1.2	2.8
6 p.m. to midnight	1.5	4.4	1.6	4.2
Midnight to 6 a.m.	1.6	5.5	1.8	3.2
Who reported the incident				
Victim	1.4%	4.7%	1.5%	3.9%
Another inmate (non-victim)	1.0	3.6	1.1	2.6
Family of victim	0.3	1.1	0.4	--
Correctional officer/frontline staff	1.6	5.1	1.7	3.9
Other facility staff	0.9	2.3	1.1	1.1
Anonymous	0.7	2.4	0.7	2.4
During investigation or monitoring	0.3	1.0	0.4	0.1
Other	0.2	0.6	0.2	--

--Less than 0.05%.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2009–11.

APPENDIX TABLE 18**Standard errors for table 12: Impact on victim and staff in substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct and harassment, by type of facility and incident, 2009–11**

Impact	All facilities	Local jails	Incident type	
			Staff sexual misconduct	Staff sexual harassment
Victim injured				
No	0.2%	0.8%	--	1.0%
Yes	0.2	0.8	--	1.0
Medical follow-up for victim				
Given medical examination	0.7%	2.2%	0.9%	0.6%
Administered rape kit	1.1	3.8	1.3	0.0
Tested for HIV/AIDS	0.3	0.9	0.3	--
Tested for other STDs	0.3	1.1	0.4	--
Provided counseling or mental health treatment	1.4	4.9	1.7	1.5
None of the above	1.1	3.6	1.3	1.6
Change in housing/custody for victim				
Placed in administrative segregation or protective custody	1.5%	5.5%	1.9%	1.5%
Placed in medical unit, ward, or hospital	0.3	1.1	0.4	--
Confined to own cell/room	0.3	0.9	0.3	0.1
Given higher level of custody in facility	--	--	--	0.0
Transferred to another facility	1.2	3.5	1.4	1.0
Other	0.7	2.6	0.9	0.1
None of the above	1.7	6.0	2.0	1.8
Sanction imposed on staff				
Legal action	1.4%	4.6%	1.4%	0.5%
Arrested	1.4	4.7	1.7	0.0
Referred for prosecution	1.7	6.1	2.0	0.5
Convicted	0.1	--	0.1	--
Loss of job	1.5%	5.0%	1.5%	3.7%
Discharged	1.8	5.9	2.1	3.8
Staff resigned (prior to investigation)	1.0	3.3	1.3	0.6
Staff resigned (after investigation)	0.8	2.9	1.0	1.1
Other sanction	1.2%	3.8%	1.0%	3.7%
Reprimanded/disciplined	1.1	3.8	1.0	3.6
Other	0.5	1.5	0.2	1.9

--Less than 0.05%.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2009–11.

APPENDIX TABLE 19

Standard errors for table 13: Selected characteristics of substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct and harassment, by sex of perpetrator, 2009–11

Characteristic	Sex of perpetrator		Characteristic	Sex of perpetrator ^a	
	Male staff	Female staff		Male staff	Female staff
Nature of incident			Age of staff		
Physical force resulting in a nonconsensual sexual act	0.1%	0.0%	24 or younger	1.1%	1.1%
Pressure or abuse of power resulting in a nonconsensual sexual act	3.2	--	25–29	2.6	1.3
Indecent exposure, invasion of privacy, or voyeurism	2.6	0.4	30–34	1.6	0.7
Unwanted touching for sexual gratification	1.5	1.6	35–39	1.6	1.9
Sexual harassment or repeated verbal statements of a sexual nature by staff	2.0	1.5	40–44	2.0	1.5
Sexual relationships between inmate and staff that “appeared to be willing”	3.0	1.5	45–54	2.4	0.5
Inappropriate sexual and other contacts—willing	0.3	0.2	55 or older	0.9	0.2
Unknown level of coercion	1.3	0.2	Who reported the incident		
Location of incident			Victim	2.3%	0.6%
Victim’s cell/room	2.2%	0.4%	Another inmate (non-victim)	1.9	0.6
Dormitory	2.4	0.6	Family of victim	0.6	--
Common area	2.4	0.7	Correctional officer/frontline staff	2.4	1.7
Program service area	2.0	1.4	Other facility staff	0.7	1.7
Staff area	0.9	2.5	Anonymous	1.3	0.1
Infirmery/medical	1.3	0.1	During investigation or monitoring	0.5	0.2
Outside/yard	1.8	1.5	Other	0.3	0.2
Other	0.6	0.1	Sanctions imposed on staff		
Sex of victim			Legal action	2.4%	1.6%
Male	1.8%	0.3%	Arrested	2.5	1.0
Female	1.8	0.3	Referred for prosecution	3.1	1.5
Position of staff involved			Convicted	0.2	--
Administrator	0.4%	--	Loss of job	2.8%	0.5%
Correctional officer	1.1	1.4%	Discharged	3.1	1.6
Clerical	--	1.5	Staff resigned (prior to investigation)	1.4	1.3
Maintenance/other facility support	0.4	0.7	Staff resigned (after investigation)	1.6	0.3
Medical or other health care	0.8	0.5	Other sanction	2.1%	0.2%
Education staff	--	0.1	Reprimanded/disciplined	2.1	0.2
Other program staff	0.1	0.2	Other	0.9	0.1
Other	0.7	--			

--Less than 0.05%.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Sexual Violence, 2009–11.



The Bureau of Justice Statistics, located in the Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, collects, analyzes, and disseminates statistical information on crime, criminal offenders, victims of crime, and the operation of justice systems at all levels of government. William J. Sabol is acting director.

This report was written by Allen J. Beck and Ramona R. Rantala. Jessica Rexroat (former BJS intern) assisted with the jurisdiction-level tables and summary-level national estimates. Alexia Cooper and Ramona R. Rantala verified the report.

Paul Guerino (former BJS statistician) and Ramona R. Rantala were the project managers for the Survey of Sexual Victimization, 2009–11. Greta B. Clark carried out data collection and processing, under the supervision of Stephen G. Simoncini, Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce. Linda Gehring and Patricia Torreyson assisted in the data collection. Suzanne M. Dorinski drew the facility samples and provided sampling weights.

Lynne McConnell (Lockheed Martin), Morgan Young, and Jill Thomas edited the report, and Barbara Quinn and Morgan Young produced the report.

January 2014, NCJ 243904



NCJ 243904

Office of Justice Programs
Innovation • Partnerships • Safer Neighborhoods
www.ojp.usdoj.gov